



**Western Cape  
Government**

Environmental Affairs &  
Development Planning

**BETTER TOGETHER.**



**Greenest Municipality Competition  
Report 2015**

## Contents

Speech by Minister.....	2
Acknowledgements .....	5
Introduction and Background .....	6
Objectives.....	6
Purpose of the Report .....	7
The rationale for the GMC.....	7
Co-ordination of GMC and the Evaluation Process .....	7
The Evaluation Panel .....	7
Participation by Municipalities.....	8
GMC Awards 2015 .....	11
Feedback: Internal Audit (IA) .....	11
Celebrating 5 Years! .....	13
GMC Awards: Categories 2015.....	14
Overview Reports 2015.....	20
Element 1: Integrated Waste Management Report .....	21
Integrated Waste Management.....	22
Element 2: Climate Change Response Report .....	69
Element 3: Biodiversity and Coastal Management.....	81
Element 4: Water Management & Conservation .....	102
Element 5: Air Quality Management .....	131
Element 6: Leadership, Compliance, Public Participation & Institutional Arrangements .....	142
Introduction .....	143
Evaluation Process .....	143
Participation by Municipalities.....	144
Element Evaluation Criteria / Methodology 2015.....	144
Compliance Evaluation and Process.....	145
Mark Allocation Methodology .....	145
District Mark Allocation .....	146
Evaluation Results.....	147
Local Spreadsheet .....	147
District Spreadsheet .....	147
Summarised findings for all participating municipalities .....	148
Local Municipality:.....	148
Conclusion .....	154



## Speech by Minister

Provincial Minister, MEC Bredell

Local Government, Environmental Affairs and Development Planning

GMC Awards Ceremony; Monday, 02 November 2015

Lord Charles Hotel, Somerset West

We are gathered here this evening for the purpose of recognizing and awarding prizes to municipalities that have worked extremely hard to achieve the expected targets in the Greenest Municipality Competition, also known as the (GMC). We are now in the fifth year of hosting the competition in the Western Cape, with evident great improvement. Let me hasten to add that the response to our call has improved significantly, but with evident challenges, since the launch of GMC in 2011 within the Western Cape. The participation level of both local and district municipalities is supposed to increase each year, as a sign of our true commitment to improving communities that we serve. There is a greater room for improvement. Some municipalities seem to be losing their cutting edge and passion for participation in the GMC. Information submitted for evaluation through the GMC Questionnaire, which is the evaluating tool for the Desktop evaluations is insufficient in some cases, and thus undermining the objectives of the competition.

On the other hand, there is an energy of innovation and leadership which continues to emanate from our Western Cape Municipalities. The work delivered on in this competition, by participating municipalities, is the essence of what is needed to create a space of socio-economic growth and prosperity. Municipalities are striving in implementing the characteristics of participation, transparency, responsiveness, consensus orientation, equity, effectiveness and efficiency, accountability and strategic vision. The Greenest Municipality Competition requires municipalities to become actively involved in advancing the objectives of the Green Economy which encompass the need to facilitate the introduction of initiatives such as solar energy, greening programmes and introduce programmes which reduce greenhouse emissions. The competition is aimed at encouraging sustainable developments while providing work opportunities and encourages innovation.

Creating clean living spaces, exploring avenues for job opportunities, restoring community pride and creating a sense of belonging for the people we serve are the socio-economic issues which we are able address through this competition. As we work hand in hand we start, and continue to create sustainable lifestyles for our communities better together.

Themes evaluated in the competition include

- Waste Management
- Climate Change Response
- Biodiversity Management, Coastal Management & Beautification
- Water Management and Conservation
- Air Quality Management and
- Leadership, Compliance, Institutional Arrangements & Public Participation

Ladies and gentlemen, ceasing an opportunity also means exposure. We must expose platforms and spaces through which we conduct sustainable municipal affairs. We must acknowledge municipalities for environmental good practice.

Each participating municipality in this competition, has in my opinion, cemented the gravity of how best the different spheres of government can have an impact by working towards a common vision.

It was also pleasing to observe the consistency of some municipalities in the competition and this gives us the reassurance that we are on the right path to achieve our objectives. We are continuing to engage communities in raising awareness about the role they should play in striving for sustainable lifestyles. It is still disturbing to find public spaces neglected, litter and waste has become a common sight to some municipal facilities. There seem to be no sense of pride in greening and beautifying public spaces. Open spaces where children are supposed to be playing and feeling safe have been neglected. This is an indication that we still have to work harder to change attitudinal and behavioural perceptions for future generations. On the same note I must commend some municipalities who are truly striving to make our province liveable.

**This competition must allow us to tell stories of hope:**

- Of how our public spaces have become a choice of destination for our communities.

**It must allow us to tell stories:**

- Of how we converted the perceptions that we do not have pride in our living spaces to telling stories of how we constantly feel at home in our communities.

**This competition must allow us to tell stories:**

- Of how we converted bare areas into beautiful green spaces in which our children play.

**It must allow each municipality to tell their own story:**

- Of how they have realised their enhanced service delivery potential by participating in our Greenest Municipality Competition.

In conclusion, as we celebrate the big achievement, winning municipalities should always remember that they have set the bar very high and that will make other competing municipalities envious. However, the standard you have set can also inspire others to work even harder to meet and exceed

your performance. In other words, positive results put you on the spotlight which others would like to occupy. To stay there and ward off competition would require winning municipalities not only to be consistent but also to double the efforts. My advice to you is that, you should always challenge yourself on gained achievements and push your horizons even further in pursuit of new goals. This way, no one will catch up with you.

Ladies and gentlemen, participating municipalities, my Department under the leadership of Mr Piet van Zyl, Director Sustainability- Mr Ronald Mukanya and your team;

Allow me to express my sincere gratitude for your ability to bring together individuals, communities, different spheres of government and leaders, to ensure that we work today, to provide a beautiful and clean socio-economic environment for our children tomorrow.

**Thank you.**

## Acknowledgements

Environmental Affairs & Development Planning acknowledges both District and Local municipalities with their communities for participation and dedication in striving to adhere to the vision of making the Western Cape Better Together.

Our gratitude goes out to all Mayors, Councillors, Municipal Managers, Senior Management and municipal officials of the respective municipalities that participated in the competition and attended the award ceremony on 02nd November 2015.



### **DEADP Management Support:**

- MEC A. Bredell (MEC: Local Government , Environmental Affairs &Development Planning)
- Mr P Van Zyl (Head of Department: Environmental Affairs & Development Planning)
- Ms K Shippey (Chief Director: Environmental Sustainability)
- Mr G Arendse (Chief Director: Environmental Quality)

**DEADP Management across all Chief Directorates are herewith thanked for their continued support in the Greenest Municipality Competition and are hereby acknowledged by Directorate as follows:**

- D: Sustainability (Mr R Mukanya)
- D: Waste Management (Mr E Hanekom)
- D: Environmental Governance (Dr E Palmer)
- D: Biodiversity & Coastal Management (Ms M Laros)
- D: Pollution Management (Dr J Leaner)
- Sub- D: Communications (Mr R. van Jaarsveldt)
- Spatial Information Management (GIS) (Mr A van der Merwe)
- D: Climate Change (Mr G. Isaacs)

## Introduction and Background

The Greenest Municipality Competition (GMC) aims to promote improved service delivery that restores community pride and commitment to caring for the living environment. It also focuses on improved integrated sustainable development strategies in municipalities and serves to improve service delivery by municipalities to communities. The competition is now in its fourth year in the Western Cape Province and includes two categories for evaluation i.e. Local and District Municipalities.

The GMC 2015 cycle started again on a high note as the participating municipalities showed consistent interest. Early this year, both local and district municipalities were invited to participate in the competition which considered efforts in various categories.

Both Local and District Municipalities were evaluated on six different themes as follows:



This competition is undertaken by all nine provinces in South Africa, with the local winners from each Province being entered into the National competition.

The provincial leg of the GMC is currently co-ordinated at DEA&DP by the Directorate: Sustainability, while various directorates within DEA&DP evaluate relevant categories of the submissions.

## Objectives

The Greenest Municipality Competition (GMC) pursues the following objectives:

- To encourage municipalities to mainstream environmental sustainability into the planning and programmes of municipalities
- To promote green technologies
- To provide a platform for showcasing environmental best practice
- To promote networking and dialogue on climate change and sustainable development.

## Purpose of the Report

The purpose of the report is to:

- highlight the results of the 2014/2015 GMC and pays homage to the municipalities which have excelled in the various categories on both a local and a district municipal level
- report on the evaluation process followed for evaluating district and local municipalities
- to highlight areas of improvement across all elements evaluated in the GMC

The rationale for the GMC

The GMC is linked to other global and national environmental initiatives. The competition aims to promote improved service delivery that would restore community pride and commitment to caring for their living environment.

The competition runs on an annual basis and opens to all the Western Cape Local Municipalities. The winners are announced at the annual Awards Ceremony where the prize money is proportionally allocated to the winning Municipalities. The winners at a Provincial level are entered into the National Greenest Municipality Competition as are all the Metropolitan Municipalities across the country.

## Co-ordination of GMC and the Evaluation Process

The Evaluation Panel

The project was co-ordinated by the Directorate Sustainability and the evaluation panel consisted of various officials from four Chief Directorates as follows:

<p><b>D: SUSTAINABILITY</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Alfonso Noble</li> <li>● Rethabile Motloung</li> <li>● Khuthala Swanepoel</li> </ul>	<p><b>D: WASTE MANAGEMENT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Belinda Langenhoven</li> <li>● Simone Bugan</li> </ul> <p><b>Additional participating officials from Directorate Waste Management:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Gregg Adams</li> <li>● Akhona Mbenyana</li> <li>● Alet van Staden</li> <li>● Chantal Dryden</li> <li>● Clayton Hendricks</li> <li>● Deon Stoltz</li> <li>● Marius Venter</li> </ul>
<p><b>D: ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Fahd Said</li> </ul>	
<p><b>D: BIODIVERSITY &amp; COASTAL MANAGEMENT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Albert Ackhurst</li> <li>● Mellisa Naicker</li> </ul>	
<p><b>D: AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Sally Benson</li> <li>● Portia Rululu</li> <li>● Njabulo Masuku</li> <li>● Akhona Ndletyana</li> </ul>	<p><b>D: POLLUTION &amp; CHEMICAL MANAGEMENT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Zayed Brown</li> <li>● Ettiene Roux</li> <li>● Catherine Bill</li> <li>● Nicole Garcia</li> </ul>
<p><b>D: Climate Change</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Lize Jennings</li> <li>● Sarah Birch</li> <li>● Frances van der Merwe</li> </ul>	

## Participation by Municipalities

In this fifth year evaluation cycle of GMC, both district and local municipalities were invited to participate and a positive response was received.

16 local municipalities participated fully by complying with the competition requirements (submitted the completed questionnaire) and these were:

- Bergriver Municipality
- Bitou Municipality
- Breede Valley Municipality
- Stellenbosch Municipality
- Cederberg Municipality
- Drakenstein Municipality
- George Municipality
- Hessequa Municipality
- Knysna Municipality
- Langeberg Municipality
- Laingsburg Municipality
- Mossel Bay Municipality
- Overstrand Municipality
- Saldanha Bay Municipality
- Swartland Municipality
- Witzenberg Municipality

4 District municipalities participated:

- Eden District Municipality
- West Coast District Municipality
- Overberg District Municipality
- Cape Winelands District Municipality

**To note:** City of Cape Town (Metro) is automatically escalated to compete at National level.

## Provincial GMC Approach 2015



Local government in the Western Cape takes the form of one metropolitan municipality, the City of Cape Town, and five district municipalities subdivided into 24 local municipalities.

- City of Cape Town
- West Coast District: Matzikama, Cederberg, Bergrivier, Saldanha Bay, Swartland
- Cape Winelands District: Witzenberg, Drakenstein, Stellenbosch, Breede Valley, Langeberg
- Overberg District: Theewaterskloof, Overstrand, Cape Agulhas, Swellendam
- Eden District: Kannaland, Hessequa, Mossel Bay, George, Oudtshoorn, Bitou, Knysna
- Central Karoo District: Laingsburg, Prince Albert, Beaufort West

For the 2014/15 evaluation cycle, the approach was as follows:

- A letter was sent to all municipalities on 13 March 2015 inviting them to participate in the competition and municipalities were required to complete an entry form for registration with a closing date of the 27 March 2015.
- 16 Local municipalities submitted the relevant entry/registration form
- For District participation, four entries (West Coast District Municipality, Eden District Municipality, Cape Winelands District Municipality and Overberg District Municipality) were received.
- The Questionnaire which served as an evaluating tool was sent to all participating municipalities (during March), upon receipt of the registration form. Municipalities were required to complete questionnaires (local and district); that detail their work in the six areas assessed in the GMC (including their areas of success and challenges) to be submitted no later than 10 July 2015. (With ALL relevant evidence).
- Site visits for verification purposes were open from April – September 2015.
- Evaluators met on the 20 September 2015, to discuss the finalisation of the scores.
- MEC was notified through submission of the winning municipalities for 2015.

- GMC Awards ceremony hosted on the 02 November 2015.
- Greenest Municipality Competition coordinating forum of evaluators, composed of DEADP provincial officials; rated the municipal submissions and recommended the winners.

Both District and Local Municipalities were evaluated on the following themes, with different weights in each category as stipulated below:

### **Local Municipalities**

- ❑ Climate Change Response– **15%**
- ❑ Biodiversity Management, Coastal Management & Urban beautification- **20%**
- ❑ Water Management & Conservation- **20%**
- ❑ Air Quality Management – **15%**
- ❑ Waste Management – **20%**
- ❑ Leadership, Compliance, Institutional arrangements & Public participation – **10%**

### **District Municipalities**

- ❑ Climate Change Response– **10%**
- ❑ Biodiversity Management, Coastal Management & Urban beautification- **25%**
- ❑ Water Management & Conservation- **10%**
- ❑ Air Quality Management – **25%**
- ❑ Waste Management – **20%**
- ❑ Leadership, Compliance, Institutional arrangements & Public participation – **10%**

## GMC Awards 2015



### Feedback: Internal Audit (IA)

An internal audit (IA) was undertaken on the Greenest Municipality Competition 2014 Evaluation Cycle, and some of the audit recommendations were implementable in the current cycle of evaluation i.e 2015/16. Internal audit is an independent, objective assurance and consulting activity designed to add value and improve the operations of the Department. It helps the Department to accomplish its objectives by bringing a systematic, disciplined approach to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of governance, risk management and control processes.

The scope of the audit for GMC has been divided into two phases:

#### Scope 1

Review the current framework and process utilised to adjudicate the Greenest Municipality Competition winners in terms of:

- Benchmarking against best practices and alignment to the National Requirements
- Reliability and Integrity of the Information flowing through the GMC process; and
- The Effectiveness and Efficiency of the GMC Process

## Scope 2

1. The second phase of the audit was conducted in line with the timeframes of the competition which commenced from August 2015 to November 2015. A memorandum outlining the results was issued in the third quarter:
  - Attend and observe all sittings of the assessment and adjudication teams;
  - Where necessary, advising the assessment and adjudication teams on whether the approved criteria, process and methodology is being consistently applied.
  - Reviewing all relevant documentation used in / generated through the assessment and adjudication processes;
  - Reviewing the assessment scores for accuracy and consistency.

The IA consulting engagement aimed at assisting management to strengthen the key controls within the Greenest Municipality Competition by optimizing attainment objectives. The process has added great value to the competition.



GMC Project Co-ordinating Team with Mr S Martin (Internal Auditor)

## Celebrating 5 Years!



DEADP wish to congratulate all 2015 winning municipalities for showing excellence, perseverance, endurance and a compassionate heart for serving the Western Cape Province.



# MOST IMPROVED LOCAL



**MOSSEBAY**  
CLIMATE CHANGE RESPONSE



**BITOU**  
WASTE MANAGEMENT



**GEORGE**  
LEADERSHIP, COMPLIANCE, INSTITUTIONAL  
ARRANGEMENTS & PUBLIC PARTICIPATION



**SWARTLAND**  
AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT

WITZENBERG BIODIVERSITY MANAGEMENT, COASTAL MANAGEMENT & URBAN BEAUTIFICATION (Not pictured here)

# CATEGORY WINNER LOCAL



**OVERSTRAND**  
WASTE MANAGEMENT



**OVERSTRAND**  
BIODIVERSITY MANAGEMENT, COASTAL  
MANAGEMENT & URBAN BEAUTIFICATION



**HESSEQUA**  
LEADERSHIP, COMPLIANCE, INSTITUTIONAL  
ARRANGEMENTS & PUBLIC PARTICIPATION



**MOSSELBAY**  
WATER MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION | CLIMATE CHANGE RESPONSE | AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT

# CATEGORY WINNER DISTRICT



EDEN

WASTE MANAGEMENT | WATER MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION | CLIMATE CHANGE RESPONSE  
 BIODIVERSITY MANAGEMENT, COASTAL MANAGEMENT & URBAN BEAUTIFICATION | AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT LEADERSHIP,  
 COMPLIANCE, INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS & PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

# INNOVATION AWARDS

This special category recognises examples of best practise within the municipalities whereby the entries had to be unique, translating an idea into an invention or a service that creates value.

In addition, the project/idea had to be a first of its kind in the Western Cape by a municipality.



## STELLENBOSCH MUNICIPALITY

Commissioned a project to reduce the volume of builders' rubble to landfill. Builders' rubble is crushed and mixed with clay to manufacture compressed building blocks which is then used at various construction projects.

This project serves Stellenbosch Municipality well by extending the lifespan of the landfill as the disposal of builders' rubble utilises a lot of landfill airspace.



## GEORGE MUNICIPALITY

The Go-George public transport project" which provides a quality public transport service that is reliable, affordable, safe, convenient and accessible.

This project helps to reduce the number of cars driven on the road, thereby contribute in reducing Greenhouse Gases.





**MOSSELBAY MUNICIPALITY**

Three electricians in the Municipality's electricity department saved the Municipality more than R1500 000.00 by designing and building a portable remote-controlled tripping and closing device for 11kV circuit breakers.

This initiative enables the operator to operate these breakers from a safe distance without the risk of injuries or worse.



**WEST COAST DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY**

Through the establishment of the Joint Municipal Air Quality Working Group (JWAQWG) and the entering of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) the WCDM meets the Local Air Quality Officers on a quarterly basis to share expertise and to assist one another with the objective of improving air quality in general.



**OVERBERG DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY**

By-law adopted and assisted Local Municipalities in their jurisdiction to have Air Quality Management Plans.



**CAPE WINELANDS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY**

As part of the Environmental Health Program, the CWDM presented education & awareness raising campaign at 80 schools on Environmental Health and Air Quality within the Cape Winelands District and reached 37 700 learners.

In addition to this, the Cape Winelands District Municipal Health Services has an awareness module on pollution and was presented to Grade 3 learners at various schools within the CWDM.

The CWDM is willing to share their developed resource Nationwide!

# TOP ACHIEVERS DISTRICT

# TOP ACHIEVERS LOCAL



EDEN PRIZE OF R130,000

**GOLD**



HESSEQUA PRIZE OF R130,000



OVERBERG PRIZE OF R70,000

**SILVER**



MOSSSEL BAY PRIZE OF R70,000



CAPE WINELANDS PRIZE OF R50,000

**BRONZE**



SWARTLAND PRIZE OF R50,000

# OVERVIEW REPORTS

## 2015



# ELEMENT 1:

## INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT REPORT



# Integrated Waste Management

## Introduction & Background

The introduction of new waste legislation and mandates for municipalities over the last few years means that a proactive approach is required to become fully compliant with the legislation and meet national and provincial waste related targets. These mandates and targets have been incorporated into the evaluation criteria of the competition. It encourages municipal waste managers to adopt a competitive spirit as they strive to excel in the various performance categories. These categories are also annually reviewed so that the criteria reflect the most critical priorities for waste management in the Western Cape and South Africa. This approach benefits our top performers who also excel in the national leg of the competition.

This year 16 Western Cape local and 4 district municipalities participated in the competition. In most cases tremendous growth was observed which bears testimony to the benefits of a system that incentivises good performance in the delivery of waste management services.

## OBJECTIVES OF EVALUATING INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE GMC

The main objective of evaluating the Integrated Waste Management Evaluation in the GMC is to:

- reward and showcase good practice in the Western Cape to assess the state of waste management in the Western Cape Province which will in turn feed into support strategies and programmes for municipalities ;
- provide constructive feedback and advice to municipalities on its waste performance so that the municipality can improve;
- motivate municipalities to adapt the national and provincial priorities that include meeting waste diversion targets, delivery of equitable waste services for all, improving waste awareness , information management, facility management etc; and
- encourage all municipalities to proactively find creative solutions to all their challenges through their participation in the GMC.

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND CRITERIA

### APPROACH TO INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT EVALUATION

The information submitted in the questionnaire by participating municipalities provides the Directorate: Waste Management with a good indication of the performance of municipalities against criteria that have been formulated to align with current mandates, compliance with national and provincial legislation, and key national and provincial priorities and targets. The evaluation and scoring is based on the information provided in this questionnaire. The Department undertakes a verification process that includes sites visits to all participating local municipalities and interviews with relevant stakeholders. Further consultation takes place with specialised units within the Department who also corroborate the information submitted in the questionnaire. In this way evaluators ensure that the final scores reflect a true and realistic account of the waste management performance of participating municipalities.

## DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY EVALUATION CRITERIA

District municipalities are evaluated on waste management support services, waste problem solving efforts, waste related capacity support provided to local municipalities on the existence, content and implementation of the Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP).

## LOCAL MUNICIPALITY EVALUATION CRITERIA

The physical condition and general cleanliness of an area is evaluated and accounts for 40% of the evaluation. The evaluation includes visits to local municipalities. To assess the cleanliness of town centres, public transport facilities, parks and sports facilities, high income residential areas, low income residential areas, informal residential areas, vacant land, walkways and roads and public open space are evaluated. Waste management facilities are evaluated in terms of compliance with operational and environmental requirements.

Municipal support systems and programmes account for 60% of the evaluation. For this section the panel consulted with various internal and external role players and conducted site visits to verify the information submitted in the competition entry. Criteria evaluated include waste minimisation programmes, waste awareness initiatives, job creation, public private partnerships, special initiatives, information management etc.

## ADJUDICATION AND WEIGHING OF SCORES

After the individual scores of the panel members were completed, the scores were adjudicated, where after it was finalised and the winner and runners up decided upon for the waste management part of the GMC.

## EVALUATION RESULTS

The positions reflected below are the collective results from the assessments and evaluation from the panel members.

Name of Municipality	Section A: Waste Collection Systems (40)	Section B: Support Systems (60)	Final Waste Score (100)
Overstrand Municipality	31.7	51	82.7
Swartland Municipality	37.9	38	75.9
Witzenberg Municipality	30.2	27	57.2
George Municipality	24.8	27	51.8
Stellenbosch Municipality	31.5	28	59.5
Knysna Municipality	27.9	27	54.9
Saldanha Municipality	30.5	26	56.5
Hessequa Municipality	29.8	43	72.8
Mossel Bay Municipality	27.9	37	64.9

Laingsburg Municipality	28.1	6	34.1
Bitou Municipality	29.5	38	67.5
Drakenstein Municipality	33	42	75
Breede Valley Municipality	23.2	37	60.2
Cederberg Municipality	28.7	15	43.7
Bergrivier Municipality	33.6	34	67.6
Langeberg Municipality	28.2	29	57.2

Participating District Municipalities	Position
Eden	1
Overberg	2
Cape Winelands	3
West Coast	4
Participating Local Municipalities	Position
Overstrand	1
Swartland	2
Drakenstein	3
Hessequa	4
Bergriver	5
Bitou	6
Mossel Bay	7
Breede Valley	8
Stellenbosch	9
Langeberg	10
Witzenberg	11
Saldanha Bay	12
Knysna	13
George	14
Cederberg	15
Laingsburg	16

The most improved local municipality is Bitou Municipality and the innovation in waste management award was won by Stellenbosch Municipality. Congratulations to these two municipalities.

## WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE CENTRAL KAROO DISTRICT

### Laingsburg Municipality

#### General impressions

The Municipality maintains a good standard of cleanliness throughout its town and provides an equitable service to all communities including the lower income and informal areas. Sufficient waste receptacles were distributed with anti-litter signage

#### The following operational waste facilities exist in Laingsburg Municipality

- Laingsburg Waste Disposal Facility (WDF) (licensed)
- Matjiesfontein Transfer Station (no license required)

#### Awareness around waste

- There has been no further waste awareness due to the termination of Youth Jobs in Waste programme. This contract has subsequently been renewed and community awareness programmes are planned for the new year. Waste awareness signage is present on the waste bins in the town centres.

#### Waste minimisation

The waste minimisation programme was terminated due to lack of resources. A new service provider has been appointed and will start their waste recovery programme shortly.

- Town inspections:

During visits to Laingsburg and Matjiesfontein, the following was noted:

- The town centres were very clean, and sufficient waste bins were present.
- Vacant land and communal spaces as well as walkways and roads in all residential areas were very clean.
- Bins were, strategically placed on major walk ways.

#### Facilities inspected:

Facility 1: Laingsburg WDF

##### *Positive*

- The facility has lockable gates for access control.
- No unauthorised persons were observed onsite.
- Garden waste was separated from the other waste types.

##### *Negative*

- No recordkeeping was observed.
- Waste was not sufficiently covered and compacted.
- Builders' rubble was not separated from the general waste.
- No container for hazardous waste was provided onsite.

The site was not manned when audits were done and hence it could not be determined whether any protective wear was available or access control is implemented.

#### Facility 2: Matjiesfontein Transfer Station

##### *Positive*

- Some of the waste was removed.
- The facility was secure and fenced, and no unauthorised persons were observed on site.
- The facility was well maintained.

##### *Negative*

- No recordkeeping system was implemented.
  - Signage must be placed at the facility.
  - Cleanliness of the area surrounding the facility must be addressed.
- No provision for the separation and safe disposal of hazardous waste was observed.

#### **Job creation in waste management:**

- Youth in Waste workers are employed by the Municipality with the assistance of the National Department of Environmental Affairs but they have not been utilised effectively for waste awareness.

#### **The Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) and Waste By-law**

- The Municipality does not have an IWMP.
- The Municipality does not have a Waste By-law.

#### **Reporting of information to the Integrated Pollutant and Waste Information System (IPWIS)**

- Waste information is reported, however, there is a need for training on the capturing and reporting of accurate information to the Department.

#### **Suggestions for continuous improvement**

Based on the site visit and the questionnaire submitted for the competition, the Municipality should address the following issues:

- An overall improvement in waste awareness is needed. It is suggested that various methods and media for waste awareness be used. A campaign that uses signage and bill boards with key waste messaging can be very effective. Waste awareness campaigns should also target various sectors within the municipality.
- Negative aspects in terms of facility management needs to be addressed.
- The Municipality should consider supporting a recycling at source project. This can include community based projects with schools; Swop Shops run by NGO's, Buy Back Centres or accessible community drop- off points.
- Green waste could be chipped and composted and opportunities to compost food waste could be considered.
- The Municipality should consider developing a waste bylaw that is aligned with the National Environmental Management Waste Act (NEM:WA) and should take advantage of the model waste bylaw that is being developed by the Department.

## **WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE CAPE WINELANDS DISTRICT**

### **Cape Winelands District Municipality**

#### **The District Municipality has an IWMP which address waste management in the district:**

- The needs of the Cape Winelands District are reflected in the Plan . The most critical need identified is the lack of long term available landfill airspace. The District Municipality is addressing this through a process of identifying suitable sites for the development of a regional landfill(s).
- An overview of the waste management activities in all the local municipalities is included in the District Municipality's IWMP.

#### **District support to local municipalities**

- The District Municipality does not have a dedicated component for waste management. This function is however fulfilled by the Technical Services Department and Environmental Health Practitioners.
- The District Municipality provides a support forum where waste management challenges can be discussed and solutions identified.
- The District Municipality's Environmental Health Services render a waste monitoring service to local municipalities by reporting illegal dumping activities and providing input with respect to waste management.
- The District Municipality assists the local municipalities with regional planning of waste related matters.

