



Municipal Budget Circular for the 2021/22 MTREF

CONTENTS

1. THE SOUTH AFRICAN ECONOMY AND INFLATION TARGETS.....	2
2. KEY FOCUS AREAS FOR THE 2021/22 BUDGET PROCESS	3
2.1 CHANGES TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT ALLOCATIONS.....	3
3. 2021 LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS AND THE BUDGET PROCESS.....	4
3.1 TRANSITIONAL PROCESSES - DEVELOPMENT AND ADOPTION OF IDPs DURING THE 2021 ELECTION YEAR 4	
3.2 HAND-OVER REPORTS FOR THE NEWLY ELECTED COUNCILS.....	4
4. MUNICIPAL STANDARD CHART OF ACCOUNTS (MSCOA)	5
4.1 OPENING BALANCES	5
4.2 SURPLUS OR DEFICIT JOURNALS.....	5
4.3 ROLLOVERS AND REPAYMENT OF UNSPENT GRANTS	5
5. THE REVENUE BUDGET	6
5.1 ESKOM BULK TARIFF INCREASES.....	6
6. FUNDING CHOICES AND MANAGEMENT ISSUES.....	6
6.1 EMPLOYEE RELATED COSTS	7
6.2 REMUNERATION OF COUNCILLORS.....	7
6.3 PAYMENT OF DANGER ALLOWANCE TO THE EMPLOYEES.....	7
6.4 MAYOR'S DISCRETIONARY FUNDS AND SIMILAR DISCRETIONARY BUDGET ALLOCATIONS	8
7. CONDITIONAL GRANT TRANSFERS TO MUNICIPALITIES.....	9
7.1 CRITERIA FOR THE ROLLOVER OF CONDITIONAL GRANT FUNDS	9
7.2 ROLLOVER REQUEST AGAINST THE COVID-19 ALLOCATED THROUGH THE EQUITABLE SHARE.....	10
7.3 UNSPENT CONDITIONAL GRANT FUNDS FOR 2020/21	11
7.4 IMPORTANCE OF SECTION 17 OF THE DIVISION OF REVENUE ACT	12
8. THE MUNICIPAL BUDGET AND REPORTING REGULATIONS.....	13
8.1 SERVICE LEVEL STANDARDS	13
8.2 ASSISTANCE WITH THE COMPILATION OF BUDGETS	13
9. BUDGET PROCESS AND SUBMISSIONS FOR THE 2021/22 MTREF	14
9.1 SUBMITTING BUDGET DOCUMENTATION AND A1 SCHEDULES FOR 2021/22 MTREF	14
9.2 CONSOLIDATED BUDGETS AND REPORTS	14
9.3 SUBMISSION USING LG UPLOAD PORTAL	15
9.4 PUBLICATION OF BUDGETS ON MUNICIPAL WEBSITES	15
ANNEXURE A: TREATMENT OF ROLLOVERS AND REPAYMENT OF UNSPENT GRANTS IN MSCOA	16

Introduction

This budget circular is a follow-up to the one issued in December 2020. It guides municipalities with their preparation of the 2021/22 Medium Term Revenue and Expenditure Framework (MTREF) and, as with previous annual budget circulars, it should be read within this context. This Circular is linked to the Municipal Budget and Reporting Regulations (MBRR) and the municipal Standard Chart of Accounts (mSCOA); and strives to support municipalities' budget preparation processes so that the minimum requirements are achieved. The key focus of this Circular is the grant allocations per the 2021 Budget Review and the 2021 Division of Revenue Bill.

Municipalities are reminded to refer to the previous years' annual budget circulars for guidance on budget preparation that is not covered in this circular.

1. The South African economy and inflation targets

The South African economy contracted by an estimated 7.2 per cent in 2020 compared with the 7.8 per cent contraction projected in the 2020 Medium Term Budget Policy Statement (MTBPS). The revised estimate results from easing lockdown restrictions in the third quarter and a faster-than-expected resumption of global growth, especially in China. The National Treasury projects real economic growth of 3.3 per cent in 2021, following an estimated contraction of 7.2 per cent in 2020. Real GDP growth is expected to moderate to 1.9 per cent in 2022 and 2023.

The outlook remains highly uncertain, and the economic effects of the pandemic are far-reaching. There were 1.7 million fewer jobs by the third quarter of 2020 compared to the same period in 2019. Rising unemployment and income losses have entrenched existing inequalities. GDP is only expected to recover to pre-pandemic levels in late 2023. High-frequency data for the third quarter, such as the volume of electricity distributed, mining and manufacturing output, business confidence and the ABSA Purchasing Managers' Index (PMI) shows evidence of a limited economic rebound.

Although growth rates are likely to improve quickly as restrictions are removed, based on current projections, the output is only expected to return to pre-pandemic levels in 2024. Given South Africa's structural constraints, its recovery will be slower than many of its developing-country peers. Industrial sectors (which include mining, manufacturing, construction and utilities) lagged substantially, undermined by structural constraints including unreliable electricity supply and weak public investment that preceded the pandemic. Over the next several years, the country requires the implementation of long-standing structural reforms to sustainably move to a higher growth path.

These economic challenges will continue to exert pressure on municipal revenue generation and collection levels; hence a conservative approach is advised for revenue projections.

The following macro-economic forecasts must be considered when preparing the 2021/22 MTREF municipal budgets.

Table 1: Macroeconomic performance and projections, 2019 - 2023

Fiscal year	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	Actual	Estimate	Forecast		
CPI Inflation	4.1%	3.3%	3.9%	4.2%	4.4%

Source: 2021 Budget Review.

