THE 80/20 REPORT

Local Government in 80 Indicators After 20 Years of Democracy



IRR
South African Institute of Race Relations
The power of ideas

THE 80/20 REPORT: LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN 80 INDICATORS OVER 20 YEARS

Editor-in-chief
FRANS CRONJE

Authors
GEORGINA ALEXANDER
JOHN KANE-BERMAN

Editors
LUCY HOLBORN
JOHN KANE-BERMAN
LERATO MOLOI

Typesetter
SARAH ZWANE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The IRR thanks all those who made the production of this report possible. Firstly, the IRR would like to thank the International Republican Institute for the funding that made this report possible. Secondly, we wish to acknowledge all the sources of our information. They are cited under the relevant table or in the text. Thirdly, we wish to thank John Kane-Berman for contributing the conclusion to this report. Finally, the author would like to thank Sarah Zwane for doing the typesetting and Chinique Mortimer for proofreading.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

1. We have always attempted to include the latest and most up-to-date information, but a cut-off point was inevitable. In general, the statistical data is from 2011.
2. As the sections were completed at different times, it is possible that information given in one section may in some cases have been overtaken by information given in another.
3. In many cases tables contain a footnote saying that 'figures should add up but may not, owing to rounding'. This rounding may have been done either by the Institute or by the agency from which the material was obtained.
4. Our use of the term 'African' to mean 'black African' is not intended to imply that people of other races have any inferior claim on being Africans. Though still used elsewhere, the term 'non-white' is widely regarded as offensive in South Africa. The IRR therefore usually uses 'black' as the collective term for African, coloured, Indian, and Asian people. Other organisations sometimes use 'black' to refer to Africans only.
5. Discrepancies in the spelling of names or styling of municipalities often occur in the press and other publications. The report uses the names as listed by the Gaffney Group, which is in partnership with the South African Local Government Association (SALGA). Where municipalities have been renamed, the new names are used.
6. In some cases the figures in the table do not appear to be correct. For example, in KwaZulu-Natal in the Umdoni local municipality it appears that 126.6% of households have their refuse removed by the local authority/private company. These figures have been checked and are correct according to the source, *Census 2011*. However, these mistakes are few and far between.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT ii
EXPLANATORY NOTES iii
INTRODUCTION 1
STRUCTURE, ROLES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA 3
Background 3
Structure of local government 3
Category A: Metropolitan municipalities 3
Category B: Local municipalities 4
Category C: District municipalities 4
Local government elections 4
Metropolitan councils 4
Local councils 5
District councils 5
District Management Areas (DMAs) 5
Composition of municipal councils 5
Governing legislation 5
The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa of 1996 6
Local Government: Municipal Structures Act of 1998 6
Local Government: Municipal Systems Act of 2000 6
Local Government: Municipal Systems Amendment Act of 2011 6
Local Government: Municipal Finance Management Act of 2003 6
Local Government: Municipal Property Rates Act of 2004 6
Objectives of local government 6
Powers and functions of municipalities 7
Financing of local government 8
Equitable share 8
Property rates 8
Service charges or tariffs 8
Main revenue sources 9
Fines 9
Other possible sources of income 9
External loans 9
Internal loans 9
Government grants 9
Donations and public contributions 9
Public/private partnerships (PPPS) 9
Municipal debt 10
Debt owed to municipalities 10
Debt owed by municipalities 10
Local government in relation to national and provincial government 10
DATA ANALYSIS OF 80 INDICATORS ON SOUTH AFRICA'S 278 MUNICIPALITIES 12
Data collecting process 12
Analysis: successes and failures 12
Poverty 12
Education 12
Employment 12
Income 13
Municipal services 13
Municipal finance 14
Best and worst performing municipalities 15

Root problems facing local government . . . 16
Political appointments . . . 16
Lack of capacity . . . 16
Lack of accountability . . . 17

HISTORICAL CONTEXT, THE CURRENT CRISIS, AND POLICY ALTERNATIVES . . . 18
Setting the scene . . . 18
Early historical background . . . 18
The interregnum from 1970–1994 . . . 20
The post-1994 era . . . 23
The current crisis . . . 24
Where to from here? . . . 30
Summary . . . 32
Sources . . . 32

Eighty indicators for 278 local municipalities . . . 33
Eastern Cape . . . 33
Free State . . . 48
Gauteng . . . 58
KwaZulu-Natal . . . 64
Limpopo . . . 85
Mpumalanga . . . 97
North West . . . 105
Northern Cape . . . 115
Western Cape . . . 127

NOTES . . . 139

Service delivery rankings by municipality . . . 140

SOURCES . . . 148

INTRODUCTION

Undoubtedly, as the IRR has repeatedly pointed out, living standards in South Africa are very much higher today than was the case at the dawn of our democracy in 1994. Yet it will not escape even the most casual observer of South Africa that at local government level there is much evidence of wastage, incompetence, and corruption. Indeed local government is the focus of much of the, often violent, anti-government protest action that has become such a feature of South Africa 20 years into its democracy. It is easy for the superficial analyst to emphasise either the socio-economic progress that has been made, or the failures of governance that are so obvious, and then to come to a simple conclusion on whether local governance in South Africa should be described as an example of failure and success. This sort of shallow and naïve analysis also produces naïve conclusions such as that 'better skills training' and 'improved delivery' will solve South Africa's local government problems.

Reality is far more complex, as the progress and the failures are part and parcel of the same local government system – which itself exists within an underperforming macro-economy. As impossible a contradiction as it seems, the improvement in living standards, especially in terms of access to water and electricity, has often been driven by the efforts of the very same local authorities that are often correctly described as incompetent and corrupt.

In this report we seek to explore that contradiction in an effort to identify the long-term policy shifts necessary to facilitate better local governance in South Africa. We set about this task in three ways. The first is to set out in simple language the structure, functions, and role of local government in South Africa. Local authorities have important powers to deliver water services, for example, but no influence at all over critical policy areas such as labour or education policy. Secondly we tracked the history of local government from the apartheid era into the present with a view to identifying the flaws in the current system and hence the keys to improving local governance. Here we show that in many respects a system of centralised – top down – local government has been continued out of the apartheid era into today. Thirdly, we provide the hard data on socio-economic circumstances in each of South Africa's local authorities. The result is a database of 80 indicators for every local authority in South Africa that we offer as a 'free to access' planning and strategy tool to development experts and policy makers.

Our conclusions are that, while accountability and the quality of management at local government level clearly leave much to be desired, the real problems confronting local authorities actually exist in the macro-economy. The IRR has always believed that South Africa's development goal should be to beat poverty and dependency levels by placing people in a position to improve their own lives. It is ultimately futile for local authorities to lay on millions of free and subsidised electricity and water connections, if the macro-economic environment is not conducive to drawing the investment and growth to allow poor people to find a job. As the 17 labour market indicators we produce for each local authority reveal, joblessness is a massive crisis at the heart of almost very local authority. In the absence of jobs, 'better service delivery' simply creates the unmet expectations and hence the protest action that has become so prevalent.

The IRR has always believed that South Africa's development goal should be to beat poverty and dependency levels by placing people in a position to improve their own lives.

Hence do not misdiagnose the problems facing local government as originating solely in poor local management practices, skills shortages, and poor 'service delivery'. Better governance and more accountability are of course important but will be achieved only where the political will to do so exists. The origins of these problems are that government at all levels, and hence the people that elect the government, are in effect willing to tolerate very poor leaders being inflicted on their communities.

All that is necessary to change this, and in fact all that can change this, is to expel corrupt leaders and appoint key officials on merit. A very important means of forcing such change is the electoral system. Too many analysts ignore that weak local government leaders were elected, directly or indirectly, by the communities they serve.

However, even with the best governance, and all the social and economic benefits this will bring, a far greater challenge is to create the macro-policy environment – and the jobs – that are necessary to meet the expectations of poor people. If this is not done then the efforts of local authorities will ultimately fail to advance an independent class of upwardly mobile employed people who, through their own efforts, are able to climb out of poverty and into the middle classes. To achieve that result the macro-policy environment must improve at a national level.

— Frans Cronje
Chief Executive

STRUCTURE, ROLES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA

Background

Local government is the first point of contact between citizens and the Government. It is the sphere of government that has the most direct impact on the day-to-day lives of South Africans.

Under the previous government local authorities, as they were known, were created by provincial governments and had no constitutional status or autonomy. Any rights and powers local authorities possessed were granted to them by provincial legislatures. Local authorities were made up of a variety of fragmented institutions which were racially segregated. As a result, unequal services were provided to different communities based on race.

The transformation of local government was directed at removing racially-based governance and making it a vehicle for the integration of society and the redistribution of municipal services from the well-off to the poor.

As per *Chapter 7* of the Constitution, municipalities were *'established for the whole of the territory of the Republic'*. The Constitution elevated local government to a sphere of government, establishing local government's autonomy. Municipalities now form the lowest formal level of democratically elected government.

Structure of local government

There are 278 municipalities in South Africa and they are broken down into three categories. There are 8 metropolitan municipalities, 44 district municipalities, and 226 local municipalities. The overall objective of these municipalities is to focus on growing local economies and to provide infrastructure and services to those living under their jurisdiction.

There are three categories of municipality:

Category A: Metropolitan municipalities

This category of municipality is single tier, meaning that it has exclusive municipal executive and legislative authority in its area. In order to be classified as metropolitan, municipalities have to have more than 500 000 voters and are established to administer South Africa's most urbanised areas. These municipalities are broken into wards. The metropolitan municipality co-ordinates the delivery of services to the area under its jurisdiction but councils may decentralise powers and functions. However, all original municipal legislative and executive powers are vested in the metropolitan council.

South Africa has eight metropolitan municipalities, namely:

- Buffalo City (East London, Eastern Cape);
- City of Cape Town (Western Cape);
- Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality (East Rand, Gauteng);
- City of eThekwini (Durban, KwaZulu-Natal);
- City of Johannesburg (Gauteng);
- Mangaung Municipality (Bloemfontein, Free State);

- Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality (Port Elizabeth, Eastern Cape); and
- City of Tshwane (Pretoria, Gauteng).

A metropolitan municipality is run by a council. The number of councillors varies depending on the municipality. Half of the metropolitan councillors are elected through a proportional representation ballot, meaning that the number of seats won by a party or group of candidates is proportionate to the number of votes received. The other half are elected as ward councillors by the residents in each ward.

Category B: Local municipalities

Areas that fall outside of the eight metropolitan municipal areas are divided into local municipalities. This category of municipality shares municipal executive and legislative authority in its area with a category C (district) municipality within whose area it falls.

There are 226 local municipalities and each municipality is broken into wards. The residents in each ward are represented by a ward councillor. As with metropolitan councils, half of local councillors are elected through a proportional representation ballot. The other half are elected as ward councillors by the residents in each ward.

Category C: District municipalities

District municipalities are made up of a number of local municipalities that fall in one district. There are usually between four and six local municipalities that come together in a district council. Some district municipalities also include nature reserves and the areas where few people live – these are called district management areas. They fall directly under the district council and have no local council. The district municipality has to co-ordinate development and delivery in the whole district. A district municipality has municipal executive and legislative authority in the area with which it shares jurisdiction with a number of category B municipalities. The allocation of responsibilities between the two tiers of local government (category B and C municipalities) is prescribed by the Municipal Structures Act of 1998. District municipalities are primarily responsible for capacity-building and district-wide planning.

The district council is made up of two types of councillors. The first are elected councillors and they are elected for the district council on a proportional representation ballot by all voters in the area. Councillors elected this way form 40% of all district councillors. The second type of councillor represents local municipalities in the area and they are sent by their council to represent it on the district council. This type of councillor makes up 60% of the district council.

While metropolitan municipalities are responsible for all local services, development and delivery in the metropolitan area, local municipalities share that responsibility with district municipalities. This is especially the case in very rural areas, where district municipalities will have more responsibility for development and service delivery.

Local government elections

Councils are elected every five years. The last election was held on 18 May 2011 and the next will be in 2016, with the specific date to be announced.

Metropolitan councils

In a metropolitan municipality each voter will vote once for a political party on a proportional representation (PR) ballot. The parties will then be given seats according to the percentage of votes that they received in the metropolitan area as a whole. Each party has a list of candidates and the councillors are drawn from this list. Each voter will also receive a ballot for their ward with the names of the ward

candidates. The person receiving the most votes in a ward will win that seat. Ward candidates may stand as representatives of parties or as independents.

Metro councils may also set up sub-councils to serve different parts of their municipality. Sub-councils are not elected directly by voters. Existing councillors are allocated to serve on each sub-council.

Local councils

In a local municipality each voter will vote once for a political party on a PR ballot. The parties will then be given seats according to the percentage of votes that they received in the area as a whole. Each voter will also receive a ballot for their ward with the names of the ward candidates. The person receiving the most votes in a ward will win that seat. Ward candidates may stand as representatives of parties or as independents.

District councils

Every voter in a local municipality will also vote for the district council that their local area is part of. The district municipality ballot will have party names on it and the seats will be allocated according to the percentage of votes parties gained in the whole district municipal area.

Not all councillors serving on a district council are directly elected. Only 40% of the seats will be given to parties on the basis of the votes they got on the PR ballot. The remaining 60% of seats on the district council will be allocated to the local councils in that area. Each local council will be given a number of seats and must send councillors from their ranks to fill those seats. The seats should be filled according to the support that parties have in a specific council. So, for example, if a local municipality is given five seats on the district council and the ANC gained 60% of the seats on the local council, the ANC councillors should fill three of the five seats. The other two seats should be allocated to other parties according to their strength.

District Management Areas (DMAs)

People who live in DMAs such as game parks and other low population areas, get a PR ballot for the district council and a PR ballot for the DMA. They do not vote for local councils or wards.

Composition of municipal councils

All councils have the following composition:

- a mayor, who heads the council;
- an executive or mayoral committee, that meets regularly to co-ordinate the work of council and make recommendations to council;
- a speaker (except in very small councils), who chairs council meetings;
- council meetings, where the full council meets to make decisions; and
- committees, where a few councillors meet to discuss specific issues.

There are different types of mayors, executives, and committees. The structures are set out in the Municipal Structures Act. In each province the member of the executive council (MEC) for local government decides what types of structures will be used by different councils.

Governing legislation

There are a number of key pieces of legislation that regulate the structure, functions, and powers of local government.

The main pieces of legislation concerned are:

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa of 1996

The Constitution established local government as a sphere of government and confirmed its autonomy. It set out the objectives, powers, and functions, developmental duties, and categories of municipalities. In addition, it set out the election, membership, length of terms, and functions of municipal councils.

Local Government: Municipal Structures Act of 1998

This piece of legislation defined how municipalities were to be established, the categories and types of municipalities, the composition, membership, operation, and dissolution of municipal councils, and how the functions and powers of municipalities were to be divided between the different categories. It also defined the roles and responsibilities of office-bearers in municipalities.

Local Government: Municipal Systems Act of 2000

The Act governs the way municipalities go about performing their primary mandate of service delivery. The Act established a framework for municipal planning and performance management as well as systems for municipalities to report on their performance. It also sets out frameworks to govern service tariffs as well as credit control and debt collection. The Act also details why and when the provincial government is allowed to place a municipality under administration.

Local Government: Municipal Systems Amendment Act of 2011

This Act was aimed at professionalising local government by:

- ensuring that professional qualifications and experience are the criteria governing the appointment of senior managers in local government;
- stating that senior political party office bearers, at any level of the party structure, may not be appointed to the top municipal jobs (the municipal manager and other senior managers who report directly to her/him). However, this provision does not apply to managers who had already been appointed when the Act took effect; and
- declaring that staff members dismissed for misconduct may only be employed in any municipality after a period, prescribed by the minister, has lapsed. In the case of misconduct related to financial duties, re-employment in any municipality is unlawful for ten years.

Local Government: Municipal Finance Management Act of 2003

This legislation aims to ‘secure sound and sustainable management of the financial affairs of municipalities and other institutions in the local sphere of government and to establish treasury norms and standards for the local sphere of government’.

Local Government: Municipal Property Rates Act of 2004

This Act regulates the power of a municipality to impose property rates, provides for the exclusion of certain properties from rating in the national interest, provides fair and equitable valuation methods of properties, and requires municipalities to implement transparent and fair system of exemptions, reductions and rebates through their rating policies.

Objectives of local government

The Constitution set out the objectives of local government. A municipality must strive, within its financial and administrative capacity, to achieve the following objectives:

- to provide democratic and accountable government for local communities;
- to ensure the provision of services to communities in a sustainable manner;
- to promote social and economic development;
- to promote a safe and healthy environment; and
- to encourage the involvement of communities and community organisations in the matters of local government.

Powers and functions of municipalities

A municipality has executive authority to make and administer by-laws for the effective administration of the matters which it has the right to administer. As per part B of Schedule 4 of the Constitution the following fall under the responsibility of local municipalities:

- air pollution;
- building regulations;
- child care facilities;
- electricity and gas regulation;
- firefighting services;
- local tourism;
- municipal airports;
- municipal planning;
- municipal health services;
- municipal public transport;
- municipal public works only in respect of the needs of municipalities in the discharge of their responsibilities to administer functions specifically assigned to them under the Constitution or any other law;
- pontoons, ferries, jetties, piers, and harbours, excluding the regulation of international and national shipping and matters related thereto;
- stormwater management systems in built-up areas;
- trading regulations; and
- water and sanitation services limited to potable water supply systems and domestic waste-water and sewage disposal systems.