#### **Capacity building and communication and projects**

- Capacity building is done at Cape Winelands Integrated Waste Management Forum meetings, where the local municipality officials can learn from each other's successes and failures.
- The District Municipal Health Services division implements awareness programmes. This entails education material provided to schools and business premises. The intention is to capacitate individuals on the 3R's of the waste management hierarchy: Reduce, Reuse, Recycle.
- The District Municipality has initiated two projects recently. This includes a Recycling Plan for the entire District setting out the recycling status quo and requirements for every municipality. The second project is a District Municipality commissioned study to identify and establish regional landfills to provide for the critical need for long term landfill capacity.
- Municipal Health Services Clean-up campaign 2014 had 30 projects using local small-scale contractors to do waste clean-up projects in residential areas throughout the Cape Winelands District. The contractors are educated about pollution control and recycling. The aim of the project is to create awareness with reference to waste management and the environment amongst the general public.
- The District Municipality strives to initiate suitable projects that intend to investigate and solve waste related problems. The District Municipality also facilitates discussions at the mentioned forum meetings.

#### **Support in terms of NWMS and NEM: WA requirements related to waste minimisation and recycling**

- The District Municipality facilitated the development of district wide Recycling Plan. This was done by creating a platform for discussion between the various local municipalities within the Cape Winelands District Municipality.

## **Co-ordination between District Municipalities and Provincial Government**

- The District Municipality personnel attend the Waste Management Forum of the Department.

### **Recommendations:**

- The District Municipality should draft a By-law aligned to the NEM:WA and obtain council approval for it.

## **Breede Valley Municipality**

### **General impressions**

The city centre and public facilities i.e. transport and sport amenities were generally clean but there was limited waste awareness signage observed. Both higher income areas in Worcester and De Doorns were very clean and had signage while lower and informal areas signage was very limited and it was very dirty. The walkways, roads and amenities were relatively clean.

The area is dominated by the following economic sectors:

- Agriculture (28.8%)
- Community services (21.9%)
- Finance (20.2%)
- Manufacturing (11.3%)
- Trade (7.7%)
- Transport (6.1%)
- Construction (2.7%)

### **The following operational waste facilities exist in Breede Valley Municipality:**

- De Doorns WDF (unlicensed)
- Touws River Transfer Station (licensed)
- Touws River Illegal Dumpsite (unlicensed)
- Worcester WDF (licensed)

## **Facility inspected**

### **De Doorns WDF**

*Negative*

- The facility was poorly managed and no systems for access control were evident at the facility.
- Informal waste salvagers were observed on site.
- Personnel onsite did not have protective clothing.
- There was insufficient cover and compaction.
- On the time of visit the existing weighbridge was not operational.
- No waste separation took place at the site.

- No provision is made for the separation of hazardous waste at the facility.

#### **Reporting of information to IPWIS**

- The Municipality reports on waste types and quantities to DEA&DP using the provincial Waste Calculator.

#### **The Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) and Waste By-law**

- The Municipality has an approved second generation IWMP and is currently drafting the third generation IWMP.
- The Municipality has a Waste By-law that is not aligned to the NEM: WA.

#### **Waste minimisation**

The following waste minimisation initiatives are implemented in this Municipality:

- Provides support to swop shops in Avian Park and Zwelethemba;
- There's an ongoing waste separation at source system in place in high income areas;
- There's a Material Recovery Facility in Touws River and Drop off facilities for e-waste and household hazardous waste at Worcester WDF;
- The Municipality has recycling bins at Mountain Mill Mall; and
- Provides recyclables collected to an association for disabled people for waste crafting projects.

#### **Job creation in waste management**

- The Municipality has Expanded Public Work Programme (EPWP) workers for area cleaning and randomly appoint unemployed people on a short term basis.

#### **Awareness around waste**

- "Bin- Bin" is the Municipality's mascot for waste education at schools, clean-up campaigns and at various public engagements within the municipal area.
- The Municipality uses newsletters and local newspapers to communicate waste management information to its citizens.
- Information pamphlets on what can be recycled is also distributed to households.

#### **Suggestions for continuous improvement**

Based on the site visit and the questionnaire submitted for the competition, the Municipality should address the following issues:

- Conduct regular internal audits of waste disposal facilities to improve facility management.
- Conduct a waste characterisation study and establish a record keeping system for facilities without weighbridges.
- Improve waste data collection and report regularly to IPWIS.
- Provide tangible municipal support to community- based waste related projects and swop shops in low income areas.

- Adopt strategies that target various sectors within the municipality to maximise the recovery of recyclables. e.g strategies for low income and informal areas should be different to those of high income residential areas .
- Establish systems and facilities for the recycling of garden refuse and builders' rubble.
- Provide equitable and consistent waste services to all the residential areas including informal areas.
- Improve the visibility of their waste awareness campaign by erecting signage in public spaces and capitalising on major public events to create awareness.
- The Municipality should consider incorporating the informal sector into its waste recovery programme. Engaging with and supporting establish private buy back centres and recyclers in the municipality can improve efficiencies and the recovery of recyclables.
- Improve the provision of waste management services in low and informal areas by providing an effective and consistent waste removal service .
- The municipal Waste By-law is outdated and must be amended to align to the NEM:WA and to reflect national and provincial priorities.

## **Drakenstein Municipality**

### **Operational waste facilities**

- Hermon Drop-off Facility (no environmental authorisation required).
- Wellington Waste Disposal Facility (WDF) (licenced)
- Daljosafat Drop-off Facility (no environmental authorisation required).
- Paarl Transfer Station and Materials Recovery Facility (MRF)(in possession of a record of decision(RoD)).
- Saron Drop-off Facility (no environmental authorisation required).
- Gouda Drop-off Facility (no environmental authorisation required).

### **General Impressions**

The walkways and roads in the city centre were very clean with waste bins along the walkways. The taxi rank and sport facility were clean but there were no visible waste awareness messaging on bins or elsewhere. The higher income residential areas were also very clean. The lower income and informal residential area was not clean and adjacent to vacant land and walkways were strewn with litter. Waste types such as builder's rubble, paper and plastic were observed.

### **Awareness around waste**

The following waste awareness initiatives were implemented:

- Recycling projects are run by a few schools, churches and old age homes in the Municipality.
- Youth employed through the DEA's Youth in Waste programme assist the Municipality with their awareness campaign.
- The Municipality organises a waste week to raise awareness around waste minimisation amongst the community and the target audience are school learners and administration staff.
- Waste awareness signage is placed throughout the Municipality.

- The Municipality places weekly articles in the local and municipal newsletters.

### **Waste minimisation**

- Recycling bins are placed in the public areas such as the shopping mall, pedestrian walkways in the town centres in the form of double bins.
- The chipped green waste is sold at the landfill site and at the transfer station.
- Waste is separated at source in the higher income communities.
- The Municipality appointed a contractor for builders' rubble crushing.
- Recycling igloos are placed strategically within the Municipal area to ensure accessibility and participation by the general public.
- Schools are taken on tours of the waste facilities as part of the waste awareness week campaign which includes an exhibition at the Paarl Mall.

### **Town inspections:**

During visits to Paarl and Wellington it was noted that-

- The town centre was very clean, with sufficient waste bins and waste awareness signage present. However some waste was observed around the recycling igloos.
- Public transport and sport facilities were very clean; however no waste signage was present.
- The higher income residential areas were very clean.
- The lower income residential areas were mostly clean but some waste was observed on the walkways and vacant land.
- The informal residential areas were fairly clean.

### **Facility Management**

Facility 1: Hermon Drop-off Facility

*Positive:*

- Recordkeeping is implemented at the facility.
- Signage at the entrance indicates permissible uses.
- Different waste containers were observed at the facility for waste separation.
- Green waste is taken to Wellington Waste Disposal Facility (WDF) for chipping.
- Containers for the disposal of hazardous waste were observed.
- No unauthorised persons were observed on site.
- The facility was well managed.

Facility 2: Wellington WDF

- The facility has an 87.5% compliance rating (Authority Audit)

### **Job creation in waste management**

- The Municipality has employed 200 people through the implementation of waste related EPWP projects.

### **Special initiatives on waste**

The waste to energy project is currently undergoing and in the final stages of the environmental impact assessment process.

### **The Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) and Waste By-law**

- The Municipality's second generation IWMP has been approved by Council and they are currently in the process of drafting a third generation IWMP .
- The Municipality has a NEM:WA aligned Waste By-law.

### **Reporting of information to the IPWIS**

- The Municipality reports regularly to the IPWIS, however, there is room for improvement as not all reports have been received.

### **Suggestions for continuous improvement**

Based on the site visit and the questionnaire submitted for the competition, the Municipality should address the following issues:

- More work needs to be done to ensure walkways and roads, open areas (such as vacant lands) and amenities (e.g. play parks), in the lower income and informal residential areas are clean.
- Waste awareness signage needs to be placed at public transport facilities, lower income and informal residential areas.

The Municipality must facilitate processes to ensure that communities in lower income areas have an opportunity to recover their waste for recycling and gain benefit from it. This could be in the form of encouraging and supporting buy-back centres or swop shops to operate in these areas.

## **Langeberg Municipality**

### **General impressions**

Langeberg Municipality city centre and residential areas were generally clean and there are waste recovery systems in place that functions very well. Waste collections takes place on a weekly basis and offer an additional door to door waste collection of garden waste and builder's rubble. The waste management facilities are were well operated and maintained. The Municipality successfully diverts substantial quantities of waste from landfill through recovery at the waste facilities.

### **The following operational waste facilities exist in Langeberg Municipality:**

- Ashton WDF (licensed)
- Ashton MRF (licensed)
- Robertson Drop-off (no license required)
- Robertson Compost Facility (unlicensed)

### **Awareness around waste**

The following waste awareness initiatives are implemented:

- Articles in the local newspaper, Langeberg Express, are used to publish articles about waste related activities.
- The waste collection vehicles have signage which informs the public about recycling.
- Pamphlets are distributed on a regular basis to inform residents about the amounts of waste recycled, as well as waste minimisation measures e.g. composting.

### **Waste minimisation**

The following waste minimisation initiatives are implemented in this Municipality:

- A split bag system is implemented in all residential areas within the Municipality, and includes the lower income residential areas.
- Recycling igloos are strategically placed at schools and in the CBD and the Municipality has drop-off facilities for the public to drop recyclable items.
- The Municipality has a clean MRF at Ashton WDF. Recyclables from the split bag system is further separated at the facility.
- Chipping and composting of green waste takes place at the Robertson Drop-off Facility, for which the Municipality has a three year tender in place.

### **Town inspections:**

During visits to Ashton and McGregor the following was noted:

- The town centres i.e., walkways and public facilities were very clean.
- Vacant land and walkways in higher income residential areas were very clean as well.
- Walkways and roads, as well as amenities (public toilets) in the lower income and informal residential areas were relatively clean.
- There was insufficient anti-litter and ant-dumping signage present, especially in vacant areas where littering was observed.

### **Facilities inspected:**

Facility 1: Ashton WDF

*Positive*

- The facility had a weighbridge installed to record all waste that enters and exits the facility.
- Waste was sufficiently covered.
- Compaction of waste took place on a daily basis.
- Access to the facility was controlled. However, many informal waste pickers had access to the site.
- Garden waste was not disposed at the WDF, because it was taken to the composting facility.
- A container was available at Ashton Material Recovery Facility (MRF) for the disposal of hazardous waste (e-waste and light bulbs).

- Municipal staff was wearing protective clothing.
- The recovery of electronic waste for recycling also takes place at the facility.

#### *Negative*

- The area surrounding the disposal area was very dirty at the time of the inspection.
- Builders' rubble was not separated from the general waste component.

#### Facility 2: Ashton MRF

#### *Positive*

- The facility had an operational weigh bridge installed and waste volumes coming in were weighted and recorded.
- Waste containers placed on site for the general public was removed on a monthly basis depending on the load.
- Access to the facility was controlled and no unauthorised persons were found onsite.
- The area surrounding the disposal area was very clean.
- The facility was well maintained.
- Municipal staff was wearing protective clothing.

#### *Negative*

- No containers are provided for hazardous waste, other than containers for E-waste were available at the facility.

#### **Job creation in waste management:**

- The Municipality employs EPWP workers and TEDCOR waste interns at the MRF to sort and group recyclables as well as for cleaning projects.

#### **The Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) and Waste Bylaw**

- The Municipality has an approved second generation IWMP.
- The Municipality has a draft Waste By-law which needs to be approved by council and published.

#### **Reporting of information to Province**

- Langeberg Municipality reports on waste types and quantities to Department using IPWIS and the provincial waste calculator.

#### **Suggestions for continuous improvement**

Based on the site visit and the questionnaire submitted for the competition, the Municipality should address the following issues:

- Improve the visibility of waste minimisation awareness by installing signage in public open spaces and facilities.
- The creation and support of community based initiatives like swap shops or buy- back centres creates awareness and income opportunities for impoverished community members while contributing to the recovery of waste materials in the municipality.

- The Municipality should consider the crushing of builders' rubble which will assist with saving up some landfill air space.

## Stellenbosch Municipality

### **General impressions**

A waste collection service is provided to households by means of the following systems; door-to-door bin collection, door-to-door black bags and waste skips where they are best suited to facilitate collections. Informal areas' waste is collected three times a week, whilst businesses and commercial areas' waste is collected two to three times a week. The Municipality's' waste minimisation initiatives such as the recycling of builders' rubble and waste clay for the manufacture of compressed bricks for construction projects and chipping & composting of green waste.

Stellenbosch is developing a major drop-off in Franschhoek town and it is currently in the site-identification stage.

### **The following operational waste facilities exist in Stellenbosch Municipality:**

- Devon Valley WDF (licensed);
- Klapmuts Transfer Station (licenced); and
- Franschhoek Mini Drop-off (does not require a licence due to its size).

### **Awareness around waste**

The following waste awareness initiatives are implemented:

- The Municipality partners with event organisers of the big festivals that take place in the municipal area to create waste awareness at these events.

### **Waste minimisation**

The following waste minimisation initiatives are implemented in this Municipality:

- The use of a Bokashi treatment system for the fermentation and composting organic waste takes place in informal settlements. eNkanini is one of the townships participating in this project. Events' greening is a requirement before granting permission to host an event in Stellenbosch Municipal Area.
- A split bag system is operational primarily in the medium and high income areas.
- Minimal recycling takes place in low income residential areas.
- The Municipality supports Huis Horison, who further sorts the waste from the Municipality's split bag programme.
- Stellenbosch Municipality has outsourced the chipping and composting of green waste. Chipped green waste is mixed with treated sewerage sludge from waste water treatment works to produce compost.
- The Municipality has approached neighbouring municipalities to consider a regionalised approach to the treatment of organic waste.

### **Town inspections:**

During visits to Stellenbosch and Franschhoek the following was noted:

- The town centres were fairly clean, with a suitable number of waste bins positioned throughout the town.
- However, certain bins were overflowing with waste which indicated a need for more frequent collections.
- Walkways in the lower income and informal residential areas were not clean.
- Windblown litter were seen around amenities.
- Skips were found in informal areas.
- Public transport facilities were not very clean although waste bins were visible.

### **Facilities inspected:**

Facility 1: Devon Valley WDF

*Positive*

- The facility has an 87.5% compliance rating.

Facility 2: Klapmuts Transfer Station

*Positive*

- The facility was clean, well-managed and maintained.
- The facility had access control and lockable gates.
- Waste was removed daily from the facility.
- The facility was fenced and no unauthorised persons were observed on site during the visit.
- Builders' rubble and green waste was separated.
- Transfer station keeps record of waste in skips as they are weighed at the WDF.

*Negative*

- No weigh bridge was in place. The facility should make use of the IPWIS provincial Waste Calculator as a tool to establish waste quantities in the absence weigh bridges.
- Hazardous waste is not catered for.

### **Job creation in waste management:**

- The Youth in Waste project is active in the Municipality whereby 12 previously unemployed youth with matric or a higher qualification were placed to gain specific waste related skills, e.g. waste administration, waste education, awareness training and landfill supervision.
- The Human Resources Department has dedicated a budget for training of its personnel on the basics of waste management.

### **Special initiatives on waste**

- The Municipality is recycling builders' rubble and waste clay by manufacturing compressed blocks to be used at various construction projects. This project was awarded the prize for innovation because of the impact it has on waste diversion from landfill as well as the re-use of construction and demolition waste.
- The Municipality is in the planning phase of waste to energy and a waste treatment facility in Klapmuts.

### **The Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) and Waste By-law**

- The Stellenbosch Municipality is currently in the final stages of finalising their third generation IWMP for submission but it will serve before Council after August 2015 before submission to Department.
- The Municipality does not have a Waste By-law.

### **Reporting of information to Province**

- The Municipality's reporting to the IPWIS system is considered to be good; however there is room for improvement as not all reports have been received.

### **Suggestions for continuous improvement**

Based on the site visit and the questionnaire submitted for the competition, the Municipality could address the following issues:

- The Municipality must submit all reports to the IPWIS.
- Larger waste awareness signage for waste minimisation, recycling, reduction and reuse could be placed in public spaces and facilities.
- Waste recovery programmes aimed at low income communities could be considered.
- A NEM:WA aligned Waste By-law should be developed.

## **Witzenberg Municipality**

### **General impressions**

All areas within the Witzenberg Municipality receive a weekly black bag waste collection service. The town centres, sports facilities and higher income residential areas were clean, while the lower income residential areas and vacant land requires improvement. Bin placement may also need to be reviewed as bins within the town city centre were sufficient, but open areas within the residences were most likely the cause for it not being as well cleaned as expected. Along with the door-to-door black bag collection, the Municipality also offers a green bag collection services for garden waste to the point where skips are provided for garden waste that may be too large for bags. Waste skips are provided, however, waste such as fluorescent tubes was still being dumped as observed during the site visit. To aid the collections mentioned above, the Municipality has procured an 18 tonne compactor tractor and a skip loader. This along with the new EPWP workers contributes to easing the waste management plight and effective service delivery in Witzenberg.

### **The following operational waste facilities exist in Witzenberg Municipality:**

- Op-die-Berg WDF (licensed);
- Tulbagh WDF (licensed);

- Prince Alfred Hamlet WDF (licensed); and
- Wolseley WDF (licensed).

Generally, there is a lack in focussed signage and there is a potential for growth with regard to waste minimisation opportunities.

### **Waste Awareness initiatives waste**

The following waste awareness initiatives are implemented:

- The Municipality has an external newsletter meant for the general public covers issues such as waste minimisation and other greening initiatives.
- Effective waste minimisation practices are communicated through the use of the Municipality's internal newsletter.
- Schools form a great part in awareness. They are specifically involved through the CEROM Schools waste project as well as the Nduli Swop Shop. The Municipality supports the Cerom(Ceres Omgewings Bestuur) Schools Waste Project with black bags and gloves. This project identifies problem areas in terms of littering and a waste clean-up action is then organised and executed by the educators and learners.
- The local community newspaper (Witzenberg Herald), the local community radio station (Valley FM), social media pages such as Facebook, the internet and the municipal website are all media through which information about waste activities, are shared.
- Waste related signage is also used to raise awareness. Corporate signage is present at the municipal offices to promote specific environmental projects.

### **Waste minimisation**

The following waste minimisation initiatives are implemented in this Municipality:

- Low income areas host the Nduli swop shop and the municipality supports them through the collection of recyclables.
- Recycling in the lower income residential areas is facilitated by the Tulbagh Disabled People of South Africa. Recyclables are collected in the lower income residential areas, which are then sold off to generate an income for the organisation.
- Garden waste is diverted through the use of a collection service and skips.
- Another means of minimisation is the placement of recycling igloos at local businesses and schools in Tulbagh, Agrimark in Wolseley and the Tulbagh landfill site. While in Ceres Spar and Pick 'n Pay are the home of recycling igloos for this town.
- The area does not have a material recovery facility, but supports a local recycler who recovers huge volumes of recyclables within the municipal area. Green waste is chipped by the Municipality, while a private composter, is also supported by the Municipality. The compost is then used for crops and other agriculture.
- Excess builder's rubble is used for landfill coverage at the Tulbagh and Prince Alfred's Hamlet WDFs.
- Other waste minimisation initiatives include the use of waste for crafting by the Disabled People of South Africa and schools such as Woveren and Tulbagh High Schools.

### **Town inspections:**

Site visits were conducted towns of Ceres and Tulbagh and it was noted that:

- Sufficient waste bins were observed along major walkways, however, signage on these bins lack waste minimisation messages.
- The town centres were very clean, with adequate waste bins throughout the towns.
- Walkways and amenities in the higher and lower income residential areas were very clean. However, vacant land in the lower income residential areas was dirty.
- Formal residential areas were very clean, while informal residential areas were polluted. Dumping and littering was evident in residential areas.
- Public transport and sports facilities were exceptionally clean.

### **Facilities inspected:**

Facility 1: Tulbagh WDF

#### *Positive*

- The Disabled Peoples Association serves as formal sorters and processors of recyclable waste.
- A container office with a fitted weigh pad was installed for accurate data and efficient record keeping.
- Waste was sufficiently covered and compacted on a daily basis.
- Proper access control was exercised and no unauthorised persons were found onsite.
- Staff onsite was wearing protective clothing.

#### *Negative*

- Numerous complaints of burning on the site. However, this was only noted in the evening after the site was closed.
- Fencing was present but there are gaps in them.
- Garden waste and builders' rubble were not separated from the rest of the waste stream.
- No containers for hazardous waste were provided.

Facility 2: Ceres WDF

#### *Positive*

- A record keeping system was implemented.
- Access control was exercised at the facility.
- Garden waste was separated from the rest of the waste onsite.

## Negative

- Waste was not sufficiently covered and compacted at the facility.
- Unauthorised persons were found onsite.
- Builders' rubble was not separated from the general waste component.
- No containers for hazardous waste were provided by the Municipality.
- Staff members were not wearing protective clothing.

### **Job creation in waste management:**

- EPWP workers were appointed in order to clean up streets, pavements, riverbanks and open spaces in the Municipality. 30 people are employed through this programme.
- 30 previously unemployed individuals from the municipality are contracted monthly as part of a Clean 'n Green programme.
- Community workers programme is in progress to maintain a clean environment within the municipal jurisdiction.

### **Waste partnerships**

- The main partnership is the twinning agreement with Essen Municipality in Belgium in terms of waste minimisation and youth development. Essen Municipality assists with resources to undertake these projects.

### **The Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) and Waste By-law**

- Currently in progress with the third generation IWMP.
- The Municipality has a Waste By-law and is in the process of updating it.

### **Reporting of information to Province**

The Municipality is partially compliant with regards to reporting to IPWIS.

### **Suggestions for continuous improvement**

Based on the site visit and the questionnaire submitted for the competition, the Municipality could address the following:

- More waste awareness signage is needed in the Municipality, specifically in public gathering spaces + facilities.
- Cleanliness in the informal residential area could be improved upon. A combination of the more frequent provision of collection services to additional bins, coupled with localised awareness campaigns could be considered.
- The negative aspects concerning waste facilities needs to be attended to.
- Material recovery needs to be extended to more areas.
- The Municipality is in the ideal position to implement a composting project.
- Crushing of builders' rubble should be investigated.
- The Municipality needs to improve on reporting to IPWIS. The Waste Calculator toolkit should be used at waste facilities that do not have weigh bridges in order to achieve 100% reporting.

- Waste minimisation awareness must be intensified in the municipality.

## **WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE EDEN DISTRICT**

### **Eden District Municipality**

#### **The District Municipality has an IWMP which addresses:**

- The regional IWMP was compiled integrating the seven municipal plans out of which regional needs and gaps were identified and goals with time frames were formulated for implementation. Relevant additional regional functions as identified by Eden DM personnel were also incorporated.
- Eden District Municipality entered into service level agreements with the B-Municipalities for the District Municipality to appoint a single service provider to assist with the review process of second generation IWMPs in order to save on costs and to ensure a uniform approach to waste management activities in the Eden District. The District IWMP was accepted and approved by Council on 31 January 2015 and incorporated into the Eden District Municipal IDP.
- The establishment of a regional landfill facility and alternative waste management technology to accommodate solid waste from the municipalities has already progressed to the final stages of the procurement process. The compilation of a Strategic Waste Minimisation Plan for the Eden District Municipality has also reached its final draft stage and will be presented to Council for approval to implement.
- The Eden Integrated Waste Information System has been finalised and all waste generators in the Eden District Municipal area is in the process of registering and reporting on the system. Integration with IPWIS is also in progress. Processes to ensure the participation of Kannaland and Hessequa Municipalities in Eden Integrated waste management forum meetings, regional waste activities and projects has been started.

#### **District support to local municipalities**

- The District Municipality has a dedicated staff component for waste management which previously supported the local municipalities. However, all municipalities in the Eden District have appointed dedicated staff to manage waste in their areas.
- The District Municipality has appointed a service provider to compile IWMP's for all local municipalities within its jurisdiction.

#### **Capacity building, communication and projects**

- The Eden Integrated Waste Management Forum serves as the project committee for the implementation of all regional waste management projects within the Eden District Municipality.
- Sub-committees of the Eden Integrated Waste Management Forum are appointed to address or investigate specific activities and provide feedback to the Forum.
- Waste related training sessions and presentations were organised over the past year.
- The following projects were initiated, supported and implemented in collaboration with the municipalities:
  - E-waste education, awareness and safe disposal program;
  - Used oil recycling education, awareness and safe disposal program;
  - Waste minimisation road show;

- Wise up on waste education on waste management and minimisation program at pre-schools and schools;
- Development of a regional strategic waste minimisation plan and waste minimisation awareness and education campaign;
- Eden Integrated Waste Information System registration and reporting from all waste generators and recyclers; and
- Waste characterisation at all the municipalities during the four seasons and during the summer holiday time.

### **Co-ordination between District Municipalities and Provincial Government**

- The District Municipality attends the Provincial Waste Management Forum and Recycling Action Group meetings as co-ordinated by the Department.
- The District Municipality is in the process of investigating an electronic link between the Eden Information System and IPWIS.
- Assistance is provided to the Department with regard to blitzes, environmental compliance inspections and other operational issues.
- Incorporation of Provincial Waste Management Programmes for implementation in the Eden District Municipal.

## **Bitou Municipality**

### **General impressions**

The Bitou Municipality is the winner for the "Most Improved Category" for the Waste Management element this year. Congratulations to the Municipality.

The Municipality has improved their efforts related to creating awareness around waste by updating their signage to share the message about recycling. Waste minimisation projects were also implemented by establishing a swap shop, buy back centres and appointing a service provider for the recovery of materials at source.

### **The following operational waste facilities exist in Bitou Municipality:**

- Natures Valley Transfer Station (unlicensed); and
- Plettenberg Bay WDF (licensed).

### **Awareness around waste**

The following waste awareness initiatives are implemented:

- The Municipality embarked on a campaign against illegal dumping.
- Waste management information is provided to residents in the form of a municipal newsletter.
- Signage about waste minimisation is placed within the Municipality. More signage was seen than previously.

### **Waste minimisation**

The following waste minimisation initiatives are implemented in this Municipality:

- The Municipality supports the Qolweni swap shop.
- Two buy-back centres are supported by the LED section of the Municipality.
- The Municipality implements a split bag system and has appointed a service provider for collection.
- Igloos are strategically placed for recyclables to be dropped off by the community.
- Material recovery is supported by the Municipality.

### **Town inspections:**

During visits to Plettenberg Bay and Nature's Valley the following was noted:

- The town centre, walkways and roads, as well as the public transport facilities were clean. Signage was present and addresses recycling.
- The sports facilities were also very clean.
- The higher income residential areas were very clean and had bins with waste awareness signage in communal spaces.
- Lower income and informal residential areas were not clean as littering and illegal dumping was a conspicuous problem in these areas.

### **Facilities inspected:**

Facility 1: Plettenberg Bay Transfer Station

- The facility has a 60% compliance rating.

Facility 2: Natures Valley Transfer Station

*Positive*

- Waste was frequently removed.
- Access control is not exercised but is not necessary as the residents use the facility correctly.
- Signage was present at the facility.
- No unauthorised persons were found onsite.
- The area surrounding the disposal area was clean.
- The facility was well maintained.