Note: the fiscal year referred to is the national fiscal year (April to March) which is more closely aligned to the municipal fiscal year (July to June) than the calendar year inflation.

2. Key focus areas for the 2021/22 budget process

2.1 Changes to local government allocations

Over the next three years, municipalities will have to adjust to significant changes in expenditure plans while improving accountability. The 2021 Budget protects transfers that focus on infrastructure, service delivery and COVID-19 spending while reducing those spent less effectively. The 2021 Budget includes funding for initiatives to improve municipal revenue collection and support financially distressed municipalities.

Transfers to local government over the medium-term account for **9.4 per cent** of nationally raised funds after providing for debt-service costs, the contingency reserve and provisional allocations. Local government's share of revenue has risen in relative terms because reductions to the public-service wage bill affect only national and provincial government. Local government transfers grow by an annual average of 5.2 per cent over the MTEF; the equitable share declines by 4.4 per cent and conditional grants grow by 7.3 per cent. As part of government's fiscal consolidation policies over the medium term, transfers to local government are reduced by R19.4 billion, including R14.7 billion from the local government equitable share, R2.7 billion from the general fuel levy and R2 billion in direct conditional grants.

Conditional grants

The reduction to direct conditional grants includes R329 million from the *municipal infrastructure grant* and R21 million from the *integrated urban development grant*. These amounts have been reprioritised from underspending grants to fund a once-off councillor gratuity for non-returning councillors. The largest proportional reduction of R1.3 billion to local government grants has been made in the *public transport network grant*, because only six of the 13 cities receiving the grant have successfully launched public transport systems. Indirect conditional grants are reduced by R286 million over the period.

Government continues to reform the system of conditional grant transfers to local government based on the principles set out in the 2019 Budget Review. In 2021, government will expand the scope of the *municipal infrastructure grant* to allow municipalities to use up to 5 per cent of their allocation to develop infrastructure asset management plans. This change addresses poor asset management in municipalities.

In 2020, the *integrated city development grant* was repurposed to assist cities to build internal capacity or obtain technical support to prepare and package key infrastructure projects. This will continue in 2021 and private sector participation will be encouraged in these projects.

Two standalone *informal settlement upgrading grants* for provinces and municipalities will be introduced from 2021/22. These grants are made up of components previously within the *human settlements development grant* and the *urban settlements development grant* for provinces and municipalities respectively. In addition, the Municipal Systems Improvement Grant scope is extended to fund comprehensive institutional diagnostic assessments of the 21 district areas where the district municipality is a water service authority and the development of institutional improvement/ support plans that will inform all future capacity development programmes and municipal support initiatives to enhance the continued rollout of the rollout of the District Development Model (DDM).

Municipalities are reminded that all allocations included in their budgets must correspond to the allocations listed in the Division of Revenue Bill. All the budget documentation can be accessed from the National Treasury website by clicking on the link below:
<http://www.treasury.gov.za/documents/national%20budget/2021/>

3. 2021 Local Government Elections and the budget process

Municipalities are advised to refer to MFMA Circular No. 107 on risks related to the Local Government elections and issues to be considered in compiling the 2021/22 MTREF in addition to the information provided below.

3.1 Transitional processes - development and adoption of IDPs during the 2021 election year

The 2020/21 municipal financial year represents the last year of the current municipal councils' electoral term. Therefore, the next municipal election to usher in new councils is expected to take place between August and November 2021 in terms of the Section 24 (2) of the Municipal Structures Act, 2000 (Act No. 32 of 2000) (MSA).

It is acknowledged that the period within which the coming election's date is expected takes place after the start of a new financial year. This particular scenario poses a latent challenge in so far as adherence to legislated timeframes with regard to the adoption of the 5-year Integrated Development Plan (IDP) and the subsequent implementation.

Given the fact that the IDP and budget would need to be reviewed and adopted by 30 June 2021, the current council has an obligation to ensure that these stipulations are complied with. In this regard, the current council will be expected to continue reviewing the IDP and ensuring that it is adopted within the legislated timeframe.

Section 25 (3) of the MSA does allow the municipal council to adopt the IDP of the preceding council. However, should the incoming councils be unhappy with the priorities set out by the current council, in this case, municipal councils are advised to consider the existing adopted IDP and resolve to initiate or not to initiate an amendment procedure as guided by the MSA and the Municipal Performance and Planning Regulations (2001).

The Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG), through the Chief Directorate: Development Planning, is rolling out the revised IDP guidelines to municipalities. These guidelines are aimed to, amongst others, guide municipalities with regards to the adoption of IDPs during an election year.

3.2 Hand-over reports for the newly elected councils

Each municipal manager, working together with the CFO and senior managers, is encouraged to prepare a hand-over report that can be tabled at the first meeting of the newly elected council. This hand-over report aims to provide the new councils important orientation information regarding the municipality, the state of its finances, service delivery and capital programme, as well as key issues that need to be addressed.

It is proposed that the hand-over report should include:

- An overview of the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the municipality;
- An overview of the organisational structure of the municipality, with the names and numbers of senior managers;
- An overview of key municipal policies that councillors need to be aware of and where they can obtain the full text of such policies;
- An overview of issues that still need to be addressed in relation to the municipality's turnaround strategy;
- An overview of the municipality's financial health, with specific reference to:
 - o Its cash and investments, and its funding of commitments (Table A8);
 - o Cash coverage of normal operations (see Supporting Table SA10);

- o Creditors outstanding for more than 30 days, along with reasons for delayed settlement;
- o Current collection levels and debtors outstanding for more than 30 days; and
- o Extent of existing loans and associated finance and redemption payments.
- The municipality's 2019/20 audit outcome and its strategy to address audit issues;
- An overview of the provision of basic services, including plans to address backlogs;
- An overview of the state of the municipality's assets, with particular reference to the asset management plan, and repairs and maintenance requirements;
- A list of the main infrastructure projects planned for the 2021/22 budget and MTREF;
- A list of key processes requiring council input over the next six months, e.g. revision of the IDP, approval of specific policies etc. and
- Any other information deemed to be important.