As per part B of Schedule 5 of the Constitution the following fall under the responsibility of local municipalities:

- beaches and amusement facilities;
- billboards and the display of advertisements in public places;
- cemeteries, funeral parlours, and crematoria;
- cleansing (street sweeping, road verge maintenance, cleaning and emptying bins, cleaning public spaces, carcass removal, removal of wrecks, cleaning after public events, collection of illegally dumped waste, and the prevention of illegal dumping);
- control of public nuisances;
- control of undertakings that sell liquor to the public;

- facilities for the accommodation, care, and burial of animals;
- fencing and fences;
- licensing of dogs;
- licensing and control of undertakings that sell food to the public;
- local amenities;
- local sport facilities;
- markets;
- municipal abattoirs;
- municipal parks and recreation;
- municipal roads;
- noise pollution;
- pounds;
- public places;
- refuse removal, refuse dumps, and solid waste disposal;
- street trading;
- street lighting; and
- traffic and parking.

Financing of local government

There are four main sources of income that municipalities use to finance their expenditure.

Equitable share

The equitable share is an amount of money that a municipality gets from national government each year. The Constitution says that all revenue collected nationally must be divided equitably between national, provincial, and local government. The local government equitable share is meant to ensure that municipalities can provide basic services and develop their areas. The amount a municipality gets depends mainly on the number of low-income people in the area – rural municipalities usually get more. Most municipalities only get a small part of their operating budget from the equitable share.

Property rates

All people and businesses who own fixed property (land, houses, factories, and office blocks) in the municipal area are charged property rates which is a yearly tax based on the value of each property. Income from property rates is used by the municipality to pay for the general services to all people, which cannot easily be charged to a specific service user as a service charge. For example roads, pavements, parks, streetlights, storm water management, etc.

Service charges or tariffs

For specific services that can be directly charged to a house or factory, the principle of ‘user pays’ is adopted. That is, to charge a price or tariff for services such as water, electricity, or approval of building plans, where the exact usage of the service can be measured, to the person or business who actually used that service.

Main revenue sources

Municipal operating revenue, 2012/2013[a]

Proportion of total revenue	*Proportion*
Property rates	16.0%
Service charges	55.0%
Interest earned – external investments	0.9%
Other revenue	8.5%
Transfers from government	19.5%

a These proportions are medium-term estimates.

Source: National Treasury, *Local Government Budgets and Expenditure Review 2011*, 10 October 2011

Fines

Traffic fines, late library book fines, and penalties for overdue payment of service charges are all another source of income for local municipalities. Fines also motivate users of services to obey laws, rules, and deadlines.

Other possible sources of income

External loans

Local municipalities may make use of external loans (from a bank or other financial institution) but this is an expensive form of financing. External loans are recommended to be used to finance the purchase of major capital items (a long-lived business asset) such as roads, buildings, sewerage works, and water systems.

Internal loans

Many municipalities have internal savings funds such as a Capital Development Fund or Consolidated Loan Fund. These funds can make internal loans to the municipality for the purchase or development of capital items, usually at a lower interest rate than for an external loan.

Government grants

Municipalities may apply to national government for grants for infrastructure development. The two main funds available are:

- CMIP (Consolidated Municipal Infrastructure Programme) – available from the Department of Provincial and Local Government
- Water Services Projects – available from the Department of Water Affairs.

Donations and public contributions

Local and foreign donors sometimes donate a capital item or money to be used specifically for the purchase of a capital item. This type of funding is usually accompanied by a request for publicity for their donation.

Public/private partnerships (PPPS)

Local municipalities can form partnerships with the private sector to finance a specific project.

Municipal debt

Debt owed to municipalities

As discussed above, municipalities have four main sources of revenue, equitable share (received from national government), property rates, service charges or tariffs, and fines.

According to the most up-to-date information, aggregate municipal consumer debts was R93.3 billion as at 31 December 2013. The Government's share of the outstanding debt represents 4.4 per cent or R4 billion. Households account for 63.2 per cent or R59 billion of money owed to municipalities.

Metropolitan municipalities were owed R52 billion as at 31 December 2013. Johannesburg is owed the largest amount at R17.6bn, followed by Ekurhuleni (Germiston) metro at R10bn, Cape Town at R6.3 billion, and Tshwane (Pretoria) at R6bn.

Persistently high debtor levels show that efforts to collect billed revenues are poor. This could be due to factors such as lack of political backing, insufficient staff or capacity, or unwillingness to carry out electricity and other service cut-offs to force payment. The majority of municipalities have collection rates (collection of service charges or tariffs and property rates) below 80 per cent.

Debt owed by municipalities

According to the 2011 *Local Government Budgets and Expenditure Review*, revenue from service charges is the largest source of municipal income. However, a large percentage of this income 'flows through municipal coffers to Eskom (electricity provider) or the water boards (depending on the municipality, between 65% and 85% of municipal electricity revenue goes to paying for bulk electricity from Eskom).'

Municipalities owed R17.7 billion as at 31 December 2013. North West has the highest percentage of creditors outstanding for more than 90 days at 70%, followed by Free State at 67% and Mpumalanga at 64%.

Local government in relation to national and provincial government

A municipality has the right to govern, on its own initiative, the local government affairs of its community. While national and provincial governments may supervise the functioning of local government, this must be done without encroaching on the institutional integrity of local government.

The national and provincial governments, by legislative and other measures, must support and strengthen the capacity of municipalities to manage their own affairs, to exercise their powers, and to perform their functions.

Draft national or provincial legislation that affects the status, institutions, powers, or functions of local government must be published for public comment before it is introduced in Parliament or a provincial legislature, in a manner that allows organised local government, municipalities, and other interested persons an opportunity to make representations with regard to the draft legislation.

An example of conflict between national and local government was in evidence in the matter between the minister for Mineral Resources and the Swartland municipality in the Western Cape.

Elsana Quarry, a mining company, bought the Langa Kloof farm in the Swartland municipality with the intention to mine granite, although the land was not zoned for mining but for agricultural use only. The zoning of land is a power held by municipalities. In June 2008 Elsana applied to the municipality to have the farm rezoned but before the application was completed, and on the advice of the minister of mineral resources, it withdrew its application as the minister said that rezoning was unnecessary. In February 2009 the minister granted Elsana a mining right for a period of 30 years. A national minister overrode a municipality's authority. Soon after mining had commenced, a neighbour lodged a complaint with the municipality as the blasting of dynamite was disrupting his cattle farming. In July 2009 the municipality launched an urgent application in the Western Cape High Court against Elsana and the minister. Ultimately, in April 2012, the Constitutional Court found in favour of the municipality and found

that Elsana had to apply to the municipality to rezone the land before they could mine it. Therefore, the Constitutional Court prevented national government from overriding local government powers.

There are some instances when provincial government may legitimately intervene in local government. The Constitution states that 'when a municipality cannot or does not fulfil an executive obligation in terms of the Constitution or legislation, the relevant provincial executive may intervene by taking any appropriate steps to ensure fulfilment of that obligation'. Therefore, if a municipality is unable or willing to perform its functions, set out by the relevant legislation, the provincial government may issue a directive to the municipal council, describing the extent of the failure to fulfil its obligations and stating any steps required to meet its obligations or assume responsibility for the relevant obligation in that municipality.

DATA ANALYSIS OF 80 INDICATORS ON SOUTH AFRICA'S 278 MUNICIPALITIES

Data collecting process

The data for the 80 indicators was sourced mainly from the Census 2011, published by Statistics South Africa (Stats SA) in October 2012 and *Gaffney's Local Government in South Africa Yearbook, 2011–2013*, published by The Gaffney Group in October 2011. Every effort was made to use the most up-to-date information available.

Analysis: successes and failures

Poverty

The poverty rates measure the proportion of households in each municipality with a monthly income below R2 300 a month. According to Stats SA a household is 'a group of persons who live together and provide themselves jointly with food and/or other essentials for living, or a single person who lives alone.' According to the same source, household income is defined as 'All receipts by all members of a household, in cash and in kind, in exchange for employment, or in return for capital investment, or receipts obtained from other sources such as social grants, pension, etc.' Household income would also include any money remitted to the household from family members living elsewhere.

The Alfred Nzo district municipality in the Eastern Cape has the highest poverty rate, at 79%. The lowest rate among all the district municipalities is that of the Cape Winelands district municipality in the Western Cape, at 48%.

The metropolitan municipality (metro) with the highest poverty rate is Buffalo City (East London), at 60%. Cape Town has the lowest, at 44%.

The local municipality with the highest poverty rate is Matatiele in the Eastern Cape, at 98%. The lowest poverty rate is in the Overstrand local municipality in the Western Cape, at 11%.

Education

The proportions in the tables refer to the highest level of education achieved by people aged 20 and older. Out of all the district municipalities, Sedibeng in Gauteng has the highest proportion of people aged 20 and older with a grade 12, at 32%. The Alfred Nzo district municipality in the Eastern Cape has the lowest, at 13%.

Of all the metros, eThekwini (Durban) has the highest proportion of people aged 20 and older with a grade 12, at 37%. Buffalo City has the lowest, at 27%.

The uMhlathuze local municipality in KwaZulu-Natal has the highest proportion of people aged 20 and older with a grade 12, at 39%. The Engcobo local municipality in the Eastern Cape has the lowest, at 10%.

Employment

The unemployment rate on the official definition refers to people aged between 15 and 64 who are without work, but who are looking for work and are available to take up employment or start a business. This definition excludes discouraged work-seekers (those who have given up looking for a job). The unemployment rate according to the expanded definition is 40%. Therefore, the actual proportion of people of working age without jobs is higher than the official rate, which currently stands at 26% for the country as a whole, compared to the to the expanded definition, which is at 40%. Unemployment rates across the municipalities range from 14% to 50%.

The Cape Winelands district municipality has the lowest unemployment rate, at 14%. The Sekhukhune district municipality in Limpopo has the highest rate, at 51%.

The West Coast district municipality in the Western Cape has the lowest youth unemployment rate, at 20%, while the Sekhukhune district municipality in Limpopo has the highest, at 61%.

South Africa has a favourable age distribution in that there are many young people available to work, according to the National Development Plan (NDP), a strategic framework that forms the basis of future government planning compiled by the National Planning Commission and adopted by the Cabinet in September 2012. However, the high unemployment rate among youth could also become a threat to social stability, the NDP says. Only five district municipalities out of the 44 in the country have youth unemployment rates below 30% and they are all in the Western Cape.

Income

According to Stats SA, 15% of South African households are considered no-income households. This means that no person in the household receives any income in the form of cash or kind, in exchange for employment, or in return for capital investment, or receipts obtained from other sources, such as pensions.

Almost one third (29%) of households in South Africa receive between R1 and R1 600 monthly.

There are vast discrepancies between municipalities in the number of households in each income group. Not surprisingly, there tend to be more households in higher income brackets in the metros than in rural areas.

In the Johannesburg metro the single largest proportion of households (29%) are in the R1–R1 600 bracket but the municipality also has the highest proportion of households in the highest income bracket in South Africa, at 0.8%. Only 0.3% of households in the country earn R204 800 or more per month, which is the highest income bracket.

Households by income bracket, 2011

Income bracket	*Proportion of households*
No Income	15.1%
R1–R1 600	29.0%
R1 601–R3 200	19.0%
R3 201–R6 400	13.0%
R6 401–R12 800	9.2%
R R12 801–R25 600	7.2%
R25 600–R51 200	4.7%
R51 201–102 400	1.9%
R102 401–R204 801	0.6%
R204 801 or more	0.3%
South Africa	**100.0%**

Source: Stats SA, *Census 2011*, 30 October 2011

Municipal services

Local government has a direct impact on the day-to-day lives of South Africans through the provision of services such as water, electricity, sanitation, and refuse removal. The overall objective of municipalities is to grow local economies and to provide infrastructure and services to those living under their jurisdiction.

The district municipality with the highest household access to electricity for lighting is the West Coast in the Western Cape, at 94%. The lowest access is in uMkhanyakude in KwaZulu-Natal, at 38%.

The local municipality with the best access to electricity used for lighting is Swartland in the Western Cape, at 98%. The lowest access is in Ntabankulu in the Eastern Cape, at 23%.

The highest levels of access to water (inside the household or on a communal stand) are shared by the Central Karoo district municipality in the Western Cape, the Nelson Mandela Bay (Port Elizabeth) metro in the Eastern Cape, and the Sedibeng district municipality (Vereeniging and Vanderbijlpark) in Gauteng, at 99% each.

The highest level of access to sanitation is in the Cape Winelands district municipality, where 92% of households have access to either a flush or a chemical lavatory. The municipality with the poorest access to sanitation is the Alfred Nzo district municipality, where 90% of households have access only to a pit latrine, bucket toilets, or no facilities at all.

There seems to be a correlation between poverty rates and service delivery. For example, the Sisonke district municipality in KwaZulu-Natal has a poverty rate of 74%. Only 26% of households there have access to a flush lavatory, while 35% have no access to piped water.

Municipal finance

Local government is required by the Public Finance Management Act of 1999 (PFMA) to compile and submit annual financial statements for auditing. The previous auditor-general (AG), Mr Terence Nombembe, accesses these financial statements and reports on their quality as well as on each municipality's annual performance reports and their compliance with legislation. Each municipality is given a rating or opinion.

Classification of opinions:

- *Clean audit:* The financial statements of the auditees are free of material errors or omissions (financially unqualified audit opinion) and there are no material findings on reporting by them on their performance objectives or compliance with laws and regulations.
- *Financially unqualified with findings:* The financial statements contain no material misstatements. Unless a clean audit outcome is given, this classification of audit outcome means that findings have been raised on either reporting on predetermined objectives or non-compliance with legislation, or both these aspects.
- *Qualified audit opinion:* The financial statements contain material misstatements in specific amounts or there is insufficient evidence for the AG to conclude that identified amounts included in the financial statements are not materially overstated or understated.
- *Adverse audit opinion:* The financial statements contain misstatements that are not confined to specific amounts or the misstatements represent a substantial portion of the financial statements.
- *Disclaimer of audit opinion:* The auditee provided insufficient evidence (documentation) on which to base an audit opinion. The lack of sufficient evidence is not confined to specific amounts or represents a substantial portion of the information contained in the financial statements

Out of the eight metros, four (50%) received clean or unqualified audits. Out of the 44 district municipalities, 29 (66%) received clean or unqualified audits. Only 82 (36%) out of 226 local municipalities received clean or unqualified audits.

The AG also reports on the amount of unauthorised, irregular, and fruitless and wasteful expenditure each municipality has incurred in the specific financial year. Unauthorised expenditure refers to overspending on the amount that was previously agreed to by Parliament or a provincial legislature. Irregular expenditure is expenditure, other than unauthorised expenditure, incurred in contravention of, or that is not in accordance with, the requirements of any applicable legislation. Fruitless and wasteful expenditure is made in vain and would have been avoided had reasonable care been exercised.

In the 2011/12 financial year, municipalities incurred almost R19 billion of unauthorised, irregular, and fruitless and wasteful expenditure.

The many mis-spent millions

Province	*Unauthorised, irregular, and fruitless and wasteful expenditure*	*Proportion of total*
	Rbn	*%*
Eastern Cape	4.6	24.4
Free State	3.2	16.9
Gauteng	1.7	9.3
KwaZulu-Natal	2.1	11.1
Limpopo	2.3	12.4
Mpumalanga	1.0	5.4
North West	1.9	10.3
Nothern Cape	0.9	4.5
Western Cape	1.1	5.8
TOTAL	**18.8**	**100.0%**[a]

a Proportions should add up to 100% but may not, owing to rounding.

Source: Auditor-general South Africa, *Consolidated General Report on the Local Government Audit Outcomes 2011/12*, August 2013

Best and worst performing municipalities

There are great discrepancies between the municipalities across South Africa. In order to gain insight into which municipalities are performing well and which are performing poorly, ten of the 80 indicators were used to rank all the municipalities. The majority of the ten indicators are service delivery indicators.

These indicators are the unemployment rate, the proportion of people aged 20 and older who have passed grade 12, the poverty rate, the number of houses which are owned but not fully paid off, the proportion of households that use electricity for lighting, the proportion of households that have access to piped water inside the dwelling or yard, the proportion of households that do not have access to piped water within one kilometre of the household, the proportion of households that have their refuse removed by the local authority or a private company, the proportion of households that have a flush or chemical lavatory, and the number of households that have no lavatory.

Each municipality was then given a score out of ten, 0 being the worst score and ten being the best. The ratings can be found between pages 140 and 147 of this report.

Some 70% of the best performing municipalities are located in the Western Cape, while 80% of the worst performing are located in the Eastern Cape.

10 Best and 10 worst performing municipalities in South Africa

10 Best performing (score above 7.5)			*10 Worst performing (score below 3.0)*		
Municipality	***Province***	***Score***	***Municipality***	***Province***	***Score***
Saldanha local	WC	7.88	Ntabankulu local	EC	2.56
Siyancuma local	NC	7.86	O R Tambo district	EC	2.56
Overstrand local	WC	7.66	Mbhashe local	EC	2.61
Umdoni local	KZN	7.65	Mbizana local	EC	2.73
Drakenstein local	WC	7.62	Msinga local	KZN	2.73
Mossel Bay local	WC	7.61	Engcobo local	EC	2.88
Swartland local	WC	7.61	Ezinqoleni local	KZN	2.90
Stellenbosch local	WC	7.55	Amathole district	EC	2.91
Gamagara local	NC	7.54	Emalahleni local	EC	2.95
Cape Town metropolitan	WC	7.53	Port St Johns local	EC	2.96

The IRR has argued that service delivery in South Africa has not been the failure that many think it has. Between 1996 and 2011 the total number of households in South Africa increased by 60%, or 5.4 million and the population by 28%, or 11.4 million. In the same period, the number of households using electricity for lighting increased by 135%, or by 7.1 million. The number of households with access to piped water increased by 82% or 5.9 million. The number of households with access to flush or chemical lavatories have increased by 99% or 4.4 million, and the number of households who have their refuse removed by their local authority by 90%, or 4.3 million.

Despite increased access to basic services, high unemployment and poverty rates detract from the improving picture. The problems identified in the above analysis, are, in many ways the symptoms of systemic problems in local government.

Root problems facing local government

In his 2011/12 report on local government audits, the AG identified lack of capacity in local government due to vacancies in key positions as a root cause of poor audit results. The NDP identifies the need to professionalise the civil service and to attract highly skilled people that will be committed to a career in local government.