*Negative*

- No record keeping system was observed.
- No containers for hazardous waste were provided.
- No staff was present onsite and therefore the use of protective clothing could not be determined.

### **Job creation in waste management:**

- EPWP workers have been employed to assist with collection services. The Municipality implements the 'Food for Waste Recycling' programme, which created 100 job opportunities as well as a participant in the Youth in Waste Programme.

### **The Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) and Waste Bylaw**

Bitou Municipality has developed a second generation IWMP, which has been approved by council.

- The Municipality has a Waste Bylaw. However, the Bylaw is not aligned to the NEM:WA.

### **Reporting of information to Province**

- Bitou Municipality has not reported to the IPWIS or waste calculator in the 2014/2015 financial year.

### **Suggestions for continuous improvement**

Based on the site visit and the questionnaire submitted for the competition, the Municipality could address the following:

- Cleanliness of the lower income and informal residential areas need to be addressed.
- Negative aspects related to facility management need to be addressed.
- Chipping and composting of green waste could be investigated. There is a huge potential for composting or even waste to energy if a large quantity of green waste is generated.
- Crushing of builders' rubble could be investigated.
- The Municipality must start reporting to the IPWIS. The provincial waste calculator toolkit can be used where no weigh bridges are available.
- The Waste Bylaw needs amended to be aligned to NEM:WA and reflect national and provincial priorities.

## **George Municipality**

### **General impressions**

George Municipality provides a weekly waste collection service to residents. Black bags are predominantly used. The town centre, sports facilities and higher income residential areas were clean. However, more needs to be done to clean the lower income and informal residential areas. The management of waste management facilities must also be improved. The Municipality implements a range of waste awareness activities to ensure the distribution of waste management information.

### **The following operational waste facilities exist in George Municipality:**

- Gwaing Builders' Rubble and Garden Refuse Waste Disposal Facility (licensed);
- Gwaing Transfer Station (licensed); and
- Uniondale WDF (unlicensed at the time of site visits).

### **Awareness around waste**

The following waste awareness initiatives are implemented:

- Signage was placed at the main entrances into George.
- Youth in Waste workers raise awareness about various waste management aspects in the communities.
- The municipality use public address systems to create waste awareness once a week in the evenings in residential areas.
- Radio and newspapers are used at least once a month to raise awareness on waste management.
- A door-to-door awareness drive was done on waste management for which a survey was completed and pamphlets on recycling and illegal dumping were distributed.
- Training is given in informal areas on how to recycle.
- Newspaper articles are written on "green projects".
- Presentations on the GMC elements are done at high schools, primary schools and crèches.
- Clean-up campaigns are conducted with community environmental NGO's and other government departments.
- Exhibitions are done at high schools to display environmental information.
- Environmental calendar days are celebrated. For World Environment Day, a clean-up was done on 5 June 2015.
- An information desk is available in area offices.

### **Waste minimisation**

The following waste minimisation initiatives are implemented in this Municipality:

- The Municipality supports the Kretzenhoop Primary School swop shop in Blanco.
- Recycling bins are placed at 17 primary schools within the Municipality.
- The Municipality supports the Buy-back centre operated by Interwaste.
- Used oil is recovered at the Gwaing Transfer Station.

### **Town inspections:**

During visits to George and Blanco it was noted that:

- The town centre, walkways, public transport and municipal sports facilities were very clean. Sufficient bins were provided.
- Signage about keeping the town clean could be seen in the town centre.
- The higher income residential areas were very clean.
- Vacant land, roads and walkways and amenities in both the lower income and informal residential areas were not clean.

- Although waste awareness signage was present, it was not effective in the lower income areas, because vacant land was used as dumping sites.

**Facilities inspected:**

Facility 1: Gwaing Transfer station

*Positive*

- Access control was exercised.
- Signage was visible at the entrance to the facility.
- The facility was well maintained.
- The staff onsite wore protective clothing.

*Negative*

- The facility has a weighbridge but it was not in working order.
- Waste removal does not seem to take place at all.
- Many unauthorised persons were observed onsite.
- The facility needed serious attention in terms of cleanliness at the area surrounding the disposal area.
- No containers for hazardous waste were provided.
- The area adjacent to the transfer station seemed to have been used to dump the waste overflow from the transfer station.

Facility 2: Gwaing Builders Rubble and Garden Waste Facility

*Positive*

- Signage was present.

*Negative*

- No recordkeeping system was implemented.
- Waste was not removed.
- Many informal waste pickers were encountered onsite.
- The area surrounding the disposal area was not clean.
- The facility was not maintained.
- No containers for hazardous waste were provided by the Municipality.
- Staff member's onsite were not wearing protective clothing.

### **Job creation in waste management:**

- The Municipality implemented the Youth Jobs in Waste Programme. Approximately 140 people were also employed for area cleaning in problem areas utilising community contractors. The Municipality also employed 31 informal waste pickers at the transfer station.

### **The Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) and Waste By-law**

- The Municipality's second generation IWMP has been approved by council and has been incorporated into the IDP.
- The Municipality has By-law on Solid Waste Management. However, there is a need for alignment with NEM:WA and with national and provincial priorities.

### **Reporting of information to Province**

- Waste information was regularly reported to the Department.

### **Suggestions for continuous improvement**

Based on the site visit and the questionnaire submitted for the competition, the Municipality could address the following:

- Waste awareness and minimisation signage can be more frequently displayed on bins and billboards.
- Cleanliness in the lower income and informal residential areas needs to be addressed. An investigation to establish the reasons for illegal dumping and littering can be launched in order to address the problem.
- The negative aspects concerning waste facilities needs to be attended to.
- Chipping of garden waste and composting could be initiated in order to reduce the volumes thereof.

## **Hessequa Municipality**

### **General impressions**

The Municipality was found to be clean and facilities generally well maintained. However, improvement is needed in the lower income and informal residential areas.

Awareness activities are conducted to inform the general public about waste management and minimisation. The Municipality also drives quite a number of waste minimisation projects that assists with waste diversion from landfill, extending the lifespan of waste disposal facilities. Cleanliness in the town centres was well maintained.

### **The following operational waste facilities exist in Hessequa Municipality:**

- Albertina WDF (unlicensed at the time of site visits);
- Droëkloof WDF (licensed);
- Steynskloof WDF (licensed);
- Slangrivier WDF (unlicensed);
- Jongensfontein WDF (licensed);
- Stilbaai Garden Refuse and Builders' Rubble Facility (unlicensed);

- Gouritsmond WDF (unlicensed at the time of site visits);
- Witsand WDF (unlicensed); and
- Melkhoutfontein WDF (unlicensed at the time of site visits).

### **Awareness around waste**

The following waste awareness initiatives are implemented:

- Waste awareness articles are placed in the Mayor's monthly newsletter to help create awareness and inform the community of planned waste management road shows and campaigns.
- Waste awareness messages are regularly featured in the local press "Suid Kaap Forum" and posters are placed at Municipal cashier's offices and libraries.
- The Municipality participates in the Eden District Municipality's roadshow as part of the Waste Minimisation Public Awareness and Minimisation Campaign.
- Youth in Waste staff implements awareness campaigns.

### **Waste minimisation**

The following waste minimisation initiatives are implemented in this Municipality:

- The Municipality operates a split-bag system to collect recyclables from households. This service is also extended to low income residential areas.
- The Municipality supports material recovery in collaboration with Henque Waste, who is contracted to operate the MRF and also manages a buy back centre.
- The Municipality acquired a chipping machine and has started chipping garden waste.
- Home composting is promoted by the municipality and residents are provided with composting bins ..
- Used oil is also recovered in the Municipality in co-operation with Eden District Municipality.

### **Town inspections:**

During visits to Heidelberg and Riversdale it was noted that:

- The city centres, walkways and roads, as well as sports facilities were very clean. Sufficient waste awareness signage was also found on walkways and roads.
- Illegal dumping on the vacant land near lower income and informal residential areas was observed subjected.
- Areas adjacent to amenities were fairly clean.

### **Facilities inspected:**

Facility 1: Droëkloof WDF

- The facility has a 75% compliance rating.

Facility 2: Steynskloof WDF

- The facility has a 63% compliance rating.

### **Job creation in waste management:**

- Yearly temporary workers are employed by the Municipality.
- A contractor was appointed to clean residential areas.

### **The Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) and Waste By-law**

- The Municipality has an IWMP that has been approved by council and is incorporated into the Municipality's IDP.

The Municipality has a Waste By-law that was published in 2008. However amendment are needed to ensure that it is aligned to the NEM:WA and reflects national and provincial waste related priorities.

### **Suggestions for continuous improvement**

Based on the site visit and the questionnaire submitted for the competition, the Municipality could address the following:

- Anti-litter waste awareness signage is needed in public open spaces, including sports facilities, to discourage littering. Waste minimisation awareness signage should also be placed at strategic locations to encourage participation in the Municipality's waste recycling programmes.
- The problematic aspects identified under facility management must be addressed.
- Crushing of builders' rubble could be implemented.
- The Municipality needs to start reporting monthly waste generation and diversion quantities to DEADP's IPWIS. The Waste Calculator toolkit should be used where no weighbridges/pads are available.

## **Knysna Municipality**

### **General impressions**

The Knysna Municipality's waste department provides a weekly door to door collection services to households, businesses and commercial areas. A mixture of door to door black bags, bins along major walkways, waste skips for garden waste and builder's rubble at drop off site only are for garden waste and builder's rubble at drop off site only are provided. No additional door to door waste collection services are provided and business collection frequency varies weekly. There are waste infrastructure projects in place such as general drop off sites, transfer station and garden/green waste facilities in operation. The Municipality disposes of domestic, commercial business and light industrial waste at Petro SA WDF.

### **The following operational waste facilities exist in Knysna Municipality:**

- Knysna Transfer station (licenced);
- Brenton on Sea Green Waste Facility (licenced);
- Knysna Recycling Facility (licensed); and
- Sedgfield Recycling Facility (licensed).

### **Awareness around waste**

The following waste awareness initiatives are implemented:

- The Municipality hosted an Open Day Road Show and exhibition in September 2014. The Municipality host programmes such as the Township Green which involves a group of individuals that run waste awareness at schools on the three R's (reduce, re-use, and recycle). They have done four shows at four schools.

### **Waste minimisation**

The following waste minimisation initiatives are implemented in this Municipality:

- There are seven swap shops covering the following areas: Rheenendal; Fresh Start swap shop, in Smutsville, Sinethembe swap shop in the Northern Area and Hornlee swap shop in Hornlee. All are supported by the municipality through the provision of containers and /or the transport of recyclables.
- A split bag pilot is implemented covering the following residential areas: The Heads, Leisure Isle, Hunters Home, Old Place, Costa Sarda, Upper Town, Lower town, Greenhaven, Paradise, Knysna Heights, Welbedaght, Bellvidere, Brenton on Sea, Brenton on Lake, Hornlee as well as all formal residential areas in Sedgefield.
- An e-Waste drop-off service is provided at Knysna Transfer Station, recycling bins at Knysna Recycling Centre and a container for used oil at Knysna Transfer Station. This supplements waste recovery in the Municipality.
- The chipping and composting of green waste takes place at 3 garden waste sites in the Municipality.

### **Town inspections:**

During visits to Knysna and Sedgefield it was noted that:

- the town centre and the higher income residential areas were very clean but there was no signage;
- the public transport facility was very dirty and did not have signage;
- the sports facility was clean but no signage was observed;
- in lower income residents, walkways, roads and amenities were partially clean with no visible signage; and
- informal areas were not clean, waste was found in open spaces and along walkways.

### **Facilities inspected:**

Brenton on Sea Garden Waste Facility

- The facility has a 45% compliance rating.

### **Job creation in waste management:**

- The Municipality has funded projects like the Ward clean-up campaigns and has EPWP funding and use some resources to fund a community clean-up project.

### **Special initiatives on waste**

- The regional Eden Green Composting Initiative and the Eden Alternative Waste Technology Initiative to minimise waste is in its planning phase.
- As part of the Eden project (Eden Waste Forum), the Municipality is involved in the EIA, PPP process, proposals for any alternative waste technology, viable composting project for the region and also regional transport of waste that will include Bitou, Knysna and George.

### **The Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) and Waste Bylaw**

- The Municipality has an approved second generation IWMP.
- The Municipality has a Waste By-law which is not aligned with NEM:WA.

### **Reporting of information to IPWIS**

- The Municipality reports to the IPWIS.

### **Suggestions for continuous improvement**

Based on the site visit and the questionnaire submitted for the competition, the Municipality could address the following:

- The municipality should improve waste minimisation signage and awareness throughout the Municipality.
- Consider the reuse and/or crushing of builders' rubble should be considered.
- Establish Public Place Recycling (PPR) systems for public areas where large numbers of people gather or visit, such as shopping centres, public transport facilities, festivals and recreational areas.
- Continue and roll out split bag system to all residential areas.

## **Mossel Bay Municipality**

### **General impressions**

Mossel Bay Municipality provides weekly removal of waste from all residential areas, business and commercial areas. Their type of collection system is based on the door to door collection of bins (higher income residential area and business/commercial), black bags (lower income residential area) and skips (informal residential area). Waste skips are also provided for garden waste collection.

### **The following operational waste facilities exist in Mossel Bay Municipality:**

- Great Brak Garden Refuse and Builders' Rubble WDF (unlicensed);
- Louis Fourie for garden waste (application for closure);
- Kwa-Nonqaba Transfer Station (licensed); and
- Sonskynvallei Transfer Station (licensed).

### **Awareness around waste**

The following waste awareness initiatives are implemented:

- The Municipality celebrates environmental calendar days. World Environment Day was celebrated with an Illegal Dumping Street March on 5 March 2015 and Annual Beach Clean-Up on 26 June 2015.
- The Municipality implements a Waste Minimisation Road Show.
- The Municipality supports Mossel Bay Arts and Craft Workshop and Exhibition Centre which gives training in the utilisation of waste items to produce arts and crafts and exhibits these as a tourism enhancement project.
- Signage about cleanliness can be seen in the town centre and no dumping signs in dumping hotspots.

### **Waste minimisation**

- The Municipality supports two swop shops which are situated in Great Brak River and KwaNonqaba. The swop shops are registered with the Premier's 110% Green Initiative. The Municipality obtained sponsorships to ensure the sustainability of the swop shops. Waste is removed regularly by the recycling facility.
- Waste separation at source is implemented by means of black bags for refuse and blue bags for recyclable materials.
- The Municipality has drop-off sites in Great Brak River, Glentana, Boggomsbaai and Little Brak River. Igloos have also been strategically placed throughout the Municipality. The Municipality is also in the process of placing igloos at all garages and the malls.
- The Municipality supports material recovery and has appointed a contractor for the collection of recyclable material from the residential areas with a roll-out percentage of 60%. The Municipality also has an office recycling programme which has been running since 2011. A waste tyre facility in Mossdustryia is also the only depot in the Southern Cape which has been initiated through REDISA. Furthermore, Herbertsdale recycling art, an arts and crafts workshop is also supported by the LED Department of the Municipality. E-waste is collected at the Sonskynvallei Transfer Station.
- The Municipality has appointed a contractor and 20 individuals to sort material for chipping.
- E-waste and waste oil is collected at Transfer Stations within the Municipality.

### **Town inspections:**

During visits to the towns of Mossel Bay and Great Brak the following was noted:

- The town centre walkways and roads were very clean with sufficient bins.
- No signs encouraging waste minimisation were seen.
- Sport facilities were clean with sufficient bins.
- Public transport facilities were fairly clean.
- The higher income areas were very clean with vacant land, communal areas and parks in good condition.
- Lower income areas were not clean and made use of waste drop off areas. Litter was seen in parts of the area. Adjacent open spaces including parks and vacant land were not clean. Litter was spotted in areas such as walkways and roads.

- The informal areas were very dirty and the skips placed for collection is not being used as waste is dumped next to it.

#### **Facilities inspected:**

Facility 1 Great Brak Garden Refuse and Builders' Rubble WDF

- The facility has a 20% compliance rating.

Facility 2: Kwa-Nonqaba Transfer Station

- The facility has a 60% compliance rating.

#### **Job creation in waste management:**

- The Municipality employs approximately 300 unemployed individuals annually as part of the street cleaning entrepreneurs' project. The aim of this project is job creation and poverty alleviation giving unemployed residents the opportunity to earn an income and at the same time to start up a small business as an entrepreneur. During 2015 a budget of R9,8 million was spent on the cleaning project.
- Additional teams have been appointed to address illegal dumping, clearing and spraying of herbicides in the residential areas. Five women from this project have been selected to be part of the national Gender Links project empowering them with business management skills.

#### **The Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) and Waste By-law**

- The second generation IWMP has been approved by council in June 2015.
- The Municipality has a waste by-law that was published in 2010. Certain sections of the bylaw must be amended to align with the NEMWA and to reflect national and provincial waste priorities.

#### **Reporting of information to Province**

- The Municipality does not report to the provincial IPWIS.

#### **Suggestions for continuous improvement**

Based on the site visit and the questionnaire submitted for the competition, the Municipality could address the following:

- The Municipality can improve waste awareness by making use of more waste minimisation signage.
- Cleanliness in the lower income and informal residential areas should be addressed. Alternative strategies to encourage communities to improve the cleanliness must be considered.
- The Municipality must report to the provincial IPWIS on a monthly basis. The DEADP's waste calculator must be used to quantify waste where weigh bridges are not available.
- Waste facility management needs to be addressed as per the audit report findings from the Waste Licensing section.

## WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE OVERBERG DISTRICT

### Overberg District Municipality

#### **The District Municipality has an IWMP which:**

- Highlights the needs identified by District in addressing the regional landfill concerns, problems related to funding as well as the need for a better tariff structure.
- The IWMP is linked to the IDP as a sectorial plan. However implementation is limited due to the budgetary restraints.
- A lease agreement was signed with Overstrand Municipality in order to get the Regional Landfill site operational again.

#### **District support to local municipalities**

- The District Municipality does not have a dedicated staff component for waste management however; this function is performed by the Environmental Management Department.
- The District Municipality has an operational Regional Waste Forum that holds meetings on a quarterly basis.
- Health Practitioners from the District Municipality monitor waste management activities on a continuous basis to ensure that refuse storage, collection, transportation, transfer and processing materials are disposed appropriately.
- The Municipal Health Practitioners also ensure proper storage, treatment, collection, transportation, handling and disposal of medical and hazardous waste. Any deviation from the above is communicated directly to the relevant municipality in order to address and rectify the situation.
- The District Municipality coordinates the Regional Waste Forum to create a platform for Local Municipalities to discuss waste related matters and share best practice models.
- An office recycling programme was started in the Overberg District Municipality buildings.

#### **Support in terms of NWMS and NEM: WA requirements related to waste minimisation and recycling**

- Municipal Health Practitioners monitor recycling plants to ensure activities are conducted within the regulatory framework.
- Two of the four local municipalities are diverting garden and fruit waste from landfill by means of composting at Karwyderskraal WDF.
- Continuous discussions take place to promote recycling initiatives and efforts.

#### **Co-ordination between District Municipalities and Provincial Government**

- Good communication exists between the District Municipality and the Department and continuous support and guidance is received when requested.
- The Department attends the Regional Waste Forum and Karwyderskraal Monitoring Committee meetings.
- DEA&DP assisted with landfill auditing and gas monitoring, technical advice on the Elim Landfill site, closure of local landfills as well as guidance for the drafting of IWMPs.

## **Recommendations**

- The District Municipality must appoint a dedicated waste management team and also appoint a Waste Management Officer that will provide support, advice and guidance with waste management.
- There is a need for awareness support from the District Municipality to the local municipalities.
- The District Municipality should draft, obtain council approval and publish a Waste By-law.

## **Overstrand Municipality**

### **General impressions**

Congratulations to Overstrand Municipality on winning the Waste Element of the GMC! This bears testimony continued excellence in providing waste management services to the citizens of Overstrand Municipality.

The Municipality have a well-functioning waste recovery system in place where various opportunities to recover waste is made possible. They have a residential split bag, separation at source system, drop-off facilities for general and hazardous waste, two Material Recovery Facilities (MRF) and their recycling contractors also manages a buy back centre respectively which allows waste pickers to derive an income from the sale of recyclables. This is one way of addressing poverty alleviation. The Municipality also runs various awareness campaigns, including engagements with schools. These measures ensure an excellent recovery rate. Informal areas are well resourced with waste bins and found to be clean and litter free during the site visits. The taxi ranks in informal areas were also found to be reasonably clean. Walk ways between homes were very clean and amenities in the lower income and informal residential areas were also clean.

Hermanus town centre was very clean with waste separation signs posted on bins on walk ways throughout the town. The sports facility visited was clean and waste bins were placed at the entrance and the stand area.

### **The following operational waste facilities exist in Overstrand Municipality:**

- Betty's Bay Drop-off Gansbaai WDF and Material Recovery Facility (licensed);
- Hermanus Material Recovery Facility (licensed);
- Hermanus Transfer Station (licensed);
- Hermanus Week-end Drop-off (unlicensed);
- Kleinmond Transfer Station (licensed);
- Onrus Waste Drop-off (unlicensed);
- Pearly Beach Drop-off (unlicensed);
- Pringle Bay/Hangklip Drop-off (unlicensed);
- Rooi Els Drop-off (unlicensed);
- Sandbaai Drop-off (unlicensed);
- Stanford Drop-off (unlicensed); and
- Voëlklip Drop-off (unlicensed).

### **Awareness around waste**

The following waste awareness initiatives are implemented:

- Awareness is raised through the municipal newsletter.
- School visits are done to inform children about waste management, recycling, composting and the importance of diversion from landfill.
- The media is also to publish awareness raising notifications to the public.
- The Waste management unit also responds to requests for presentations/ awareness raising from various organisations. Awareness raising is also done with the children at the swap shops when they bring their recyclables.
- Clean up campaigns are done in collaboration with the District Municipality. Contractors appointed for area cleaning also do awareness raising for littering and illegal dumping.

### **Waste minimisation**

The following waste minimisation initiatives are implemented in this Municipality:

- Swap shops are supported by transporting the recovered materials from the swap shop to the recyclers' premises.
- Waste is separated at source throughout the whole of Overstrand Municipality by means of a two bag system.
- Drop-off facilities are available for the public to drop their waste.
- Material recovery is supported by the Municipality and takes place at two MRFs which is contracted to the Municipality.
- Garden waste is chipped and composted for diversion from landfill.

### **Town inspections:**

During visits to Hermanus and Gansbaai it was noted that –

- the town centres was very clean, and with adequate waste bins throughout the town;
- public transport facilities were very clean;
- walkways in the lower income and informal residential areas were fairly clean;
- bins were placed throughout the informal areas as well as major walk ways;
- open spaces in the lower income and informal residential areas were also clean; and
- waste signage was placed in the lower income residential areas.

### **Waste partnerships**

- The contractors responsible for waste recovery collect business waste at their own cost.

### **Special initiatives on waste management**

- In order to reduce the cost of rehabilitation, alternative land-use was investigated. Authorisation was sought and granted by DEADP to put an oxidation dam for the sewerage system on the old Pearly Beach WDF. An impact assessment will be done to remove this facility from the list for rehabilitation.

### **Facilities inspected:**

Facility 1: Gansbaai WDF and Material Recovery Facility

- The facility has a 25% compliance rating.

Facility 2: Stanford Drop-off Facility

*Positive*

- The facility was clean, well maintained and managed.
- Recordkeeping is done at the facility.
- Waste was removed regularly from the facility.
- The facility had access control and lockable gates.
- Access control is exercised at the facility.
- The facility was fenced and no unauthorised persons were observed on site during the visit.
- The area surrounding the disposal area was very clean.
- Containers were provided for the collection of hazardous waste.
- The staff member onsite wore protective clothing.

### **Job creation in waste management:**

- Youth in Waste workers were appointed at the Municipality.
- Contractors were appointed on for a three year term to clean streets and open spaces as well as raise awareness for littering and illegal dumping.

### **The Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) and Waste By-law**

- Overstrand Municipality has an IWMP which has been approved by Council.
- The Municipality has a Waste By-law that is aligned to NEM:WA.

### **Reporting of information to Province**

- All waste information was reported to the Department.

### **Suggestions for continuous improvement**

Based on the site visit and the questionnaire submitted for the competition, the Municipality could address the following:

- Facility management at Gansbaai WDF need to be addressed as per the audit report.

## **WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE WEST COAST DISTRICT**

### **West Coast District Municipality**

#### **The District Municipality has an IWMP which addresses:**

- The needs of the District Municipality in terms of waste management and waste management activities of the entire district.
- The identification of a regional site for Matzikama and Cederberg Municipalities.

#### **District support to local municipalities**

- The District Municipality has a dedicated staff component for waste management.
- The West Coast District Municipality is responsible for the development of the Regional Waste Disposal Facility.

#### **Capacity building, communication and projects**

- No capacity building projects is implemented by the District Municipality.

#### **Support in terms of NWMS and NEM: WA requirements related to waste minimisation and recycling**

- No support is provided.

#### **Co-ordination between District Municipalities and Provincial Government**

- No co-ordination is mentioned.

#### **The following recommendations are made:**

- Information needs to be provided of how the IWMP addresses the needs of the district in terms of waste management as well as the waste management activities of the entire district.
- The District Municipality needs to indicate how it will support local municipalities, within its jurisdiction, to achieve the objectives as set out in the IWMP in addition to providing timelines for implementation.
- Support services needs to be extended to include activities beyond the regional waste disposal facility.
- The District Municipality needs to address matters related to capacity building.
- The District Municipality needs to institute measures to communicate with local municipalities regarding waste related challenges experienced at local level.
- The District Municipality should attend the Departmental Waste Forum. The Department welcomes all municipalities at the Waste Management Officer's Forum.

## Berg River Municipality

### General impressions

Waste is collected by the Municipality on a weekly basis from all residential and business areas, with the predominant means of collection through a black bag system. In addition, the Municipality provides additional waste collection services for garden waste.

Waste skips are strategically located in open areas of the lower income residential areas. The waste management facilities were generally well operated and maintained. The town centres and higher income residential areas were clean. The lower income residential areas could be cleaner. The Municipality successfully diverts substantial quantities of waste from landfill through numerous waste minimisation initiatives such as the recovery of recyclables at the waste facilities, utilising a three bag waste separation bag system, strategically locating waste igloos and chipping of garden waste. Numerous waste awareness initiatives ensure waste related issues are brought to the attention of residents in the Municipality.

### The following operational waste facilities exist in Bergriver Municipality:

- Aurora Drop-off Facility (unlicensed );
- Piketberg Transfer Station (licensed);
- Piketberg WDF (unlicensed);
- Porterville Drop-off Facility (unlicensed);
- Porterville WDF (licensed);
- Redelinghuys WDF (licensed );
- Velddrift Transfer Station (licensed); and
- Velddrift MRF (licensed).

### Awareness around waste

The following waste awareness initiatives are implemented:

- Waste awareness signage is present on bins.
- Waste awareness signage is present at waste disposal and drop-off facilities;
- Waste related articles are published in municipal newsletters and local newspapers; and
- The public is also informed about waste management through Public Awareness programmes and public meetings.

### Waste minimisation

The following waste minimisation initiatives are implemented in this Municipality:

- A three bag system is used in all residential areas. A black bag is used for waste that can't be recycled, a clear bag for recyclable waste and a green bag for garden refuse. The Municipality has appointed a contractor to manage the recyclables.
- Drop-off facilities are available in Porterville and Aurora and recycling are strategically placed within the towns of Porterville and Velddrift.
- Recycling bins are also placed at the holiday resort during festive seasons.

- The Municipality supports material recovery which takes place in Piketberg and Velddrift. This service is provided by a contractor.
- Garden waste is chipped by the Municipality and the final product is used as cover material on the old landfill sites and also as ground cover in Municipal and private gardens.

### **Town inspections:**

During visits to Velddrift and Piketberg, the following was noticed:

- The walkways and roads in the city centres were very clean with sufficient bins placed along the walkways.
- The public transport and sport facilities were also very clean with sufficient waste bins.
- The higher income residential areas had clean vacant land, communal spaces and walkways and roads.