In addition to the hand-over report, each new councillor should be given the municipalities' revised IDP, the adopted 2021/22 MTREF budget, the mid-year budget and performance assessment report for 2020/21, and the latest monthly financial statement, and the annual report for 2019/20.

Municipal managers should submit their municipality's hand-over report to the relevant provincial department responsible for local government, to the Department of Co-operative Governance (DCoG) and National and Provincial Treasuries.

4. Municipal Standard Chart of Accounts (*mSCOA*)

4.1 Opening balances

It was noted that some municipalities are not transferring their opening balances consistently to the current year of transacting. Opening balances for the previous year must be transferred in the first month (M01) of the current year, and all adjustments made during the preparation of the annual financial statements in period 14 and 15 must be transferred through journals to the opening balances of the current year in the month that it becomes apparent. When municipalities are not doing this correctly and consistently, it compromises the credibility of the *mSCOA* data strings submitted.

Importantly, journals may only be passed in the core financial system and not in 3rd party sub-systems.

4.2 Surplus or deficit journals

The Municipal Finance Management Act, 2003 (Act No. 56 of 2003) (MFMA) and MBRR require that municipalities perform their month-end reconciliations at the end of every month before they submit their financial performance information to the National Treasury. Surplus or deficit journals must be passed monthly before a data string is generated to ensure that the financial system remains in balance. The monthly data strings reflected in the Statement of Financial position (table C6 of the regulated C Schedules) will not be in balance for those municipalities that are not doing this, and their *mSCOA* data strings will therefore not be accurate.

Municipalities must also reconcile their creditors and debtors and all month-end processes **before** they submit their monthly data strings to ensure that the data submitted to the National Treasury Local Government Database is credible.

4.3 Rollovers and repayment of unspent grants

Municipalities are required to use the correct posting levels and movement accounting when conditional grants are being receipted, recognised, rolled over, and unspent grants are repaid. The accounting for grants should be done in accordance with GRAP 23: Revenue from

exchange transactions (Taxes and Transfers). Refer to **Annexure A** of this Circular on the correct treatment of rollovers and repayment of unspent grants in *mSCOA*.

5. The revenue budget

National Treasury encourages municipalities to maintain tariff increases at levels that reflect an appropriate balance between the affordability to poorer households and other customers while ensuring the municipality's financial sustainability. The Consumer Price Index (CPI) is forecasted to be within the lower limit of the 3 to 6 per cent target band; therefore, municipalities are required **to justify all increases in excess of the projected inflation target for 2021/22 MTREF** in their budget narratives and pay careful attention to the differential incidence of tariff increases across all consumer groups. It is noted that the tariff increases by Eskom and Water Boards are above inflation and should be considered as such while determining cost-reflective tariffs. In addition, municipalities should include a detail of their revenue growth assumptions for the different service charges in the budget narrative.

Local government also confronts tough fiscal choices in the face of financial and institutional problems that result in service-delivery breakdowns and unpaid bills. Municipalities can offset these trends by improving its own revenue collection, working more efficiently and implementing cost-containment measures.

5.1 Eskom Bulk Tariff increases

The National Energy Regulator of South Africa (NERSA) is responsible for price determination of the bulk costs for electricity. In March, NERSA approved a municipal tariff increase of 6.9 per cent effective 1 July 2020 (1.2 per cent lower than the tariff increase in Multi-Year Price Determination (MYPD) 4 period due to differences in municipal and national financial years).

The equitable share formula uses the 9.9 per cent bulk tariff increase used when National Treasury calculated the baseline for this year in the 2020 MTEF period. Other (non-bulk) electricity costs are updated based on the National Treasury's inflation projections in the 2020 MTBPS. This is due to fiscal constraints and the fact that the court had not pronounced on the Eskom matter at the time that the budget was finalised.

The additional R10 billion that the courts have allowed Eskom to recover in the 2021/22 national financial year translates to a 15.6 per cent bulk increase over the national financial year. However, given that the increase only comes into effect in July for municipalities, NERSA typically allows a higher percentage increase so that Eskom can recover the additional allowable revenue from municipalities over 9 months before the national financial year ends. Therefore, the increase should be expected to be between 16 to 20 per cent. Municipalities can mitigate the negative impact of this increase by improving efficiencies on both the revenue collections and the spending side.

The outer two years of the 2021 MTEF use 8.9 per cent, which is an average annual tariff increase used for the NERSA's multi-year price determination period of 1 April 2019 to 31 March 2022. Moreover, the outer year is anticipated to be the first year of the MYPD 5 period, yet to be published.

6. Funding choices and management issues

Municipalities are under pressure to generate revenue as a result of the economic landscape, the COVID-19 pandemic, weak tariff setting and increases in key cost drivers to provide basic municipal services. Customers' ability to pay for services is declining, which means that less revenue will be collected.

In order to achieve financial sustainability, municipalities must demonstrate the political will to implement the changes required to improve their performance. Where municipalities consistently fail to deliver their mandates, the Constitution provides for provincial and/or national government to intervene.