There have been numerous reports detailing the problems facing local government. Although the problems are vast, three main systemic issues have been identified. These key problem areas are political appointments, lack of capacity, and lack of accountability. In many cases the three key problems in local government overlap.

Political appointments

The NDP admits that political interference and political appointments have caused ‘turbulence that has undermined the morale of public servants and citizens’ confidence in the State’ [John Kane-Berman in *Fast Facts*, July 2013].

Lack of capacity

The lack of capacity or skills in local government affects the way local municipalities are run and therefore their ability to deliver on their mandate. The AG noted that ‘vacancies in key positions and key officials without the minimum competencies and skills continued to make it difficult to produce credible financial statements and performance reports’ [Auditor-general South Africa, *Consolidated general report on the audit outcomes of local government, 2011–12*, 13 August 2013, p12]. For example, in the Northern Cape, 11 out of the 32 municipalities have chief financial officers with no qualification higher than a grade 12 [SABC News, 1 August 2012].

Most municipalities have difficulty in attracting critical skills such as engineers, spatial planners and chartered accountants. A report by the Municipal Demarcation Board in October 2012 estimated that the situation is most acute in mainly rural and district municipalities. According to the report, staff vacancies are large, with just 72% of the available municipal posts filled nationally. Limpopo has the highest number of vacancies (39.5%). The survey also found that 49% of municipalities do not have a registered engineer and that almost 50% of technical services managers did not have under-graduate degrees or diplomas. The inability to manage and maintain infrastructure has led to a decline in the condition of infrastructure and an increase in service delivery protests.

Corruption, cadre deployment, skills shortages, and poor administration have all been blamed for poor local government performance. But it must also be acknowledged that some South African district municipalities are larger than many countries and American states.

Our largest district municipality, Namakwa (NorthernCape), is larger than the state of New York, which contains 62 counties, each with their own mayor and administration. Switzerland, which is smaller than three of our district municipalities, is divided into 26 cantons, and approximately 2 700 communes. Every canton has its own parliament, government, constitution, laws, and courts.

It could be that some of the municipalities do not function as they should due to the sheer size of them.

Lack of accountability

The AG also identified a lack of consequences as a reason why poor performance was allowed to continue. The public protector, Ms Thuli Madonsela, also identified that ‘lack of accountability and lapses in leadership are some of the causes of governance failure’ [*City Press* 23 October 2013].

The director-general in the Presidency for monitoring, Mr Sean Phillips, has also stated that poor performance in the Government too often goes unpunished. The system was not working well [*City Press* 3 October 2013], he said.

Local government can respond to the problems it faces only within the framework of its functions. This can limit the scope local government has to address these problems. It is also true that the problems seen in local government are not unique to this level of government, but can be found at the provincial and national levels too. Therefore, if the problems within local government are to be fixed, they must also be fixed at the provincial and national levels.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT, THE CURRENT CRISIS, AND POLICY ALTERNATIVES

Setting the scene

Even though the apartheid system has been replaced by majority rule, local government is now entering its fifth decade of centralised and politicised control, accompanied by chronic unrest. Indeed, local government is now facing a crisis of both effectiveness and legitimacy. This is partly the result of decades of wrong-headed policy under the previous government. However, it is also the result of current misguided policies. There are lessons to be learned from the mistakes of the past.

Early historical background

During the apartheid era urban local government was organised on racial lines, reflecting the segregated residential patterns that were largely already in place when the Union of South Africa came into being in 1910. Members of the four main population groups – Africans, coloured people, Indians, and whites – lived in separate areas. After the National Party (NP) came to power in 1948, residential segregation was intensified across the entire country. Slum clearance was sometimes used as a pretext to resettle Africans thought to be living too close to white suburbs. It was further used as a pretext to get rid of those few black areas where freehold homeownership rights existed. The inhabitants of Sophiatown, a freehold area a few miles west of the Johannesburg city centre, were thus forced in the 1950s to move from there to the new South Western Township (Soweto) established further away after the Second World War. Later, many households were also removed to Soweto right across the city from Alexandra township, north-east of Johannesburg. The Johannesburg City Council opposed both the forced removals and the extinction of freehold rights, but its objections were ignored by the central government.

Segregation was imposed on the coloured and Indian minorities as well. They were forced to divest themselves of their homes and businesses in areas reserved for exclusive white occupation, or thought to be too close to such areas. Over the years some 630 000 coloured and Indian people all over the country were thus displaced – most notoriously from District Six in Cape Town. In most cases, communities forced to move were shifted much further out of town.

One of the key instruments of such segregation was the Group Areas Act of 1950, while the presence of Africans in areas set aside for white ownership was also regulated by the Bantu Urban Areas Consolidation Act of 1945, and its predecessor, the Natives (Urban Areas) Act of 1923.

The policy had two prongs: one was to limit the influx of people from rural areas to the cities; the other was to remove people already in the cities.

Although they were subject to residential segregation, the coloured and Indian minorities were allowed to remain in South African cities and towns (except that Indians could not stay overnight in the Orange Free State province). But Africans, because they constituted the majority of the population, were subject to additional restrictions. The overarching policy was that their number in the cities and towns should be kept to the minimum required for labour purposes. Even this number were regarded not as permanent residents but as ‘temporary sojourners’ who could remain there only for as long as their labour was required. The policy had two prongs: one was to limit the influx of people from rural areas to the cities; the other was to remove people already in the cities. It was enforced using an internal passport known as a ‘pass’ or ‘reference book’ which the

police were entitled to inspect at any time to ascertain whether the bearer had official permission to be where he or she was.

The underlying rationale was that the margin by which Africans outnumbered whites in the 'white' area should be kept as narrow as possible, lest sheer weight of numbers undermine minority rule. The policy applied not only in the urban areas, but also to Africans living and working on white-owned farms in rural areas. Between two and three million Africans were accordingly removed from 'white' urban and rural areas to the ten 'homelands'.

'White' area was a misnomer all along. The technical term was actually 'prescribed area'. Even though Africans were a majority of the population in most cities and towns, they were not allowed to own fixed property there. Their economic opportunities were also limited. This applied even to African dormitory townships, such as Soweto, in the wider 'white' area. The types of businesses Africans could open were restricted to small single shops, while their product range was generally limited to household essentials. Manufacturing was not allowed at all – and in fact some of the African industrialists who had started up in Soweto were forced to move to the homelands. The overriding idea was that Africans wishing to expand their businesses should go and do so in one or other of the ten homelands to which they were all assigned according to ethnic group. This policy was partly ideologically motivated, but also the result of pressure from white business to eliminate competition from blacks.

African townships belonged to the local authority, as did all the housing within those townships.

For Soweto and all the other thousands of black townships across the country, this overarching policy meant that development was deliberately stunted. The inhabitants of these townships were officially regarded as little more than workers for white households, commerce, and industry. Their shopping needs could be fulfilled by white retailers in the city centre around which they constituted dormitories from which they commuted every day. One consequence of these policies, as the South African Institute of Race Relations pointed out at the time, was to hamper the growth of a black middle class.

By about 1970 residential segregation was the norm across the country. African, coloured, and Indian suburbs within the 'white' towns had been taken over by whites or simply disestablished. Generally speaking, whites lived closer to the city centres, while the blacks (Africans, coloured people, and Indians) lived further out, incurring higher transport costs and longer commuting times. Certain bus and railway services were subsidised.

Another aspect of policy was property ownership. Whites generally owned their land and any buildings upon it in freehold. African townships belonged to the local authority, as did all the housing within those townships. There were a few African villages in various parts of the country where the homeowners had title to their land, but these villages were gradually disestablished and their inhabitants removed. The overall objective of policy was to ensure that there was no individual African ownership of fixed property outside the homelands.

The post-apartheid government thus inherited an almost totally segregated pattern of residential accommodation across the country.

The post-apartheid government thus inherited an almost totally segregated pattern of residential accommodation across the country. It also inherited infrastructural backlogs in many areas. The white suburbs of the cities invariably had higher incomes, better amenities, and more extensive local services than their surrounding black dormitory areas. The electrification of black townships was discouraged (until the 1980s) lest it make these areas too attractive.

The system of local government reflected both the segregation pattern and the overall policy of white control. White local authorities were elected and politically accountable to their electorates. Municipal services were efficient and the cities were properly run.

From the early 1920s, the African, coloured, and Indian townships were supposedly represented by local advisory councils with varying degrees of power, but all subordinate to the control of the white local authority. Whether or not township residents should have anything to do with these advisory bodies became more and more contentious within the townships, particularly from the latter part of the 1960s onwards.

The white-controlled local authorities had two main sources of income. The first was charges for services such as electricity, water, and refuse removal. The second was rates levied on the value of property, in other words property tax. Since Africans did not own any land or housing, rates could not be levied upon them. Instead they paid rent for their housing to the local authority, although they were charged for municipal services. The absence of rates helped to ensure that local authorities had an inadequate source of income from the townships they owned. Consequently they established monopolies on the sale of sorghum beer from beer halls and gardens which they owned and ran. They also had a monopoly on the sale of hard liquor. The profits on the sale of liquor became an important source of income for the white local authorities to spend on the black townships they controlled. However, most of the profits on hard liquor sales had to be transferred to the central government for use in the homelands.

The homelands together constituted some 13% of the land surface of the country, as provided for in the Land Acts of 1913 and 1936.

Overall policy around the country was that African townships should be self-sufficient. One of the few exceptions was Soweto. Whereas most local authorities and therefore the African townships under their control were run by the National Party (NP), Johannesburg was under the control of the official opposition, the United Party (UP). Where it had discretion, the UP-controlled Johannesburg City Council applied apartheid less rigidly than was the case in NP-controlled local authorities. The Johannesburg City Council's Non-European Affairs Department (NEAD), which managed Soweto, was a relatively liberal administration within the overall national apartheid framework. One of the things it did from 1941 onwards was to subsidise Soweto from the rates paid by white homeowners and businesses. Another aspect of its liberal administration was to build African housing in an attempt to keep up with demand arising from urbanisation and natural population increase. In 1956 it obtained a very large 30-year loan from the mining industry to help with this.

However, as the NP intensified its apartheid policy, it put a stop to this liberal approach. Since it wished to encourage Africans to move from the white area to the homelands, it preferred to build not only housing but also secondary schools in the homelands rather than in the urban townships. One of the many instruments of this policy was to remove women from waiting lists for township housing. During the 1960s, the central government became more and more reluctant to approve housing funds for extensions to Soweto. In 1968 housing construction in Soweto was frozen altogether.

The homelands together constituted some 13% of the land surface of the country, as provided for in the Land Acts of 1913 and 1936. Each had its own elected legislature with powers over such matters as school education. The ultimate objective of apartheid policy was that all of the homelands would become constitutionally separate states. South Africa's Africans would all become citizens of one or other of them, and in the process cease to be South African citizens. Four homelands were in fact hived off into this separate constitutional orbit in the 1970s and 1980s, before the policy was discarded in the second half of the 1980s as ultimately unworkable. The constitutional negotiations, followed by the first democratic election in 1994, followed.

The interregnum from 1970–1994

In order to pursue its policies uniformly across the country, the Government in the early 1970s shifted control of all the African townships from local authorities to itself. All the African townships were thus in a sense 'nationalised'. The central government's instruments of control were 22 Bantu Affairs

Administration Boards, whose areas of jurisdiction covered the entire country outside the homelands. This meant that the Johannesburg City Council's Non-European Affairs Department had all its assets and functions transferred to the West Rand Administration Board. The same happened with non-European affairs departments of local authorities elsewhere in the country.

Ideological control from the top replaced the (admittedly limited) downward accountability of the previously decentralised administrative system.

The performance of the boards varied enormously. Some ran relatively liberal administrations, some the opposite. The board responsible for townships in the Vaal Triangle further south than Soweto was one of the former. For example, it gave the maintenance and repair work on all its vehicles to black backyard mechanics. The West Rand board was an example of the latter. In fact, the contrast between the relatively liberal administration of the Johannesburg NEAD and the manner in which the West Rand board ran Soweto was striking. One aspect was that the subsidies previously made available by Johannesburg to its NEAD for Soweto were no longer paid.

The legislation which established the 22 boards in fact provided not only that the townships under their control should be self-supporting, but that any credits the boards might accumulate should be used for the development of the homelands. The IRR warned at the time that 'this augurs ill for Soweto and cannot but presage a curtailment of services'. In a foretaste of the policy of cadre deployment later implemented by the ANC, the minister to whom all the new administration boards reported put his brother (a former schoolmaster) in charge of the one responsible for Soweto.

Whereas in the past the officials who administered Soweto and other townships across the country were accountable to elected local authorities, these officials were now accountable to a minister in the central government. Ideological control from the top replaced the (admittedly limited) downward accountability of the previously decentralised administrative system.

The contentious advisory councils in the various townships became even more contentious. The elected Urban Bantu Council (UBC) established in Soweto in 1968 became known by some of its opponents as the 'Useless Boys Club' or the 'United Bunch of Crooks'. Some of the township residents elected to these councils attempted to do the best they could for their constituents, but their powers were largely advisory. They were widely criticised for helping to implement apartheid ideology. The central government further undermined their limited legitimacy by suggesting that the vote that township residents could exercise for these councils was a substitute for the parliamentary franchise.

At the same time, during the 1970s and early 1980s, the central government attempted to implement its policies of influx control even more strictly than in the past. Only in 1986 were these policies abandoned, on the grounds that they had become unworkable and unenforceable.

By the time law and order had been restored about 18 months later, some 700 people, most of them black, were dead.

It was not more than a few years before the whole board system ended in disaster. On 16th June 1976 police opened fire on a protest march by schoolchildren in Soweto. The protest was essentially on a language issue, but the homicidal police response caused the whole area to erupt in violence. This soon spread to dozens upon dozens of other townships across the country. By the time law and order had been restored about 18 months later, some 700 people, most of them black, were dead. Some died in conflict between militant youngsters and migrant workers living in township hostels, but most fatalities by far were at the hands of the police.

Harsher implementation of apartheid policy by the new administration boards was one of the ingredients in the violent eruption in Soweto and elsewhere. Buildings destroyed included the boards' administration offices, but also beer halls that they had taken over from the city council.

Another ingredient in the violent eruption was ideology. Some years before, in the late 1960s, a charismatic black leader by the name of Steve Biko had formed various organisations to promote 'black consciousness'. This was the idea that black people should take pride in themselves and abandon negative terminology that described them as 'non-white' or 'non-European'. It meant also setting up separate black anti-apartheid organisations in place of the multiracial liberal ones often dominated by whites. Biko himself had been banned, along with many of the organisations he founded. But his ideas lived on. They were widely publicised by black journalists, most of whom were strongly supportive.

Students in Soweto were in fact critical of the ANC for its inactivity within the country.

'Black consciousness' – sometimes embracing slogans such as 'black is beautiful' and sometimes also symbolised by the clenched fist 'black power' salute – had a significant impact on university students as well as on schoolchildren across the country. Many of the school pupils in Soweto in particular said their parents had for too long been acquiescent in the oppressive apartheid system; they themselves, however, were no longer prepared to take it lying down. The chairman of the Soweto Urban Bantu Council, the township's putative mayor, was literally frogmarched out of office by schoolchildren.

Another influence on the growth of student activism was the end of Portuguese colonial administration in Mozambique and Angola after a coup in Lisbon in 1974 and the assumption of power in those countries by Marxist black liberation movements.

The African National Congress (ANC) played little part in these developments. It had been banned in 1960, and Nelson Mandela had been jailed in 1964. The security clampdown of the 1960s had virtually destroyed its operational capacity within the country, so that its main activity was to mobilise international pressure against apartheid. Students in Soweto were in fact critical of the ANC for its inactivity within the country. However, the ANC – and in particular the South African Communist Party (SACP) and Umkhonto we Sizwe, its military wing – were the major beneficiaries of the post-1976 security clampdown.

Many of the students involved in the revolt in Soweto and elsewhere fled the country and then wound up in military training camps in the Soviet Union and elsewhere. They soon returned to the country to participate in revolutionary activities sponsored by the ANC, or Umkhonto, and the SACP. By the mid-1980s these had been widened into a "people's war".

One component of the "people's war" was an assassination campaign against black policemen and local councillors. Although the latter, as shown above, had seldom had much legitimacy given their limited powers within the apartheid system, they were now targeted as collaborators who should be eliminated. Their elimination was part of a wider campaign to make the townships 'ungovernable' for as long as the NP remained in power and the apartheid system in operation. In the period between January 1990 and February 1991, for example, there were at least 195 petrol-bomb and other attacks on black councillors. Sixteen were killed in the 18 months between January 1990 and June 1991. Over roughly the same period, 358 resigned, 85% saying they had been intimidated into doing so. Will Carr, former manager of the Johannesburg NEAD, said that councillors appeared to be 'living in terror of the comrades'.

One component of the "people's war" was an assassination campaign against black policemen and local councillors.

The "people's war" overtook all the NP Government's (limited) attempts to reform township administration. These reforms included introducing a new 'community council' system set up under legislation in 1977 and writing off the West Rand board's accumulated debt for Soweto. Homeownership in the form of 30-year and 99-year year leases was introduced, and additional sites for housing made available. Some of the restrictions on black business development were lifted. Although the Government said that blacks should be 'weaned

from outside assistance', an interdepartmental committee to look into the financing of housing, services, and facilities in Soweto and other townships was established. The Government even suggested that the idea that Africans in the 'prescribed areas' were only 'temporary sojourners' was becoming a thing of the past. In what was widely taken as a symbol of the Government's recognition that people in Soweto were now permanent residents of Johannesburg, the prime minister paid the township a visit.