### **Facilities inspected:**

Facility 1: Velddrift Transfer Station

#### *Positive*

- A waste quantities were recorded at the entrance to the facility.
- Waste removal from the facility took place at an acceptable frequency.
- The facility was fenced, had lockable gates and security was present at the gate.
- Signage at the facility was present and complied to the requirements.
- The area surrounding the disposal area was clean.
- The facility was well maintained.
- Municipal workers were wearing protective clothing.

#### *Negative*

- Unauthorised persons were present on site.
- No containers for the disposal of hazardous waste were present at the facility.

Facility 2: Piketberg Transfer Station

#### *Positive*

- A waste record keeping system was implemented.
- Waste removal from the facility was done regularly.
- The facility was fenced and had lockable gates. No unauthorised persons were observed on site.
- The facility has the required onsite signage.
- The area surrounding the disposal areas was relatively clean.
- The facility was well maintained.
- Staff on site was dressed in the appropriate protective clothing.

## Negative

- No containers for the disposal of hazardous waste were present at the facility.

### **Job creation in waste management:**

- EPWP projects were implemented for waste separation and for cleaning streets and public open spaces. An amount of R470 000 in was utilised for this initiative.

### **The Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) and Waste By-law**

- Bergriver Municipality has second generation IWMP, which has been approved by council.
- The Municipality has a By-law which is not aligned to NEM:WA.

### **Reporting of information to Province**

- Waste information was reported to the Department.

### **Suggestions for continuous improvement**

Based on the site visit and the questionnaire submitted for the competition, the Municipality could address the following:

- The cleanliness in the lower income residential areas needs to be improved upon.
- Crushing of builders' rubble could be investigated.
- Negative aspects in terms of facility management needs to be addressed.
- The Waste By-law needs to be amended in order to aligned it with NEM:WA.

## Cederberg Municipality

### **General impressions**

Waste is collected by the Municipality on a weekly basis from all residential and business areas. The municipality provide waste bin collection services to high, lower residential, commercial and a black bag system to informal areas mainly in Clanwilliam. In addition the Municipality provide a weekly service for collection of garden waste to residential and commercials areas. The waste disposal facilities were poorly managed and in very bad conditions with litter windblown in and outside the facility. The town centres and higher to lower income residential areas were reasonably clean. However the informal areas were not clean and there was no waste containers provided. Overall the town was general clean but the facilities require attention.

The following operational waste facilities exist in Cederberg Municipality:

- Clanwilliam WDF (licensed);
- Lamberts Bay WDF (licensed);
- Graafwater WDF (licensed);
- Leipoldtville WDF (licensed for closure);
- Algeria WDF (licensed for closure);
- Wupperthal (licensed);
- Elandsbaai WDF (licensed); and

- Eselsbank WDF (licensed).

### **Awareness around waste**

The Municipality has initiated and implemented the following projects with regards to waste management:

- Road shows by Youth Jobs in Waste in the form of door-to-door and school awareness campaigns;
- Waste awareness signs were present on some bins in the town centres.

### **Waste minimisation**

The following waste minimisation initiatives are implemented in this Municipality:

- The Municipality provides support to a number of privately owned businesses that recovers waste e.g. provides green waste to Patrysvlei for chipping and composting and mentorship and training to Boeta Joe's Scrap.

### **Town inspections:**

During visits to Lamberts Bay and Clanwilliam, the following were observed:

- The town centres were reasonably clean, with sufficient waste bins with signage.
- The higher and lower income residential areas were generally clean.
- The cleanliness of walkways especially in the informal and lower income residential areas was not clean and could be improved.
- On vacant land in the informal and lower income areas there were issues of illegal dumping.

### **Facilities inspected:**

Facility 1: Lamberts Bay WDF

#### *Positive*

- The facility was fenced and had lockable gates and security.
- Garden and builders waste were separated from general waste.
- Staff at the facility had protective clothing.

#### *Negative*

- Waste was not sufficiently covered or compacted on a daily basis.
- Due to insufficient covering, the waste is windblown inside and the outside the facility.
- Burning of waste along the fence was observed.
- Containers for the disposal of hazardous waste were not provided.
- There were unauthorised informal waste salvagers at the facility.
- Record keeping did not take place at the time of the visit.

## Facility 2: Clanwilliam WDF

### *Positive*

- Staff and personnel at the facility had protective clothing.

### *Negative*

- The facility was not secure and had no lockable gates and there were unauthorised scavengers on site.
- There was no sufficient cover or compaction of waste at the facility.
- There were animals i.e. monkeys, pigs and sheep foraging for foods at the landfill.
- A record keeping system was not evident on the day of the site visit.
- No containers for the disposal of hazardous waste were provided.

### **Job creation in waste management:**

- The Municipality has EPWP workers and Youth in Waste workers employed to clean towns, do rehabilitation and cleaning of illegal dumping and around landfill sites.

### **Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) and Waste By-law.**

- Cederberg Municipality has a second generation IWMP and has a third generation plan in draft. The IWMPs developed are aligned with (NEM:WA).
- The Municipality has a Waste By-law that was published in 2005 and therefore not aligned to NEM:WA.

### **Reporting of information to Province**

- Cederberg Municipality does not report waste types and quantities to IPWIS.

### **Suggestions for continuous improvement**

Based on the site visit and the questionnaire submitted for the competition, the Municipality could address the following:

- There is a need for the Municipality to increase and support the number of recyclers in the area to improve the recovery rate. Recyclers should then be encouraged to provide the Municipality with waste recovery figures.
- The Municipality should register and report waste data to IPWIS.
- Improved waste awareness signage in walk ways, open areas, residential areas especially in lower income and informal areas.
- Improve waste collection services in informal areas.
- The burning of waste at landfills must be stopped.

Concerns identified at the waste facilities and the communities, as listed above, should be urgently addressed. The Municipality should mainstream waste minimisation in the IWMP. Further the municipality should continue educating, training and increasing public awareness on waste management and encourage residents to recycle. The Municipality must improve the management of waste facilities urgently especially landfill sites and should consider investing in integrated waste management infrastructure in different areas of the Municipality to improve waste minimisation and create employment opportunities for recycling.

## **Swartland Municipality**

### **General impressions**

Swartland Municipality provides a good waste management service in the form of a weekly waste collection from households. Waste management facilities are generally well operated and maintained. The town centres, sports facilities and residential areas were clean. Successful waste diversion from landfill takes place in the form of material recovery from a dirty MRF. The municipality supports swap shops, has a drop off facility and has placed recycling igloos in towns.

The Municipality also undertakes various waste awareness initiatives and is successful in creating job opportunities through the provision of waste management services.

### **The following operational waste facilities exist in Swartland Municipality:**

- Darling WDF (licensed);
- Kalbaskraal Drop-off (unlicensed);
- Koringberg Drop-off (unlicensed);
- Koringberg WDF (licensed)
- Highlands WDF and MRF (licensed)
- Moorreesburg WDF (licensed)
- Riebeek Kasteel WDF (licensed)
- Riebeek West WDF (licensed)
- Yzerfontein WDF (licensed)

### **Awareness around waste**

The following waste awareness initiatives are implemented:

- The Municipality has produced 20 000 pamphlets on the topic "What is the impact of refuse on your environment?" which was handed out to community members.
- 19 Advertising boards and 23 new notice boards were placed throughout Swartland Municipality to promote recycling.
- Awareness prints on all public refuse bins to promote, reduce, re-use and recycle.
- This recycling initiative and other town cleaning news are promoted to the community via quarterly newsletter.
- "Keep our town clean" car license disc stickers are distributed at schools and garages by the Traffic Department.

- The Greenest Municipality Competition is promoted on the municipal letterhead.
- Door-to-door campaigns are conducted in communities where illegal dumping is observed.
- The Municipality, together with TEDCOR's Youth in Waste Programme, has initiated road shows focussing on promoting recycling and a cleaner environment in all 11 towns within the Municipality.
- The TEDCOR Youth in Waste Programme also includes raising awareness at schools.
- Waste awareness signage in the city centre and lower income residential areas were encountered during site visits.

### **Waste minimisation**

The following waste minimisation initiatives are implemented in this Municipality:

- The Municipality supports two swop shops, namely Darling and Paardeberg, by transporting recyclables to the Highlands MRF and WDF. The materials are bought from the swop shops by the contractor who operates the MRF.
- The Municipality has 77 recycling igloos of which 26 are placed at schools and other strategic locations within the Municipality for the collection of recyclables.
- The Municipality supports material recovery which takes place at the Highlands MRF. This service is managed by a contractor.
- Garden refuse is separated from the rest of the waste in the town of Moorreesburg.

### **Town inspections:**

During visits to Malmesbury and Riebeek West, it was noted that:

- The town centres were very clean along the roads and walkways.
- Sufficient waste bins were placed along the major walkways.
- The public transport and sports facilities were very clean.
- Walkways and roads in the lower income and informal residential areas were very clean. (signage is needed in the higher income and informal residential areas).

### **Facilities inspected:**

Facility 1: Highlands WDF

- The facility has a 98% compliance rating (Authority Audit).

Facility 2: Darling WDF

- The facility has a 67% compliance rating (Authority Audit).

### **Job creation in waste management:**

- EPWP funding is utilised to employ 97 workers for area cleaning within the municipality.
- The Municipality employs 10 workers as watchmen at the skips and to clean the open spaces within the Municipality.

### **The Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) and Waste By-law**

- The Municipality has a Council-approved Second Generation IWMP.
- The Municipality has a waste by-law that was published in 2011.

### **Reporting of information to Province**

- The Municipality reported their waste information to the Department's IPWIS.

### **Suggestions for continuous improvement**

Based on the site visit and the questionnaire submitted for the competition, the Municipality could address the following:

- Composting and crushing of builders' rubble could be investigated.
- There is room for improvement in the management of Darling WDF.
- The municipality can explore other feasible options to maximise the waste diversion rate

## **Saldanha Bay Municipality**

### **General impressions**

The town was found to be relatively clean during the time of the site visit. Open spaces and public amenities were also found to be reasonably well maintained.

Awareness around waste

### **The following operational waste facilities exist in Saldanha Bay Municipality:**

- Diazville Drop-off; (un-licensed)
- Kalkrug Drop-off; (un-licensed)
- Langebaan WDF; (licensed)
- Vredenburg MRF; (licensed)
- Vredenburg WDF; (licensed)
- Laingville Drop-off; (un-licensed) and
- Hopefield Drop-off. (un-licensed)

### **Waste awareness**

- Youth in Waste employees conducted door-to-door awareness campaigns within the Municipality.
- A quarterly recycling advertisement was placed in a local newspaper called the Weslander.

### **Waste minimisation**

The following waste minimisation initiatives are implemented in this Municipality:

- Recycling igloos are strategically placed throughout the Municipality.

- The Municipality supports material recovery. However, the Municipality did not have a contract in place during the time of the evaluation. They were however in the process of implementing a new contract.
- The Municipality also supports the initiative of Langebaan Country Estate to separate waste at source by transporting the recycling material to the MRF or the local recycler.
- The chipping of green waste takes place within the Municipality.

#### **Town inspections:**

During visits to Vredenburg and Diazville it was noted that –

#### **Facilities inspected:**

Facility 1: Vredenburg WDF

- The facility has a 67% compliance rating (Authority Audit).

Facility 2: Diazville Drop-off Facility

#### *Positive*

- Recordkeeping was not observed onsite.
- Waste is removed frequently.
- Access is controlled at the facility and no unauthorised persons were observed onsite.
- No signage was observed at the facility.
- The area surrounding the disposal area was very clean.
- The facility is well maintained.
- Staff onsite wore protective clothing.

#### *Negative*

- Containers for hazardous waste were not available at the facility.

#### **Job creation in waste management:**

- EPWP waste teams were appointed in the Municipality to assist with area cleaning.

#### **The Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) and Waste By-law**

- The Municipality has a draft IWMP.
- The Municipality has a waste by-law which is not aligned with NEM:WA.

#### **Reporting of information to Province**

- Waste information was reported by Municipality to the IPWIS.

#### **Suggestions for continuous improvement**

Based on the site visit and the questionnaire submitted for the competition, the Municipality could address the following:

- There is a need to improve their waste minimisation initiatives so that waste diversion from landfill can be maximised.
- Waste awareness campaigns and recovery infrastructure should also target the seasonal influx of holiday makers.
- A waste minimisation strategy must be developed to cater for the planned growth resulting from the IDZ initiative
- Chipping and composting of garden waste should be investigated.
- The Municipality should align its by-law with NEM:WA and in a manner that maximises recovery of recyclables and meets other provincial and national priorities.

# ELEMENT 2:

## CLIMATE CHANGE RESPONSE REPORT



## Introduction & Background

This report provides an overview of the evaluation process and results for Element 2: Climate Change Response, of the Western Cape Government Greenest Municipality Competition 2015.

The Western Cape Climate Change Response Strategy (WCCCRS, 2014), following the approach given in the National Climate Change Response White Paper (2011), has two main thrusts in addressing climate change:

- A) Mitigation:** To contribute to national and global efforts to significantly reduce greenhouse gasses (GHGs) and build a sustainable low carbon economy, which simultaneously address the need for economic growth, job creation and improving socio-economic conditions, and
- B) Adaptation:** To develop the climate resilience of the Western Cape's economy, people, ecosystems and infrastructure in a manner that simultaneously addresses the province's socio-economic and environmental goals.

The strategy, which aims to develop a coordinated and programmatic response to climate change, identifies local governments as key role players in transitioning to a low carbon and climate resilient province.

In 2014 the climate change element of the GMC questionnaire was divided into two separate sections, namely adaptation and mitigation. The 2015 questionnaire however, was aligned to the Directorate's integrated approach to addressing climate change response implementation.

Each municipality was scored solely based on the contents of the returned questionnaire and supporting documentation. No site visits were conducted.

This section of the GMC is aimed at scoring municipalities on international best practice, and highlights whether there is a sense of urgency in climate response. It should also be acknowledged that it is a relatively new need for municipalities to be considering climate change in decision-making, even though there is need for urgent transformative thinking. Further to that there has yet to be a cross-sectoral understanding that climate change impacts all infrastructure, planning and economic development. Thus there is still a substantial amount of capacity building required to understand our new climatic parameters, and low carbon economy objectives. We also acknowledge that climate change traditionally was seen as solely an environmental function, whilst it actually influences social and economic development just as strongly, and therefore requires responses across all spheres of government and sectors, not just environmental. The climate change component is thus a challenging section as it requires a coordinated response from the most strategic point in a municipality (such as the Mayor's office, the Municipal Managers office, or office of the IDP manager). While some municipalities in the province are leading the way and pushing the boundaries of what is possible with constrained resources, there is still vast scope for strengthening municipal responses and collective learning on climate change across the board.

## Evaluation Process

### The Evaluation Panel

The evaluation panel consisted of two primary members and one supporting member from the Directorate: Climate Change. The Adjudicator for this section was the Director of Climate Change. To ensure consistency, the two primary members were assigned questions to assess across all municipalities (i.e. a particular question was assessed by an individual member for consistency). After the initial individual assessment, the scores were discussed among all members, and where necessary adjusted based on the input from the group. This was done to ensure that evaluators utilized the same level of assessment across all questions. The scores were then discussed, vetted, and verified by the Adjudicator (Director).

### Participation by Municipalities

The following local municipalities participated:

- Bergrivier
- Breede Valley
- Cederberg
- Drakenstein
- George
- Hessequa
- Knysna
- Laingsberg
- Langeberg
- Mossel Bay
- Overstrand
- Saldanha Bay
- Stellenbosch
- Swartland
- Witzenberg

The following district municipalities participated:

- Cape Winelands District
- Overberg District
- Eden District
- West Coast District

### Element Evaluation Criteria / Methodology 2015

The following scoring system was used:

Score	Description
0	Nothing entered, or project N/A
1	Planned project (concept/negotiations), any compliance initiative, or application for funds.
3	Feasibility study in progress/completed
5	Standard practice project implemented (renewable energy projects: construction in progress, but no energy being generated)
10	Innovative/additional / showcase project implemented by municipality; and electricity generation projects currently generating power*
<p>* Scores were adjusted to reflect the generating capacity of a project, e.g. a project that only has a capacity of a few kW will not achieve the full score of 10 points.</p> <p>A response was deemed to be N/A if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the project listed did not occur in the relevant assessment period covered by the competition;</li> <li>● the response was previously reported and scored in a previous year's assessment; no further scoring would be given unless additional / updated information was included;</li> <li>● the response was not referring to a municipal project or one that was not contributed to in terms of funds, capacity or other similar contributions by the municipality (unless the question specified otherwise); and</li> <li>● the response did not comply with the type of project specified in the question.</li> </ul> <p>In scoring the municipalities, special attention was given to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Strategies/plans (complete/draft format) to reduce carbon emissions and improve adaptive capacity at municipal level and whether budget has been allocated to this implementation.</li> <li>● Governance and planning structures and processes (both internal and external) which municipalities have put in place to implement climate change responses.</li> <li>● Programmes and projects planned and currently in place to improve adaptive capacity and reduce risk as well as any carbon emission reduction project.</li> <li>● Initiatives that go beyond standard practice 'standards, compliance, and legal requirements' but that have included 'new climate norms' such as increased flooding, and increased temperature thresholds – and are thus responding to climate change stimuli directly.</li> <li>● Partnerships and innovative multi-stakeholder projects regarding climate adaptation / mitigation.</li> <li>● Awareness of key climate related risks within the municipality's area of jurisdiction, and identification of key adaptation areas/sectors.</li> </ul>	

## Results

### Local Spreadsheet

Climate Change Response (Element 2)			
MUNICIPALITIES	FM (%)	CM (15%)	Position
Mossel Bay	70.3	10.54	1
Hessequa	61.4	9.21	2
Swartland	53.7	8.05	3
Stellenbosch	45.9	6.89	4
Drakenstein	36.9	5.53	5
Bergrivier	26.5	3.98	6
George	25.7	3.85	7
Witzenberg	21.8	3.28	8
Knysna	16.7	2.5	9
Saldanha Bay	16.3	2.44	10
Breedde Valley	8.1	1.21	11
Cederberg	7.3	1.1	12
Overstrand	7.3	1.1	13
Langeberg	2.3	0.35	14
Laingsberg	0.7	0.1	15

Key: FM – Final Mark

CM – Converted Mark (to weight percentage of specific element)

## District Spreadsheet

Climate Change Response (Element 2)			
MUNICIPALITIES	FM (%)	CM (10%)	Position
Eden District	63.3	6.33	1
West Coast District	24.7	2.47	2
Cape Winelands District	23.3	2.33	3
Overberg District	22.9	2.29	4

Key: FM – Final Mark

CM – Converted Mark (to weight percentage of specific element)

### Summarized findings for all participating municipalities

General remarks:

- Overall participating local and district municipalities are expressing a greater level of maturity in understanding of how climate change impacts local service delivery as well as advancing in their climate change responses. The increasing responses are tremendously encouraging and providing a solid basis upon which to build a low carbon and climate resilient province.
- A number of municipalities missed opportunities to report on climate change related projects in this section. The quality of the inputs into the Climate Change response section may be a result of the complex nature of climate change. No one directorate is responsible for climate change integration as it cuts across all local government departments. It is encouraged that the person responsible for this section canvas and coordinate responses across all departments in order to ensure higher scoring potential.
- A number of municipalities did not submit sufficient evidence to support the information in the questionnaire. In some instances, where proof was submitted it was not clearly marked.
- Many municipalities submitted information that had already been submitted in previous years without amendments. The assessment is clearly based on scoring new achievements in competition cycle; as a result these projects were not awarded scores.
- In some instances, questions were not fully completed, resulting in a loss of potential points. For example, a municipality may have recorded implementation of a lighting retrofit as a project, but with no additional information given on the scale, location, types of lighting or electricity savings realized. Municipalities need to assume that the assessor knows nothing about the project and therefore needs to provide all the necessary information.

## Feedback for local municipalities (in alphabetical order)

Name of Municipality	Feedback	Recommendations
<b>Bergviver</b>	<p>Full responses with sufficient information were not always provided in order to adequately assess the answer. It is encouraging to see some of the interesting projects taking place within the municipality.</p> <p>Some information submitted in previous questionnaires were re-submitted in this questionnaire. We are unable to score projects that may have received points in previous years. In some cases, private sector initiatives that had no involvement or participation from the Municipality were reported on.</p>	<p>Further detail required in answers.</p> <p>Only submit projects and information relevant to the time period covered by the competition.</p>
<b>Breede Valley</b>	<p>Supporting documentation was not submitted for all questions.</p> <p>The municipality did not complete the entire climate change questionnaire.</p>	<p>Supporting documentation needs to be included for every project submitted.</p> <p>A cross-sectoral response to this section would increase the richness of the responses and support a stronger submission.</p>
<b>Cederberg</b>	<p>Full responses with sufficient information were not always provided in order to adequately assess the answer.</p> <p>Some information submitted in previous questionnaires were re-submitted in this questionnaire. We are unable to score projects that may have received points in previous years. Supporting documentation was not submitted for all questions.</p> <p>The municipality did not complete the entire climate change questionnaire.</p>	<p>Further detail required in answers.</p> <p>Only submit projects and information relevant to the time period covered by the competition.</p> <p>Supporting documentation needs to be included for every project submitted.</p> <p>A cross-sectoral response to this section would increase the richness of the responses and support a stronger submission.</p>
<b>Drakenstein</b>	<p>It is encouraging to see a range of climate related activities taking place within the municipality.</p> <p>Full responses with sufficient information were not always provided in order to adequately assess the answer.</p> <p>Some information submitted in previous questionnaires were re-submitted in this questionnaire. We are unable to score projects that may have received points in previous years. Sometimes no supporting evidence was submitted for a question.</p> <p>There was some duplication of information between questions.</p>	<p>Further detail required in answers.</p> <p>Only submit projects and information relevant to the time period covered by the competition.</p> <p>Supporting documentation needs to be included for every project submitted.</p>
<b>George</b>	<p>It is evident that there has been a lot of effort placed in trying to secure additional funding for climate change-related projects in the municipality.</p> <p>Some information submitted in previous questionnaires were re-submitted in this questionnaire. We are unable to score projects that may have received points in previous years. In some cases, it was difficult to tell from the information submitted whether a project had actually taken place, was still planned or had</p>	<p>Only submit projects and information relevant to the time period covered by the competition.</p> <p>Further detail required in answers.</p> <p>Climate Change response goes beyond compliance, and we suggest that provision of additional information beyond compliance will assist</p>

Name of Municipality	Feedback	Recommendations
	been cancelled due to lack of funding.	in attaining a higher score in future.
<b>Hessequa</b>	<p>The extent of climate change response across sectors and departments in Mossel Bay is very encouraging.</p> <p>Full responses with sufficient information were not always provided in order to adequately assess the answer.</p> <p>Some information submitted in previous questionnaires were re-submitted in this questionnaire. We are unable to score projects that may have received points in previous years.</p> <p>Supporting documentation was not submitted for all questions.</p> <p>Thorough coverage of multiple projects per question.</p>	<p>Further detail required in answers.</p> <p>Only submit projects and information relevant to the time period covered by the competition.</p> <p>Supporting documentation needs to be included for every project submitted.</p>
<b>Knysna</b>	<p>The municipality has a wide range of potential climate related activities taking place within its boundaries, many of which could be reported on more extensively across all departments in future.</p> <p>Full responses with sufficient information were not always provided in order to adequately assess the answer, particularly on the scale of projects or the estimated electricity savings.</p> <p>Some information submitted in previous questionnaires were re-submitted in this questionnaire. We are unable to score projects that may have received points in previous years.</p> <p>Very little supporting evidence was submitted to accompany the questionnaire, making it very difficult to accurately assess the question. Where evidence was submitted it was easy to find.</p>	<p>Ensure that questions are completed in full, with all relevant information included.</p> <p>Only submit projects and information relevant to the time period covered by the competition.</p> <p>Supporting documentation needs to be included for every project submitted.</p>
<b>Laingsberg</b>	Only one question was answered.	
<b>Langeberg</b>	<p>Full responses with sufficient information were not always provided in order to adequately assess the answer.</p> <p>The municipality did not complete the entire climate change questionnaire.</p>	Further detail required in answers.
<b>Mossel Bay</b>	<p>The extent of climate change response across sectors and departments in Mossel Bay is very encouraging.</p> <p>Full responses with sufficient information were not always provided in order to adequately assess the answer.</p> <p>Some information submitted in previous questionnaires were re-submitted in this questionnaire. We are unable to score projects that may have received points in previous years.</p> <p>Very little supporting evidence was submitted to accompany the questionnaire, making it very difficult to accurately assess the question.</p> <p>Municipality was thorough in often covering more than one project for each question.</p>	<p>Further detail required in answers.</p> <p>Only submit projects and information relevant to the time period covered by the competition.</p> <p>Supporting documentation needs to be included for every project submitted.</p>

Name of Municipality	Feedback	Recommendations
<b>Overstrand</b>	The municipality has a wide range of potential climate related activities taking place within its boundaries, many of which could be reported on more extensively across all departments in future. The municipality did not complete the entire climate change questionnaire.	
<b>Saldanha Bay</b>	The municipality has a wide range of potential climate related activities taking place within its boundaries, many of which could be reported on more extensively across all departments in future. Full responses with sufficient information were not always provided in order to adequately assess the answer. There was some duplication between questions.	Further detail required in answers.
<b>Stellenbosch</b>	The municipality has made good progress on sustainable energy initiatives; more focus can be applied to reporting on climate change resilience across sectors, particularly water. Full responses with sufficient information were not always provided in order to adequately assess the answer. Some information submitted in previous questionnaires were re-submitted in this questionnaire. We are unable to score projects that may have received points in previous years. Supporting documentation was not submitted for all questions.	Further detail required in answers. Only submit projects and information relevant to the time period covered by the competition. Supporting documentation needs to be included for every project submitted.
<b>Swartland</b>	It is encouraging to see that the municipality seems to invest a lot of energy in thorough investigation of projects' feasibility before initiating a project. Full responses with sufficient information were not always provided in order to adequately assess the answer, particularly around the locations and scale of projects.	Further detail required in answers.
<b>Witzenberg</b>	The district responded encouragingly from a disaster response perspective; we suggest that the climate change elements can mature by increasing involvement of other departments. Full responses with sufficient information were not always provided in order to adequately assess the answer. Supporting documentation was not submitted for all questions.	Further detail required in answers. Supporting documentation needs to be included for every project submitted.

## Feedback for district municipalities:

Name of Municipality	Feedback	Recommendations
<b>Cape Winelands District</b>	It is very encouraging that Cape Winelands now has a Climate Change Adaptation Strategy. Some information submitted in previous questionnaires were re-submitted in this questionnaire. We are unable to score projects that may have received points in previous years. Only a limited part of the questionnaire was filled in.	Only submit projects and information relevant to the time period covered by the competition.
<b>Eden District</b>	The extent of climate change response across sectors and departments in Eden District is very progressive. Extensive responses were provided, although in some instances, insufficient answers provided in the actual questionnaire itself. In some cases, private sector initiatives that had no evident involvement or participation from the Municipality were reported on. Sometimes answers referred to evidence that couldn't be found.	Further detail required in some answers.  Evidence needs to be clearly referenced to the questions.
<b>Overberg District</b>	The district responded encouragingly from a disaster response perspective; we suggest that the climate change elements can mature by increasing involvement of other departments. Supporting documentation was not submitted for all questions.	Supporting documentation needs to be included for every project submitted.
<b>West Coast District</b>	It is very encouraging that West Coast now has a Climate Change Response Strategy. Full responses with sufficient information were not always provided in order to adequately assess the answer.	Further detail required in answers.