6.1 Employee related costs

The *Salary and Wage Collective Agreement* for the period 01 July 2018 to 31 June 2020 has come to an end and a new agreement is under consultation, which we hope will take into account the current fiscal constraints faced by government. Therefore, in the absence of any information in this regard from the South African Local Government Bargaining Council (SALGBC), municipalities are advised to take into account their financial sustainability when considering salary increases. It has been observed over the previous years that salary increases were above inflation. In addition, municipalities that could not afford such increases did not apply for exemption as provided by SALGBC.

Given the current economic condition exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, municipalities are urged to consider projecting increases to wage that would reflect their affordability. Some municipalities are already not able to afford the current wage cost and would indeed have to apply no more than a zero per cent increase in the 2021/22 MTREF and exercise the option for exemption for any negotiated increase above the level of their affordability.

Therefore, should accounting officers fail to consider salary increases within the ambit of the municipality's available resources and financial position, such failure will constitute an act of financial misconduct as defined in section 171 of the MFMA read with the Municipal Regulations on Financial Misconduct Procedures and Criminal Proceedings.

6.2 Remuneration of councillors

Municipalities are advised to budget for the actual costs approved in accordance with the Government Gazette on the Remuneration of Public Office Bearers Act: Determination of Upper Limits of Salaries, Allowances and Benefits of different members of municipal councils published annually between December and January by the Department of Cooperative Governance. It is anticipated that this salary determination will also take into account the fiscal constraints. Municipalities should also consider guidance provided above on salary increases for municipal officials during this process.

6.3 Payment of danger allowance to the employees

The work undertaken by the frontline staff in rendering services to communities must be appreciated whilst understanding the country's economic situation and the world resulting from the impact of COVID-19 pandemic. The SALGBC Circular No. 5 of 2020 provides advice to municipalities about the payment of danger allowance to employees working at the frontline to fight the COVID-19 pandemic.

The Circular provides that the council of the municipality must have an approved policy that should guide how the danger allowance should be paid, based on the affordability of the municipality. During this difficult financial situation posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, municipalities must consider the following:

1. Determine whether or not the municipality will afford the percentage increase in order to accommodate the Danger Allowance;
2. Assess the current status of the Employee Related Costs that form part of the municipality's budget in order to ascertain whether or not the inclusion of such allowance will not place the municipality's financial position in jeopardy in terms of the total Employee Related Costs as a percentage of the total expenditure;
3. Determine the credible funding source for the payment of Danger Allowance;

4. In this case the municipality must subject that change to “public participation processes” when dealing with the 2021/2022 MTREF based on the funding source; and
5. The municipality must also have a policy that operationalise the implementation of this kind of an allowance, only based on the determination/ assessment as per the aforementioned points.

6.4 Mayor’s discretionary funds and similar discretionary budget allocations

It has been observed that many municipal budgets contain sub-votes or allocations to “Mayoral Discretionary Funds”, “Special Projects”, “Special Events” or similar discretionary type funds. Municipalities must refer to section 12 of the MFMA in relation to setting up a relief, charitable, trust or other funds.

National Treasury regards these types of allocations as a bad practice because:

- It is not clear how they are aligned to the constitutional requirement that municipalities structure their budgeting and planning processes to give priority to the basic needs of the community, and to promote the social and economic development of the community (see section 153(a) of the Constitution);
- They do not provide for the appropriation of funds for the purposes of a department or functional area of the municipality (see the definition of ‘vote’ in section 1 of the MFMA);
- They undermine the budget consultation processes since the intended use of the funds is not transparently reflected in the tabled budget; and
- There is a risk that they may be abused for personal gain or to improperly benefit another person or organisation.

Therefore, National Treasury discourages allocations of this nature. Good budget practice requires that a municipal budget should transparently indicate the purposes and areas where municipal funds (i.e. public funds) are to be allocated. These kinds of discretionary funds immediately raise public suspicions of impropriety and corruption. In terms of section 52(a) of the MFMA the Mayor “must provide general political guidance over the fiscal and financial affairs of the municipality”. The Mayor, therefore, provides direct input into the budget. If this is the case, why does the Mayor require a ‘discretionary / personal slush fund’?

Section 17(3)(b) of the MFMA requires that when an annual budget is tabled it must be accompanied by “measurable performance objectives ... for each vote in the budget”. What measurable performance objectives can be set in relation to these funds given that their use is at the discretion of the Mayor? This means the transparent and effective use of these funds cannot be monitored and assessed by the council and the public.

National Treasury notes that section 17(3)(j) of the MFMA requires that when an annual budget is tabled it must be accompanied by “particulars of any proposed allocations or grants by the municipality to ... (iv) any organisations or bodies referred to in section 67(1)”. The aim of this provision is to ensure that all proposed allocations or grants are presented transparently in the budget documentation that is tabled for public consultation and council approval, as well as for budget management and monitoring purposes. *Any allocations or grants made to organisations or bodies that are not reflected in a municipality’s budget or adjustments budget must be regarded as unauthorised expenditure because they are “(f) a grant by the municipality otherwise than in accordance with this Act”* (see definition of unauthorised expenditure in section 1 of the MFMA).

National Treasury further notes that section 67 of the MFMA only allows funds to be transferred to ‘an organisation or body’ and not to an individual. Any allocations or grants to individuals, *other than in terms of the municipality’s indigent policy or bursary scheme, must be regarded as*

irregular expenditure because they are expenditures not in accordance with a requirement of the MFMA.