The post-1994 era

The segregated system of local government naturally had to disappear with the rest of the apartheid when South Africa held its first democratic election under the post-apartheid constitution in 1994. The centrally controlled administration boards were abolished. Initially the post-apartheid South Africa had 843 municipalities, but this number was later reduced to the present 278. These include eight metropolitan and 266 local municipalities, the latter usually being grouped together under 44 district municipalities. A total of 8 951 elected councillors preside over these municipalities, which are made up of 3 753 wards.

Two key principles underlie the present system. One is 'wall-to-wall' coverage. This means that the entire country falls under the jurisdiction of local government, including rural areas that were never previously part of local government but rather fell under provincial control. A few municipalities, such as Johannesburg, are responsible for a single city (which includes Sandton, to which Johannesburg's central business district has moved). But most embrace many more cities, towns, and villages. The metropolitan municipality of Tshwane thus includes not only the country's executive capital, Pretoria, but a number of smaller towns and their adjoining townships, some of them an hour's drive away through farming areas. Tshwane also includes a number of very poor rural settlements.

Among the consequences of wall-to-wall coverage is that some of South Africa's district municipalities cover very large areas. Our largest district municipality, Namakwa (Northern Cape), is about the same size as the state of New York and larger than Louisiana, Mississippi, and Ohio. Three of our municipalities are larger than whole countries such as Denmark, Switzerland, Belgium, and Jamaica. Switzerland, which is smaller than three of South Africa's district municipalities, is divided into 26 cantons and approximately 2 700 communes. But South Africa's district municipalities have below them only smaller local municipalities.

The second principle underlying our present system of local government is that it is constitutionally mandated to be developmental and redistributive. Whether local government has either the human or the financial resources effectively to play this role is open to doubt. Even 20 years after the handover of power from the NP to the ANC in 1994, the discrepancies between previously black and previously white areas resulting from apartheid remain large – and, in some cases, vast.

The second principle underlying our present system of local government is that it is constitutionally mandated to be developmental and redistributive.

Yet local government has a limited revenue base. Charges for services such as electricity, water, and refuse removal account for 55% of municipal revenue. Profits from electricity sales are often used to subsidise other municipal activities. But to use charges for services in some areas to subsidise those in others risks deterioration of services in the better-off areas. The other major local source of municipal income is property taxes or rates (16% of revenue). But again it is fiscally dubious to use these for redistributive purposes. The deterioration of services and maintenance in the old Johannesburg city centre as well as in many of the formerly well administered white suburbs is plainly visible, as are many of the improvements in places such as Soweto. But the deterioration in the established areas risks creating an exodus from those areas, so undermining the city's ability to collect revenues from them.

The third main source of revenue for local government is transfers from central government, which account for 20% of their revenue. While local government collects service charges and rates, central

government collects all income and indirect taxes in South Africa. About 90% of such tax revenues are spent more or less equally on national and provincial government, the amount going to local government being somewhat less than 10% of the total.

One of the (worsening) problems municipalities have is collecting local revenues due to them. In 2010 they were collectively owed R62 billion, a figure which had risen by June 2013 to R87 billion. This is the amount outstanding for water, electricity, sanitation, refuse removal, and rates. It is roughly equivalent to a third of budgeted current municipal revenue, and also roughly equivalent to the total amount budgeted for transfers to local government from national taxes.

About 90% of such tax revenues are spent more or less equally on national and provincial government, the amount going to local government being somewhat less than 10% of the total.

Most municipal debt is owed by households, followed by business, and then government itself. Reasons for failure of households to pay debt include financial stress. An official report said last year that rapid urbanisation and economic stagnation meant that a growing number of households could not pay for increasingly expensive municipal services. However, there is also a view that there should be no charges for all the numerous things the ANC has promised to provide as part of its 'better life for all', to use one of its election slogans. An ANC member of Parliament who is about to retire said in April 2014 that unrealistic rhetoric had contributed to the thousands of service-delivery protests – 'a sad testimony to the reckless promises not being sustained'.

But, there is also problem of enforcement: people whose water supply or electricity is disconnected because of failure to pay simply reconnect it illegally (sometimes with lethal consequences). Municipalities' inability to collect all the debt owed to them means in turn that they are unable to pay some of their own bills: a year or two ago, for example, 78 local authorities between them owed R1.3 billion in arrears to 12 water boards.

Another problem is priorities. Johannesburg, for example, is busy with huge plans for bicycle routes, solar energy, and the like, along with the extension of a hugely expensive and highly disruptive rapid transport system. The more mundane work of servicing buses, fixing potholes in roads, and repairing collapsed storm-water drains, is largely neglected. Very large numbers of traffic lights can be out of order for days if not weeks or even months on end.

There are also problems with audits and irregular expenditure. In 2012 some R16 billion in municipal expenditure was said by the finance minister to have been irregular. Some 56% of municipalities received qualified audits last year. Only 22% managed to stick to the regulations governing expenditure.

Many local authorities also ignore warnings from the National Treasury about tariff increases. At the end of last year the treasury said that tariff increases for municipal services should not exceed 6% (the upper limit of the Government's current inflation targets). However Johannesburg recently announced 9% increases in water and sanitation tariffs, while Tshwane announced 10% increases in water, sanitation, and property taxes, and a 25% increase in refuse removal. Cape Town put up tariffs by 11%, and numerous other municipalities also exceeded the limits advised by the treasury. Increases on this scale will exacerbate a problem identified in the recent report on city finances, namely that tariff increases have generally outstripped increases in household incomes. The report also pointed out that 'employee-related costs have risen significantly', whereas repair and maintenance expenditure has been 'very modest'.

The current crisis

Violent protests are now endemic right across the country at local level. This violence is not out of the ordinary in a violent society, where, for example, 45 murders are reported every day. Violence during strikes, most of it inflicted by organisers of strikes on non-striking workers, has killed 181 people in the

last 15 years. Since 1983, 3 990 policemen have been killed, 70% of them since 1994. Last year alone, there were 431 deaths at the hands of the police, inflicted during the course of arrests or in other circumstances. In August 2012 there were 48 deaths at Marikana in the North West province, among them 34 caused by the police during unrest at the Lonmin platinum mine. In 2008, 62 people, half of them foreigners, were killed during xenophobic violence. Violent attacks on shopkeepers who have come to South Africa from elsewhere in Africa occur regularly. Communities complaining of police ineptitude and corruption periodically also go on the rampage hunting for alleged rapists and other criminals; if they are caught, such people are invariably 'necklaced' – a tyre is hung around round their neck, doused with petrol, and then set alight. Train drivers have recently asked for security protection because they know from experience that they may be attacked by angry commuters if trains are delayed. South Africa thus has a violent citizenry and a violent police force.

South Africa thus has a violent citizenry and a violent police force.

What are now commonly called 'service-delivery protests' thus occur against a background of widespread public violence. A count by the IRR shows that 45 people have died in these protests over the past decade, most of them at the hands of the police. (These figures exclude the fatalities at Marikana.)

According to a recent statement by the police, there were 1 882 violent protests between April 2012 and March 2013. Most protests are in fact non-violent, but those that are violent are running at an average of five a day. The police in Gauteng province said earlier this year that violent protest there was stretching their resources to the limit. Although it is clear that in some cases police have been besieged by violent protesters, few of the fatalities as depicted in the press seem to have been justified.

These protests occur both in formal townships characterised by conventional housing and in so-called 'informal' settlements comprised of shacks and shanties. In one or two cases residents of an informal settlement have attacked nearby suburban flats and houses.

Most of the protests are routinely described as 'service delivery' protests. Those that are disruptive or violent often take the form of burning barricades across roads, stonethrowing, and arson attacks on houses, municipal buildings, ANC offices, vehicles, schools, libraries, clinics, foreign and locally-owned shops, and other facilities – even, on a few occasions, police stations.

Grievances include lack of water, or housing, or sanitation, or electricity. In some cases promises had not been met, while in others delivery had been interrupted. Where water has eventually been supplied in response to protests, it has sometimes been dirty. High prices of water and electricity are also cited as a grievance, along with the installation of pre-paid electricity meters. Another complaint is that the Government wastes money on such things as road naming: 'What is the difference between Church Street and Steve Biko Street?', one demonstrator wanted to know.

Grievances include lack of water, or housing, or sanitation, or electricity. In some cases promises had not been met, while in others delivery had been interrupted.

Dissatisfaction is not confined to black townships. Many white ratepayers have periodically voiced it too. Until the practice was outlawed by the courts, they have sometimes withheld payments for poor service delivery and instead put the money into trust accounts from which they have then paid for services provided by private contractors. Rhodes University in Grahamstown in the Eastern Cape recently said it would have to close after having been without water for two weeks. However, protest action which involves taking to the streets is largely confined to black townships or informal settlements within larger metropolitan, district, or local municipalities.

The Madibeng district municipality, west of Pretoria in the North West province, is one of several that have experienced conflict over water. Last year there were at least four protests citing water supply

as a grievance. In January 2014 four people were shot dead by the police as the protests continued. Demonstrators were suspicious that water supplies had deliberately been interrupted by councillors or officials who received kickbacks from owners of water-bowsers who made money by selling water at a premium. Suspicion was compounded by the fact that a report on this corrupt – and particularly harmful and odious – practice had been suppressed. A one-time administrator of the municipality said it had been run by an 'over-entrenched cartel that turned it into their cash cow'.

The Madibeng story is but one of a great number that could be cited to show that behind all the dissatisfaction with 'service delivery' is dissatisfaction with the way local government operates. Corruption and nepotism in the awarding of tenders is often cited in press reports as a major grievance. Various studies, official and unofficial, confirm this, as do admissions by ministers.

The Tlokwe municipality shows, however, that the ANC is reluctant to deal with corruption.

In 2009 a spokesman for one of the ministers responsible for local government in fact said that the root cause of problems in local government was nepotism, irregular appointments of staff, irregular awarding of tenders, taking bribes and kickbacks, inflation of tender amounts for personal benefit, and the awarding of tenders to particular individuals. A report by the auditor general in 2012 found that in 46% of audited municipalities, contracts were awarded to employees, councillors, and other state officials. A study by the Mistra group at five sites in five provinces concluded that municipal councillors were abusing their positions to prey upon the poor. Nepotism was the norm, not the exception, Mistra commented. Corruption Watch, a non-governmental organisation which relies on tipoffs from the public, said that local government was the most corrupt institution in South Africa, followed by the traffic police and schools.

The Tlokwe municipality (a hundred miles away from Madibeng in the same province) shows, however, that the ANC is reluctant to deal with corruption. In November 2012 ANC councillors in the town joined forces with the opposition Democratic Alliance (DA) to throw out a corrupt mayor, who was then replaced by a DA mayor. Their reward was expulsion from the party and visits by top party officials, including ministers and the deputy leader of the party, Cyril Ramaphosa, attempting to whip them back into line. President Jacob Zuma also admonished them. At the beginning of 2014 the ANC succeeded in getting a new person elected as mayor, after regaining majority support in the council. Reluctance on the part of the ANC to deal with corruption in its ranks is indeed one of the factors helping to undermine the legitimacy of local government. In Tlokwe, in fact, the ANC did not simply fail to stamp out corruption within its ranks – it mobilised its top leadership to stamp upon those who tried to stamp it out. In the Camdeboo municipality in the Eastern Cape a municipal manager was appointed despite the fact that he was facing fraud and other charges.

Numerous press reports claim that protests turn violent only after the failure of peaceful methods of resolving grievances over service delivery or corruption or other matters. A study published by a group at the University of Johannesburg in February 2014 reiterated this. Protesters were desperate people crying out to be heard. Local councillors were attacked because they were the arm of government most visible and accessible.

Numerous press reports claim that protests turn violent only after the failure of peaceful methods of resolving grievances over service delivery or corruption or other matters.

The widely used term 'service-delivery protests' is probably by now a misnomer. While it might be true that protests turn to violence only after formal channels have been exhausted, there is a bigger issue here than poor response by local councillors and officials. The widespread corruption and nepotism that is now so evident is a more serious problem than mere lack of responsiveness. Nor is Madibeng the only place where an apparent problem – water supply – is actually really a problem of organised corruption. Not only that, as with Tlokwe, the ANC's failure to deal with corruption makes the problem even more serious.

Another factor is political fraud. An ANC task team found widespread manipulation and fraud in nominations for councillors for the local government elections held in 2011. Having investigated disputes in 419 wards, it recommended that the selection processes be redone in 125 of them. Yet another problem is factionalism, mayors in some areas having been removed by provincial officials because they do not support President Zuma. Perhaps as many as six local councillors who have tried to investigate tender or other irregularities have been assassinated.

The upshot is that local councillors all over the country are facing a legitimacy crisis.

The upshot is that local councillors all over the country are facing a legitimacy crisis. Nor is this a new problem. President Thabo Mbeki complained as long ago as 2006 about the murders of local councillors. Since then, the legitimacy problem has probably worsened. In eThekwini (the official name of the metropolitan council in Durban), 22 of the 205 councillors have been given private security protection, prompting queries from the DA opposition as to why the council has to spend money on private security when it has its own police department. In the Govan Mbeki district municipality in Mpumalanga province, local councillors turned to security guards to protect them from angry residents after 45 councillors' houses were set on fire. In Estcourt, a town in KwaZulu-Natal, the provincial ANC was reported to be thinking of hiring private security guards to protect its councillors following a spate of killings in the area. The ANC's national chief whip said that councillors needed to be protected when working in their communities.

Reports of violent attacks on councillors or their houses in different parts of the country now appear in the press almost weekly. According to a report in *The Times*, a daily paper in Johannesburg, ANC representatives in most black townships across the country were being forced to flee as frustrations about lack of service delivery were vented on them. The ANC referred to a 'chaotic trend of burning councillors' houses'. One of the ministers responsible for local government said that these attacks 'remind me of apartheid councillors during the 1980s who were guarded and looked after by municipal police'.

Although it is borne out by the facts, this is an astonishing admission. As indicated above, local councillors under the previous government had no real powers and they were widely seen as stooges implementing the hated apartheid system. From the early 1980s onwards, both they and municipal police were the targets of an assassination campaign sponsored by the ANC and its allies as part of their "people's war" to destabilise the country and make it 'ungovernable'. That the situation of ANC councillors should even be compared with that of their apartheid predecessors – and that by an ANC minister – testifies to the crisis that local government in South Africa is facing twenty years after the advent of democracy.

In some places, the ANC is itself pursuing the 'ungovernability' strategy. This is mainly occurring in the Western Cape which the DA rules as the provincial government, a democratic outcome of the 2009 national and provincial election to which the ANC has never reconciled itself. It has on occasion helped to organise localised protests over 'service delivery' and labour matters in an attempt to destabilise the DA provincial government.

In some places, the ANC is itself pursuing the 'ungovernability' strategy.

In other parts of the country, where the ANC is in power in local government, there is evidence that one or another faction in the ANC at local level exploits 'service-delivery' grievances. According to Ray Hartley, a senior journalist, there is evidence that in Madibeng, for example, ANC members who had lost out in elections were involved in the protest over the water bowsers. In Bronkhorstspruit, a town that falls under the distant Tshwane municipality, a suspended councillor and two groups of businessmen who had been shut out from tenders were now leading people on to the streets. Hartley said there was a battle over power and money, and that people were mobilising protests to help their case.

If this is indeed the case, it calls into question the claim that protests turn violent only after peaceful attempts to voice grievances have fallen on deaf ears. Moreover, frequent resort to violence may be a

hangover from the ANC's strategy of making black townships ungovernable as part of the "people's war". This was supported by trade unions, churches, local civic associations, student organisations, many non-governmental organisations, the media, radical white groups, and foreign embassies in South Africa. Children were pulled out of school both to help destabilise local government and confront the police. The popular culture of 'ungovernability' thus created may well have persisted into the post-apartheid era – where the ANC in fact continues to encourage it in the Western Cape.

Unemployment among African males between the ages of 15 and 24 is running at 51%.

Jeremy Cronin, a deputy minister and also a senior official in the South African Communist Party, said he agreed with an analysis by another journalist that competing ANC factions linked with former councillors were behind the mobilisation of angry youth. Given South Africa's very high rate of unemployment, there are indeed plenty of youths who could be mobilised. Unemployment among African males between the ages of 15 and 24 is running at 51%. According to some studies of the protests, unemployed youths form a large component. In some protests, according to the Government, children have been in the forefront and are being used as shields.

South Africa's overall unemployment rate has risen from 20% in 1994 on the strict definition to 26% last year. On the expanded definition, which includes discouraged workers who have given up looking for work, it has risen over that period from 31% to 37%. The number of unemployed on the strict definition has risen from 2.0 million to 4.7 million, and on the expanded definition from 3.7 million to 8.0 million. Two thirds of all unemployed people have been unemployed for more than a year.

Unemployment per se has seldom been mentioned as a cause of any of the protests. On one occasion in Ermelo in Mpumalanga, however, 26 youths appeared in court on public violence and theft charges. They complained that they had dropped off their CVs at the municipal offices after finishing their matric exams, but got no reply. Compounding their grievance was that they had heard that someone without any qualification but who was related to a councillor had been given a job.

South Africa has recently introduced a youth wage subsidy system, which may take some unemployed people off the streets.

High unemployment may be one of the factors that makes the ability of councillors to profit from tenders so important. The Mistra study suggested that councillors were vulnerable because they lack professional qualifications. They would not be able to get jobs elsewhere, so would have to use their time as councillors to build 'nests'. Their lack of qualifications, Mistra said, meant there would be more service delivery protests.

Lack of skills is indeed a serious problem. According to the Institute of Municipal Finance Officers, one third of all municipal officers, chief financial officers, and municipal supply chain managers do not have the right skills for the job. Three quarters of these posts are vacant. An audit by the South African Institute of Civil Engineering found that 83 municipalities – in other words, about a third of them – had no civil engineers, technologists, or technicians on their staff. Some 35% of these posts – enough for 1 000 engineers – were unfilled, mainly because of budget constraints.

South Africa's overall unemployment rate has risen from 20% in 1994 on the strict definition to 26% last year.