## Category winners

<b>Element Winners (Climate Change)</b>	Local Municipality: Mossel Bay
	District Municipality: Eden
<b>Brief description for nominated element winner</b>	<p><b>Mossel Bay (MBM)</b></p> <p>MBM contributed to and is a signatory of the Eden Municipal District Climate Change Plan. A thorough and integrated understanding of climate change response requirements is clearly displayed in responses to the GMC questionnaire. MBM's urban densification policy holds potential for Climate Change mitigation, and in addition protects ecosystem services and ecological infrastructure important for buffering against climate change impacts. Various renewable energy (RE) projects and energy efficiency (EE) projects have</p>

	<p>been implemented and are supported by the municipality. Examples of projects include energy efficient lighting and streetlights and the replacement of waste water treatment motors with more EE ones. There has also been an ongoing roll-out of ripple control as well as awareness raising around energy efficiency with all stakeholders in the municipality. An Integrated Public Transport Network plan has been developed, but implementation still needs to take place.</p> <p>The municipality has advanced disaster management ideals. Flood modelling for climate related disaster management is ongoing in the municipality. Estuary Management Plans have been compiled for the Great Brak &amp; Little Brak Estuaries. The municipality is focusing on rehabilitation of coastal areas and improvement of storm water systems to accommodate increase in intensity of rainfall, as well as running alien clearing projects to improve water security.</p> <p>The municipality provided multiple projects in response to questions, with a rich analysis and description in the questionnaire and fair supporting documentation for judgement.</p> <p><b>Eden District</b></p> <p>The Eden District Municipality has a Climate Change and Energy Strategy which was developed in 2008 and revised in August 2014. The Eden District Municipality also has a Climate Change Adaptation Plan, and intend to finalize a draft Climate Change Mitigation Plan in 2015. The Risk Implementation Plan refers to energy demand and efficiency; and alternative energy sources are cited as a municipal priority in the IDP. Eden also stands out in the level of climate change-related disaster preparedness displayed in their strategic plans, which is also being implemented, as well as their pro-active coastal management. There is progress being made on energy generation, climate change sensitive storm water management, as well as training of officials and the public on climate change preparedness and response. Extensive alien clearing is taking place, as well as various other programmes relating to climate change, including food security, and various EPWP programmes. Multiple partnerships and projects have been initiated with many stakeholders and organizations – a critical requirement in the complex nature of effective climate change response. The district provided multiple projects in response to questions, with a rich analysis and description in the questionnaire and fair supporting documentation for judgement.</p>
<b>Most improved municipality</b>	<p>Local: Mossel Bay</p> <p>District: West Coast</p>
<b>Previous scores of the most improved municipality (2014)</b>	<p>Mossel Bay: 31.2%</p> <p>West Coast District: 14.4%</p>
<b>Current scores of the most improved municipality (2015)</b>	<p>Mossel Bay: 70.3%</p> <p>West Coast District: 24.7%</p>
<b>Innovation Award</b>	<p>George Municipality</p>

<b>Brief description of the Innovative project</b>	<p>The George Integrated Public Transport Network (GIPTN, aka GoGeorge) is a flagship public transport project, and George municipality is the first non-metro municipality of this size in the country to implement this type of transport system, which is groundbreaking. The implementation of this project will contribute significantly to the municipality's economic growth potential as well as improving municipal sustainability and livability for local residents.</p>
--	---

## Closing Remarks

This year's GMC submissions show that municipalities are continuing to improve their consideration of climate change-related issues in their operations, as well as tackling ambitious stand-alone projects related to climate change. However, there is still a wide range in the quality of the responses to the GMC questionnaire for the climate change component. The impression is that incomplete and inadequate responses seem to occur where one person is tasked with responding to what is a strategic and cross-sectoral issue. As this section cuts across all sectors, it is suggested that multiple persons should be included in the response to this section and that it should be coordinated at a strategic and high level (such as the IDP Manager). This will not only assist municipalities in providing a comprehensive response, but additionally prove helpful in supporting their own internal discussions on the impacts of climate change across all departments and service delivery mandates. Should any municipality require advice or support in their climate change projects we encourage them to contact the provincial climate change team for inputs. We look forward to seeing the exciting future developments in municipalities' climate change (mitigation and adaptation) responses.

# ELEMENT 3:

## BIODIVERSITY AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT



## Introduction & Background

Biodiversity and Coastal Management is critically important in the context of the Western Cape's economic growth and development, as it provides a foundation to the economy, makes our living environment bearable and is critical in keeping environmental conditions stable. The Western Cape Government recognizes the dependencies between biodiversity, coastal processes, the people of the province and development pressures. Thus it remains a provincial responsibility to respond to national and global biodiversity and coastal obligations in this regard. Municipalities should therefore also recognize and incorporate the importance of Biodiversity and Coastal Management in their development and planning.

## Evaluation Process

The Biodiversity and Coastal Management Units of the Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning were tasked with providing questions to be included in the questionnaire for the Greenest Municipality Competition 2015. The Units subsequently provided 21 questions for local municipalities and 20 questions for district municipalities for inclusion in the questionnaire under Element 3. Questions were allocated as follows: 21 questions for local municipalities, 10 for Coastal Management and 11 for Biodiversity; and 20 questions for district municipalities, 10 for Coastal Management and 10 for Biodiversity.

## The evaluation panel

The evaluation panel consisted of:

**Albert Ackhurst:** Sub-Directorate Biodiversity

**Mellisa Naiker:** Sub-Directorate Coastal Management

## Participation by Municipalities

The following local and district municipalities completed Element 3 of the questionnaire and were assessed according to the evaluation process discussed below:

### Local Municipalities:

- Berg River
- Bitou
- Breede valley
- Cederberg
- Drakenstein
- George
- Hessequa
- Knysna
- Witzenberg
- Laingsburg
- Langeberg
- Mosselbay
- Overstrand
- Saldanha
- Stellenbosch
- Swartland

### **District Municipalities:**

- Cape Winelands
- Eden
- Overberg
- West Coast

### **Element Evaluation Criteria / Methodology 2015**

Because the Western Cape Province consist of local authorities that are landlocked while others are coastal municipalities, it was necessary to afford them fair access to relevant performance areas in order to equal the playing field as far as adjudication is concerned.

Six of the Local municipalities (Breede Valley, Laingsburg, Langeberg, Drakenstein, Witzenberg and Stellenbosch) are not situated along the coast; as a result, they had to be evaluated differently. The six were therefore scored for Biodiversity (7 questions) and Ecosystems (4 Questions), and the percentage was based on that score. One of the District Municipalities (Cape Winelands) is an inland municipality; therefore it was also evaluated differently and scored for biodiversity (6 questions) and ecosystems (4 questions).

The questions supplied by the Biodiversity Unit were assessed by Mr Albert Ackhurst and the questions supplied by the Coastal Management Unit were assessed by Ms Mellisa Naiker.

## Biodiversity Assessment

All of the questions were evaluated using the same criteria; this applies to questions asked to both Local and District Municipalities. For each question the evaluator provided a point out of ten based on the following:

- Whether the municipality answered the question adequately (e.g. was the response relevant to the question)
- Specified the role of the municipality in the specific performance area.
- Provided adequate explanation or evidence to support the claims
- Did the explanation or evidence indicate the extent to which the performance was executed? (e.g. a municipality that planted 10 trees in a year vs. a similar municipality that planted 1000 trees. And a municipality that had multiple biodiversity oriented projects of different kinds vs. a municipality with only one project).
- The quality of the response was also considered, e.g. whether there was a clear explanation in order for the evaluator to form a picture of the project or performance area.
- Was evidence and support documents referenced and numbered?
- Was the evidence adequately explanatory (in some instances there were files/graphics and other documentation with no relevance to the actual topics).

Although mostly a subjective allocation of points the evaluator ensured that all municipalities were compared equally for each question and can motivate the allocation of points with the responses and the evidence provided by the municipalities.

**Coastal Management Assessment** All the questions were based on the responsibilities and mandates assigned to the Local and District Municipalities as per the Integrated Coastal Management Amendment Act (No.36 of 2014). In terms of ICMA; the compilation of an estuary management plan is a legislated requirement for all estuaries in the municipal area. District municipalities are responsible for estuary management for those estuaries which cross municipal borders, and District municipalities are obliged to support local municipalities in all activities as mandated by the ICMA; the same as Provincial government is obliged to support all.

All of the questions were evaluated using the criteria developed (See Excel File: 2015 GMC Final Evaluation Scoring Sheet Biodiversity & Coastal II). This applies to questions asked to both Local and District Municipalities. For each question the evaluator provided a point out of five based on the following:

- Whether the municipality answered the question adequately (e.g. was the response relevant to the question)
- Provided adequate explanation or evidence to support the claims
- Did the explanation or evidence indicate the extent to which the performance was executed? (e.g. a municipality that had multiple coastal oriented projects of various kinds vs. a municipality with only one project).
- The quality of the response was also considered, e.g. whether there was a clear explanation in order for the evaluator to have a good understanding of the project or performance area.

- Was evidence and supporting documents referenced and numbered?
- Was the evidence adequately explanatory (in some instances there were files/graphics and other documentation with no relevance to the actual topics).

Although mostly a subjective allocation of points the evaluator ensured that all municipalities were compared equally for each question and can motivate the allocation of points with the responses and the evidence provided by the municipalities.

All coastal management assessment points were thereafter combined with those of biodiversity assessment to get a final total score and determine the position of municipalities.

## Results

### Local Spreadsheet

Local Municipalities	Berg River	Bitou	Breede valley	Cederberg	Drakenstein	George	Hessequa	Knysna	Laingsburg	Langeberg	Mosselbay	Overstrand	Saldanha	Stellenbosch	Swarland	Witzenberg
<b>Total Biodiversity</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Total Coastal</b>	11	0		0		13	42	13			32	48	4		3	
Totals combined	36	0	15	18	75	42	83	34	12	11	67	92	15	70	34	63
Position	8	14	11	10	3	7	2	9	12	13	5	1	11	4	9	6
<b>(20%) Final Score</b>	7.2	0.0	2.9	3.6	14.9	8.3	16.5	6.7	2.4	2.2	13.4	18.3	2.9	14.0	6.7	12.5

### District Spreadsheet

District Municipalities	Cape Winelands	Eden		West Coast
<b>Total Biodiversity</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Total Coastal</b>		50	29	29
Final mark	46	86	52	67
Position	4	1	3	2
<b>(25%) Converted Mark</b>	11.5	21.5	13.1	16.8

## Summarized findings for all participating municipalities

Municipality	Findings
<p><b>Berg River</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Good greening and urban beautification efforts as well as the use of useful trees like olives albeit non-indigenous. Municipality is well associated with biodiversity and estuary management entities and biodiversity is considered within the SDF.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> There is alignment for some coastal projects that have been included in the IDP budgets of the municipality; this shows their commitment and forward planning to the coastal programme.</p> <p><b><u>Negative Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Not clear how Q1 relates to biodiversity conservation but seems more socio-economic. Although the municipality is a member of several biodiversity and estuary management concerns it does not illustrate the development or expansion of conservation areas. Biodiversity well defined in SDF but CBAs have not been assigned to the correct spatial planning category, see map 11.4.4 strategies and proposals vol. 2, page 22. CBAs are core 2. Q5, only one example of support to an organisation that does awareness, unclear what the support entails. Significance of only three biodiversity features not described.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> It seems that the municipality does not provide any support for educational and awareness programmes focused on coastal issues and this is of concern.</p> <p><b><u>Challenges</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> One photograph was submitted 16 times in the evidence files. Precinct Plans not submitted as evidence. Not much data to verify Biodiversity issues.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> The municipality did not provide evidence, either pictorial or otherwise in support of the answers provided.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Would like to see more active projects (not just plans) for biodiversity conservation (alien clearing and planting indigenous plants as restoration efforts)</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> The coastal unit recommends a closer working relationship with the District to co-ordinate and provides support for coastal awareness and educational events. Also that the municipality provides evidence of their work in future which would support their application.</p>
<p><b>Bitou</b></p>	<p>Not responsive to biodiversity Not responsive to Coastal Recommendations</p>
<p><b>Breede valley</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p>

	<p>Municipality has a good disaster management plan addressing at least fire and storm water issues.</p> <p><b><u>Negative Feedback</u></b></p> <p>Not responsive to 1st three questions. Q4: There are numerous maps that include the CBA layer as an informant in the maps. However the CBA layer does not affect the placement of other spatial priorities. Table 5.3.2.1 provides for CBA's to be afforded Core 1 status, however in text of the document only "large CBA's" are given core 1 status and other CBA's are given core 2 status. This is confusing, pg. 293 and 294. Weak response to raising awareness on biodiversity conservation. Not responsive to Q 6, 7, 8, 9, 10</p> <p><b><u>Challenges</u></b></p> <p>Not much information to work with</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p>To respond more fully to the questions in future and to incorporate biodiversity and ecosystems in cross cutting programs utilizing alien clearing and tree planting, etc., in job creation programs.</p>
<p><b>Cederberg</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p> <p>Biodiversity is well defined and considered in the SDF and All CBA's outside of formal protected areas have been assigned to Core 1b SPC and recommendations are made for implementation. However the draft does not include a map in this regard.</p> <p><b><u>Negative Feedback</u></b></p> <p>Responses not well described. Just a few words per category or a reference to e.g. IDP or SDF which the evaluator did not necessarily have access to. Unclear what the role was of the municipality in most categories. No explanations provided for the role of the municipality in awareness of local biodiversity conservation and management. Didn't explain the significance of the two biodiversity features or the efforts undertaken to conserve it. No description of significant urban beautification (greening) programmes.</p> <p><b><u>Challenges</u></b></p> <p>A series of one line responses was difficult to adjudicate with minimum evidence provided.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p>Provide explanations for the activities of the municipality, how the municipality contributed to the performance area and provide some form of evidence through pictures, files, proposals, news clippings or plans, etc.</p> <p><b><u>Coastal:</u></b></p> <p>Non responsive to coastal questions</p>
<p><b>Drakenstein</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p> <p>Good example of conservation work associated with co- benefits for the municipality and community. Actively involved in alien clearing and commendable tree planting policy favoring indigenous plants. Actively expanding biodiversity conservation and opportunities for biodiversity corridors in</p>

	<p>development planning. Awareness promoted through involving communities in tree planting and beautification and commendable partnership with CapeNature to implement the "adopt a wetland" project with schools. Well documented efforts to conserve and promote biodiversity featuring beautification programmes that are well illustrated including the collaboration of and support to local communities regarding its maintenance. Municipality actively involved in ecosystems planning and awareness. Very good emergency preparedness plan including veld-fires, heavy rains (Flooding), landslide as well as drought and flora &amp; fauna disease issues.</p> <p><b><u>Negative Feedback</u></b></p> <p>CBA's are well mentioned in the SDF but it is unclear what spatial zoning or category it has been ascribed to. The questionnaire lacked the description of the significance of 5 unique biodiversity features.</p> <p><b><u>Challenges</u></b></p> <p>Report and references were easy to follow</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p>River and wetland management are considered in the IDP but is better defined in the River EMP. SDF should indicate the correct spatial planning category, e.g. Core 1.</p>
<p><b>George</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> The project to build an EE and Science center through EPIP is commendable. It is good that CBA's have been assigned Core 1 and SPC's are based on the CBA map and ESA's were assigned Core 2 SPC based on the CBA map, as described in Table 7. It is apparent that maintenance on green areas is evident as well as apparent support to the botanical gardens.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> The proposal for initiating pilot blue flag beaches is a positive beginning for the municipality.</p> <p><b><u>Negative Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Although there is an involvement by the municipality with biodiversity projects with a job creation focus, the respondent fails to illustrate how awareness is raised through that project, like for instance the work with crèche learners. No real expansion of biodiversity corridors or conservation areas. Although Four unique biodiversity features were identified, they were not described and particular efforts to conserve or promote those were vague. Limited evidence of urban beautification was submitted within the category biodiversity.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> Even though the compilation of EMPs for each estuary within a municipality is a legal requirement; this municipality has not developed EMPs for any of its estuaries and has not indicated if there are any plans to develop EMPs.</p> <p><b><u>Challenges</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> There is some planting of trees and some spending on Alien clearing but evidence was scant or difficult to trace. Apparent evidence on a "forum" that would tackle invasive plants was illegible.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u></p>

	<p>The evidence provided in support of answers was not accessible and the answers provided were sometimes quite vague.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> It is important to describe the role of the municipality in the projects listed and also to provide clear evidence of such.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> It is important to show linkages of proposed projects as identified in the Municipal / District Coastal Management programmes to the municipal IDP for planning and budgeting purposes. For the purposes of the GMC application it is also essential that the municipality provide the documentation that supports the answers.</p>
<p><b>Hessequa</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Good use of green community projects that can assist with biodiversity conservation, especially around sustainable aloe, thatch and fynbos to Gin. Very good tree planting policy and alien management guidelines combined with participation and awareness on these issues. Actively involved in biodiversity conservation expansion and management of conservation areas. The appropriate spatial planning categories has been assigned to CBA's in the SDF e.g. Core 1. Excellent awareness raising projects &amp; campaigns e.g. Tuin-op-die-Brak (TOB) and affiliations with relevant biodiversity conservation entities. Biodiversity features generally not adequately described in terms of uniqueness (except TOB) but good efforts in the promotion and protection thereof. Significant and visible beautification associated with indigenous biodiversity features, e.g. Aloe gardens and TOB.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> This LM is very supportive of projects and initiatives planned for within the municipality and provides assistance to the development of EMPs and the establishment of the EMFs. The LM is also very active and supportive of coastal awareness events. This is also one of the few LM's that have identified coastal access land.</p> <p><b><u>Negative Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Although CBA's were attributed to the correct SPC's, the growth management plan illustrates growth areas that overlap on CBA's for instance on the maps the CBA's are blanked out with solid color, e.g. area C on the Riversdal map, so that one can't see the underlying features. This is repeated in other town maps as well.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> Not applicable</p> <p><b><u>Challenges</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> The evidence was not well referenced and made it difficult for the evaluator to understand the context of the evidence.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> In some instances the LM did not provide the appropriate evidence to support the answer provided.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> If evidence is offered it should be clearly referenced with the relevant questions.</p>

	<p><u>Coastal:</u> If the LM indicates that it supports a project or programme e.g. the MCC it should provide the relevant evidence in support of the answer.</p>
<p><b>Knysna</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> A nursery for traditional medicines is planned but no evidence was submitted. Municipality very active in the planting of indigenous trees (although evidence of tree policy was lacking). However the eradication of aliens in the upper catchment of the Knysna river is commendable. Points were awarded for ongoing maintenance of existing green areas and reserves as well as the alleged proposed expansion of the Brenton Blue Butterfly reserve. Good evidence of raising awareness of local biodiversity conservation and management especially related to the marine environment.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> The municipality does commendable work in providing services at Estuaries.</p> <p><b><u>Negative Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> No significant promotion evidence for biodiversity conservation whilst establishment of indigenous biodiversity corridors, expansion and development of conservation areas can't be conducted through commenting on land use applications and developments only, CBA Maps has been considered in the latest SDFs draft but only on a superficial level, additionally CBA's have not consistently been associated with the correct spatial categories (e.g. Core 1). No response to Q6.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> The LM has not answered the questions appropriately.</p> <p><b><u>Challenges</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Large documents were included in the questionnaire making it very cumbersome to adjudicate and establish the relevance.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> The LM has not answered the questions and has not made the appropriate evidence available.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Planting of indigenous trees at crèche's and during arbor week are noticed but evidence of the Knysna in Bloom project could have been provided.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> It is important to show linkages of proposed projects as identified in the Municipal / District Coastal Management programmes to the municipal IDP for planning and budgeting purposes. For the purposes of the GMC application it is also essential that the municipality provides the documentation that supports the answers.</p>
<p><b>Laingsburg</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p> <p>River cleaning was budgeted for 2014/15 as cleaning and greening Campaign to the tune of R54 000-00. Indicated that Disaster management has provided funding for flooding projects but no details or evidence provided.</p> <p><b><u>Negative Feedback</u></b></p> <p>No description or evidence of green community projects or description of the</p>

	<p>role of the municipality in the NCC: Prosperity Project. No response to Q 3 &amp; 4 and no explanation for Q5. No biodiversity features described. Liangsburg Prosperity project indicated again for beautification (greening) programmes but no description, evidence or role of the municipality provided. No response to Q 8 and 9. Only mention in IDP of EPWP is Central Karoo Alien Clearing as an external sector plan.</p> <p><b><u>Challenges</u></b></p> <p>Questionnaire very vaguely answered with no evidence.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p>Municipality should describe their projects in much better detail and provide some evidence.</p>
<p><b>Langeberg</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p> <p>Apparent involvement in awareness but didn't specify or describe the role of municipality</p> <p><b><u>Negative Feedback</u></b></p> <p>No green community projects. Planting indigenous plants and alien clearing on an ad hoc basis (as necessary) but no evidence in SDF, except mention in the IDP of District municipality alien eradication activities in the area. Not active in biodiversity conservation or expansion but maintenance is conducted on existing green areas, however no evidence or description. no response on Q4. Biodiversity features not described or significance indicated, ad hoc maintenance and alien clearing as indicated earlier. Beautification (greening) not well described except for mentioning greening of cemeteries (No evidence). No response on Q8-11.</p> <p><b><u>Challenges</u></b></p> <p>Only IDP provided as evidence.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p>Municipality should describe their projects in much better detail and provide some evidence</p>
<p><b>Mosselbay</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Biodiversity:</u></b>  Spending R1 million annually on Alien clearing while motivating communities to participate and benefit from the process is commendable. Tree policy is good but does not specify the use of indigenous vegetation and although only 11 trees planted during arbor day, a further 200 hundred indigenous trees were planted during the Dream project and funded with R50K. Actively involved in the expansion and management of valuable biodiversity and conservation areas e.g. expansion of Diosma Reserve by 65ha and dune rehabilitation. Some very good representation of how CBAs has influenced the urban edge. Municipality active in awareness raising through its newsletter, publications about Pinnacle Point caves and involvement with landscape/seascape initiatives and for instance Blue Flag educational workshop for EPWP beach cleaners. Four biodiversity (and heritage) features were well described and good management measures undertaken to maintain them. Active in urban beautification (greening) programmes as is evident by the 3 play parks, street gardening and</p>

	<p>indigenous tree planting.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> The LM has done commendable work in including the proposed work of the CMP into the budgeting and planning cycles of the IDP.</p> <p><b><u>Negative Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Although there is some very good representation of how CBAs has influenced the urban edge, others are poor and in terms of spatial categories (SDF 2013) In some instances Core 1 is indicated for Publicly owned CBA and Buffer 1 for CBA in private ownership. From the described biodiversity and heritage features some are participatory, e.g. Gouritz Biosphere reserve and not administered by the municipality.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> Not applicable</p> <p><b><u>Challenges</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> No real challenges</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> Although the LM has answered the questions relatively well it has not provided supporting evidence for some of the questions.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> To provide more evidence, especially photographic related to alien clearing, greening and community involvement with conservation</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> Municipality should describe their projects in much better detail and provide evidence where needed.</p>
<p><b>Overstrand</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Very good examples of biodiversity conservation with community co-benefits and reducing impacts on biodiversity. Extensive planting of indigenous vegetation and well documented high level eradication of alien invasive species on both coastal and inland catchments. It is obvious from the Overstrand SEMF that biodiversity conservation carries a high priority in all its requisite facets. The SEMF, which is an addendum to the IDF, recognizes CBA's, the management activities associated therewith as well as their importance and the correct Spatial category is attributed to CBA's. Very good participation with conservation entities and active promotion of biodiversity through environmental education, print media and informative walks. Biodiversity features very well described as well as its significance and management efforts. Fine examples of municipal greening (beautification) in various areas including biodiversity walks, public areas, tree planting with communities, and gardening competitions.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> This LM has done excellent work in aligning their CMP and IDP as well as their EPIP strategy to ensure available funds for proposed projects. They have answered the questions fully and referenced their provided evidence accordingly. They also show commendable support to the EMFs in the areas as well as support in the development of the EMPs.</p>

	<p><b><u>Negative Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Hard to find</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> Not applicable</p> <p><b><u>Challenges</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> No real challenges</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> Not applicable</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Keep up the good work</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> This LM has answered the GMC questions very well and referenced its evidence, The quality of the application shows the dedication of its officials in environmental management and they deserve recognition. Keep it up, well done.</p>
<p><b>Saldanha</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> It is encouraging that the municipality is undergoing a study to value the open spaces of the municipality and that they conducted a study on the erosion around the lagoon affecting the municipality.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> The soon to be adopted CMP for the Local Municipality shows the Municipalities commitment to their obligations in regards to the fulfilment of the ICMAAct.</p> <p><b><u>Negative Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> No response to Q1. No elaboration or evidence of planting indigenous vegetation or eradication of aliens or description of the role of the municipality in it. Responded "no" to question but does recognize that green belts exist and that the municipality intends to value them. CBAs on Publicly owned land have been assigned to the correct spatial planning category (Conservation I which equates to Core 1), however CBA's identified on Private land have been given Conservation II status (equates to Core2 or Buffer). Activities allowed in conservation 1 and 2 are the same. Within the IDZ not all CBAs are taken up. Not very active in raising awareness of local biodiversity conservation and management. Only Langebaan lagoon mentioned and some studies related to management of erosion and sewer pollution. Very little greening (urban beautification) described.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> The LM has not answered the questions adequately or provided evidence in support of the answers.</p> <p><b><u>Challenges</u></b></p>

	<p><u>Biodiversity:</u> No real evidence to go on and insufficient descriptions of municipality's role and involvement in projects</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> No evidence in support of answers has been provided and questions were not adequately answered.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> To play a more active role in considering and participating in biodiversity projects and to describe these better in future.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> More effort and thought is required in answering the GMC questionnaire fully with the relevant supporting evidence.</p>
<p><b>Stellenbosch</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p> <p>Food security project and 1 Million trees project is commendable and the firewood tender project serves well to illustrate green community projects that can assist with biodiversity conservation in the area. Actively involved in alien invasive species eradication and planting of indigenous trees. Actively involved in biodiversity conservation expansion and management. Full points for trying to break the record of hugging 1200 trees, with media coverage but half point for only hugging 700 trees and even less for hugging Alien species :). However, good evidence of awareness raising through regular road shows and school visits. Four unique biodiversity features were well described as well as their significance (another, wetlands was just mentioned) however management activities to promote/conservate these were well explained. Good urban beautification projects and well combined with 1 Million Trees project and conservation objectives. Good collaboration with entities on sustainable ecosystems, especially water. It is encouraging to see good participation in the Stellenbosch River Collaborative to develop or restore ecosystems infrastructure and developing a rivers management plan plus is in the process of initiating the Stellenbosch River Stewardship Action. Disaster management is apparently high on the agenda but need to be finalized.</p> <p><b><u>Negative Feedback</u></b></p> <p>It is unclear whether the Food security and Million Trees project maintained adequate momentum during the competition period July 2014 to June 2015. Biodiversity is considered in the current EMF but is allocated to Category B: Buffer Areas, although a prioritized strategy is to obtain statutory conservation status for CBA's in private ownership through e.g. the establishment of Special Management Areas (SMAs). Not much evidence of Fire management collaboration. Ecosystems and ecosystems infrastructure are incorporated into the IDP but within the context of heritage and water resource planning only.</p> <p><b><u>Challenges</u></b></p> <p>No real challenges</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p>Consider CBA's as primary areas for protection within Spatial Planning Category (Core 1) or similar.</p>

<p><b>Swartland</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Well described green community projects. Good apparent policy on planting indigenous vegetation and alien clearing projects. Active and involved with biodiversity conservation, especially with WCBR and Capenature but unclear in terms of when expansion of conservation estate took place. Good collaborative programs and projects but some focus on awareness raising through environmental education and tourism sector lacking. Unique features were described but not always in terms of its uniqueness to the area or its significance to the municipality but management activities and efforts were indicated. Good use of the spring-flower season and good efforts to conduct beautification and greening.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> The municipality has a very active working for the coast and epwp section.</p> <p><b><u>Negative Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Some photographic evidence or project plans would have been welcome to illustrate green community projects. Evidence, scale of projects and municipal involvement in planting trees and alien eradication not well described. Strategy 6 indicates that biodiversity and threatened ecosystems are of value but in the absence of CBA's, Critically endangered and Endangered threatened ecosystems should have been afforded Core 1 and not only Renosterveld types as Core 1 or 2.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> The municipality does not consider estuaries to be present within their municipal jurisdiction. However the Environmental Manager at the District has confirmed the presence of a few estuaries. The compilation of an EMP is legislated and municipalities have to develop EMP for all estuaries within their jurisdiction.</p> <p><b><u>Challenges</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Limited evidence supplied</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> The LM has not answered the questions adequately or provided evidence in support of the answers.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Municipality does well to consider biodiversity and can score much better with more relevant evidence</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> More effort and thought is required in answering the GMC questionnaire fully with the relevant supporting evidence.</p>
<p><b>Witzenberg</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p> <p>Some green community projects with co-benefits and livelihoods but mostly described awareness and beautification. Some work evident on planting indigenous vegetation and eradication of alien invasive species. Some good work on greening public parks areas. Biodiversity is very well represented in the SDF, CBA's have been assigned core 1 status see figure C2 page 128. Additionally Plan C 1 page 134. See management of conservation areas pages 145 – 154. Very involved in awareness raising through programmes and projects in all aspects but lacking evidence on role of municipality in the tourism sector. Five types of fynbos were described and their collective uniqueness and significance to valley vegetation as well as the associated formation of wetlands.</p>

Urban beautification programmes were well documented. Ecosystems and ecosystems infrastructure are mentioned in the IDP albeit as intended activities only.