National Treasury and provincial treasuries will exercise close oversight of all discretionary type allocations in municipal budgets. If there are any concerns about the use of these funds, section 74 of the MFMA will be used to request information in this regard and analyse it for consistency with the MFMA legal framework.

7. Conditional Grant Transfers to Municipalities

The annual Division of Revenue Act requires that municipalities must request for a rollover approval against any unspent conditional grants that were allocated through the Act, therefore this section provides guidance to municipalities with regard to the preparation for the 2020/21 unspent conditional grant and rollover process and should be referenced against previous annual budget circulars.

7.1 Criteria for the rollover of conditional grant funds

In terms of Section 22 of the Division of Revenue Act, 2020 (Act No.4 of 2020) (DoRA) in conjunction with the Division of Revenue Amendment Act, 2020 (Act No. 10 of 2020) (DoRAA) and the Division of Revenue Second Amendment Act, 2020 (Act No. 20 of 2020), the Act requires that any conditional allocation or a portion thereof that is not spent at the end of the 2020/21 financial year reverts to the National Revenue Fund, unless the rollover of the allocation is approved in terms of subsection (2). Furthermore, the receiving officer, provincial treasury and national transferring officer is required to prove to National Treasury that the unspent allocation is committed to identifiable projects, in which case the funds may be rolled over.

When requesting a rollover in terms of section 22(2) of the 2020 DoRA, municipalities must include the following information with their submission to National Treasury:

1. A formal letter, signed by the accounting officer addressed to the National Treasury requesting the rollover of unspent conditional grants in terms of section 22(2) of the 2020 DoRA;
2. A list of all the projects that are linked to the unspent conditional grants and a breakdown of how much was allocated and spent per project;
3. The following evidence indicating that work on each of the projects has commenced, as applicable to the specific rollover(s):
 - a) Proof that a contractor or service provider was appointed for delivery of the project before 31 March; or
 - b) Proof of project tender and tender submissions published and closed before 31 March with the appointment of contractor or service provider for delivery of service before 30 June in cases where additional funding was allocated during the course of the final year of the project;
 - c) Incorporation of the Appropriation Statement;
 - d) Evidence that all projects linked to an allocation will be fully utilised by 30 June 2022 (attach cash flow projection for the applicable grant).
4. A progress report (also in percentages) on the status of each project's implementation that includes an attached **legible implementation plan**;
5. The value of the committed project funding and the conditional allocation from the funding source;
6. Reasons why the grants were not fully spent during the year of original allocation per the DoRA;

7. Rollover of rollovers will not be considered therefore municipalities must not include previous year's unspent conditional grants as rollover request;
8. An indication of the time period within which the funds are to be spent if the rollover is approved; and
9. Proof that the Municipal Manager and Chief Financial Officer are permanently appointed.

No rollover requests will be considered for municipalities with vacant or acting Chief Financial Officers and Municipal Managers for a period exceeding 6 months from the date of vacancy; this also includes acting appointments as a result of suspensions of either MM or CFO that are more than 12 months.

If any of the above information is not provided or the application is received by National Treasury (Intergovernmental Relations Division) after 31 August 2021, the application will be declined.

In addition, National Treasury will also consider the following information when assessing rollover applications; and reserves the right to decline an application should there be non-performance by the municipality in any of these areas:

1. Compliance with the in-year reporting requirements in terms of sections 71 and 72 of the MFMA and section 12 of the 2020 DoRA, **including the municipal manager and chief financial officer signing-off on the information** sent to National Treasury;
2. Submission of the pre-audited Annual Financial Statements to National Treasury by 31 August 2021;
3. Accurate disclosure of grant performance in the 2020/21 pre-audited Annual Financial Statements, (i.e. correct disclosure of grant receipts and spending in the notes to the AFS);
4. Despite the fact local government is required to comply to different norms and standards prescribed by different legislations, municipalities are expected to fully comply with the provisions of DoRA that relates to rollover processes and disclose conditional grant performance in the 2020/21 pre-audited Annual Financial Statements in order to verify grant expenditure; and
5. Cash available in the bank (net position including short term investments) as at 30 June 2021 is equivalent to the unspent amount at the end of the financial year. If the amount that is requested for rollover **is not entirely cash-backed**, such a rollover will not be approved. National Treasury will also not approve portions of rollover requests.

It should be noted that under no circumstances will the National Treasury consider requests to rollover:

1. The entire 2020/21 allocation to the municipality, in cases whereby the rollover request is more than 50 per cent of the total allocation, National Treasury will approve the rollover amount up to 50 per cent of the 2020/21 allocation;
2. Rollover request of the same grant for the third consecutive time;
3. Funding for projects constituted through Regulation 32 of the Municipal Supply Chain Management Regulations (Gazette No.27636). Projects linked to additional funding and disasters are exempted; and
4. A portion of an allocation where the proof of commitment for the rollover application is linked to invoices that were issued before or on 31 May 2021.

7.2 Rollover request against the Covid-19 allocated through the Equitable Share

The Division of Revenue Amendment Act, 2020 (Act No 10 of 2020) made available to Local government an amount of R11 billion following the President's speech on 20 April 2020. The President pronounced that R20 billion would be made available to municipalities in order to provide emergency water supply, increase sanitation of public transport facilities, and provide

food and shelter for the homeless. The R20 billion consisted of an additional allocation of R11 billion, which was transferred through the Equitable Share, and the R9 billion was funded from the repurposed spending within conditional grants allocated to municipalities. This increased the 2020/21 municipal Equitable Share allocation from R74.7 billion to R85.7 billion.