Shortages are to be found in many industries and occupations across the country. However, they have been exacerbated at local level by racial policies. The South African Institute of Electrical Engineers has stated that huge numbers of engineers have been displaced, while the Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA) has tried to recruit personnel for municipalities making use of the white professionals pushed out of the public service by the Government's affirmative action policies. In terms of these policies, all levels of the workforce must reflect the country's racial make-up. This has frequently meant encouraging

whites to take early retirement to reduce their number and proportion. It is also frequently meant leaving posts vacant rather than filling them with whites when there are no blacks available.

If racial policies have exacerbated the skills deficit at local level, a further problem is the ANC's cadre deployment policy. This is designed to give the party control of all 'centres of power'. Jay Naidoo, a former minister and chairman of the development bank, blamed political interference for the fact that 90% of municipalities were dysfunctional. The *Financial Mail (FM)* reported that municipalities were being used as employment agencies for ANC cadres, and that this had destroyed local government. Officials fired from one municipality frequently surfaced in another. Naidoo, complaining that greed, corruption, and entitlement were destroying the social fabric, suggested that South Africa needed a professional civil service.

If racial policies have exacerbated the skills deficit at local level, a further problem is the ANC's cadre deployment policy.

In October this year the Government is due to establish a new training college for civil servants. Although strong opposition has caused it to proceed with caution, the Government favours combining employees of national and provincial government departments with those of municipalities in a single civil service. Until now municipal employees have been employed only at that level and have not been part of the centrally controlled civil service. Legislation has, however, been tabled to enable the Government to transfer staff from one level of government to another. The ANC argues that the new arrangements will enable it to deploy national or provincial employees to use their experience to help with service delivery at local level. The secretary general of the ANC, Gwede Mantashe, thus said that the new transfer policy meant that even ministers could be deployed to small towns.

Critics point out that the competence of national and provincial employees often leaves much to be desired. They also fear that the transfer policy will further reduce the autonomy of local government and at the same time give party headquarters even more control over appointments at local level. They are also apprehensive that these increased powers will be abused. Although the ANC removed three councillors in Madibeng in response to the protests there, it also filled a senior position with a former member of Parliament who had pleaded guilty to illegal use of travel vouchers. Critics fear that local government will be used as a dumping ground for embarrassing or failed politicians.

The Government has attempted to sort out some of the problems of local government by putting failing municipalities under direct provincial administration. However, the *FM* reported that not one of the 57 interventions by provincial government to take over local government had been successful.

Further compounding the challenges faced by local government is that of expectations. The ANC promised in its first election campaign 20 years ago to provide a better life for all. It has indeed been quite successful in the provision of housing, electrification, water, and sanitation, as the IRR has frequently pointed out (much to the gratification of President Zuma and others, who have cited our findings to substantiate their claims of success). The ANC government has in fact built enough brick and mortar houses to increase the country's stock from just under 6.0 million to 11.2 million. That it has done so despite skill shortages is quite an achievement, although infrastructure is poorly maintained, while the quality of housing is often poor. As part of its anti-poverty strategy, the ANC government also provides free water and electricity to indigent households, while more than half of schoolchildren attend no-fee schools. The proportion of the population in receipt of social grants from the State – including old-age pensions and child support grants – has risen from 6% in 1996 to 31% today. The University of Johannesburg study referred to earlier talked of 'twenty disappointed years of broken promises' as one of the reasons for protest. Apart from the major failures on the jobs front, this is not entirely true, as some of the figures just cited indicate.

Further compounding the challenges faced by local government is that of expectations.

But in the process South Africa has become an entitlement state. People have come to expect that the State will provide them with houses, water, electricity, free education, and the like. When people see their neighbours obtaining these things, their own dissatisfaction mounts as they become impatient for their own turn to come. The ANC has thus given local communities a stick with which to beat it when it fails to 'deliver' on the scale that its own promises have created. The party indeed says that development is always a source of conflict about who must benefit.

Unlike in 1976, protest in the post-apartheid era has hitherto been localised rather than an expression of a wider ideology such as the black consciousness. Also, again unlike the situation in 1976, there does not appear to be any underlying ideology as opposed to widespread feelings of alienation, and distrust. Nor, despite violent attacks on ANC councillors, does protest yet seem to be aimed at the ANC itself. The party still seems to enjoy high legitimacy and credibility. Several reports on protests stressed that though protesters were often rival groups of ANC councillors, they all remained loyal to the party. As one man said of a provincial premier his faction wanted removed, 'We love the ANC, but Ace [Magashule] must go.'

Where to from here?

The previous chapter of this report looked at some of the micro-issues that could be tackled as a way of improving both the performance and the accountability of local government in South Africa. Some of the other solutions on offer include channelling discontent, better communication, better managed protests, systems to get early warnings of dissatisfaction, better policing, refraining from overpromising, opening up tenders to municipal scrutiny, better crisis management, more compassion, and creating the image of a 'caring government'.

All of this might help to reduce the extent of dissatisfaction and the frequency and violence of protest. But none of it deals with the fundamental problems that plague local government in South Africa.

One is finance. The Financial and Fiscal Commission, a statutory body, reported last year that the existing formula did not consider poverty and economic activity levels or the capacity of municipalities to generate revenue and perform their functions. Cronin is probably correct in his view that municipalities have hugely expanded but underfunded mandates.

The report on city finances referred to above made the point that cities on the one hand needed to roll out infrastructure to poor and excluded communities that were a 'legacy of our history'; on the other they had to maintain and expand the core of city assets that represented their current tax base. Insufficient reinvestment in the latter 'is an enormous financial burden that poses a serious challenge for the future', the report said. In other words attempts to deal with the old backlog legacy are creating a new backlog legacy.

The report also made the rather startling statement that much of current municipal development planning 'does not contain a strong financial component'. The chairman of an enquiry into municipal government and finance appointed by the Government in fact said about ten years ago that the new wall-to-wall municipal system had been drawn up when the department responsible for local government was not on speaking terms with the National Treasury.

In other words attempts to deal with the old backlog legacy are creating a new backlog legacy.

Another structural problem, as already indicated, is municipal geography: the very size of municipalities, along with the number of towns they embrace. Earlier this year townships falling under the Bronkhorst-spruit municipality in the Gauteng province were described by some newspapers as a 'war zone' after violence erupted. Bronkhorstspruit is one of 36 towns covered by the Tshwane metropolitan municipality, whose headquarters, Pretoria, is some 80 kilometres (50 miles) to the west in a total municipal area of more than 6 250 square kilometres. One of the issues that emerged during the protests was that officials in Tshwane were simply too far away and too distant from the

Bronkhorstspruit townships which erupted in violence. Bronkhorstspruit townships had in fact earlier objected to incorporation into Tshwane. Businessmen who had previously obtained contracts at local level now found that these were awarded far away in the metropolis.

Moreover, although post-apartheid local government is in a voting sense more democratic than the previous system, it remains highly centralised. This is because mayors and other top political figures at local level are in practice appointed by the ANC's deployment committee at party headquarters in terms of the party's policy of 'democratic centralism'. They are therefore accountable upwards to the ANC just as the previous government's administration board executives were accountable to a minister in the central government.

They are therefore accountable upwards to the ANC just as the previous government's administration board executives were accountable to a minister in the central government.

Personnel appointments at managerial level in local government are now supposed to be merit-based instead of party-based, but this reform is opposed by trade unions in the public sector. Regulations giving effect to the new policy were promulgated as this report was being written. Inter alia, they stipulate that municipal managers must have the 'skills, expertise, competencies, and qualifications as prescribed' before they can be appointed. The impact of this necessary (though long overdue) reform may be undermined by non-compliance on the part of local politicians, who, according to a senior journalist on *Business Day*, had 'for many years treated municipalities as their private fiefdoms'.

The appointment of public servants according to party-political considerations rather than on merit applies throughout the country. It is not an aberration but part of the ANC's strategic plan to gain control of all centres of power at national, provincial, and local level, as well as of all other agencies and branches of government. Also applicable throughout the country and at all levels of government is the ANC's policy of affirmative action – known in the relevant legislation as 'employment equity'. This applies to both the public and the private sector. It means that appointments and promotions must reflect the racial breakdown of the country's economically active population, which is 75% African, 11% white, 11% coloured, and 3% Indian. Given huge shortages of skills, the application of racial criteria to public service appointments is one of the reasons why so many local authorities are actually dysfunctional.

Many of the problems plaguing local government also plague other levels of government. Getting local government on to a sound footing implies shifting the whole country's system of government on to a sounder footing. This means replacing a racially chosen public service with a professional one based on merit at all levels of government. It also implies making politicians, whether at national, provincial, or local level, accountable to their electorates rather than to party headquarters. Professionalisation of the civil service and democratic accountability of politicians would also help overcome one of the other major problems facing the country: its inability to spend the revenues budgeted for necessary infrastructure, including electricity and transport.

Given huge shortages of skills, the application of racial criteria to public service appointments is one of the reasons why so many local authorities are actually dysfunctional.

Professionalisation is further essential to dealing with another major problem, which is the corruption that characterises the awarding of contracts and tenders. Such awards must be removed entirely from politicians. Corruption must be punished by prosecution and imprisonment. The prosecution service itself should be run by professionals who are entirely independent of all branches of government and of the ruling party.

Finally, South Africa needs higher rates of economic growth. The Government's stated objective is to achieve an annual average GDP growth rate of 5.4% between now and 2030. This average – against an

average of 3.3% since 1994 – is seen as necessary to reduce unemployment from its current level of between 25% and 40% to 6%.

Higher rates of economic growth are also necessary for the Government to be able to keep on gathering the tax revenues to fulfil its promises of 'a better life for all', which entail a massive redistribution programme. The social component – health, education, housing and related amenities, and welfare payments – now accounts for nearly 60% of the national budget, up from 45% when the ANC came to power. Already the Government is borrowing to finance current expenditure. The country's savings are extremely low, so that most investment has to be financed with capital inflows from abroad. These are vulnerable to political uncertainty within South Africa, as well as to better investment opportunities available in other emerging markets, not to mention in the US and elsewhere. Some sort of fiscal or balance-of-payments crisis down the road could have destabilising consequences if the ANC had to cut back on its redistribution programme at local and other levels of government.

Summary

The analysis in this concluding chapter makes clear that so-called 'service delivery' protests reflect a very much deeper malaise. Accordingly, the solutions just suggested are designed to deal with that deeper malaise. Better municipal management is a vital part of the solution, along with accountability. A professional civil service at municipal level is another important component, necessitating the abandonment of both affirmative action and the cadre deployment policy. These reforms are in turn essential to stamping out corruption. Restructuring of the geography of local government, and redesign of its finances, are equally important. Finally, little is achievable without rates of economic growth fast enough to absorb many millions more people into wage-earning employment and so reduce the demands upon the State. Faster rates of growth in turn necessitate much higher levels of private investment, and therefore government policies which attract such investment.

Eighty indicators for 278 local municipalities[a]

Eastern Cape	*Alfred Nzo District municipality*	*Matatiele*	*Mbizana*	*Ntaba-nkulu*	*Umzi-mvubu*	*Amathole District municipality*	*Amahlathi*	*Great Kei*
Demographics								
Size (km^2)	10 731	4 352	2 416	1 384	2 577	21 594	4 820	1 735
Share of country area (%)	0.9%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	1.8%	0.4%	0.1%
Main town	**N/A[n]**	**Matatiele**	**Bizana**	**Taba-nkulu**	**Mount Ayliff**	**N/A[n]**	**Stutterheim**	**Komga**
Population[b]	801 344	203 843	281 905	123 976	191 620	892 637	254 909	252 390
— African	99.1%	98.1%	99.6%	99.4%	99.4%	97.2%	96.5%	91.3%
— Coloured	0.4%	0.9%	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%	1.5%	1.2%	1.3%
— Indian	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
— White	0.2%	0.7%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	1.0%	2.0%	7.1%
Age structure[b]								
0–14	40.9%	38.4%	44.2%	41.5%	38.3%	33.4%	31.3%	28.7%
15–64	52.9%	54.6%	50.6%	52.2%	55.0%	57.6%	60.1%	62.0%
65+	6.2%	6.9%	5.2%	6.3%	6.7%	8.9%	8.6%	9.3%
Households								
Number of households	169 261	49 527	48 447	24 397	46 891	237 776	34 159	10 310
Average household size	4.3	3.7	5.0	4.6	3.8	3.6	3.4	3.4
Poverty rate[c]	83.2%	97.8%	79.8%	80.8%	75.3%	68.6%	79.3%	66.9%
Settlement type								
Rural	N/A[n]	73.7%	99.1%	98.8%	98.1%	N/A[n]	80.9%	98.4%
Urban	N/A[n]	26.3%	0.9%	1.2%	1.9%	N/A[n]	19.1%	1.6%
Education								
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds								
– No schooling	13.6%	9.4%	19.4%	17.9%	8.0%	13.5%	10.0%	19.5%
– Some primary schooling	25.3%	25.5%	24.0%	29.4%	24.1%	23.5%	24.6%	19.8%
– Completed primary school	7.2%	8.2%	6.0%	6.5%	8.2%	7.9%	9.4%	7.0%
– Some secondary schooling	35.8%	38.4%	32.4%	32.7%	39.4%	35.6%	37.7%	33.6%
– Grade 12/Std 10	12.6%	12.8%	13.0%	9.8%	13.7%	13.5%	13.6%	15.2%
– Higher	5.5%	5.8%	5.1%	3.9%	6.5%	6.1%	4.7%	5.0%
Employment								
Working-age population[d]	424 126	111 375	142 730	64 662	105 360	514 180	73 735	24 176
Participation rate (supply)[e]	26.4%	32.0%	21.7%	19.9%	30.8%	30.3%	36.4%	35.2%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	14.9%	19.6%	12.3%	9.9%	16.5%	17.2%	23.2%	24.7%
Employed	63 123	21 800	17 525	6 371	17 427	88 696	17 143	5 970
Employment by industry[g]								
Agriculture	6.8%	1.8%	3.0%	0.8%	0.9%	10.1%	2.9%	5.2%
Mining/quarrying	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.6%	0.3%	0.0%
Manufacturing	6.2%	1.3%	2.4%	1.0%	1.4%	9.4%	3.4%	1.6%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.3%	0.0%
Construction	3.4%	1.4%	0.8%	0.2%	0.9%	5.5%	1.6%	3.5%
Wholesale/retail trade	8.6%	3.9%	1.7%	1.2%	1.9%	14.5%	4.1%	3.7%

Eastern Cape	*Alfred Nzo District municipality*	*Matatiele*	*Mbizana*	*Ntaba-nkulu*	*Umzi-mvubu*	*Amathole District municipality*	*Amahlathi*	*Great Kei*
Employment by industry[g] (contd)								
Transport/storage/com-munication	2.1%	0.7%	0.5%	0.6%	0.3%	3.1%	0.9%	2.0%
Financial/insurance/real estate	3.7%	1.1%	1.1%	0.7%	0.8%	5.7%	1.8%	1.3%
Community/social/personal services	15.4%	4.7%	3.3%	3.5%	4.5%	22.4%	4.7%	5.5%
Private households/other	53.1%	9.5%	19.7%	14.0%	10.5%	28.3%	6.1%	12.6%
Unemployment								
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	43.5%	38.7%	43.6%	50.6%	45.9%	42.9%	36.1%	29.8%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	52.3%	47.2%	52.4%	60.7%	54.5%	53.4%	47.1%	39.7%
Income								
Average annual household income (R)	37 147	38 561	37 023	31 446	38 762	39 476	39 062	47 535
Monthly income (% of population)[b]								
No income	N/A[n]	16.8%	15.9%	15.7%	16.1%	N/A[n]	14.3%	16.0%
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	48.2%	47.8%	49.1%	46.9%	N/A[n]	43.1%	41.7%
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	19.8%	21.0%	22.1%	21.1%	N/A[n]	25.2%	23.2%
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	6.6%	6.9%	6.6%	6.9%	N/A[n]	9.0%	9.2%
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	4.1%	4.3%	3.5%	4.7%	N/A[n]	4.4%	4.3%
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	2.8%	2.5%	1.9%	2.8%	N/A[n]	2.5%	3.1%
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	1.3%	1.1%	0.8%	1.0%	N/A[n]	1.1%	1.8%
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.4%
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.2%
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.1%
Assets (%)[b]								
Dwelling occupied								
Formal	42.1%	52.7%	44.2%	24.9%	38.1%	53.0%	59.0%	62.7%
Informal	1.2%	1.5%	1.0%	0.5%	1.6%	5.5%	4.5%	18.3%
Traditional	56.7%	45.8%	54.8%	74.6%	60.3%	41.6%	36.5%	19.0%
Households by tenure status								
Households owned and fully paid off	61.3%	56.8%	65.6%	62.6%	61.2%	67.0%	69.0%	60.6%
Households owned but not paid off	7.7%	8.7%	7.3%	9.2%	6.5%	4.8%	4.6%	7.1%
Rented	9.6%	9.1%	10.0%	6.0%	11.4%	9.9%	7.6%	11.3%
Occupied rent free	21.4%	25.4%	17.2%	22.1%	21.0%	18.3%	18.7%	21.0%
Household goods								
Radio	55.1%	61.5%	49.5%	50.2%	56.8%	60.3%	65.4%	62.7%
Television	41.3%	43.4%	48.4%	27.7%	38.7%	55.5%	66.1%	64.8%
Refrigerator	29.1%	32.9%	29.1%	17.5%	31.0%	45.2%	55.0%	55.1%
Computer	3.0%	4.0%	2.8%	1.5%	2.8%	4.6%	5.0%	9.6%
Cellphone	80.4%	80.0%	83.7%	74.7%	80.3%	78.0%	79.2%	72.8%
Landline	2.0%	2.8%	1.9%	1.2%	1.7%	3.5%	4.3%	9.5%
Internet[i]	16.6%	16.7%	16.1%	12.5%	19.0%	16.6%	16.4%	17.6%
Household access levels								
Electricity								
Lighting	46.2%	44.9%	60.0%	23.3%	45.2%	69.8%	82.4%	80.2%
Cooking	28.4%	31.9%	30.9%	13.4%	29.7%	55.3%	67.1%	63.7%
Heating	11.4%	12.5%	13.9%	4.9%	10.8%	20.7%	16.5%	36.1%