**Negative Feedback**

Scant reference on how unique biodiversity features are conserved or promoted by the municipality. Apart from co-operation with some relevant stakeholders the role of the municipality is unclear in terms of sustainable ecosystems awareness and planning. Alien clearing of a river is commendable but it is unclear what the strategic objective is in terms of ecosystems infrastructure, e.g. flood amelioration, enhanced water resources, or fire reduction if not all. The Cape Winelands District Municipality Hazard identification, Vulnerability and Risk prioritization document was submitted but it's unclear whether Witzenberg even endorses or subscribes to it since the IDP also mentions the Witzenberg Draft Disaster Management plan.

**Challenges**

No real challenges

**Recommendations**

Being active in the development of biodiversity corridors and expansion of conservation areas (reserves) would have been seen as very positive.

District Municipality	Findings
<p><b>Cape Winelands</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p> <p>Alien clearing across municipalities and innovative rodent control using owls. Good use of the Biosphere Reserve to promote awareness and conservation in the district. Involved in two NRM programmes in terms of Alien Vegetation Management Programme and the Bergrivier and Asbos programme and inclusion into 5 year budget plan. Tourism Division facilitates and assists with promotion and funding of tourism products. CBA's and ESA's are included in the Core 1 &amp; 2 areas respectively and both are adequately explained with proposed actions to conserve biodiversity. Good cooperation with FPAs but no mention of specific cooperation with farmers and /or water entities. Updated disaster risk management plan.</p> <p><b><u>Negative Feedback</u></b></p> <p>No biodiversity Specialist appointed. No measures in place to develop or restore ecosystems infrastructure associated with water, soil erosion etc. Ecosystems and ecosystems infrastructure not incorporated into IDP.</p> <p><b><u>Challenges</u></b></p> <p>Some evidence offered was older than 10 years and difficult to establish in which context it was relevant for the current year.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p>More evidence of current activities would have been advisable</p>
<p><b>Eden</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Eden is active in cross cutting projects through its local municipalities. Significant involvement with provincial, national AND international plans/programs/projects to improve biodiversity conservation in the district. Significant involvement in EPWP projects associated with NRM but unclear why Bitou Agriforestry projects were included under EDEN. Although Eden is active in the promotion of tourism it also links well with other tourism initiatives, in many instances related to biodiversity conservation and responsible tourism as is evident from hosting four tourism products from its own website. The Biodiversity and Coastal Management officer of EDM fulfills the role of biodiversity specialist and co-opts the inputs of various biodiversity specialists as required. A Strategy for rates rebate for the conservation of biodiversity and the removal of alien vegetation is positive.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> This DM has shown excellent alignment of its CMP with the IDP which includes an implementation plan for the identified projects. It has provided evidence of innovative events which promotes coastal awareness. The DM is active and supports the local coastal municipalities. This DM has provided excellent evidence in support of their answers and is to be commended on the efforts and activities.</p> <p><b><u>Negative Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Although biodiversity is represented within the SDF there is no reference to CBA's or their importance,</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> Not applicable</p> <p><b><u>Challenges</u></b></p>

	<p><u>Biodiversity:</u> A mass of unstructured and unreferenced information and evidence were provided (some of which had no bearing on the biodiversity issues at hand and others possibly added and "double counted" whereas it should have counted for the particular <u>local</u> municipality) and it was very difficult to discern the relevance of much of the evidence to the particular DM's Biodiversity questions</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> A large amount of pictorial evidence was provided that was at times not adequately labelled and referenced to answer particular questions and had to be sifted through.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> A more systematic approach with evidence files referenced to specific questions is advised for future reference.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> It will be difficult to improve on the performance of this DM in the next cycle of GMC and we look forward to more innovative work being presented. Well done to the official / s who manage the coastal space.</p>
<p><b>Overberg</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> The CMP provides for coastal terrestrial and important bird areas and there is evidence of the LAB wetlands involvement as well as the Fynbos fire project, which are both cross cutting within the DM. SDF recognizes that critical CBA's need to be protected. Good examples of NRM projects related to biodiversity and conservation. It appears as if the Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve Framework Plan includes a tourism plan developed by Overberg Tourism and there is evidence of an outdated tourism plan for the Agulhas National Plan and a Theewaterskloof tourism strategy but unclear what the role of the DM is in such.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> This DM is very active in the coastal space and has actively worked towards completing the District CMP. The DM supports the LMs in various activities both financially and with personnel.</p> <p><b><u>Negative Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Although ODM has an environmental policy there is much emphasis on coastal management (which is adjudicated elsewhere) and very little linkages with Provincial plans (e.g. PBSAP, PSDF or WCNCBA) and the SDF does recognize that critical CBA's need to be protected but makes no definitive proposals on how to achieve this or identify any areas for action either in the text or spatially. Examples of NRM projects also unclear whether it is accountable under the DM or the particular LM. (Possibility of double accounting). No biodiversity specialist appointed. Within the SDF text reference is made to the protection of CBA's and it is suggested that it be assigned Core status however the SDF does not follow through with the suggestion. The SDF only assigns Core status to formally protected areas and CBA's to Buffer 1, Page 210 - 212.</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> The department acknowledges that the management of most estuaries is a LM function; however the DEADP expects that the DM supports the LM in fulfilling its responsibilities. The DM has not indicated any support to the LM.</p> <p><b><u>Challenges</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> No Challenges</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u></p>

	<p>Not applicable</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> To assign Core 1 status to CBA's in the SDF</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> It is important to show linkages of proposed projects as identified in the Municipal / District Coastal Management programme to the municipal IDP for planning and budgeting purposes.</p>
<p><b>West Coast</b></p>	<p><b><u>Positive Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> Very good example of cross cutting activities into Tree planting and alien clearing. Good examples of activities linked with provincial and/or national plans/programs/projects to improve biodiversity conservation in the district albeit leaning towards coastal management as well. Good example of NRM projects ((EPWP, EPIP &amp; Landcare) and special achievements as one of the best implementers during the year. Good initiative and reaction to tourism needs in terms of expanding hiking and birding. The Head Environmental Management Officer fulfills the role of biodiversity specialist and co-opts the inputs of various biodiversity specialists as required. The SDF 2014 makes ample provision for Biodiversity concerns and the correct SPC is attributed to CBA's (Core 1).</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> The department commends the DM on the outstanding work that was done by the DM and EPIP programme as well as the well co-ordinated and supported MCC.</p> <p><b><u>Negative Feedback</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> No negative feedback</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> The DM did not provide the IDP documentation to confirm alignment with the CMP.</p> <p><b><u>Challenges</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> No real challenges</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> Although the DM has answered the questions relatively well it has not provided supportive evidence for some of the questions.</p> <p><b><u>Recommendations</u></b></p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u> To provide more biodiversity information and evidence in future</p> <p><u>Coastal:</u> Municipality should describe their projects in much better detail and provide the appropriate evidence in support.</p>

## Category winners

<b>Element Winner for Local Municipality Biodiversity and Coastal management)</b>	Overstrand
<b>Brief description for overall nominated element winner</b>	Prime example of a municipality that takes biodiversity conservation and coastal management seriously with community co-benefits and reducing impacts on biodiversity. Pro-active environmental planning as is evident with their Strategic Environmental Management Framework (SEMF) that considers biodiversity and coastal management planning and an excellent example of aligning their CMP and IDP as well as their EPIP strategy to ensure available funds for proposed projects.
<b>Element Winner for District Municipalities in Biodiversity and Coastal management)</b>	Eden
<b>Brief description for nominated District Municipality element winner</b>	Eden is active in cross cutting projects through its local municipalities. Significant involvement with provincial, national AND international plans/programs/projects to improve both biodiversity conservation and coastal management and combine it with responsible tourism in the district. Excellent alignment of its CMP with the IDP which includes an implementation plan for the identified projects. It has provided evidence of innovative events which promotes coastal awareness.
<b>Most improved municipality</b>	Witzenberg This is a NON coastal municipality, however it has been awarded the most improved category due to a 20% increase in score from the last cycle, Because of improved community greening projects and livelihoods for communities.
<b>Previous scores of the most improved municipality (2014)</b>	43
<b>Current scores of the most improved municipality (2015)</b>	63
<b>Innovation Award</b>	None
<b>Brief description of the Innovative project</b>	

## Closing Remarks

The element is technically very complex with some coastal municipalities and other non-coastal municipalities unevenly distributed between Local municipalities (LM) and District municipalities (DM). It is suggested that the overall element winner (including DM's and LM's) be recognized with the category prize/trophy.

However to also give the smaller municipalities a chance to illustrate their efforts it is suggested to recognize (with a certificate or other) local and district municipalities that performed best in the specific categories of Biodiversity management and Coastal management. In this instance it is suggested that Drakenstein receives a meritorious mention or certificate for best municipality in the category Biodiversity & Terrestrial Ecosystems Management because they outscored all other non-coastal municipalities in this segment. Similarly West Coast District Municipality also deserves a meritorious mention or certificate in the Category Biodiversity Management because they outscored all other DMs in that segment. Considering that the most improved municipality award has been won by a non-coastal municipality it is recommended that Saldanha Municipality (LM) be given a meritorious mention of most improved coastal municipality with an improvement of 15% up from their score for GMC last year.

These additional awards/certificates/special mentions are very good for morale for the smaller municipalities in order to keep all municipalities interested in entering for the GMC.

# ELEMENT 4:

## WATER MANAGEMENT & CONSERVATION



## Introduction and Background

The amount of water on earth is finite; meaning that it cannot be increased or decreased. Water is merely recycled within the earth's atmosphere, surface and subsurface in a cycle known as the water cycle. Although the amount of water cannot be increased or decreased, good management of our water resources and the use of alternative non-conventional sources of water (treated effluent, grey water etc.), may lead to an increase in the availability of good quality water, for a wide range of applications. Because the earth has so much water on its surface, it is actually known as the Blue Planet in our solar system. In fact, 70% of the earth's surface is covered with water but of this, approximately 97% is salt water, with the remaining 3% being fresh water. Of this 3%, less than 1% is available for life on earth, whilst the rest is in the form of ice at the Polar Regions.

The availability of this less than 1% suitable drinking water is however unequally distributed across the earth. South Africa, specifically, receives, on average, an annual rainfall of about 450 millimetres whereas the rest of the earth receives on average 860 millimetres. This is nearly half the earth's average and thus South Africa can be classified as a water-stressed country. There is an ever increasing need for water for use in industry, agriculture and households. This increase in water demand can be directly related to the increase in population across the world as well as industrialisation.

One needs to make a distinction between raw water and treated water. Raw water is water found in its natural state in rivers and dams etc. The main user of raw water is the agricultural sector and the water is mostly used for irrigation purposes. Treated water, on the other hand has gone through a process where it is cleaned by various processes including disinfection as a final step.

This is the water that is reticulated or piped to individual households or to stand pipes. This water is a lot more expensive and the treatment cost is carried by the municipality which is recovered from the end-users.

A large part of the high cost of treating raw water to potable standard is the high cost of electricity. Water losses, which could be substantial, caused by leaks from pipes and faucets within the reticulation system, also have an economic impact as the losses are inevitably covered by the tax payer. Furthermore, it is inefficient to use costly potable water for uses that do not require such high quality water (fit for use concept). For example, flushing of toilets should ideally not use potable water. Some industrial and irrigation activities could also use water of a lower quality which would make treated/potable water available for expansion of the reticulation system as the demand grows.

In South Africa, we are dealing with problems which developed countries have largely overcome. The consequences of historical and political inequities are still being addressed with the provision of water and sanitation enjoying of the highest priority.

Water security is critical to the development of any nation. The problem Government now faces however is how to meet a demand that is potentially greater than the supply. A specialist report published by the CSIR in 2005 indicated that more than 95% of the country's freshwater resources had already been allocated, (*A CSIR perspective on water in South Africa – 2010*). This means we need to find new ways of increasing the amount of available water, as well as increasing the level of efficiency of supply for the current water availability.

One of the ways is to address the management of water directly. The Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS) developed the Water for Growth and Development framework (WfGD) that acknowledges that municipalities ought to have more prominent role in management of water supplies which includes:

- Supporting economic activities to achieve the country's growth target;
- Provide for domestic and social needs;
- Maintaining the environment in terms of ecological functioning, and
- Improving the overall quality of life of people living in South Africa.

The South African Constitution places the stewardship of water on the DWS by means of the National Water Act (Act 36 of 1998). The Water Services Act (Act 108 of 1997) describes the roles of the Local-, as well as the District Municipalities, in terms of water management. The National Water Resources Strategy 2 document, 2012 sets out the strategic direction for water resources management in the country over the next 20 years.

Water is such an important factor for any growing economy, and this is acknowledged in the GMC. Therefore, it is not surprising that the mark contribution allocated for Element 4 accounts for 20 % of the final mark for Local Municipalities and 10% for District Municipalities, whose roles and responsibilities in terms of water management differs.

In terms of the Greenest Municipality Competition, the Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&DP), needs to evaluate municipalities in terms of the water management and water conservation criteria as they are mandated to provide water services in terms of the Constitution. In terms of Element 4 the DEA&DP evaluates the management, budget allocation, projects (current and planned), use of alternative and non-conventional sources of water as well as water losses and waste water effluent water quality.

In future, the competition will focus more on reducing water losses, improving effluent quality as well as innovative means of meeting water demand through the use of alternative and non-conventional sources of water.

DEA&DP therefore implores all municipalities to include these aspects into their focus areas and highlight these aspects to the Department when answering the questionnaires.

Municipalities need to inform as wide an audience of their achievements but they need to be as concise and clear as possible.

However as the Department, we need to get a clear understanding of what the municipalities are saying and easily extract all the information required when evaluating them.

We all need to be more conscious of our water usage and we must each actively do our bit to help preserve one of our country's most precious resources, water.

## The Evaluation Process

### The Evaluation Panel

<b>Adjudicator</b>	Ms Wilna Kloppers
<b>Head Evaluator</b>	Mr Etienne Roux
<b>Core Evaluator</b>	Mrs Catherine Warr
<b>Core Evaluator</b>	Mr Gunther Frantz
<b>Evaluator</b>	Mrs Shehaam Brinkhuis
<b>Evaluator</b>	Mr Zayed Brown
<b>Evaluator</b>	Mr Anthony van Wyk
<b>Evaluator</b>	Mr Russell Mehl
<b>Evaluator</b>	Ms Caren George
<b>Evaluator</b>	Ms Nicole Garcia
<b>Evaluator</b>	Mr Akhona Ndletyana

### Participating Municipalities

The following municipalities took part in the 2015 GMC:

#### Local Municipality

- Berg River Municipality
- Breede Valley Municipality
- Cederberg Municipality
- Drakenstein Municipality
- George Municipality
- Hessequa Municipality
- Knysna Municipality
- Laingsburg Municipality
- Langeberg Municipality
- Mosselbay Municipality
- Overstrand Municipality
- Saldanha Bay Municipality
- Stellenbosch Municipality
- Swartland Municipality
- Witzenberg Municipality

#### District Municipality

- Eden District Municipality
- Cape Winelands District Municipality
- Overberg District Municipality
- West Coast District Municipality

## Element Evaluation Methodology

The D: PCM introduced new questions as well as some new evaluation criteria for the 2015 GMC evaluations. These questionnaires were sent to municipalities as part of the full GMC questionnaire and were received by this Directorate on 17 July 2015.

Once received, the head evaluator assigned each evaluator with their respective municipalities to be evaluated. These evaluators completed the evaluation of the participating municipalities based on the information contained in the completed questionnaires supplied.

After the first round of evaluations, the head evaluator audited the evaluators' review of their respective municipalities and also ensured that marks were captured accurately.

This was followed by a review by the Core Evaluator team to confirm the accuracy and integrity of the evaluations and to ensure that marks were captured correctly.

As a final step, the evaluations were checked by the Adjudicator and the final marks were endorsed and signed off by the Adjudicator and sent to the Directorate: Sustainability.

## Results

Local Municipality	Score	Converted Score
Mosselbay	87.2	17.45
Witzenberg	80.9	16.17
Hessequa	80.9	16.17
Swartland	77.7	15.53
Overstrand	77.7	15.53
Drakenstein	73.4	14.68
Knysna	73.4	14.68
Stellenbosch	68.1	13.62
Langeberg	63.8	12.77
Saldanha Bay	62.8	12.55
Breede Valley	62.8	12.55
Berg River	59.6	11.91
George	58.5	11.70
Laingsburg	42.5	8.50
Cederberg	18.1	3.62

District Municipality	Score	Converted Score
Eden	81	16.20
West Coast	59	11.80
Overberg	56	11.20
Cape Winelands	49	9.80

## Summarized finding for all participating municipalities

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
<p><b>Mosselbay LM</b></p>	<p>Some of the WC/WDM strategies that the municipality has implemented successfully include the replacement of 500 defective water meters, replacement of old water pipelines, installation of electronic bulk water meters at water purification plants as well as the implementation of Automatic Meter Reading (AMR) devices for bulk customers as well as households. From the Greendrop System (GDS) it was indicated that there was increase in their microbiological compliance from 67.71% to 87.5% for the years ending January 2014 and January 2015 respectively.</p>	<p>The municipality has however had an increase in the amount of non-revenue water (NRW). This went up from 16.4 % for the year ending March 2014 to 16.7% for the year ending March 2015.</p>	<p>The municipality has cited inaccurate water meters, pipe breakages, illegal water connections as well as billing related errors amongst the reasons as to the increase in NRW.</p>	<p>The municipality is commended for their work in terms of improvement of their effluent compliance. The municipality must however endeavour to input their data into the GDS completely. This eases the evaluation process on the GMC evaluator's side. The municipality should continue to put effort into reducing NRW.</p>
<p><b>Witzenberg LM</b></p>	<p>Witzenberg has completed a water meter audit and have met their target of unaccounted for water as mentioned in their annual Service Delivery and Budget Implantation Plan (SDBIP) report. Other plans included in their WC/WDM strategy</p>	<p>The municipality's NRW increased from 31.6 % to 36.3% for the years ending March 2014 and March 2015 respectively</p>	<p>The municipality has cited old infrastructure as well as leaks amongst the reasons for water losses. The municipality also stated there are</p>	<p>Water losses and NRW are high and addressing these needs to be prioritised on the budget. The municipality is commended for their 100% monitoring compliance in terms of waste water treatment. The municipality must however engage with the officials in charge of the</p>

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>are ongoing meter replacement programme, water network, pipe and valve replacement as well as the implementation of recommendations for the reduction of UAW.</p> <p>According to the GDS, the municipality has a monitoring compliance of 100%. This means that they are doing all water quality tests according to the standards as set out by the DWS. Although their microbiological compliance decreased from 83.33% for the year ending January 2014 to 70.83% for the year ending January 2015, there has been an increase in both their physical and chemical compliance, as captured by the GDS.</p>		<p>financial constraints related to water infrastructure. According to the questionnaire the budget allocated for the operation and maintenance of water related infrastructure is not adequate.</p>	<p>water treatment facilities and prioritise these services in order to ensure that there is sufficient budget for operation and maintenance of the systems.</p>
<b>Hessequa LM</b>	<p>Hessequa's IDP indicates 5 development strategies. These include, quarterly water balances reported to DWS, reduction of water losses, replacement of bulk water meters, pressure management as well</p>	<p>Hessequa has managed to keep their NRW at 13.1% for the year ending March 2014, which is slightly higher than the 12.9% for the year ending March 2015.</p>	<p>The municipality has cited ageing infrastructure, old water meters, pipe bursts, illegal users on the system as well as values that are not</p>	<p>The municipality is commended for keeping their NRW low. The municipality should however endeavour to improve their monitoring compliance as well as their microbiological compliance, in terms of the GDS.</p>

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>as upgrading of the telemetry system which will be implemented at all works over the following financial years.</p> <p>The low increase in their NRW can be attributed to the pressure management initiatives, meter replacement programme to improve the accuracy of water metering as well as the undertaking of regular water balancing.</p>		<p>recorded sufficiently, as possible reasons for the NRW</p>	
<b>Swartland LM</b>	<p>Swartland municipality has replaced sections in their water reticulation network, replaced aged water meters as well as installed 386 water demand management devices in the new housing development in Abbotsdale to date. Other interventions include leak repairs at indigent households as well as the re-use of treated effluent for the irrigation of sports fields.</p> <p>Swartland Municipality recently upgraded the</p>	<p>Swartland has a low monitoring compliance and it has decreased from 69.19% for the year ending January 2014 to 65.59% for the year ending January 2015. The microbiological compliance of the municipality is very low at 20.42% for the year ending January 2015. This shows a decrease from the 27.08% for microbiological compliance obtained for the year ending January 2014. The Riebeeck Kasteel WWTW was</p>	<p>Swartland municipality has identified which of the WWTW in the area are in need of upgrades.</p>	<p>The municipality is commended for maintaining a relatively low NRW, below 20%. The municipality supplied the D: PCM with a plethora of supporting documentation. This helped the evaluation of the municipality immensely. However, only achievements obtained within the financial year evaluated can be scored. GDS scoring was used for evaluation purposes. The Riebeeck Kasteel WWTW was also not in operation and this resulted in the municipality losing marks. An effort should be made by the Municipality to improve on all aspects of their wastewater</p>

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>Riebeeck Kasteel WWTW. This works will now be a regional works that will treat effluent from three nearby towns, namely Riebeeck-Wes, Riebeeck Kasteel as well as the households Ongegund (or PPC) works. The works was not yet commissioned but were to be commissioned within three months. All three systems used to be oxidation pond systems with unlined ponds and the capacities of the three works (Riebeeck-Wes, Riebeeck Kasteel and Ongegund) are respectively 0.3 m<sup>3</sup>/day; 0.2 m<sup>3</sup>/day and 0.15 m<sup>3</sup>/day. The new works will be an activated sludge system with a total design capacity of 1.8 ML/day. The works is expected to last for the next 20 years based on the municipality's growth estimation.</p>	<p>also not in operation resulting in the municipality losing marks. However, it should be noted that this plant will be taken into consideration for next year's GMC cycle.</p>		<p>compliance.</p>
<p><b>Overstrand LM</b></p>	<p>Overstrand adopted a WC/WDM strategy as part of its turn-around strategy in 2010. The municipality have interventions in place to reduce water losses such as</p>	<p>The municipality managed to reduce its NRW, however this is still a relatively high value at 21.4 % for the year ending March 2015. Some</p>	<p>The municipality has cited pipe bursts, leaks, ageing water meters, firefighting and</p>	<p>The municipality is commended for its work in terms of reducing its NRW as well as improving the effluent quality of its treatment works. Even though the municipality managed to reduce its</p>

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>replacement of old water pipelines, pressure management, public awareness raising as well as leak detection and repairs amongst others.</p> <p>The municipality has had a decrease in the amount of NRW and this value decreased from 24.5% for the year ending March 2014 to 21.4% for the year ending March 2015. The microbiological, chemical as well as physical compliance as measured by the GDS all improved.</p>	<p>supporting documentation requested in the questionnaire was also not received from the municipality.</p>	<p>unauthorised consumption as possible reasons for their water losses.</p>	<p>NRW, it is still relatively high at 21.4% for the year ending March 2015. The municipality must continue with its WC/WDM strategy and work towards reducing its water losses even further.</p>
<p><b>Drakenstein LM</b></p>	<p>The Drakenstein municipality has highlighted a number of initiatives that form part of their WC/WDM strategy, such as, the refurbishment of pipelines, fixing of leaking taps, pressure management, public awareness raising as well as a preventative maintenance program amongst others.</p>	<p>Although NRW is relatively low, the municipality has however seen an increase in their NRW as this increased from 13.2% to 16.2% for the years ending March 2014 and 2015 respectively. The municipality has a high monitoring compliance but the microbiological compliance decreased from 48.61% to 34.03% for the years ending January 2014 and 2015 respectively.</p>	<p>The municipality has cited increasing vandalism of infrastructure, unmetered connections as well as pipe breakages and scouring of pipe systems as possible explanations for their water losses.</p>	<p>The municipality must focus on improving the compliance with regard to the quality of the treated effluent from the waste water treatment works in the municipal area.</p>

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
<b>Knysna LM</b>	<p>Knysna has highlighted a number of programs that form part of their WC/WDM strategy. These include a pipe replacement program, remote monitoring of reservoirs as well as the installation of flow restrictors and standpipes.</p> <p>The microbiological compliance of the WWTWs in the municipal area increased from 40.48% to 60.71% for the years ending January 2014 and 2015 respectively.</p> <p>The municipality currently has at least 5 water related projects that are running, or have been completed in the 2014/2015 financial year. These include work at the Knysna WWTW as well as the Sedgfield WWTW.</p>	<p>Although low, the municipality's NRW went up from 6.5% to 10.3% for the years ending March 2014 and 2015 respectively.</p>	<p>The municipality cited ageing infrastructure and insufficient budget as constraints leading to the increase in water losses. According to the questionnaire, the water related infrastructure budget has a shortfall of about 10%.</p>	<p>The municipality is highly commended for its excellent NRW results. The budget allocation should be relooked and better prioritised. The municipality is also urged to apply for other forms of funding like MIG, RBIG and ACIP and to consider other funding models to cover the capital and maintenance shortfall.</p>
<b>Stellenbosch LM</b>	<p>Stellenbosch indicated that upgrading and rehabilitation of the water network infrastructure, completion of the 2013/2014 water audit, improved response time with regard to pipe burst repairs as well as</p>	<p>The municipality is not reporting on its non-revenue water to DWS, however, according to the questionnaire, Stellenbosch Municipality has had an increase in NRW from 22.5% in the 2013/2014 cycle, to 29% in the</p>	<p>The municipality has indicated that aging infrastructure that leads to burst mains and illegal and unmetered connections in informal settlements</p>	<p>The Municipality must ensure that they increase their monitoring compliance with regard to WWTW effluent. The municipality should focus on interventions to reduce their NRW and also ensure that the NRW data is supplied to DWS on a regular basis as required.</p>

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>upgrading of the telemetry system all form part of its WC/WDM strategy. Other programs include the reduction and maintenance of low levels of water losses through the network, increased use of alternative water resources as well as ensuring the efficient use of water in new developments. In the past financial year, they have commissioned a Nereda plant in Wemmershoek. The GDS website shows the monitoring compliance of the municipality has increased from 55.06% to 61.86%. The microbiological compliance, as well as the physical and chemical compliance of the municipality also increased from the year ending January 2014 to the year ending January 2015.</p>	<p>2014/2015 cycle.</p>	<p>are reasons for the increase in water losses.</p>	
<p><b>Langeberg LM</b></p>	<p>Langeberg municipality has indicated that annual water audits, asset register management as well as water meter management form part of their WC/WDM strategy. The monitoring</p>	<p>The NRW from the municipality increased slightly from 15.7% for the year ending March 2014 to 16.5% for the year ending March 2015.</p>	<p>The municipality has highlighted some programs that are to be implemented; however the municipality is</p>	<p>The municipality is commended on its relatively low NRW. The municipality is urged to fill in their questionnaire more comprehensively as the municipality lost marks due to questions not being adequately answered. The</p>