The R11 billion added to the local government Equitable Share allowed municipalities to maintain existing services despite a temporary decline in revenue collections and also cover some additional expenses incurred in response to the pandemic, including the provision of temporary shelter for homeless people during the lockdown.

Although the R11 billion was allocated through an unconditional grant (Equitable Share), these are committed funds in response to the Covid-19 pandemic. Consequently, the municipalities are required to request a rollover from National Treasury of any unspent committed Covid-19 allocation to be rolled over into the 2021/22 financial year.

Municipalities are therefore required to provide the following information to National Treasury in order to prove that the unspent funds are committed and also provide approval to allow the unspent funds to be spent in the 2021/22 financial year.

1. Provide the contracts that are linked to the response of the Covid-19 pandemic in line with the provisions made in the 2020 DoRAA;
2. Reasons why the funds were not fully spent during the year of original allocation per the DoRAA;
3. Accurate disclosure of Covid-19 allocation expenditure in the 2020/21 pre-audited Annual Financial Statements, (i.e. correct disclosure of grant receipts and spending in the notes to the AFS); and
4. Any expenditure incurred against the unspent Covid-19 funds that was not approved for the rollover will be regarded as unauthorized expenditure.

7.3 Unspent conditional grant funds for 2020/21

The process to ensure the return of unspent conditional grants for the 2020/21 financial year will be managed in accordance with section 22 of the DoRA. In addition to the previous MFMA Circulars, the following practical arrangements will apply:

- Step 1: Municipalities must submit their June 2021 conditional grant expenditure reports according to section 71 of the MFMA reflecting all accrued expenditure on conditional grants and further ensure that expenditure reported to both National Treasury and national transferring officers reconcile;
- Step 2: When preparing the Annual Financial Statements, a municipality must determine the portion of each national conditional grant allocation that remained unspent as at 30 June 2021. These amounts **MUST** exclude all interest earned on conditional grants, retentions and VAT related to conditional grant spending that has been reclaimed from SARS, which must be disclosed separately; and
- Step 3: If the receiving officer wants to motivate in terms of section 22(2) of the 2020 DoRA that the unspent funds are committed to identifiable projects, the rollover application pack must be submitted to National Treasury by no later than 31 August 2021.

National Treasury will not consider any rollover requests that are incomplete or received after this deadline.

- Step 4: National Treasury will confirm in writing whether or not the municipality may retain any of the unspent funds as a rollover based on criteria outlined above by 22 October 2021;

- Step 5: National Treasury will communicate the unspent conditional grants amount by 08 November 2021. A municipality must return the remaining unspent conditional grant funds that are not subject to a specific repayment arrangement to the National Revenue Fund by 19 November 2021; and
- Step 6: Any unspent conditional grant funds that should have, but has not been repaid to the National Revenue Fund by 19 November 2021, and for which a municipality has not requested a repayment arrangement, will be offset against the municipality's 07 December 2021 equitable share allocation.

All other issues pertaining to Appropriation Statement and reporting on approved rollovers are addressed in the Annexure to MFMA Circular No. 86.

7.4 Importance of section 17 of the Division of Revenue Act

The purpose of this section is to provide further clarity on section 17 of DoRA in relation to the transfer of funds to the organ of state in order to implement projects on behalf of the municipalities.

Section 17 (3) of DoRA states that a receiving officer may not allocate any portion of a schedule 5 allocation to any other organ of state for the performance of a function, unless the receiving officer and the organ of the state agree on the obligation of both parties and a payment schedule, the receiving officer has notified the transferring officer, the relevant provincial treasury and National Treasury of the agreed payment schedule and:

- a. The allocation
 - i) Is approved in the budget for the receiving provincial department or municipality; or
 - ii) If not already approved;
 - aa) the receiving officer notifies the National Treasury that the purpose of the allocation is not to artificially inflate the expenditure estimates of the relevant municipality and indicates the reasons for the allocation; and
 - bb) the National Treasury approves the allocation; or
- b. The allocation is for the payment for goods or services procured in accordance with the procurement prescripts applicable to the relevant province or municipality and, if it is an advance payment, paragraph (a) (ii) applies with the necessary changes.

Further, section 17 (4) states that the receiving officer must submit a copy of the agreement envisaged in subsection (3) to the transferring officer and the National Treasury before payment is made.

This section requires municipalities to comply with section 17 (3) before any DoRA allocated funds are allocated to any organ of state, and the municipality should first seek approval from National Treasury.

Note that National Treasury considers the following when assessing the request from the municipality for approval:

1. If the municipality is benefitting and utilising from the five per cent from capital grants that may be utilised for Project Management Unit (PMU). In terms of the capital grant framework (i.e. MIG and IUDG and three per cent for the USDG), municipalities are allowed to utilise a certain per cent of the grant for PMU or capacity support in order to implement capital projects. Therefore, if municipalities are benefitting from this initiative, the PMU should be capacitated enough to implement capital project;
2. Municipalities that are benefitting from the added technical support from Municipal Infrastructure Support Agent (MISA) will not be granted approval because MISA would assist with providing support and develop technical capacity towards sustained

- accelerated municipal and service delivery. This implies that the municipality would be capacitated and be in a better position to implement capital project; and
3. If the request does not comply with the grant conditions, framework and if the transfer artificially inflates the expenditure estimates.