Eastern Cape	*Alfred Nzo District municipality*	*Matatiele*	*Mbizana*	*Ntaba-nkulu*	*Umzi-mvubu*	*Amathole District municipality*	*Amahlathi*	*Great Kei*
Piped (tap) Water								
Inside yard/dwelling	16.0%	27.6%	6.9%	8.0%	17.2%	24.9%	37.0%	40.2%
On communal stand	34.2%	46.4%	8.2%	41.9%	44.2%	45.2%	48.1%	50.7%
No access	49.8%	26.0%	84.9%	50.0%	38.6%	29.9%	14.9%	9.0%
Refuse removal								
Removed by local authority/ Private company	7.3%	12.8%	2.5%	4.5%	7.7%	16.7%	20.8%	34.6%
Communal/Own refuse dump	73.6%	71.8%	79.5%	61.1%	75.9%	65.2%	72.9%	56.4%
No refuse disposal	16.7%	12.1%	16.2%	31.9%	14.2%	15.5%	5.5%	8.3%
Sanitation								
Flush/chemical toilet	12.1%	16.6%	6.1%	8.9%	15.1%	20.3%	23.5%	36.5%
Pit latrine	67.8%	64.4%	74.5%	57.7%	69.7%	46.4%	64.5%	35.8%
Bucket toilet	0.5%	0.3%	0.8%	0.6%	0.3%	1.1%	0.3%	0.8%
No Toilet	14.5%	12.5%	14.1%	26.4%	10.9%	17.2%	8.5%	23.8%
Social security recipients[j]								
Child support grant	9.0%	21.5%	27.3%	27.2%	24.8%	9.1%	19.2%	19.9%
Old age pension	2.5%	7.0%	6.3%	7.4%	7.6%	3.9%	9.8%	8.3%
Municipal Finance								
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	389.2	N/A[n]	3.4	11.4	0.0	N/A[n]	0.0	4.6
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	247.4	0.5	1.2	43.8	23.9	1.8	18.1	6.3
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.0	0.2	0.7	2.6	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.8

Eastern Cape	*Mbhashe*	*Mnquma*	*Ngqushwa*	*Nkonkobe*	*Nxuba*	*Cacadu District municipality*	*Baviaans*	*Blue Crane*	*Camdeboo*
Demographics									
Size (km^2)	3 169	3 270	2 240	3 626	2 731	58 243	11 668	1 168	12 422
Share of country area (%)	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	4.8%	1.0%	0.1%	1.0%
Main town	**Idutywa**	**Butter-worth**	**Peddie**	**Alice**	**Adelaide**	**N/A[n]**	**Willow-more**	**Somerset East**	**Graaff-Reinet**
Population[b]	38 991	122 778	72 190	127 115	24 264	450 584	17 897	36 002	50 993
— African	99.4%	99.4%	99.2%	94.5%	73.5%	53.3%	12.0%	59.0%	24.8%
— Coloured	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	4.0%	20.6%	34.9%	80.3%	33.0%	64.8%
— Indian	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%
— White	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	1.0%	4.9%	10.9%	7.0%	6.8%	9.6%
Age structure[b]									
0–14	38.0%	34.3%	30.0%	28.8%	30.0%	27.2%	31.1%	29.2%	29.8%
15–64	53.9%	56.7%	58.1%	62.0%	61.6%	65.8%	62.4%	63.8%	63.3%
65+	8.1%	9.0%	11.9%	9.2%	8.4%	7.0%	6.5%	7.0%	6.9%
Households									
Number of households	60 124	69 732	21 384	35 355	6 711	125 632	4 610	9 761	12 400
Average household size	4.1	3.5	3.2	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.8	3.5	3.8
Poverty rate[c]	77.2%	85.5%	76.5%	35.8%	59.0%	43.2%	42.2%	51.8%	50.7%

Eastern Cape	*Mbhashe*	*Mnquma*	*Ngqushwa*	*Nkonkobe*	*Nxuba*	*Cacadu District municipality*	*Baviaans*	*Blue Crane*	*Camdeboo*
Settlement type									
Rural	98.8%	98.8%	97.9%	97.0%	88.7%	N/A[n]	70.9%	85.9%	56.0%
Urban	1.2%	1.2%	2.1%	3.0%	11.3%	N/A[n]	29.1%	14.1%	44.0%
Education									
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds									
– No schooling	21.2%	11.5%	13.7%	7.2%	6.3%	7.5%	8.0%	10.5%	9.0%
– Some primary schooling	25.0%	22.9%	23.5%	22.6%	21.6%	19.3%	21.7%	23.4%	18.4%
– Completed primary school	6.7%	7.4%	8.7%	8.9%	8.9%	7.8%	10.9%	7.8%	8.5%
– Some secondary schooling	31.8%	36.8%	35.2%	37.1%	41.9%	36.8%	38.3%	33.1%	34.9%
– Grade 12/Std 10	10.2%	13.4%	15.0%	17.0%	15.1%	20.4%	16.4%	18.9%	19.6%
– Higher	5.1%	8.1%	3.9%	7.1%	6.2%	8.3%	4.7%	6.3%	9.5%
Employment									
Working-age population[d]	137 414	143 146	41 951	78 821	14 937	296 436	11 085	22 962	32 281
Participation rate (supply)[e]	21.8%	29.8%	30.1%	34.5%	55.1%	54.0%	52.0%	45.8%	54.1%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	12.4%	16.6%	14.1%	17.8%	31.9%	40.5%	36.7%	31.9%	37.8%
Employed	17 078	23 784	5 929	14 033	4 759	120 176	4 067	7 322	12 210
Employment by industry[g]									
Agriculture	0.3%	1.9%	1.7%	2.4%	6.3%	18.5%	10.3%	9.7%	3.6%
Mining/quarrying	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%
Manufacturing	0.5%	2.6%	1.6%	0.8%	4.4%	9.5%	0.8%	4.1%	2.6%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Construction	0.4%	0.9%	0.7%	1.1%	1.3%	8.2%	0.9%	2.1%	2.5%
Wholesale/retail trade	1.7%	2.9%	3.4%	3.0%	3.1%	11.0%	2.6%	2.9%	6.6%
Transport/storage/communication	0.2%	0.9%	0.2%	0.4%	0.5%	1.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.8%
Financial/insurance/real estate	0.5%	1.4%	0.9%	1.0%	0.9%	7.3%	1.1%	1.8%	1.9%
Community/social/personal services	2.3%	6.4%	4.0%	4.0%	5.4%	18.4%	6.3%	7.6%	6.5%
Private households/other	4.6%	6.4%	3.2%	4.1%	8.4%	24.7%	5.3%	10.3%	11.5%
Unemployment									
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	42.4%	44.2%	52.8%	48.1%	42.0%	24.9%	29.4%	30.7%	30.1%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	50.7%	55.7%	64.1%	59.6%	52.5%	31.4%	37.9%	40.0%	39.4%
Income									
Average annual household income (R)	36 157	40 564	32 547	42 764	53 229	76 250	59 740	61 639	85 250
Monthly income (% of population)[b]									
No income	14.0%	13.6%	16.1%	18.7%	12.9%	N/A[n]	7.8%	12.1%	10.8%
R1–R1 600	46.9%	45.8%	47.6%	41.6%	40.2%	N/A[n]	35.0%	36.5%	28.4%
R1 601–R3 200	24.2%	23.5%	22.6%	21.5%	23.3%	N/A[n]	28.4%	24.0%	23.5%
R3 201–R6 400	7.3%	7.5%	7.8%	8.1%	11.1%	N/A[n]	13.9%	12.2%	16.0%
R6 401–R12 800	4.0%	4.8%	3.4%	5.0%	6.0%	N/A[n]	7.3%	7.1%	9.5%
R12 801–R25 600	2.3%	3.3%	1.6%	3.1%	3.9%	N/A[n]	4.2%	5.0%	7.0%
R25 601–R51 200	0.8%	1.1%	0.6%	1.4%	1.9%	N/A[n]	2.3%	2.2%	3.2%

Eastern Cape	*Mbhashe*	*Mnquma*	*Ngqushwa*	*Nkonkobe*	*Nxuba*	*Cacadu District municipality*	*Baviaans*	*Blue Crane*	*Camdeboo*
Monthly income (% of population)[b] (contd)									
R51 201–R102 400	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.4%	N/A[n]	0.6%	0.5%	0.9%
R102 401–R204 800	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%
R204 801 or more	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%
Assets (%)[b]									
Dwelling occupied									
Formal	31.1%	48.7%	72.4%	71.0%	89.7%	86.6%	98.2%	96.4%	94.6%
Informal	2.5%	8.0%	6.2%	1.9%	7.3%	11.2%	0.9%	2.9%	5.1%
Traditional	66.4%	43.3%	21.5%	27.1%	3.0%	2.2%	1.0%	0.7%	0.3%
Households by tenure status									
Households owned and fully paid off	73.4%	66.8%	77.9%	54.7%	42.4%	43.9%	54.4%	47.7%	51.2%
Households owned but not paid off	5.1%	4.0%	4.0%	4.5%	12.7%	7.3%	6.4%	6.5%	7.0%
Rented	9.5%	12.1%	3.9%	8.0%	30.7%	22.4%	18.6%	27.1%	26.3%
Occupied rent free	12.1%	17.1%	14.1%	32.9%	14.2%	26.4%	20.6%	18.7%	15.5%
Household goods									
Radio	51.2%	59.7%	67.1%	66.4%	65.7%	64.0%	58.0%	66.7%	68.6%
Television	38.3%	49.0%	71.2%	71.3%	75.9%	74.4%	71.0%	75.1%	81.2%
Refrigerator	26.9%	36.6%	64.8%	64.3%	69.0%	66.9%	63.3%	67.2%	74.1%
Computer	2.5%	4.3%	4.0%	6.2%	10.6%	17.5%	11.5%	12.9%	19.3%
Cellphone	76.8%	78.8%	78.7%	78.6%	76.4%	78.1%	73.8%	69.6%	79.4%
Landline	1.7%	2.1%	4.2%	4.7%	11.2%	16.3%	15.9%	14.2%	20.2%
Internet[i]	15.4%	15.9%	17.5%	19.0%	17.8%	26.1%	16.1%	26.0%	24.4%
Household access levels									
Electricity									
Lighting	49.7%	61.4%	91.4%	88.4%	92.2%	87.3%	89.2%	86.9%	94.1%
Cooking	36.7%	45.6%	71.7%	76.3%	87.2%	80.5%	81.0%	82.2%	86.9%
Heating	15.0%	18.9%	27.5%	25.8%	40.7%	51.1%	43.3%	59.2%	65.2%
Piped (tap) Water									
Inside yard/dwelling	7.7%	17.7%	22.3%	42.1%	87.4%	85.9%	95.3%	91.4%	97.9%
On communal stand	34.4%	43.2%	74.5%	51.9%	9.4%	10.2%	1.9%	5.1%	1.1%
No access	57.9%	39.1%	3.1%	6.0%	3.2%	3.8%	2.8%	3.5%	1.0%
Refuse removal									
Removed by local authority/ Private company	3.7%	16.2%	7.2%	25.0%	75.7%	80.6%	76.3%	80.9%	84.7%
Communal/Own refuse dump	57.0%	66.0%	86.9%	68.9%	17.3%	15.5%	20.1%	15.6%	13.1%
No refuse disposal	34.6%	14.1%	5.4%	5.6%	6.0%	2.6%	2.2%	2.0%	1.2%
Sanitation									
Flush/chemical toilet	7.7%	19.3%	8.5%	34.6%	65.3%	74.5%	83.5%	84.8%	89.4%
Pit latrine	34.0%	37.4%	84.6%	56.0%	5.7%	12.3%	6.1%	4.2%	3.9%
Bucket toilet	0.6%	0.6%	0.1%	0.8%	21.7%	5.0%	3.6%	2.8%	0.9%
No Toilet	45.4%	7.2%	4.9%	4.8%	5.9%	4.8%	4.6%	6.3%	4.7%
Social security recipients[j]									
Child support grant	28.5%	24.1%	20.1%	19.0%	19.2%	3.2%	19.5%	10.6%	13.4%
Old age pension	10.1%	8.8%	13.5%	10.9%	8.9%	1.7%	5.8%	7.6%	7.4%

Eastern Cape	*Mbhashe*	*Mnquma*	*Ngqushwa*	*Nkonkobe*	*Nxuba*	*Cacadu District municipality*	*Baviaans*	*Blue Crane*	*Camdeboo*
Municipal Finance									
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	1.7	15.4	18.4	19.0	15.2	N/A[n]	9.9	13.0	0.0
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	1.2	0.6	35.6	2.4	9.1	16.6	4.5	2.6	0.0
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	N/A[n]

Eastern Cape	*Ikwezi*	*Kouga*	*Kou-Kamma*	*Makana*	*Ndlambe*	*Sunday's River Valley*	*Chris Hani District municipality*	*Emala-hleni*	*Engcobo*
Demographics									
Size (km^2)	4 562	2 669	3 642	4 375	1 840	5 993	36 143	3 447	2 483
Share of country area (%)	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.2%	0.5%	3.0%	0.3%	0.2%
Main town	**Jansen-ville**	**Jeffreys Bay**	**Karee-douw**	**Grahams-town**	**Port Alfred**	**Kirkwood**	**N/A[n]**	**Lady Frere**	**Ngcobo**
Population[b]	10 537	98 558	40 663	80 390	61 176	54 504	795 461	119 460	155 513
— African	37.2%	38.8%	30.6%	78.0%	77.7%	71.8%	93.3%	98.5%	99.6%
— Coloured	54.6%	42.6%	59.8%	12.1%	7.3%	21.4%	4.1%	0.6%	0.1%
— Indian	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
— White	7.6%	17.6%	8.2%	8.7%	14.2%	5.9%	2.0%	0.6%	0.1%
Age structure[b]									
0–14	31.1%	26.8%	29.7%	24.4%	25.2%	26.7%	34.4%	35.1%	39.5%
15–64	62.0%	65.3%	65.7%	69.4%	64.8%	68.0%	57.6%	55.0%	52.9%
65+	7.0%	7.9%	4.5%	6.2%	9.9%	5.2%	8.1%	9.9%	7.6%
Households									
Number of households	2 915	29 447	11 032	21 388	19 331	14 749	210 852	31 681	37 214
Average household size	3.5	3.2	3.6	3.4	3.0	3.5	3.6	3.7	4.0
Poverty rate[c]	33.3%	32.7%	34.9%	43.6%	51.5%	48.0%	66.9%	73.4%	75.4%
Settlement type									
Rural	86.0%	80.6%	99.5%	80.4%	88.2%	99.7%	N/A[n]	92.2%	98.9%
Urban	14.0%	19.4%	0.5%	19.6%	11.8%	0.3%	N/A[n]	7.8%	1.1%
Education									
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds									
– No schooling	12.6%	4.9%	5.3%	6.3%	9.7%	8.8%	13.9%	18.9%	19.8%
– Some primary schooling	23.9%	15.8%	22.7%	16.0%	20.3%	23.3%	24.2%	29.7%	27.4%
– Completed primary school	8.3%	7.2%	10.3%	6.3%	6.4%	8.8%	6.9%	6.7%	6.7%
– Some secondary schooling	34.3%	38.0%	40.2%	36.5%	33.5%	40.0%	33.0%	29.9%	31.3%
– Grade 12/Std 10	15.5%	24.6%	17.6%	22.9%	20.1%	15.2%	14.8%	11.0%	9.6%
– Higher	5.4%	9.5%	3.9%	12.0%	9.9%	3.8%	7.1%	3.8%	5.2%
Employment									
Working-age population[d]	6 529	64 331	26 731	55 777	39 651	37 089	457 801	65 724	82 211
Participation rate (supply)[e]	49.3%	57.9%	65.0%	50.6%	54.4%	50.0%	34.5%	25.9%	24.6%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	40.5%	45.6%	55.3%	34.2%	37.9%	42.5%	21.0%	13.8%	13.3%
Employed	2 642	29 310	14 778	19 062	15 034	15 751	96 130	9 085	10 905