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>compliance of the municipality has increased from 77.33% to 88.98% for the years ending January 2014 and 2015 respectively.</p>		<p>still waiting for funding in order to initiate their water meter audit for example. The municipality has listed inadequate budget as a constraint. The percentage shortfall indicated by the municipality is 17%. The municipality has cited ageing infrastructure as reasons for their water losses.</p>	<p>municipality should consider alternative funding models to address budget shortfalls.</p>
<p><b>Saldanha Bay LM</b></p>	<p>The municipality has included the reduction and maintenance of low levels of water losses through the reticulation system, reduction and maintenance of low levels of non-revenue water demand by users, maximisation of the use of treated effluent, ensuring the quality of treated effluent, the introduction of more equitable tariffs as well as the promotion</p>	<p>The municipality has seen an increase in the NRW which has increased from 12.4% for the year ending March 2014 to 14.3% for the year ending March 2015</p>	<p>The municipality has cited network losses, pipe breaks, reservoirs spilling, unbilled sites, illegal water connections as well as the increase of informal areas as possible reasons for their water losses. The municipality</p>	<p>The municipality is commended on their increase in monitoring compliance in terms of the GDS website. The municipality should however endeavour to increase the WWTW effluent quality compliance even more. The municipality is commended for its relatively low NRW and should strive to maintain this.</p>

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>of the efficient use of water to consumers and customers as strategies that form part of their WC/WDM.</p> <p>The municipality has in the last financial year upgraded the drying beds at both Laingsville and Vredenburg WWTW.</p> <p>The monitoring compliance of the municipality, in terms of the GDS website, has increased substantially from 48.45 to 92.57%. The microbiological, chemical as well as the physical compliance increased as well, with the greatest increase being that of the chemical compliance that increased from 38.84% for the year ending January 2014 to 74.21% for the year ending January 2015.</p>		<p>has indicated which plants are in need of upgrades and also supplied reasons as to why these upgrades are required</p>	
<p><b>Breede Valley LM</b></p>	<p>The municipality has listed replacement of bulk water meters, replacement of domestic meters as well as pipe cracking as part of their WC/WDM strategy. In the 2014/2015 financial year, the municipality recommissioned an old unit at the</p>	<p>The municipality has experienced an increase in NRW as their NRW increased from 21.5% to 25.5 % for the years ending March 2014 and 2015 respectively</p>	<p>The municipality has cited unbilled unmetered consumption, consumer meter and data errors and real losses as reasons for their water losses.</p>	<p>The municipality is commended for securing funding from ACIP as well as their excellent microbiological compliance results. The municipality is doing well in terms of compliance, according to the GDS website, however they neglected to substantiate their questionnaire with evidence. The lack of</p>

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>Rawsonville WWTW which increased the plant capacity from 240 m<sup>3</sup> to 480 m<sup>3</sup> / day. The Stettynskloof WTW was completed in Sept/Oct 2015.</p> <p>From the GDS website, Breede valley has an excellent monitoring compliance. This value increased from 98.44% to 100% for the years ending January 2014 and 2015 respectively. The microbiological compliance of the municipality decreased slightly from 96.67% to 94.82% for the same period. Both the Physical and Chemical compliance however increased.</p>		<p>The municipality has listed four facilities that are in need of upgrades.</p>	<p>evidence counted against them. More effort needs to be made to curb and reduce NRW below 20%.</p>
<b>Berg River LM</b>	<p>The municipality has indicated that their WC/WDM targets are that all end users are metered, all household meters comply with specifications of class C meters, to repair pipe burst immediately, to reduce high water pressure zones as well as have all water utilised from hydrants metered.</p>	<p>The municipality has experienced an increase in their NRW as this value increased from 6.5% to 11.5% for the years ending March 2014 and 2015 respectively.</p> <p>According to the GDS website, the monitoring compliance of the municipality decreased from the year ending January 2014</p>	<p>Berg River Municipality has identified two towns at which WWTW are required. These are Aurora and Redelinghuys. Porterville's WWTW has been indicated to be in need of upgrades due to ageing infrastructure and limited</p>	<p>Berg River is highly commended for its low NRW figures and should strive to maintain this. More effort needs to be made to improve effluent compliance. Berg River should fill in their questionnaires more comprehensively and should include applicable supporting documentation, as little water related documentation was sent through to this directorate. The municipality is also</p>

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
		(73.22%) to the year ending January 2015 (60.92%). This trend can also be seen in both their chemical and microbiological compliance which also declined from 44.68% to 31.25% respectively for the same years.	capacity. The municipality has indicated that they have a budget shortfall with regard to water related infrastructure; however the first phases of the Veldrif WWTW and Piketberg WTW have been completed in the 2014/2015 financial year.	encouraged to report on the GDS website on a regular basis ensuring that their monitoring compliance is increased. If budget is a constraint, the municipality should look at means to prioritise the budgets accordingly and should also apply for other forms of funding.
<b>George LM</b>	<p>George Municipality has been implementing their WC/WDM strategies. Some of the interventions include reducing unaccounted for water and water inefficiencies, reduction of high pressures for residential consumers, leak and meter repair programmes, public information and education programs as well as an ultra-filtration plant making the re-use of treated effluent possible.</p> <p>The GDS website shows that there has been an increase in the monitoring compliance of the</p>	The NRW have increased from 17.1% (January 2014) to 19% (January 2015).	<p>The municipality has indicated that pipe breaks, unmetered water connections, inaccurate meters as well as fire brigade usage as the reasons for the unaccounted for water. The municipality has indicated a budget shortfall of 20% with regard to water related infrastructure. WWTWs that have been highlighted by the</p>	The municipality should endeavour to reduce their NRW to previous levels or lower. They should increase their monitoring compliance in terms of GDS. The municipality should prioritise budgets to prevent a shortfall and should look at alternative funding models to fund water related projects.

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>municipality. The microbiological, physical as well as chemical compliance has also increase from previous years and are at 67.68%, 76.78% and 66.63% respectively for the year ending January 2015.</p>		<p>municipality in need of upgrades are the Outeniqua WWTW, Gwaing WWTW, Haarlem WWTW. These upgrades are due as a result of new housing projects. The municipality also indicated that a new water treatment plant is required because of limited capacity.</p>	
<p><b>Laingsburg LM</b></p>	<p>Laingsburg Municipality has mentioned in their questionnaire that measures have been put in place to reduce water wastage. These measures include the minimisation of night flows through the system, as well as regular checking of water balances and water audits that are conducted. The municipality also indicated that they currently have a war on leaks campaign ongoing that is</p>	<p>Laingsburg, however, still has a very high percentage of water that is wasted. The NRW data supplied by DWS shows that the NRW of the municipality increased from 44.7% (January 2014) to 59.3% (January 2015). The municipality failed to supply reasons in the questionnaire for water losses. Laingsburg's monitoring compliance as</p>	<p>According to the municipality, Laingsburg WWTW sewerage ponds are in need of upgrades. The Matjiesfontien WWTW upgrade, which comprised of the installation of a package plant, was completed in the 2014/2015 financial year.</p>	<p>NRW and effluent quality urgently need to be improved. The municipality must endeavour to increase the monitoring compliance on the GDS website. The municipality should then also put interventions in place to increase their microbiological, physical and chemical compliances. The municipality should also fill in their questionnaires more thoroughly and provide applicable evidence where it is requested. The municipality should</p>

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
	currently in its 2nd phase of implementation.	reflected on the GDS website indicated that the municipality is either not uploading their data or that they are not performing the monitoring according to DWS standards. The monitoring compliance for the municipality decreased from 23.25% (January 2014) to 2.96% (January 2015). Currently the microbiological, physical and chemical compliance is at 4.17%, 2.08% and 2.08% for the year January 2015, respectively. These values are very low and need urgent attention from the municipality.		upload data onto the GDS website more frequently to increase their monitoring compliance.
<b>Cederberg LM</b>	The municipality failed to fill in the questionnaire comprehensively and no supporting documentation accompanied the questionnaire.	The monitoring compliance of Cederberg decreased from 40.40% to 26.86% for the years ending January 2014 and 2015 respectively. The microbiological, physical and chemical compliance of the municipality all decreased year on	The municipality indicated that Citrusdal, Clanwilliam, Lambert's Bay, Elands Bay as well as Graafwater WWTWs are in need of upgrades. Clanwilliam is also in need of a WTW.	There was minimal information in the questionnaire And no supporting documentation. It was therefore difficult to assess performance. The municipality should prioritise the filling in of the questionnaire as well as the compliance aspects in terms of the GDS website. However, it is clear that the municipality has huge

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
		year and was at 5.95%, 17.46% and 12.10% for the year ending January 2015 respectively.		challenges and needs to consider alternative funding and cost recovery models.

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
<p><b>Eden DM</b></p>	<p>Eden District Municipality (EDM) encourages co-operative planning with the local municipalities under their jurisdiction. All applications for expansion of WWTW and WTW are scrutinized by EDM, good communication between water services authorities as well as non-water service authorities are promoted and law enforcement in the form of compliance inspections are performed in collaboration with local municipalities and DWS. Eden DM has also completed a feasibility study for water augmentation in Bitou and Knysna. The district has a bulk water master plan in place, and the George water plan was completed in conjunction with the EDM. The district has a disaster risk management plan in place that has interventions in place in case of</p>	<p>There have been instances of non-compliance and these incidences are investigated and appropriate steps are taken. Problems occurred at Oudsthoorn and Kannaland as the final effluent does not comply. An intergovernmental task team has been established and investigated the issues and pre-directives were issued. The upgrading of the WWTW at Oudtshoorn is currently in progress.</p>	<p>Eden DM indicated which municipalities under their jurisdiction are performing the worst in terms of the Green Drop assessment, and have had several meetings and joint inspections between Eden DM, DWS, The Provincial Health Department as well as DEADP to assist the municipalities in carrying out their mandates and improving their performance.</p>	<p>Eden district is commended on their excellent work in encouraging cooperation between district and local municipalities. The district is urged to assist the municipalities under their jurisdiction that are not performing well in terms of WC/WDM and Green Drop compliance e.g. in grant funding applications and skills training; and also to encourage those municipalities that are not taking part in the GMC to take part in the future.</p>

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>droughts. The district is also part of an initiative that meets on a weekly basis to try and find alternative solutions to address water scarcity in Kannaland and also to find an effective long term solution for the water scarcity in the area. Water scarce areas are signposted throughout the Eden DM for tourists to save water during holiday seasons. The Eden DM has a rigorous monitoring program. They monitor the municipal WWTW final effluent, private WWTW' final effluent, rivers, estuaries and boreholes to determine if any pollution is present as well as water used for agriculture and drinking water. These samples include bacteriological as well as chemical samples. Some of the projects listed as being implemented is the Eden Bulk Water Feasibility Study, the eradication of alien</p>			

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>vegetation in the Godwana, Keurbooms and Hessequa areas as well as the upgrade of the Kannaland WWTW.</p> <p>In terms of EPWP projects, related to water, the municipality indicated that work is being done in Plettenberg Bay, Godwana as well as George.</p>			
<b>West Coast DM</b>	<p>The West Coast District Municipality is the bulk water supplier to three local municipalities under its jurisdiction. In terms of co-operative planning with the local municipalities the district municipality has meetings on a regular basis. For example the WCDM attends the WCWSS Steering Committee meetings with DWS, holds 3-monthly bilateral meetings with B municipalities and DWS, do master planning with the three B municipalities, report back to service providers on their behalf, jointly draw up BDS system and also do pipeline</p>	<p>The DM did not indicate the average Green drop score of the municipalities in their jurisdiction, but could state that Cederberg is the municipality that is performing the worst. The municipality could not indicate any assistance they offered Cederberg to help them improve on their GDS.</p>	<p>The DM has indicated that Berg River municipality is the worst performing municipality in terms of BDS. They have had joint meetings and joint evaluations with DWS in order to improve the Blue Drop score of Berg River Municipality.</p>	<p>The district should look into the Green drop scores of municipalities under their jurisdiction and assist the municipalities in achieving Green drop status.</p>

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>assessments and water meter audit and water balances. The municipality assists with water week planning, which promotes public awareness regarding water conservation and water demand management, specifically in schools, as well as communicating monthly reports to authorities.</p> <p>The WCDM has a bulk water master plan in place. The municipality also has a Disaster Risk Management plan in place that includes interventions to mitigate the effects of droughts as well as pollution of water resources.</p> <p>The municipality is currently in the process of updating their master plan.</p> <p>Other projects include the alien vegetation removal in the lower Berg River as well as in the Goedverwacht area.</p>			
<b>Overberg DM</b>	The Overberg DM has developed a bulk infrastructure	The district has listed financials as a constraint.	Financials has been listed as a constraint.	Swellendam Municipality must be encouraged to upload

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>master plan for water and sanitation. Other plans in place include a drought master plan that has identified drought as a main hazard and identified the capabilities and resources that exist to manage this risk. The plan also identifies water pollution as a risk and describes the necessary resources to be activated in case of such an event.</p> <p>Meetings are held on ad hoc basis if an incident should occur. The district does monthly monitoring of water supply, waste water treatment water quality as well as sewage sludge handling.</p> <p>The municipal health services conduct regular water monitoring (quarterly samples are taken, but this number can increase on request of the municipality or if an incident occurred) and the district then report back to local municipalities on the</p>	<p>The district could identify which local municipality under its jurisdiction is performing the worst in terms of Green Drop accreditation, namely Cape Agulhas Municipality.</p>	<p>In terms of Blue Drop, Swellendam Municipality has been identified as the worst performer in the district. According to the district, the compliance levels have been too low and there were extended periods where the water did not comply with standard or no monitoring took place to confirm the actual quality of the tap water.</p>	<p>their data in order for the district to get an understanding of the status quo at their water purification plants.</p> <p>The District must support the local municipalities in terms of water conservation and water demand management practices.</p>

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>water monitoring results. According to the questionnaire, technical assistance was also given to local municipalities by creating awareness on Green Drop. In cases of non-compliant effluent results, this gets reported to the relevant local authority. The district mentioned that clearing of alien invasive species are being performed in the Overberg region under the EPWP, Working for Fire program.</p>			
<p><b>Cape Winelands</b></p>	<p>The Cape Winelands DM assists local municipalities in updating their water and sanitation master plans as well as storm water master plans. The district only assist the local municipalities with drafting their bulk water, storm water and sewage master plans as they do not provide bulk water sewerage services nor do they plan for a district scale storm water master plan. Meetings between</p>	<p>The disaster management plan does not include interventions for the pollution of water resources. The district did not comment on any green drop or blue drop scores of the local municipalities under their jurisdiction.</p>	<p>In the case of non-compliant water samples, the cases are brought to the attention of the responsible water service authority. Reactions to these situations vary, but cases that can be attended to quickly are addressed, whilst other cases might require upgrades or other long term</p>	<p>Cape Winelands DM must assist municipalities in terms of their Green drop and Blue drop scores. The DM must also include interventions for water pollution in terms of their disaster management plan.</p>

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>the district and the local municipalities are held when the need occurs.</p> <p>A Technological Risk assessment for Cape Winelands was conducted in 2005 and was updated in 2013 to include drought, severe weather, flooding, desertification and loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>The district has a comprehensive microbiological water quality monitoring programme which includes the monitoring of sewage effluent, rivers, canals, etc. Samples are taken at least once a month.</p> <p>The district has listed the updating of the Breede Valley Storm Water Master Plan as well as the Water and Sanitation Master Plan for Stellenbosch as two projects that they are currently undertaking.</p> <p>In terms of EPWP projects, although there is no formal agreement between the district municipality and</p>		<p>interventions.</p>	

Name of Municipality	Positive Feedback/ Findings	Negative Feedback/ Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
	<p>Langeberg Municipality, the district assists with the clearing of invasive alien species located in the catchment of the Dassies Hoek Municipal Dam, which supplies water to Robertson as well as the Working for Water: Asbos and Berg River Natural Resources Management Programme in the Stellenbosch and Drakenstein municipal areas.</p>			

## Category winners

<b>Element Winner (Water Management and Water Conservation)</b>	<p><b>Local Municipality</b> – Mosselbay Municipality</p> <p><b>District Municipality</b> – Eden District Municipality</p>
<b>Brief description for nominated element winner</b>	<p><b>Local Municipality</b> – Mosselbay Municipality</p> <p>Mosselbay Municipality has a good WC/WDM strategy in place. They have started implementing some of the plans. Even though they had a slight increase in NRW, the NRW of the municipality is relatively low at 16.9%. The municipality also improved their effluent quality and has various plans in place to both improve the quality of WWTW effluent, as well as the use of non-conventional sources of water.</p> <p><b>District Municipality</b> – Eden District Municipality</p> <p>Eden District Municipality has good communication between the local and district municipality. This leads to assistance being given where it is necessary. Eden DM has a good understanding of what is happening in the district. Eden DM also addresses issues when they appear, like non-compliant effluent results for example.</p>
<b>Most improved municipality</b>	<p>Not assessed. Changes in questionnaire and evaluations were changed substantially from the previous year and therefore it was not possible to nominate a winner in this category..</p>
<b>Previous scores of the most improved municipality (2014)</b>	<p>N/A</p>
<b>Current scores of the most improved municipality (2015)</b>	<p>N/A</p>
<b>Innovation Award</b>	<p>No innovative project was put forward for Element 4: Water Management and Water Conservation</p>
<b>Brief description of the Innovative project</b>	<p>N/A</p>

## Closing Remarks

The Directorate: Pollution and Chemicals Management congratulates the winners of the District- and Local Municipal categories of Element 4: Mosselbay Local Municipality and Eden District Municipality respectively.

D: PCM is satisfied with the effort expended by all participating municipalities. Most questionnaires were filled in satisfactorily and which included the required relevant and detailed information.

It is concerning, however, that none of the municipalities have listed any truly innovative projects related to water management and water conservation as we are currently experiencing one of the worst droughts South Africa has seen in recent years.

The D: PCM wishes to emphasise to municipalities the need to investigate:

- The augmentation of non-conventional sources of water, ;
- To be vigilant in bettering effluent quality from WWTW's and
- To reduce water leaks to a minimum.

The D: PCM also wishes to encourage municipalities that have not been taking part in the GMC to participate in the next GMC in order to highlight their achievements as well.

# ELEMENT 5:

## AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT



## Introduction and Background

The Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning provides a supportive and supervisory role, assisting municipalities with respect to air quality management in the province.

With the promulgation of the National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act, Act No. 39 of 2004 (NEM: AQA), a distinct shift from an exclusively source-based air pollution control approach to a holistic and integrated effects-based air quality management approach was formulated. Chapter 4 of the 2012 National Framework for Air Quality Management in the Republic of South Africa describes the governance roles and responsibilities of the different spheres of government as contained in, or implied by, the NEM: AQA. The GMC questions were based on the principle roles and responsibilities of the district and local municipalities with regard to air quality management in their jurisdiction; as per NEM: AQA.

The GMC therefore provides municipalities with a platform on which to showcase progress they have made towards giving effect to the NEM: AQA. Thirteen (13) out of 24 local municipalities and four out of five district municipalities responded to Element 5: Air Quality Management, of the 2015 GMC.

The GMC winners are therefore municipalities that have not only met their mandatory requirements in terms of NEM: AQA, but have also developed effective tools for achieving continuous improvement of ambient air quality over time.

## Evaluation Process

The Director: Air Quality Management was appointed as the adjudicator and three officials from the Sub-Directorate: Air Quality Planning and Information Management were appointed as evaluators for the Element: Air Quality Management.

The evaluation process took place in three distinct phases, namely:

### Phase 1:

The Evaluators met on 16/07/2015 to discuss the questions, expected answers and allocation of scores/marks for each of the questions in the GMC Questionnaire.

As an example: Question 7 of the Local Municipal questionnaire counted out of **eight** marks, which were allocated as follows:

- **Four** for including an Air Quality Management Plan as a Sector Plan in the Municipality's Integrated Development Plan (IDP);
- **Two** for indicating the section in the IDP in which the AQMP is included;
- **Two** for indicating the allocated budget for the AQMP.

Therefore, if a municipality answered "yes" to Question 7 but failed to attach a copy of the IDP, they only scored 4/8 marks; if the municipality mentioned where the AQMP was addressed in the IDP and

attached a copy thereof, they scored 6/8 marks; and, if a budget for air quality management was provided for in the IDP, 8/8 marks were given.

## **Phase 2:**

Copies of the completed GMC questionnaires were received by the D: AQM on 20/07/2015. Each evaluator was given the opportunity to assess and score the participants independently. The three evaluators met for evaluation meetings on the 05/08/2015 and 08/08/2015 to discuss and consolidate the 2015 GMC scores.

During the evaluation meetings, the municipalities were evaluated individually and each evaluator was given an opportunity to discuss the marks (scores) he/she had awarded for each question. Once a score was agreed upon by all three evaluators, the final score was entered into a table that was created in an Excel spreadsheet. Explanatory comments were inserted along with the scores to explain why "low" scores were given for a particular answer and also to remind the evaluators of where the municipalities omitted to give evidence.

## **Phase 3:**

Once the scores were consolidated, and the winners of the various categories were identified, the adjudicator evaluated the process. The final results were sent to the GMC co-ordinators.

## **The Evaluation Panel**

The D: AQM evaluation panel consisted of the following officials from the Sub-Directorate: Air Quality Planning and Information Management:

Adjudicator: Dr Joy Leaner.

Evaluators: Ms Sally Benson, Ms Portia Rululu and Mr Njabulo Masuku.

## **Participation by Municipalities**

Four district municipalities (DM) and thirteen local municipalities (LM) entered the 2015 GMC for the Element: Air Quality Management.

The Laingsburg LM entered the GMC for the first time, while the Cape Agulhas LM did not enter the 2015 GMC for the Element: Air Quality Management.

## **Element Evaluation Criteria / Methodology 2015**

The evaluation process can be regarded as a desktop study as all evidence needed to be attached to the questionnaire. Where municipalities did not attach the required evidence, they lost marks.

The evaluators were given an opportunity to evaluate the questionnaires individually and met to discuss and consolidate the scores. All three evaluators witnessed that the scores were awarded fairly and correctly.

## Results

The questions for the Air Quality Management (AQM) component counted out of 60 marks, and the AQM component contributed 15% towards to GMC weighting; while the total score for the District Municipalities counted out of 70 marks and the AQM component contributed 25% towards the GMC weighting. Table 1.2 shows the total scores of each the Local Municipalities that entered the GMC with their % weighting obtained; while Table 1.3 shows the total scores of each of the District Municipalities that entered the GMC with their % weighting obtained for the component AQM.

## Results

The Local Municipality scores and % weighting for the component: Air Quality

### Management

LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES															MARKS KEY	GMC LOCAL RESULTS 2015
Drakenstein	Mossel Bay	Bergriver	Knysna	Saldanha Bay	George	Hessequa	Witzenberg	Overstrand	Cape Agulhas	Bitou	Laingsburg	Stellenbosch	Swartland	Cederberg		DIRECTORATES
32	60	27	54	28	28	58	22	22	0	0	10	30	51	16	FM	Air Quality Management /60
7.9	15	6.	13	7.0	7.0	14.5	5.5	5.5	0	0	2.5	7.5	12.7	4.0	CM	15%

**Marks Key:** **FM** – Final Mark and **CM** – Converted Mark (to weight percentage of specific element)

## The District Municipality scores and % weighting for the component:

### Air Quality Management

DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES				MARKS KEY	GMC DISTRICT RESULTS 2015
CWDM	EDM	WCDCM	ODM		DIRECTORATES
49	69	44	45	FM	Air Quality Management /70
17.5	24.8	15.8	16.0	CM	25%

Marks Key: FM – Final Mark and CM – Converted Mark (to weight percentage of specific element)

### Summarised findings for all participating municipalities

Generally, there has been an improvement as more municipalities have made progress in terms of fulfilling the mandatory obligation in terms of the NEM: AQA.

Municipalities did, however, lose marks for the following reasons:

- The GMC questionnaire was not completed correctly.
- In some cases, municipalities failed to attach evidence.
- Some of the questions were not answered at all.

In some cases, it seemed as if the 2015 GMC questionnaire was completed by someone other than the Air Quality Officials within the municipality. This resulted in the official failing to attach the necessary evidence and/or even answering the questionnaire incorrectly. Therefore, a distorted picture of what is happening in the municipality in terms of air quality management was portrayed.

Where Municipalities failed to attach evidence, they scored low even if the NEM: AQA mandates had been met and implemented.

In some instances a drop in scores between the 2014 versus the 2015 GMC was noticed, and it was assumed that this was due to the fact the questionnaire was completed by officials not responsible for air quality management duties and therefore the requested evidence was not attached to the GMC Questionnaire.

The table below summarises the positive and negative feedback and or findings; as well as the challenges noted, and recommendations made during the evaluation process of the GMC.

## Local Municipalities 2015 GMC summary

Local Municipalities	Positive Feedback/Findings	Negative Feedback/Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
<b>Drakenstein</b>	The Drakenstein LM has an established air quality forum that is open to the public and industry.	The Councillors and the MM needs to promote institutional structures and activities with regards to air quality management.	No budget has been allocated for air quality management activities in the IDP for the 2015/2016 period.	An Air Quality Officer needs to be appointed.
<b>Mossel Bay</b>	The Mossel Bay Municipality works very hard towards fulfilling its mandatory air quality management obligations.	The capacity constraint in terms of human resources needs to be addressed.	Available budget for sampling is inadequate and there is a lack of capacity in terms of human resources to carry out air quality functions and activities.	Capacity constraints need to be addressed.
<b>Bergriver</b>	The Bergriver Municipality has an Air Quality Officer and an AQMP and works closely with the WCDM to fulfil its air quality management functions.	Environmental Education and Awareness Programmes needs to be established.	There is no dedicated budget for air quality management functions. The IDP addresses air quality management functions in its "Law Enforcement" budget.	The AQMP needs to be included in the IDP to secure funding for air quality management functions.
<b>Knysna</b>	The Knysna Municipality works very hard towards fulfilling its mandatory air quality management obligations.	Evidence was "copied and pasted" into the Questionnaire. By adding the evidence as annexures it makes it easy to assess and mark the questionnaire.	Vehicle emission testing is required in Knysna as the N2 highway passes through it.	Vehicle emission monitoring needs to be conducted due to high traffic volumes.
<b>Saldanha Bay</b>	The Saldanha Bay Municipality is the first municipality to have acquired air quality monitoring Stations.	Education and awareness projects are lacking due to capacity constraints.	A comprehensive Emission Inventory of the greater Saldanha Bay area needs to be developed and updated to keep up with the industrial, social and economic growth taking place in the area.	Capacity constraints need to be addressed.

<b>George</b>	The George LM is working hard to fulfill its mandatory air quality management obligations.	Education and awareness projects are lacking due to capacity constraints.	Capacity and resources are limited.	Capacity constraints need to be addressed.
---------------	--	---	-------------------------------------	--

<b>Hessequa</b>	<b>The Hessequa LM has fulfilled its mandatory air quality management obligations through a SLA with the EDM.</b>	<b>Capacity and resources are limited.</b>	<b>Capacity and resources are limited.</b>	<b>The current capacity (e.g. EMI training) needs to be strengthened.</b>
<b>Witzenberg</b>	The Witzenberg LM has an AQO and the review of its AQMP is in progress.	Witzenberg must establish and provide platforms for civil society to share information on air quality management.	Capacity and resources are limited.	The current capacity needs to be strengthened. EMI training should be considered.
<b>Overstrand</b>	The Overstrand LM has an AQMP and has appointed an AQO.	Awareness-raising projects need to be established.	There is limited funding and capacity constraints are huge challenges.	The current capacity needs to be strengthened. EMI training should be considered.
<b>Laingsburg</b>	The Laingsburg LM has participated for the 1 <sup>st</sup> time and they have a draft AQMP.	Evidence needs to be attached where required.	There are capacity constraints.	An AQO needs to be appointed and the current capacity needs to be strengthened.
<b>Stellenbosch</b>	The Stellenbosch Municipality has a draft AQMP and has nominated an AQO.	The draft AQMP needs to be adopted.	Agricultural activities such as seasonal burning and crop spraying need to be addressed in the AQMP.	Stellenbosch needs to appoint an AQO and adopt the AQMP.
<b>Swartland</b>	The Swartland LM has an AQMP, appointed an AQO adopted a by-law.	Agricultural activities such as seasonal burning and crop spraying needs to be addressed.	There are capacity constraints.	The current capacity (e.g. EMI training) needs to be strengthened.
<b>Cederberg</b>	Cederberg has a draft AQMP, and needs to appoint an AQO.	An AQO needs to be appointed and the draft AQMP needs to be adopted.	There are capacity constraints.	An AQO needs to be appointed. The current capacity (e.g. EMI training) needs to be strengthened. Budget needs to be allocated for air quality management activities in the IDP.