The following information must be submitted to National Treasury before approval is granted to municipalities to transfer funds to organs of the state:

1. In consultation with the relevant transferring officer municipalities must submit their request to National Treasury for approval;
2. Provide the time frames regarding the duration of this arrangement between the municipality and the organ of the state;
3. Provide the Service Level Agreement between the municipality and the organ of the state in consultation with the relevant transferring officer;
4. Provide the agreed payment schedule reflecting the disbursement of the funds;
5. Must provide the reasons why the municipality has taken such a decision;
7. If amongst the reasons for the request is related to capacity challenges, the municipality must therefore prove beyond reasonable doubt that there are capacity challenges and the reasons thereof; and
8. Upon approval, the municipality must submit the approved budget that includes the allocation.

Note that once the allocation has been approved, the payment for goods or services must be procured in accordance with or in compliance with the procurement prescripts applicable to the relevant municipality. If there is an agreement for an advancement, subsection (a) (ii) will apply in order to determine if the payment does not artificially inflate the expenditure estimates. Further, before funds are transferred, the national transferring officer and National Treasury must agree on the payment schedule.

Therefore, if any expenditure incurred which emanates from such an arrangement while there was non-compliance with section 17, grant conditions and framework, such expenditure will not be recognised by both National Treasury and relevant transferring officer and will be classified as unauthorised expenditure.

8. The Municipal Budget and Reporting Regulations

8.1 Service Level Standards

Municipalities are reminded to update the service level standards which must form part of their 2021/22 MTREF tabled budget documentation. A broad framework on the minimum service standards was issued with MFMA Circular No. 75. Therefore, the outline must be used as a guideline and be amended accordingly to align to the municipality's specific circumstances.

8.2 Assistance with the compilation of budgets

If municipalities require advice with the compilation of their respective budgets, specifically the budget documents or Schedule A1, they should direct their enquiries to their respective provincial treasuries or to the following National Treasury officials:

Province	Responsible NT officials	Tel. No.	Email
Eastern Cape	Matjatji Mashoeshoe	012-315 5553	Matjatji.Mashoeshoe@treasury.gov.za
Buffalo City	Mandla Gilimani	012-315 5807	Mandla.Gilimani@treasury.gov.za
Free State	Cethekile Moshane	012-315 5079	Cethekile.moshane@treasury.gov.za

Gauteng	Kgomotso Baloyi	012-315 5866	Kgomotso.Baloyi@treasury.gov.za
Johannesburg and Tshwane	Kevin Bell	012-315 5725	Kevin.Bell@treasury.gov.za
	Willem Voigt	012-315 5830	WillemCordes.Voigt@treasury.gov.za
			Sifiso.Mabaso@treasury.gov.za
KwaZulu-Natal	Kgomotso Baloyi	012-315 5866	Kgomotso.Baloyi@treasury.gov.za
eThekweni	Mpati Rakgwale		Mpati.Rakgwale@treasury.gov.za
	Una Rautenbach	012-315 5700	Una.Rautenbach@treasury.gov.za
	Abigail Maila		Abigail.Maila@treasury.gov.za
Limpopo	Willem Voigt	012-315 5830	WillemCordes.Voigt@treasury.gov.za
	Sifiso Mabaso	012-315 5952	Sifiso.Mabaso@treasury.gov.za
Mpumalanga	Mandla Gilimani	012-315 5807	Mandla.Gilimani@treasury.gov.za
Northern Cape	Mandla Gilimani	012-315 5807	Mandla.Gilimani@treasury.gov.za
	Phumelele Gulukunqu	012 315 5539	Phumelele.Gulukunqu@treasury.gov.za
North West	Willem Voigt	012-315 5830	WillemCordes.Voigt@treasury.gov.za
	Makgabo Mabotja	012-315 5156	Makgabo.Mabotja@treasury.gov.za
Cape Town	Kgomotso Baloyi	012-315 5866	Kgomotso.Baloyi@treasury.gov.za
George	Willem Voigt and	012-315 5830	WillemCordes.Voigt@treasury.gov.za
	Mandla Gilimani	012-315 5807	Mandla.Gilimani@treasury.gov.za
Technical issues with Excel formats	Kgomotoso Baloyi	012-315 5866	Kgomotso.Baloyi@treasury.gov.za

9. Budget process and submissions for the 2021/22 MTREF

9.1 Submitting budget documentation and A1 schedules for 2021/22 MTREF

To facilitate oversight of compliance with the MBRR, accounting officers are reminded that:

- Section 22(b)(i) of the MFMA requires that **immediately** after an annual budget is tabled in a municipal council, it must be submitted to the National Treasury and the relevant provincial treasury in electronic formats. If the annual budget is tabled to council on **31 March 2021**, the final date of submission of the electronic budget documents and corresponding mSCOA data strings is **Thursday, 01 April 2021**.

Section 24(3) of the MFMA, read together with regulation 20(1) of the MBRR, requires that municipalities must submit the approved annual budget to both National Treasury and the relevant provincial treasury **within ten working days** after the council has approved the annual budget. E.g. if the council approves the annual budget on **31 May 2021**, given the new timeframe for the evaluation of the municipal budgets, the adopted budget data strings and documentation must be submitted by the latest **Monday, 14 June 2020**.

Municipalities are no longer expected to submit hard copies of all required documents including budget-related, Integrated Development Plan, Service Delivery Budget and Implementation Plan, Annual Financial Statements and Annual Reports to National Treasury via post or courier services. Electronic copies must be submitted in pdf format to the LG Upload portal or lgdocuments@treasury.gov.za.

9.2 Consolidated budgets and reports

Municipalities with entities are reminded that they must prepare and submit MTREF budgets, section 71 reports, annual financial statements and annual reports for both the parent municipalities and consolidated documents that incorporates the entity information in terms of the MBRR.