Eastern Cape	*Ikwezi*	*Kouga*	*Kou-Kamma*	*Makana*	*Ndlambe*	*Sunday's River Valley*	*Chris Hani District municipality*	*Emala-hleni*	*Engcobo*
Employment by industry[g]									
Agriculture	4.5%	5.6%	21.5%	1.6%	3.7%	11.6%	9.7%	0.5%	0.9%
Mining/quarrying	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%
Manufacturing	1.0%	5.4%	5.0%	1.5%	4.5%	3.9%	8.7%	0.7%	0.7%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.2%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.1%
Construction	1.8%	5.2%	1.1%	2.5%	5.3%	1.6%	5.6%	0.9%	0.5%
Wholesale/retail trade	2.2%	4.1%	2.5%	4.0%	4.7%	4.2%	14.7%	1.7%	2.4%
Transport/storage/com-munication	0.0%	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%	0.4%	0.7%	2.6%	0.5%	0.6%
Financial/insurance/ real estate	0.5%	4.9%	1.1%	3.1%	3.0%	2.0%	6.7%	0.1%	0.8%
Community/social/personal services	5.0%	6.0%	2.9%	11.6%	6.1%	4.4%	25.5%	2.1%	3.9%
Private households/other	10.5%	11.7%	19.7%	4.0%	8.5%	5.4%	25.8%	1.5%	4.6%
Unemployment									
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	18.3%	21.5%	15.0%	32.5%	30.3%	15.0%	39.0%	46.3%	45.7%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	22.7%	26.7%	17.5%	42.3%	39.0%	18.8%	48.5%	55.3%	55.3%
Income									
Average annual household income (R)	44 663	88 429	56 977	89 694	78 517	56 850	48 183	31 606	36 707
Monthly income (% of population)[b]									
No income	10.8%	15.6%	8.1%	12.7%	15.3%	11.7%	N/A[n]	15.2%	15.3%
R1–R1 600	43.7%	26.0%	31.4%	29.6%	32.9%	35.6%	N/A[n]	47.1%	49.0%
R1 601–R3 200	22.3%	20.7%	28.0%	20.5%	21.5%	26.7%	N/A[n]	24.7%	21.4%
R3 201–R6 400	11.1%	15.4%	18.6%	14.2%	12.2%	15.4%	N/A[n]	7.2%	6.9%
R6 401–R12 800	6.2%	9.8%	7.2%	10.2%	7.7%	5.4%	N/A[n]	3.1%	3.6%
R12 801–R25 600	4.4%	7.4%	4.3%	7.0%	6.0%	2.9%	N/A[n]	1.7%	2.5%
R25 601–R51 200	1.1%	3.4%	1.7%	4.1%	2.8%	1.6%	N/A[n]	0.7%	0.9%
R51 201–R102 400	0.2%	1.0%	0.3%	1.2%	0.9%	0.3%	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.2%
R102 401–R204 800	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.1%
R204 801 or more	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.1%
Assets (%)[b]									
Dwelling occupied									
Formal	97.6%	77.1%	92.0%	86.2%	84.7%	85.3%	62.3%	56.3%	31.1%
Informal	2.1%	21.8%	7.6%	10.2%	11.5%	9.7%	2.1%	0.5%	1.7%
Traditional	0.2%	1.1%	0.3%	3.7%	3.8%	5.0%	35.6%	43.2%	67.1%
Households by tenure status									
Households owned and fully paid off	50.6%	46.5%	42.7%	42.8%	35.7%	38.8%	56.7%	60.5%	61.8%
Households owned but not paid off	5.1%	7.4%	6.8%	8.4%	7.6%	6.8%	7.5%	4.8%	7.0%
Rented	20.8%	24.5%	19.0%	28.2%	16.9%	15.2%	12.3%	5.0%	7.7%
Occupied rent free	23.4%	21.5%	31.4%	20.5%	39.8%	39.2%	23.5%	29.7%	23.5%
Household goods									
Radio	62.6%	64.0%	50.3%	35.1%	65.5%	60.2%	60.8%	57.8%	50.9%
Television	71.1%	75.7%	0.0%	30.3%	73.9%	65.7%	60.0%	56.5%	39.0%
Refrigerator	65.5%	69.6%	0.0%	6.3%	64.8%	53.8%	51.0%	48.6%	26.1%

Eastern Cape	*Ikwezi*	*Kouga*	*Kou-Kamma*	*Makana*	*Ndlambe*	*Sunday's River Valley*	*Chris Hani District municipality*	*Emala-hleni*	*Engcobo*
Household goods (contd)									
Computer	10.9%	23.1%	0.0%	37.4%	18.1%	8.9%	6.6%	2.8%	2.3%
Cellphone	72.2%	83.0%	0.0%	5.8%	80.2%	69.2%	80.9%	78.8%	81.7%
Landline	14.8%	21.3%	0.0%	11.7%	17.6%	8.8%	5.5%	2.7%	1.6%
Internet[i]	19.4%	28.0%	0.0%	0.0%	30.0%	19.6%	20.5%	16.2%	16.0%
Household access levels									
Electricity									
Lighting	88.5%	86.9%	87.1%	89.5%	86.3%	79.8%	76.3%	78.5%	50.9%
Cooking	77.3%	82.1%	83.1%	80.6%	77.4%	73.6%	62.6%	60.7%	35.7%
Heating	53.6%	60.0%	53.7%	35.0%	43.4%	49.2%	24.1%	21.2%	15.0%
Piped (tap) Water									
Inside yard/dwelling	95.2%	82.4%	89.6%	85.2%	86.0%	72.6%	42.5%	29.3%	7.4%
On communal stand	2.6%	16.5%	5.8%	10.5%	9.7%	16.7%	44.0%	63.3%	59.5%
No access	2.2%	1.1%	4.6%	4.3%	4.3%	10.7%	13.5%	7.4%	33.2%
Refuse removal									
Removed by local authority/ Private company	79.9%	84.7%	70.7%	89.6%	80.9%	64.2%	29.1%	8.8%	3.3%
Communal/Own refuse dump	17.8%	12.7%	23.9%	7.6%	14.1%	27.8%	51.2%	65.3%	63.8%
No refuse disposal	1.9%	1.9%	3.7%	1.5%	3.0%	5.7%	16.9%	21.7%	29.1%
Sanitation									
Flush/chemical toilet	83.6%	77.4%	76.3%	74.5%	62.3%	59.3%	36.4%	21.0%	7.9%
Pit latrine	3.7%	5.1%	9.9%	16.1%	25.9%	21.2%	35.5%	43.3%	41.8%
Bucket toilet	3.7%	11.2%	3.1%	3.6%	0.8%	7.2%	0.9%	0.9%	0.5%
No Toilet	8.3%	4.6%	5.8%	3.9%	2.9%	6.6%	23.3%	31.6%	43.5%
Social security recipients[j]									
Child support grant	22.8%	8.6%	13.2%	11.6%	8.7%	12.3%	10.7%	27.5%	31.1%
Old age pension	5.0%	4.8%	4.7%	6.4%	8.6%	5.7%	4.0%	12.1%	9.9%
Municipal Finance									
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	0.0	123.2	9.3	48.3	12.0	11.9	56.4	78.9	36.6
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	11.3	47.7	9.6	39.5	44.1	17.2	200.7	5.5	44.4
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.0	9.8	1.2	0.0	0.2	3.1	0.3	0.5	2.8

Eastern Cape	*Inkwanca*	*Intsika Yethu*	*Inxuba Yethemba*	*Lukhanji*	*Sakhisizwe*	*Tsolwana*	*Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan municipality*
Demographics							
Size (km^2)	3 584	2 711	11 662	3 812	2 354	6 086	1 958
Share of country area (%)	0.3%	0.2%	1.0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.5%	0.2%
Main town	**Molteno**	**Cofimvaba**	**Cradock**	**Queenstown**	**Elliot**	**Tarkastad**	**Port Elizabeth**
Population[b]	21 971	145 372	65 560	190 723	63 582	33 281	1 152 115
— African	89.1%	99.4%	56.2%	92.6%	97.7%	91.0%	60.1%
— Coloured	4.1%	0.2%	32.2%	3.8%	0.8%	5.8%	23.6%
— Indian	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%	1.1%
— White	6.2%	0.1%	10.5%	2.7%	1.1%	2.8%	14.4%

Eastern Cape	*Inkwanca*	*Intsika Yethu*	*Inxuba Yethemba*	*Lukhanji*	*Sakhisizwe*	*Tsolwana*	*Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan municipality*
Age structure[b]							
0–14	31.0%	36.1%	29.1%	30.5%	35.0%	33.1%	25.5%
15–64	62.6%	53.9%	64.6%	62.6%	57.5%	58.6%	68.5%
65+	6.5%	10.0%	6.2%	6.9%	7.5%	8.2%	6.0%
Households							
Number of households	6 228	40 448	18 463	51 173	16 151	9 494	324 292
Average household size	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.4
Poverty rate[c]	62.3%	76.8%	53.7%	59.9%	67.8%	66.2%	34.3%
Settlement type							
Rural	46.3%	98.3%	99.1%	93.1%	86.5%	95.3%	N/A[n]
Urban	53.7%	1.7%	0.9%	609.0%	13.5%	4.7%	N/A[n]
Education							
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds							
– No schooling	13.4%	14.6%	10.8%	7.9%	12.8%	16.1%	3.0%
– Some primary schooling	25.0%	28.7%	20.2%	16.9%	24.6%	26.6%	8.9%
– Completed primary school	7.6%	8.1%	7.6%	5.9%	6.9%	7.4%	4.6%
– Some secondary schooling	31.5%	33.3%	32.6%	35.8%	35.2%	30.9%	40.8%
– Grade 12/Std 10	15.3%	10.1%	20.1%	22.2%	14.2%	14.0%	30.6%
– Higher	7.2%	5.1%	8.8%	11.4%	6.4%	5.0%	12.0%
Employment							
Working-age population[d]	13 743	78 342	42 371	119 320	36 574	19 517	789 212
Participation rate (supply)[e]	48.3%	25.2%	39.1%	31.8%	38.5%	36.1%	56.7%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	29.3%	13.4%	39.1%	26.9%	23.4%	22.3%	35.9%
Employed	4 026	10 517	16 557	32 107	8 575	4 358	283 260
Employment by industry[g]							
Agriculture	6.0%	0.4%	6.4%	1.2%	1.6%	5.9%	3.1%
Mining/quarrying	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.4%
Manufacturing	1.7%	0.5%	3.6%	3.1%	0.7%	1.1%	22.5%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
Construction	0.8%	0.4%	2.3%	1.5%	1.0%	0.6%	7.2%
Wholesale/retail trade	3.1%	60.0%	5.0%	4.9%	0.9%	0.8%	14.3%
Transport/storage/com-munication	0.2%	0.3%	1.5%	0.2%	0.3%	0.5%	4.0%
Financial/insurance/real estate	0.6%	0.2%	2.7%	2.4%	1.2%	0.9%	11.4%
Community/social/personal services	4.7%	2.7%	8.8%	5.9%	5.3%	5.5%	16.4%
Private households/other	5.5%	6.7%	7.3%	4.1%	4.3%	5.1%	20.0%
Unemployment							
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	39.3%	46.6%	25.7%	36.8%	38.8%	38.2%	36.6%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	47.6%	56.4%	33.2%	47.3%	48.6%	46.9%	47.3%
Income							
Average annual household income (R)	50 892	30 822	81 892	68 655	50 378	40 787	105 602
Monthly income (% of population)[b]							
No income	12.0%	15.2%	10.8%	14.3%	14.4%	15.3%	15.8%
R1–R1 600	42.0%	48.2%	32.4%	35.7%	44.1%	45.0%	26.4%
R1 601–R3 200	24.3%	23.4%	22.4%	21.3%	21.8%	22.9%	17.2%

Eastern Cape	*Inkwanca*	*Intsika Yethu*	*Inxuba Yethemba*	*Lukhanji*	*Sakhisizwe*	*Tsolwana*	*Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan municipality*
Monthly income (% of population)[b] (contd)							
R3 201–R6 400	10.3%	6.6%	13.5%	10.8%	8.5%	8.5%	12.9%
R6 401–R12 800	5.6%	3.4%	9.6%	7.8%	5.3%	4.4%	10.7%
R12 801–R25 600	3.1%	2.1%	6.8%	6.0%	3.5%	2.4%	9.0%
R25 601–R51 200	1.8%	0.7%	3.1%	3.1%	1.7%	1.1%	5.6%
R51 201–R102 400	0.4%	0.1%	0.8%	0.7%	0.4%	0.2%	1.6%
R102 401–R204 800	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.4%
R204 801 or more	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%
Assets (%)[b]							
Dwelling occupied							
Formal	97.9%	33.1%	97.6%	88.8%	64.7%	88.0%	87.6%
Informal	1.4%	1.1%	2.1%	3.6%	4.9%	0.9%	12.0%
Traditional	0.7%	65.8%	0.4%	7.5%	30.4%	11.1%	0.3%
Households by tenure status							
Households owned and fully paid off	34.9%	70.2%	36.7%	52.9%	38.5%	68.3%	48.9%
Households owned but not paid off	13.2%	4.0%	12.1%	10.0%	10.6%	2.5%	14.7%
Rented	13.0%	6.8%	30.0%	18.1%	13.2%	10.3%	20.0%
Occupied rent free	38.9%	19.1%	21.3%	19.1%	37.7%	18.8%	16.4%
Household goods							
Radio	67.8%	54.4%	72.8%	68.9%	63.9%	59.8%	67.9%
Television	72.3%	44.3%	80.6%	78.6%	62.7%	68.0%	83.9%
Refrigerator	62.5%	35.6%	73.5%	71.8%	50.2%	59.6%	78.2%
Computer	9.3%	2.6%	16.8%	12.0%	5.1%	5.9%	26.3%
Cellphone	77.2%	79.4%	77.6%	83.9%	83.1%	79.3%	85.5%
Landline	9.6%	1.4%	15.0%	9.6%	4.8%	6.2%	23.5%
Internet[i]	23.3%	12.5%	26.3%	30.7%	21.4%	18.0%	34.8%
Household access levels							
Electricity							
Lighting	91.7%	64.3%	95.6%	90.9%	79.1%	88.0%	90.5%
Cooking	79.8%	45.4%	90.2%	83.4%	59.3%	76.8%	85.9%
Heating	25.9%	14.2%	56.8%	28.7%	25.1%	20.9%	54.5%
Piped (tap) Water							
Inside yard/dwelling	96.2%	9.5%	95.8%	73.0%	45.3%	57.9%	90.4%
On communal stand	2.0%	65.5%	3.5%	24.4%	45.3%	37.2%	8.6%
No access	1.8%	25.0%	0.8%	2.6%	9.4%	4.9%	1.0%
Refuse removal							
Removed by local authority/ Private company	84.3%	3.3%	84.8%	58.5%	15.7%	28.1%	91.5%
Communal/Own refuse dump	13.1%	64.3%	11.8%	34.7%	64.3%	67.2%	5.6%
No refuse disposal	1.8%	29.4%	2.3%	4.7%	17.9%	2.5%	2.2%
Sanitation							
Flush/chemical toilet	89.4%	4.9%	90.2%	70.3%	27.7%	24.8%	89.4%
Pit latrine	1.7%	53.0%	2.7%	20.7%	48.5%	54.5%	1.5%
Bucket toilet	0.3%	0.3%	0.6%	0.2%	1.9%	8.3%	6.3%
No Toilet	6.3%	37.1%	5.0%	6.0%	15.6%	10.5%	1.9%

Eastern Cape	*Inkwanca*	*Intsika Yethu*	*Inxuba Yethemba*	*Lukhanji*	*Sakhisizwe*	*Tsolwana*	*Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan municipality*
Social security recipients[j]							
Child support grant	19.2%	28.9%	16.0%	21.8%	22.9%	21.8%	2.0%
Old age pension	8.8%	11.2%	6.8%	7.3%	10.0%	10.3%	0.9%
Municipal Finance							
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	31.6	117.3	0.0	17.4	6.4	8.0	318.7
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	2.6	31.7	10.0	19.5	24.9	6.9	233.9
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	N/A[n]	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.7	0.3	97.6

Eastern Cape	*O R Tambo District municipality*	*Ingquza/ Ngquza Hill*	*King Sabata Dalindyebo*	*Mhlontlo*	*Nyandeni*	*Port St Johns*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	12 095	2 476	3 027	2 826	2 474	1 291
Share of country area (%)	1.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%
Main town	**N/A[n]**	**Flagstaff**	**Mthatha (Umtata)**	**Qumbu**	**Libode**	**Port St Johns**
Population[b]	1 364 943	278 481	451 710	188 226	290 390	156 136
— African	99.0%	99.2%	98.5%	99.4%	99.4%	99.3%
— Coloured	0.5%	0.4%	0.8%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%
— Indian	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
— White	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%
Age structure[b]						
0–14	39.0%	42.4%	35.0%	38.3%	40.6%	42.5%
15–64	55.4%	52.2%	59.9%	54.5%	54.0%	51.8%
65+	5.6%	5.4%	5.1%	7.2%	5.4%	5.6%
Households						
Number of households	298 229	56 213	105 240	43 414	61 647	31 715
Average household size	4.3	4.7	4.0	4.2	4.6	4.5
Poverty rate[c]	73.3%	77.0%	63.8%	73.4%	75.6%	76.5%
Settlement type						
Rural	N/A[n]	98.0%	97.7%	97.5%	98.6%	94.2%
Urban	N/A[n]	2.0%	2.3%	2.5%	1.4%	5.8%
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	17.3%	20.8%	14.0%	14.8%	18.2%	23.6%
– Some primary schooling	20.6%	23.1%	16.6%	22.4%	21.4%	25.6%
– Completed primary school	5.8%	5.8%	5.2%	7.0%	6.0%	5.8%
– Some secondary schooling	34.2%	32.3%	34.5%	38.6%	35.0%	29.1%
– Grade 12/Std 10	15.3%	12.6%	18.9%	12.3%	15.2%	11.9%
– Higher	6.8%	5.3%	10.7%	4.9%	4.2%	3.9%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	756 391	145 363	270 740	102 551	156 784	80 955
Participation rate (supply)[e]	27.5%	25.2%	33.8%	27.1%	23.7%	18.2%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	15.3%	12.1%	20.6%	13.8%	13.1%	9.1%
Employed	115 501	17 632	55 870	14 137	20 511	7 351