<b>Breede Valley</b>	Breede Valley did not participate in Element: Air Quality Management.	An AQO needs to be appointed.	An AQMP needs to be drafted.	Budget needs to be allocated for air quality management activities in the IDP.
<b>Cape Agulhas</b>	<b>Cape Agulhas did not participate.</b>			
<b>Bitou</b>	<b>Bitou did not participate</b>			

### District Municipalities 2015 GMC summary

District Municipalities	Positive Feedback/Findings	Negative Feedback/Findings	Challenges	Recommendations
<b>Cape Winelands</b>	The CWDM developed education and awareness raising projects.	Capacity and resources are limited.	Limited budget, capacity and resources.	Budget needs to be allocated for air quality management activities in the CWDM.
<b>Eden</b>	The EDM worked hard to fulfil its mandatory AQM requirements, and has excelled with regards to environmental education and the raising of awareness in the district.	Capacity and resources are limited.	Capacity and resources are limited.	EDM's Environmental Education Programmes need to be shared with other DMs.
<b>West Coast</b>	The WCDM is assisting B-Municipalities to fulfil their mandatory air quality management obligations.	Evidence needs to be attached where required.	An environmental Education and Awareness-Raising project needs to be developed.	Environmental Education and Awareness-Raising projects need to be developed
<b>Overberg</b>	The ODM is assisting B-Municipalities to fulfil their mandatory air quality management obligations.	Environmental Education and Awareness-Raising projects need to be developed.	Budget needs to be allocated for air quality management activities in the ODM.	Budget needs to be allocated for air quality management activities in the ODM.

## Category winners

	Local Municipality	District Municipality
<b>Element Winner for Air Quality Management</b>	Mossel Bay	Eden
<b>Brief description for nominated element winner</b>	The Mossel Bay LM has fulfilled its mandatory AQM requirements and has excelled with regard to environmental education and raising of air quality awareness campaigns.	EDM has fulfilled its mandatory AQM requirements, and has entered into a SLA with the LMs to ensure that the LMs fulfil their air quality management roles and responsibilities. EDM has excelled with regard to environmental education and raising of air quality awareness campaigns.
<b>Most improved municipality</b>	Swartland	
<b>Previous scores of the most improved municipality (2014)</b>	27%	
<b>Current scores of the most improved municipality (2015)</b>	85%	
<b>Brief description of the most improved municipality</b>	During 2015, the Swartland Local Municipality developed and adopted a by-law, set municipal standards for emissions from point, non-point and mobile sources and included the AQMP in the Swartland IDP.	
<b>Innovation Award</b>		WCDM, CWDM and ODM
<b>Brief description of the Innovative project</b>		<p><b>West Coast District Municipality</b> Through the establishment of the Joint Municipal Air Quality Working Group (JMAQWG) and the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), the WCDM meets with the Local Air Quality Officers on a quarterly basis to share expertise and assist one another with the objective of improving air quality in general.</p> <p><b>Cape Winelands District Municipality</b> As part of the Environmental health Program, the CWDM presented an awareness raising campaign on Environmental Health and Air Quality at 80 schools within the Cape</p>

		<p>Winelands District, and reached 37 700 learners. In addition to this, the CWDM's Municipal Health Service presented an awareness module on pollution to Grade 3 learners at various schools within the CWDM region.</p> <p><b>Overberg District Municipality</b> The Air Quality Officials in the ODM have to share their air quality management functions and activities with their environmental health functions. Despite the capacity and time constraints, these officials have managed to get the ODM's by-law adopted, while ensuring that the Local Municipalities within their jurisdiction have Air Quality Management Plans drafted and adopted.</p>
--	--	--

## Closing Remarks

The GMC has highlighted the fact that most of the Air Quality Officers (AQOs) are currently not able to focus solely on air quality management needs; as they have general Environmental Health portfolios that take up most of their time. In addition to this, air quality management is often not regarded as a priority function within a municipality, and therefore budget, personnel capacity and limited resources are huge challenges and constraints experienced in most municipalities.

As a result of budget and personnel capacity constraints, most municipalities do not have environmental education and awareness raising programmes.

The Directorate: Air Quality Management recommends that municipalities ensure that buy in from Councillors and Municipal Managers with regards to air quality institutional structures and activities are obtained. This would ensure that air quality management functions and responsibilities are budgeted for.

As sustainable economic growth and development is all important in this Province, it is important that all Municipalities in the Western Cape fulfil their mandatory obligation to the National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act, (Act No. 39 of 2004).



## Introduction

District and Local municipality differs not only in geographical areas but in functionality with respect to service delivery with clear mandatory roles and responsibilities. In understanding these fundamental mandates, the questionnaires create a platform for municipalities to highlight and share good practices and challenges for carrying out environmental management thereby support the provincial and national government.

The assessed element (element six) is leadership and compliance with a specific aim of awarding municipalities in leadership component by:

- providing a safe and healthy environment for its communities
- Encouraging involvement of communities in local government matters
- promoting economic and social development for its communities
- providing services to its communities in a sustainable manner

*"A leader is someone who crafts a vision and inspires people to act collectively to make it happen, responding to whatever changes and challenges arise along the way. A sustainability leader is someone who inspires and supports action towards a better world."* Quote by Polly Courtice, Director, CISL

The compliance component deals with certain section within the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act 107 of 1998), NEMA and its SEMA's (specific environmental management acts). The principles of NEMA are embedded in section 24 of the constitution which states that: "Everyone has the right to an environment that is not harmful to their health or wellbeing and to have the environment protected through reasonable legislative measures." The municipality has a responsibility to its community to ensure that this constitutional right is upheld and this can be done by ensure that they together with their community comply with the NEMA.

## Evaluation Process

Element six was evaluated by two directorates within DEADP that is Dir:Sustainability for Leadership component while Environmental Compliance component was evaluated Dir: Environmental Compliance and Enforcement.

The evaluators of Leadership, Compliance, Public Participation& Institutional Arrangements (element Six) were:

Leadership, Public Participation and Institutional Arrangements

- **Mr. AW Noble (Core Evaluator)**
- **Ms. R Motloung (Core Evaluator)**
- **Ms. KF Swanepoel (Adjudicator)**
- **Ms. K Shippey (Adjudicator)**

Compliance

- **Mr Fahd Said (Core evaluator)**
- **Dr Eshaam Palmer (Adjudicator)**

## Participation by Municipalities

**Leadership:** A total of 16 local municipalities filled in questionnaires on leadership section namely: Bergrivier; Swartland; Witzenberg; Cederberg; Drakenstein; George; Hessequa; Knysna; Laingsburg; Langeberg; Mossel Bay; Overstrand; Stellenbosch; Saldanha Bay and Breede Valley while a total of 4 district municipalities filled in questionnaires for leadership namely: Cape Winelands, Eden, Overberg and West Coast.

**Compliance:** A total of 16 local municipalities completed the Compliance component of the 2015 edition of the GMC. There was one new participant for this year's competition which was Saldanha Bay municipality. There were two municipalities, namely Laingsburg and Breede Valley who submitted a questionnaire, but did not complete the compliance questions. There were four district municipalities out of the five in the Western Cape that participated in the 2015 edition of the GMC (i.e. Cape Winelands, Eden, Overberg and West Coast). Overberg and Cape Winelands participated for the first time in 2015 on compliance component.

## Element Evaluation Criteria / Methodology 2015

Leadership-District Municipalities were evaluated using the following set of indicators:

THEME	MARKS
<b>LEADERSHIP: INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● LOCAL MUNICIPAL SUPPORT STRATEGIES AND OR POLICIES IN SUPPORT OF LOCAL ENV ACTION PLANS</li> <li>● STAFF APPOINTED</li> <li>● PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNESHIPS ESTABLISHED</li> <li>● FUNDING SOURCED AND SUPPORTED ENV INITIATIVES BY LOCAL MUN</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Support Strategies in Place, with evidence attached <b>(2 Marks)</b></li> <li>● The appointment of designated staff <b>( 2 Marks)</b></li> <li>● Public-private partnerships established <b>(3 Marks)</b></li> <li>● Funding Sources received <b>(3 Marks)</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Total: 10 Marks</b></p>
<b>LEADERSHIP: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/AWARENESS INITIATIVES</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Public participation initiatives listed with attached evidence</li> </ul> <p><b>Total: 4 marks</b></p>
<b>LEADERSHIP: INNOVATION</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● ENHANCEMENT OF GOVERNANCE TO SUPPORT RESEARCH FOR IMPROVEMENT AND PROTECTION OF W.CAPE RESOURCES</li> <li>● ENHANCEMENT OF GOVERNANCE TO SUPPORT TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION THAT IMPROVE AND PROTECT THE W.CAPE RESOURCES</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Research support <b>(3 Marks)</b></li> <li>● Technology innovation support &amp; projects <b>(3 Marks)</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Total: 6 marks</b></p>
<b>Total</b>	<b>20 Marks</b>

Local municipalities were evaluated based on the following indicators:

THEME	MARKS
<b>LEADERSHIP: INNOVATION</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● ENHANCEMENT OF GOVERNANCE TO SUPPORT RESEARCH FOR IMPROVEMENT AND PROTECTION OF W.CAPE RESOURCES</li> <li>● ENHANCEMENT OF GOVERNANCE TO SUPPORT TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION THAT IMPROVE AND PROTECT THE W.CAPE RESOURCES</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Research support <b>(3 Marks)</b></li> <li>● Technology innovation support &amp; projects <b>(3 Marks)</b></li> <li>● <b>Total: 6 marks</b></li> </ul>
<b>LEADERSHIP: INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● INNOVATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS EXTERNAL FUNDING SOURCED</li> <li>● PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS ESTABLISHED</li> <li>● REPRESENTATION ON ENV FORUMS</li> <li>● STAFF OR MUNICIPAL STRUCTURES APPOINTED</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● External organization/sources; Type of funding &amp; Utilization initiatives <b>(3 marks)</b></li> <li>● Public-Private Partnerships Established <b>(3 Marks)</b></li> <li>● Representation on Env. Forums <b>(2 Marks)</b></li> <li>● Staff or municipal structures appointed <b>(2 Marks)</b></li> <li>● <b>Total: 10 marks</b></li> </ul>
<b>LEADERSHIP: PARTICIPATION</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● PUBLIC PARTICIPATION INITIATIVES IN 2014/15</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Public participation initiatives with evidence and more than one <b>(4 marks)</b></li> <li>● <b>Total: 4 marks</b></li> </ul>
<b>Total</b>	<b>20 marks</b>

## Compliance Evaluation and Process

### Mark Allocation Methodology

- A maximum of **5%** awarded to a municipality for each of the five questions posed by the Directorate: Environmental Governance.
- A **ZERO** allocated if a question was ignored or if the response was not adequate.
- Marks for **Question 4** allocated as follows. A maximum of **5%** will be allocated for a **NO** response. If the response is **YES** but the comment is **JUSTIFIABLE** then a mark not exceeding **2%** allocated
- Marks for **Question 5** allocated as follows. A maximum of **5%** will be allocated for a **NO** response. If the response is **YES** and the number of applications submitted within the 24 month period is less than 2 then a mark not exceeding **2%** allocated. If there is more than 1 application submitted within the 24 month period then a mark of **ZERO** allocated.
- Marks for **Question 6** allocated as follows. A maximum of **5%** allocated for a **NO** response. If the response is **YES** but the fine was paid then a mark not exceeding **2%** allocated. If the fine was not paid then a mark of **ZERO** allocated.

- Marks for **Question 7** allocated as follows. A maximum of **2%** allocated for a **YES** response. An additional **3%** allocated to the mark based on **ACCEPTABLE** supporting evidence. A reason will be given as to why supporting evidence was not deemed to be **ACCEPTABLE**.
- Marks for **Question 8** allocated as follows. A maximum of **3%** allocated for a **YES** response. An additional **1%** for official(s) monitoring compliance with environmental legislation and an additional **1%** for official(s) reporting non-compliance to the Department of Environmental Affairs for the financial year **2014-2015**.
- Marks for **Question 9** allocated as follows. A maximum of **4%** allocated for officials who have already completed the Municipal EMI training. An additional **1%** will be allocated for official(s) who completed the EMI training during the financial year **2014-2015**.
- Marks for **Question 10** allocated as follows. A maximum of **2%** allocated for a **YES** response. An additional **3%** will be allocated for proof either in the form of flyers, photos, brochures, etc.
- Questions awarded if the correct mark based on the information at hand.

### District Mark Allocation

- Marks for **Question 5** allocated as follows. A maximum of **5%** will be allocated for a **NO** response. If the response is **YES** but the comment is **JUSTIFIABLE** then a mark not exceeding **2%** allocated
- Marks for **Question 6** allocated as follows. A maximum of **5%** allocated for a **NO** response. If the response is **YES** and the number of applications submitted within the 24 month period is less than 2 then a mark not exceeding **2%** allocated. If there is more than 1 application submitted within the 24 month period then a mark of **ZERO** allocated.
- Marks for **Question 7** allocated as follows. A maximum of **5%** allocated for a **NO** response. If the response is **YES** but the fine was paid then a mark not exceeding **2%** allocated. If the fine was not paid then a mark of **ZERO** allocated.
- Marks for **Question 8** allocated as follows. A maximum of **2%** allocated for a **YES** response. An additional **1%** allocated for an **ACCEPTABLE** comment and an additional **2%** for proof. **The proof will be taken from the proof provided by one of the local municipalities in the district as they are responsible for informing applicants.** A reason will be given as to why a comment was not deemed to be **ACCEPTABLE**.
- Marks for **Question 9** allocated as follows. A maximum of **3%** allocated for a **YES** response. An additional **1%** for official(s) monitoring compliance with environmental legislation and an additional **1%** for official(s) reporting non-compliance to the Department of Environmental Affairs for the financial year **2014-2015**.
- Marks for **Question 10** allocated as follows. A maximum of **2%** allocated for a **YES** response. An additional **3%** allocated for proof either in the form of flyers, photos, brochures, etc.

## Evaluation Results

### Local Spreadsheet

Local Municipality	Bergriver	Breede Valley	Cederberg	Darkenstein	George	Hessequa	Overstrand	Bifou	Langeberg	Laingsburg	Knysna	Stellenbosch	Swariland	Mossel Bay	Saldanha bay	Witzenberg
<b>Leadership Score</b>	15	0	3	0	17	19	15	14	6	0	14	20	13	16	6	12
<b>Compliance Score</b>	12	0	5	10	28	29	16	12	12	0	25	12	21	29	22	19
<b>FM</b>	27	0	8	10	45	48	31	26	18	0	39	32	34	45	28	31
<b>10% (CM)</b>	4.9	0	1.5	1.8	8.2	8.7	5.6	4.7	4.9	0	7.1	5.8	6.2	8.2	5.1	5.6
<b>Position</b>	8	12	11	10	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	6	9	8	12	<b>3</b>	5	4	<b>2</b>	7	6

Key: FM – Final Mark

CM – Converted Mark (to weight percentage of specific element)

### District Spreadsheet

District Municipalities	Cape Winelands	Eden	Overberg	West Coast
<b>Total Leadership</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Total Compliance</b>	25	30	25	27
Final mark (FM)	31	49	41	44
<b>Converted Percentage 10% (CM)</b>	6.2	9.8	8.2	8.8
Position	4	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>

Key: FM – Final Mark

CM – Converted Mark (to weight percentage of specific element)

## Summarised findings for all participating municipalities

### Local Municipality:

Name of municipality	Positive feedback	Challenges	Recommendation
<p><b>Knysna</b></p>	<p>The municipality has really performed well in answering the questions within leadership component.</p> <p>The following was highlighted as key w.r.t progress within the competition cycle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Implemented a New Integrated Spatial Development Framework Research Project</li> <li>● Installed Smart Metering Units , to reduce the installation cost associated with wires and cables</li> <li>● Formal Committee structures in place to address environmental issues</li> <li>● Active in raising awareness during environmental calendar days.</li> </ul>	<p>The municipality was brief in answering some of the questions and left some unanswered, this might be due to a lack of expertise or lack of relevant officials completing the questionnaire</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Lack of supporting documents remains a challenge, resulting in subtraction of marks.</li> <li>● The municipality is implementing more than what has been submitted and this is not being filtered through of which the expectation remains that the evaluators will seek information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The municipal manager to disseminate the questionnaire to the relevant officials.</li> <li>● Officials to contact the relevant evaluators for clarity should the questions or the nature of the supporting documents is unclear. Submit relevant supporting documents that are clearly marked to the respective questions.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Breede valley</b></p>	<p>The participation of municipality is encouraged, just need to answer all questions.</p>	<p>The municipality indicated "Not Applicable" as an answer to all the questions within the Leadership Section and none of the compliance questions were answered</p>	<p>The absence of answers resulted in no marks being allocated, raising a concern as this is not a true reflection of progress/work done within the municipality. Municipality can liaise with DEADP if assistance is required</p>
<p><b>Hessequa</b></p>	<p>The municipality has performed remarkably well in addressing the leadership section within Element Six.</p> <p>Key initiatives highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Strong partnerships with other Government Entities, Academia (US etc) to protect the natural resources within the municipal boundaries and it was</li> </ul>	<p>There are no challenges observed neither highlighted by the municipality.</p>	<p>The municipality has answered all the questions very well with supporting documentation, indicating a clear understanding of the competition and the questions.</p> <p>The only recommendation is to keep up the good work.</p>

	<p>well supported with evidential documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation of new Green Infrastructure Technologies to address various environmental challenges.</li> <li>Proactive exploration of external funding opportunities and this is well supported with evidential documentation</li> <li>Active in raising awareness on environmental issues during various public participation initiatives and this was well supported with evidential documentation</li> </ul>		
<b>Laingsburg</b>	<p>The participation of the municipality in the competition is recognized and valued.</p>	<p>The municipality indicated "Not Applicable" as an answer to all the questions within the Leadership Section of Element Six; this resulted in no marks being scored, raising a concern as this is not a true reflection w.r.t the progress/work implemented within the municipality.</p>	<p>The following to be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DEADP to provide additional support through workshops to reintroduce the GMC.</li> <li>The municipal council to provide more support to the GMC and if assistance is required, DEADP can be contacted.</li> </ul>
<b>Cederberg</b>	<p>The participation of the municipality in the competition is recognized and valued.</p>	<p>The municipality did not answer some of the key questions on element six.</p>	<p>It is recommended that all questions should be answered and clearly marked evidence provided in order to get full marks.</p> <p>The following to be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The municipal council must provide more support to the competition and if necessary seek support from DEADP.</li> </ul>
<b>Mosselbay</b>	<p>The municipality has done well and undertaken several projects.</p> <p>The following key progress/initiatives was highlighted:</p>	<p>The municipality has been the overall winner for the past two years, and has shown remarkable progress, however some of the questions within the leadership section were</p>	<p>The municipality has answered all the questions well and provided supporting documentation, however there remains room for improvement to continue in providing the relevant</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Feasibility Study in collaboration with DEADP</li> <li>● The Coastal Sedimentary Processes Research Project</li> <li>● Green Infrastructure Projects (the GIS programme rolled out internally, containing shape-files relating to major municipal infrastructure networks and a capital programme to replace existing 11kv circuit breakers with SF6 and vacuum type circuit breakers. The true innovation to the circuit breaker programme was the remote controlled tripping and closing device, discovered by three municipal officials, saving the municipality about R1 500 000.00 as it enables the operator to operate these breakers from a safe distance without risk of injuries or worse)</li> </ul> <p>The municipality is active in public participation initiatives and this was substantiated with supporting evidence.</p>	<p>answered in brief and this is a concern.</p> <p>The municipality received notice for non-compliance with the NEMA</p>	<p>information as per the questions in detail with clear labels.</p> <p>It is recommended that the municipality comply with NEMA and SEMA's. If they require advice they should contact the Department before commencing with any activity that may cause pollution of degradation to the environment.</p>
<p><b>Bergriver</b></p>	<p>The Municipality has answered most of the questions for leadership section and highlighted several innovative projects/initiatives like the partnership with UCT as part of ACIDI initiative; the FLOW Ambassador programme helping municipality by identifying and providing GPS coordinates to be used for environmental management; ability to source funding and the resulting Climate Change Adaptation Plan with the support from DEADP.</p>	<p>The answers for leadership section provided are not backed up with clearly marked evidence (like pictures, meeting minutes, or even documents that relates to meetings).</p> <p>The municipality did not answer questions on the compliance section and this then resulted with low marks allocated.</p>	<p>The municipality should seek assistance in terms of compliance-related questions if necessary and try to answer all questions in the next cycle.</p>

<p><b>Swartland</b></p>	<p>The municipality answered most questions of the leadership section and highlighted several initiatives. Like, the ability to source external funding ( R10 million from DOE) and (R5 million to upgrade the WWTW); the municipality forms part of several forums to exchange knowledge and networking with other municipalities; it is also evident that this municipality had attended or hosted several capacity building and awareness initiatives</p>	<p>The provided answers are not backed up with clearly marked evidence; as a result the municipality forfeits marks.</p>	<p>It is advisable to collect evidence to support the provided answers (like meeting minutes, pictures for awareness raising activities, and any other document that is related to the initiative).</p>
<p><b>Witzenberg</b></p>	<p>The municipality is in partnership with the Belgian municipality and this partnership has resulted in several initiatives undertaken like creating play parks, planting indigenous plants, creating educational botanical gardens.</p> <p>There are several school educational programmes that the municipality undertook. In addition this municipality has hired two environmental officers to deal with municipal environmental management functions.</p>	<p>The municipality gave vague answers to some questions with no evidence, hence marks were not allocated.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the municipality read questions carefully and fill in relevant information. It is also acceptable to get different people within the municipality to fill the questionnaire in order to improve the scores.</p>
<p><b>Drakenstein</b></p>	<p>The municipality did fill some sections of the questionnaire including compliance section.</p>	<p>This municipality reported that environmental management is disarray at present and no answers were provided.</p>	<p>The municipality should try to sort out the problems and find a way to complete this section in the next cycle.</p> <p>It is recommended that the municipality answer questions with either a yes or no if requested; need to provide hardcopy evidence as requested and consider raising awareness around compliance with the NEMA and SEMA's</p>

<b>Stellenbosch</b>	<p>This municipality has several initiatives that resulted in formed partnerships (with SUN, GreenCape) that enhance governance while supporting research and providing new solutions and innovative ways to improve service delivery. The municipality is a member of Stellenbosch River Collaborative and is able to actively source funding from WWF for running projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Have a dedicated environmental planner responsible for environmental management.</li> <li>● Active in raising awareness on environmental issues during various public participation initiatives and this was well supported with evidential documentation</li> </ul>	<p>The municipality needs to answer compliance section of the questionnaire in a good manner like they answered the leadership section in GMC 2015.</p>	<p>It is re commended that the municipality answer questions with either a yes or no if requested; need to provide hardcopy evidence as requested and consider raising awareness around compliance with the NEMA and SEMA's.</p>
<b>Langeberg</b>	<p>The municipality partially completed element six. The municipality has embarked on raising awareness around compliance with the NEMA and SEMA's and have finalized the SDF and it is commendable</p>	<p>The municipality is probably doing more than what is recorded on the questionnaire. The provided information is not sufficient.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the municipality get a team of people filling the questionnaire to provide adequate information.</p>
<b>Overstrand</b>	<p>The municipality initiated an Integrated Environmental Management System to monitor the environmental management; ability to actively source external funding (WfW, Working for the Coast, etc.); and had several initiatives raising environmental awareness and public participation initiatives</p>	<p>Municipality should answer all questions and provide clearly marked evidence.</p>	<p>Municipality is encouraged to have public-private partnership that would help the overall environmental management.</p>

<b>George</b>	The municipality is recognized as the most improved municipality for this element because of their overall compliance to NEMA and SEMA's. In addition, the municipality has initiated a wide range of initiatives like providing support to the Honeybush tea industry, biomass to energy and public transport project; waste related projects and are part of SANPARKS social ecology science lab.	There is not enough clearly marked evidence to support answers provided for compliance questions.	It is recommended that the municipality starts looking at forming public-private partnerships to enhance overall environmental management governance.
<b>Bitou</b>	The municipality has made provision in the budget to appoint air quality officer and environmental practitioner. The municipality is implementing the residential load management or geyser control system and largely committing part of the budget to waste management and alien clearing.	The municipality did not provide detailed answers to some questions and some of the provided answers did not answer the specific questions.	The municipality should read the questions carefully and provide appropriate answers. It is highly recommended that the municipality answer the questions as a team not as an individual exercise.
<b>Saldanha bay</b>	The municipality has recently employed an environmental officer and is part of water quality forum trust. It is noted that the municipality has provided answers for compliance section for the first time in this competition and is commended for it.	The municipality did not provide most of the answers and supporting documents for evidence as required.	The municipality must gather information for projects that will be entered into GMC and prepare ahead of time so when the questionnaires arrive they provide answers with clearly marked supporting evidence.

## Conclusion

Rapid changes fuelled by the world economy and technology have been forcing organizations to transform themselves in order to become more responsive and competitive. This has resulted in “a pervasive need for people at every level to participate in the leadership process”. Since no single leader has all the answers to all problems, all members or employees of an organization, as far as possible, need to be leaders. Moreover, established leaders need to be better prepared to participate in leadership.

The above statements emphasize that leadership qualities are needed to improve service delivery in local government, adjust to the ever-changing demands of local authority as well as address the inequalities of the past. Moreover, local government needs to change from an institutional to a developmental organization.

Vehicles to achieve these objectives are not embedded and in the external organizational sphere (public-private partnerships and small, medium and micro enterprises), but also in the workplace conditions of service, and the quality and sustainability of the internal working environment (District Municipality IDP and IDP Review).

Through the GMC, DEADP also want to see community learning and development playing a more central role in supporting the involvement of communities, including young people, in the community planning process. The biggest winner is our environment. We hold the competition every year to encourage municipalities to come on-board to contribute their efforts towards protecting nature which refers to a variety of ecosystems. In practical terms, when nature wins, you and I and millions of other South Africans are the real winners.

We all depend on nature and an environment in a healthy state will always provide resources to sustain all forms of life and help to boost economic trades. When an environment is neglected to a point of degradation, the biological life it was sustaining perishes or survival becomes very expensive as human beings and animals' migration begins in search of environmental resources.

DEADP would like to thank all municipalities for participating in the GMC and we look forward to engage with you in the next cycle!





**PRODUCED BY:** Directorate Sustainability

**Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and  
Development Planning**

Leeusig Building, 01 Dorp Street, Cape Town, 8001  
Private Bag X9086, Cape Town, 8000

**Telephone:** 021 483 2610 **Facsimile:** 021 483 3093

**Email:** Khuthala.Swanepoel@westerncape.gov.za

**Website:** www.westerncape.gov.za/eadp

**MANY THANKS TO:**

Western Cape Government **Department of Agriculture** for providing the **cover image**.

© Creative Common **Gene Spesard** [https://www.flickr.com/photos/arizona\\_native/8475385486/](https://www.flickr.com/photos/arizona_native/8475385486/)  
for providing the section image: **Element 1** Integrated Waste Management Report.

© Creative Common **Kevin Dooley** <https://www.flickr.com/photos/pagedooley/4370352638>  
for providing the section image: **Element 2** Climate Change Response Report.

**CapeNature** (Robberg) for providing the section image: **Element 3** Biodiversity and Coastal Management.

© Creative Common **Joel D'souza** <https://www.flickr.com/photos/52243088@N00/10963504525>  
for providing the section image: **Element 4** Water Management & Conservation

© Creative Common **Maurits Vermeulen** <https://www.flickr.com/photos/mvvermeulen/93531079/>  
for providing the section image: **Element 5** Air Quality Management



**Western Cape  
Government**

Environmental Affairs &  
Development Planning