9.3 Submission using LG Upload Portal

In MFMA Budget Circular No 107, it was indicated that budget-related documents and schedules must be uploaded by approved registered users using the LG Upload Portal at: <https://lguploadportal.treasury.gov.za/> and that National Treasury was planning to retire lgdocuments@treasury.gov.za from 01 July 2021 to ensure that there is a single collection point of municipal financial data. However, based on workflow licensing challenges on the LG Upload Portal, data string submissions will shortly be shifted to the Open Portal GoMuni while documents must still be submitted using lgdocuments@treasury.gov.za. The document submissions will also be shifted to GoMuni as soon as possible.

All municipalities and their entities had to prepare their MTREF budget directly on the mSCOA financial systems from 01 July 2017. Therefore, all MBRR schedule submissions must be submitted in **PDF format only**.

9.4 Publication of budgets on municipal websites

In terms of section 75 of the MFMA, all municipalities are required to publish their tabled budgets, adopted budgets, annual reports (containing audited annual financial statements) and other relevant information on the municipality's website. This will aid in promoting public accountability and good governance.

All relevant documents mentioned in this circular are available on the National Treasury website, <http://mfma.treasury.gov.za/Pages/Default.aspx>. Municipalities are encouraged to visit it regularly as documents are regularly added/ updated on the website.

Contact



national treasury

Department:
National Treasury
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Post Private Bag X115, Pretoria 0001

Phone 012 315 5009

Fax 012 395 6553

Website <http://www.treasury.gov.za/default.aspx>

JH Hattingh

Chief Director: Local Government Budget Analysis

08 March 2021

Annexure A: Treatment of Rollovers and repayment of unspent grants in mSCOA

Cash receipting of a conditional grant

The receiving of grants must be accounted for against (Dt) Bank and (Cr) Item Liabilities: Unspent grants: Capital: Monetary: Municipal Infrastructure Grant: Receipts as shown below:

— Municipal Infrastructure Grant(IL-001-007-002-001-002-005-002)

Opening Balance(IL-001-007-002-001-002-005-002-001)

Receipts(IL-001-007-002-001-002-005-002-002)

Recognising the revenue when the grant is spent

When the grant is spent in accordance with the conditions of the grant, a transaction must be passed against the (Dt) Item Liabilities: Transferred to Revenue/ Capital Expenditure and (Cr) Item Revenue: Non-Exchange Transactions: Transfers and subsidies: Capital: Monetary allocations: National Government: Municipal Infrastructure Grant as shown below:

Debit Item Liability: posting level

— Municipal Infrastructure Grant(IL-001-007-002-001-002-005-002)

Opening Balance(IL-001-007-002-001-002-005-002-001)

Receipts(IL-001-007-002-001-002-005-002-002)

Transferred to Revenue/Capital Expenditure(IL-001-007-002-001-002-005-002-003)

Credit revenue recognised: posting level

— Transfers and Subsidies(IR-003-005)

— Capital(IR-003-005-001)

+ Allocations In-kind(IR-003-005-001-001)

— Monetary Allocations(IR-003-005-001-002)

+ Departmental Agencies and Accounts(IR-003-005-001-002-001)

+ District Municipalities(IR-003-005-001-002-002)

+ Foreign Government and International Organisations(IR-003-005-001-002-003)

+ Households(IR-003-005-001-002-004)

— National Government(IR-003-005-001-002-005)

Integrated National Electrification Programme Grant(IR-003-005-001-002-005-001)

Municipal Infrastructure Grant(IR-003-005-001-002-005-002)

Rollovers

In the event that the full grant was not spent at the end of the financial year, the municipality must apply for a rollover as per the process stipulated in the Division of Revenue Act (DoRA). Until such approval has been granted by the National Treasury, a municipality may not continue to incur expenditure against the unspent conditional grant allocation. This does not mean that the municipality should stop or cancel ongoing projects, but Council approval must be obtained to fund the spending from own funding sources until rollover approval is granted by the National Treasury. Once the rollover has been approved by the National Treasury, the amount of the rollover must be ratified through an adjustments budget. The mSCOA chart makes provision for all the required transactions in this regard.

Roll over not approved/ Offset against Equitable share

In the event that the rollover is not approved by the National Treasury, the unspent grant funding must be paid back to the National Revenue Fund or alternatively be offset against the Equitable Share and the Liability must be reduced by:

- 1) Debiting Unspent Grant (Repayment) to reduce the liability that was still outstanding; and
- 2) Crediting Item Revenue Equitable Share to adjust the revenue in line with DoRA.

This is further illustrated below:

- 1) Debit Liability: posting level

 Municipal Infrastructure Grant(IL-001-007-002-001-002-005-002)
Opening Balance(IL-001-007-002-001-002-005-002-001)
Receipts(IL-001-007-002-001-002-005-002-002)
Transferred to Revenue/Capital Expenditure(IL-001-007-002-001-002-005-002-003)
 (Retired) Closing Balance(IL-001-007-002-001-002-005-002-004)
Re-payment of Unspent Grant(IL-001-007-002-001-002-005-002-005)

- 2) Credit Revenue: posting level

 National Revenue Fund(IR-003-005-002-002-006)
Fuel Levy (RSC Replacement Grant)(IR-003-005-002-002-006-001)
Equitable Share(IR-003-005-002-002-006-002)

Unauthorised, Irregular, Fruitless and Wasteful (UIFW) expenditure

If the municipality continues to spend against the conditional grant allocation, but rollover approval has not been granted by the National Treasury, this expenditure will be viewed as unauthorised expenditure.