Eastern Cape	*O R Tambo District municipality*	*Ingquza/ Ngquza Hill*	*King Sabata Dalindyebo*	*Mhlontlo*	*Nyandeni*	*Port St Johns*
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	15.8%	8.6%	2.4%	4.0%	1.4%	15.0%
Mining/quarrying	0.9%	0.7%	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%
Manufacturing	12.5%	8.6%	2.6%	4.9%	2.0%	2.0%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Construction	3.6%	1.1%	1.3%	1.9%	0.5%	0.6%
Wholesale/retail trade	7.3%	2.8%	2.4%	2.4%	1.9%	1.4%
Transport/storage/communication	1.9%	1.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.6%
Financial/insurance/real estate	6.5%	5.7%	1.3%	1.4%	0.9%	1.0%
Community/social/personal services	12.0%	3.2%	5.3%	3.0%	3.1%	2.0%
Private households/other	39.4%	15.7%	11.0%	8.5%	10.8%	19.8%
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	44.1%	51.6%	38.3%	48.9%	44.8%	50.3%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	54.2%	60.9%	48.3%	59.5%	55.0%	61.0%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	43 652	37 592	60 017	35 367	33 677	30 997
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	N/A[n]	17.6%	16.7%	15.3%	17.2%	19.6%
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	46.1%	39.2%	47.2%	48.3%	47.8%
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	20.3%	19.7%	22.7%	20.6%	20.4%
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	7.1%	9.0%	7.2%	7.0%	6.3%
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	4.5%	6.9%	3.9%	3.8%	3.0%
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	3.0%	5.1%	2.4%	2.1%	1.9%
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	1.0%	2.6%	0.9%	0.8%	0.7%
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	43.8%	40.7%	60.9%	34.3%	34.1%	24.7%
Informal	1.5%	1.0%	2.0%	2.4%	0.7%	1.0%
Traditional	54.7%	58.3%	37.1%	63.4%	65.2%	74.3%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	57.2%	56.0%	51.1%	51.6%	66.9%	68.7%
Households owned but not paid off	8.8%	11.6%	7.5%	8.0%	8.4%	10.4%
Rented	13.7%	9.5%	22.8%	7.2%	9.1%	8.0%
Occupied rent free	20.3%	22.9%	18.6%	33.3%	15.5%	12.9%
Household goods						
Radio	51.8%	51.5%	56.5%	49.4%	48.8%	46.3%
Television	51.4%	46.7%	59.2%	48.7%	49.8%	40.9%
Refrigerator	37.5%	28.6%	46.2%	35.7%	37.0%	28.0%
Computer	4.7%	2.6%	8.3%	2.9%	2.9%	2.2%
Cellphone	81.5%	80.1%	84.6%	81.9%	80.1%	75.9%
Landline	2.9%	2.0%	4.5%	2.1%	1.7%	2.3%
Internet[i]	19.8%	18.2%	24.9%	16.8%	16.9%	15.8%

Eastern Cape	*O R Tambo District municipality*	*Ingquza/ Ngquza Hill*	*King Sabata Dalindyebo*	*Mhlontlo*	*Nyandeni*	*Port St Johns*
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	70.2%	62.8%	73.3%	72.6%	71.0%	67.8%
Cooking	45.2%	36.2%	57.5%	44.8%	40.0%	31.2%
Heating	17.8%	19.0%	19.8%	15.0%	15.5%	17.0%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	19.1%	8.4%	38.3%	54.2%	6.4%	7.5%
On communal stand	30.0%	22.4%	0.0%	95.4%	38.3%	27.2%
No access	50.9%	69.2%	0.0%	0.0%	55.3%	65.3%
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/Private company	11.6%	3.8%	26.2%	5.8%	2.1%	3.5%
Communal/Own refuse dump	66.5%	75.8%	61.4%	63.6%	69.1%	65.5%
No refuse disposal	19.6%	18.4%	10.9%	27.4%	25.5%	28.6%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	18.3%	13.0%	33.8%	9.0%	6.2%	12.8%
Pit latrine	57.4%	66.7%	49.0%	65.1%	59.5%	54.2%
Bucket toilet	0.7%	1.2%	0.5%	0.6%	0.8%	0.9%
No Toilet	18.9%	14.4%	13.1%	22.0%	27.1%	26.3%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	9.9%	28.2%	22.8%	26.7%	28.3%	29.4%
Old age pension	2.3%	5.2%	5.9%	8.4%	5.8%	6.4%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	398.4	N/A[n]	179.8	16.6	17.6	32.7
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	58.3	107.9	119.4	32.2	32.9	11.9
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.0	0.3	0.9	0.1	0.1	0.6

Eastern Cape	*Joe Gqabi District municipality*	*Elundini*	*Gariep*	*Maletswai*	*Senqu*	*Buffalo City Metropolitan municipality*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	25 662	5 064	8 911	4 357	7 329	2 535
Share of country area (%)	2.1%	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	0.6%	0.2%
Main town	**N/A[n]**	**Mount Fletcher**	**Burgersdorp**	**Aliwal North**	**Barkly East**	**East London**
Population[b]	349 768	138 141	33 677	43 800	134 150	755 200
— African	93.8%	98.1%	72.9%	85.3%	97.3%	85.1%
— Coloured	3.5%	1.0%	17.8%	7.4%	1.2%	6.0%
— Indian	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.8%
— White	2.4%	0.7%	8.7%	6.7%	1.1%	7.7%
Age structure[b]						
0–14	34.1%	35.4%	31.7%	32.4%	34.0%	26.4%
15–64	58.4%	56.4%	61.8%	62.1%	58.3%	67.6%
65+	7.5%	8.3%	6.5%	5.5%	7.7%	6.0%

Eastern Cape	*Joe Gqabi District municipality*	*Elundini*	*Gariep*	*Maletswai*	*Senqu*	*Buffalo City Metropolitan municipality*
Households						
Number of households	97 775	37 854	9 770	12 105	38 046	223 568
Average household size	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.2
Poverty rate[c]	71.2%	77.6%	78.7%	53.3%	75.1%	70.0%
Settlement type						
Rural	N/A[n]	98.5%	56.5%	97.8%	97.0%	78.5%
Urban	N/A[n]	1.5%	43.5%	2.2%	3.0%	21.5%
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	14.7%	16.0%	15.0%	11.0%	14.5%	4.9%
– Some primary schooling	24.5%	26.4%	22.7%	18.0%	25.3%	10.9%
– Completed primary school	7.2%	7.7%	6.8%	6.4%	7.2%	5.2%
– Some secondary schooling	33.3%	33.0%	31.9%	32.5%	34.4%	37.9%
– Grade 12/Std 10	14.1%	11.8%	16.2%	21.9%	13.2%	27.2%
– Higher	6.2%	5.2%	7.5%	10.1%	5.4%	13.9%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	204 121	77 876	20 812	27 187	78 245	510 700
Participation rate (supply)[e]	37.8%	31.2%	53.0%	51.3%	35.7%	53.9%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	24.5%	17.4%	39.3%	37.4%	23.0%	35.2%
Employed	49 942	13 574	8 183	10 177	18 008	179 590
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	14.4%	3.9%	5.9%	4.4%	2.4%	3.4%
Mining/quarrying	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%
Manufacturing	6.6%	2.1%	1.7%	2.8%	0.8%	12.9%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.1%	0.6%
Construction	6.4%	2.4%	1.3%	1.6%	0.9%	6.2%
Wholesale/retail trade	8.9%	2.4%	2.5%	4.2%	1.3%	13.0%
Transport/storage/communication	1.8%	0.6%	0.1%	0.9%	0.3%	3.5%
Financial/insurance/real estate	6.5%	2.0%	1.9%	2.0%	1.1%	10.0%
Community/social/personal services	18.8%	5.0%	4.9%	5.6%	4.0%	19.9%
Private households/other	35.3%	11.5%	8.1%	11.7%	5.4%	30.3%
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	35.4%	44.4%	25.8%	26.7%	35.5%	35.1%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	43.3%	52.8%	31.4%	35.0%	43.6%	45.1%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	45 295	33 775	70 825	82 038	38 480	97 554
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	N/A[n]	16.9%	9.1%	10.9%	16.0%	17.0%
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	49.5%	37.5%	33.8%	47.4%	30.7%
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	19.1%	25.8%	21.3%	21.1%	17.0%
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	6.6%	12.1%	12.9%	7.2%	11.1%
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	4.4%	7.5%	9.8%	4.2%	8.9%
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	2.3%	4.8%	6.5%	2.7%	7.9%
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	0.9%	2.1%	3.4%	1.0%	4.9%
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.5%	0.8%	0.2%	1.5%

Eastern Cape	*Joe Gqabi District municipality*	*Elundini*	*Gariep*	*Maletswai*	*Senqu*	*Buffalo City Metropolitan municipality*
Monthly income (% of population)[b] (contd)						
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%	0.4%
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	60.7%	33.2%	96.7%	85.9%	70.9%	73.0%
Informal	4.3%	0.9%	2.8%	13.4%	5.1%	22.4%
Traditional	35.0%	65.9%	0.5%	0.7%	24.0%	4.6%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	60.9%	62.7%	47.1%	42.3%	68.7%	38.0%
Households owned but not paid off	5.5%	5.3%	7.1%	6.2%	5.1%	13.8%
Rented	12.8%	9.9%	25.1%	25.0%	8.4%	24.2%
Occupied rent free	20.8%	22.0%	20.7%	26.6%	17.8%	23.9%
Household goods						
Radio	59.4%	56.3%	66.6%	67.1%	58.2%	68.4%
Television	53.3%	38.1%	74.9%	74.9%	56.1%	74.9%
Refrigerator	48.1%	29.3%	66.2%	67.2%	56.0%	66.7%
Computer	6.2%	3.4%	12.4%	15.1%	4.5%	19.5%
Cellphone	79.7%	77.8%	76.8%	81.0%	81.9%	86.4%
Landline	4.2%	2.0%	13.0%	9.8%	2.4%	14.6%
Internet[i]	18.0%	13.9%	20.9%	28.8%	17.9%	32.9%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	69.0%	46.3%	90.5%	84.2%	81.1%	80.9%
Cooking	56.4%	34.9%	81.2%	78.5%	64.4%	74.4%
Heating	22.7%	13.1%	30.6%	38.1%	25.3%	41.1%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	42.2%	17.6%	95.0%	80.2%	41.1%	70.6%
On communal stand	31.8%	35.5%	3.1%	17.9%	40.0%	26.8%
No access	25.9%	46.9%	1.9%	1.9%	18.9%	2.5%
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/Private company	28.9%	13.7%	81.1%	84.2%	12.9%	71.3%
Communal/Own refuse dump	56.2%	66.2%	16.7%	11.2%	70.9%	24.1%
No refuse disposal	13.7%	18.6%	1.9%	3.8%	15.0%	3.2%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	30.4%	14.0%	79.9%	78.5%	18.6%	72.9%
Pit latrine	47.3%	57.7%	3.0%	6.2%	61.5%	16.3%
Bucket toilet	1.8%	0.7%	7.6%	0.6%	1.7%	1.2%
No Toilet	17.1%	22.8%	8.6%	11.0%	15.6%	6.4%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	8.2%	24.7%	15.4%	16.7%	22.6%	3.0%
Old age pension	3.3%	9.1%	6.9%	5.9%	9.9%	1.2%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	71.3	35.3	75.1	27.8	0.0	0.0
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	4.4	0.7	10.1	16.2	1.5	663.8
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.0	0.7	1.6	0.3	0.0	1.0

Free State	*Fezile Dabi District municipality*	*Mafube*	*Metsimaholo*	*Moqhaka*	*Ngwathe*	*Lejweleputswa District municipality*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	20 668	3 971	1 717	7 924	7 055	31 930
Share of country area (%)	1.7%	0.3%	0.1%	0.6%	0.6%	2.6%
Main town	**N/A[n]**	**Frankfort**	**Sasolburg**	**Kroonstad**	**Parys**	**N/A[n]**
***Population*[b]**	488 036	57 876	149 108	160 532	120 520	627 626
— African	86.1%	91.9%	82.3%	87.2%	86.5%	88.9%
— Coloured	1.9%	0.6%	0.7%	2.9%	2.6%	1.9%
— Indian	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%
— White	11.4%	7.0%	16.4%	9.3%	10.3%	8.6%
***Age structure*[b]**						
0–14	28.1%	31.6%	26.3%	27.0%	30.1%	28.9%
15–64	65.8%	62.1%	69.3%	66.4%	62.4%	66.1%
65+	6.1%	6.3%	4.4%	6.5%	7.5%	5.0%
Households						
Number of households	144 980	16 460	45 757	45 661	37 102	183 163
Average household size	3.2	3.4	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.2
Poverty rate[c]	49.9%	64.3%	42.4%	44.9%	57.6%	61.5%
Settlement type						
Rural	N/A[n]	95.3%	84.4%	98.4%	89.8%	N/A[n]
Urban	N/A[n]	4.7%	15.6%	1.6%	10.2%	N/A[n]
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	7.3%	14.1%	5.7%	5.4%	8.6%	6.8%
– Some primary schooling	15.9%	18.1%	12.0%	16.7%	19.0%	16.5%
– Completed primary school	5.0%	5.0%	4.1%	5.5%	5.4%	6.1%
– Some secondary schooling	35.2%	32.0%	35.8%	36.0%	34.7%	37.0%
– Grade 12/Std 10	27.6%	24.5%	29.9%	27.8%	25.9%	25.9%
– Higher	9.0%	6.3%	12.5%	8.6%	6.4%	7.7%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	321 207	35 934	103 363	106 668	75 242	414 593
Participation rate (supply)[e]	54.6%	48.4%	61.7%	51.7%	52.1%	53.0%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	36.1%	32.2%	41.8%	33.4%	33.7%	33.6%
Employed	115 844	11 574	43 220	35 674	25 376	139 262
***Employment by industry*[g]**						
Agriculture	N/A[n]	5.4%	1.4%	4.5%	5.9%	N/A[n]
Mining/quarrying	N/A[n]	0.3%	1.7%	18.7%	0.3%	N/A[n]
Manufacturing	N/A[n]	3.2%	8.1%	3.1%	5.7%	N/A[n]
Electricity/gas/water supply	N/A[n]	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	N/A[n]
Construction	N/A[n]	1.2%	2.0%	1.0%	1.8%	N/A[n]
Wholesale/retail trade	N/A[n]	5.9%	4.7%	4.0%	6.6%	N/A[n]
Transport/storage/communication	N/A[n]	1.9%	1.2%	1.6%	0.9%	N/A[n]
Financial/insurance/real estate	N/A[n]	1.6%	3.5%	2.6%	1.7%	N/A[n]
Community/social/personal services	N/A[n]	5.5%	5.4%	5.2%	6.0%	N/A[n]
Private households/other	N/A[n]	8.7%	7.5%	8.4%	7.1%	N/A[n]

Free State	*Fezile Dabi District municipality*	*Mafube*	*Metsimaholo*	*Moqhaka*	*Ngwathe*	*Lejweleputswa District municipality*
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	33.9%	33.4%	32.1%	35.2%	35.2%	36.5%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	44.4%	44.3%	41.6%	47.2%	45.1%	48.7%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	76 4230	53 586	105 581	71 627	56 316	65 932
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	N/A[n]	12.3%	13.2%	8.4%	13.0%	N/A[n]
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	37.2%	26.8%	35.1%	38.7%	N/A[n]
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	24.7%	19.0%	23.9%	22.9%	N/A[n]
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	12.7%	14.1%	13.9%	11.5%	N/A[n]
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	6.7%	10.2%	8.8%	6.7%	N/A[n]
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	3.8%	8.8%	6.0%	4.2%	N/A[n]
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	1.8%	5.4%	2.7%	2.1%	N/A[n]
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.4%	1.8%	0.6%	0.5%	N/A[n]
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	N/A[n]
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	N/A[n]
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	84.0%	71.1%	85.2%	89.2%	81.9%	80.1%
Informal	0.5%	1.3%	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%
Traditional	15.5%	27.6%	14.5%	10.4%	17.7%	19.5%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	52.8%	63.0%	44.4%	50.0%	62.2%	51.0%
Households owned but not paid off	9.4%	6.5%	14.7%	7.6%	6.4%	9.1%
Rented	23.0%	18.2%	23.0%	28.8%	18.2%	21.4%
Occupied rent free	14.7%	12.3%	17.8%	13.6%	13.3%	18.5%
Household goods						
Radio	77.0%	72.6%	77.4%	78.7%	76.6%	73.1%
Television	79.8%	75.5%	78.8%	82.0%	80.3%	79.4%
Refrigerator	75.6%	69.8%	74.4%	78.9%	75.7%	72.4%
Computer	18.0%	12.7%	23.3%	17.1%	14.8%	16.0%
Cellphone	89.0%	85.3%	92.5%	88.3%	87.0%	87.3%
Landline	11.7%	7.4%	12.9%	12.8%	10.7%	9.8%
Internet[i]	32.7%	32.4%	41.1%	28.7%	27.3%	27.2%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	89.8%	84.4%	86.4%	74.8%	92.0%	90.9%
Cooking	85.3%	75.2%	83.1%	71.6%	88.1%	87.1%
Heating	66.1%	58.1%	67.7%	56.3%	0.0%	62.0%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	91.5%	86.5%	93.8%	94.2%	87.6%	90.8%
On communal stand	7.3%	11.1%	5.3%	4.7%	11.4%	7.1%
No access	1.1%	2.4%	0.9%	1.0%	1.0%	2.0%

Free State	*Fezile Dabi District municipality*	*Mafube*	*Metsimaholo*	*Moqhaka*	*Ngwathe*	*Lejweleputswa District municipality*
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/Private company	83.1%	82.6%	79.9%	85.2%	84.5%	81.7%
Communal/Own refuse dump	13.0%	11.1%	15.9%	11.8%	11.9%	13.1%
No refuse disposal	3.3%	5.3%	3.5%	2.5%	3.0%	4.3%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	80.3%	79.4%	76.0%	87.4%	77.1%	77.6%
Pit latrine	10.5%	2.4%	16.7%	7.7%	9.7%	9.7%
Bucket toilet	6.0%	15.3%	3.4%	1.6%	10.7%	7.5%
No Toilet	1.7%	1.9%	1.3%	2.0%	1.6%	3.2%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	3.4%	18.2%	11.0%	12.6%	13.7%	3.0%
Old age pension	1.4%	5.7%	4.1%	5.3%	6.6%	1.1%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	0.3	17.9	6.2	52.6	N/A[n]	0.2
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	4.3	56.1	66.7	111.7	N/A[n]	13.5
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.0	7.2	1.0	13.0	N/A[n]	0.0

Free State	*Masilonyana*	*Matjhabeng*	*Nala*	*Tokologo*	*Tswelopele*	*Thabo Mofutsanyana District municipality*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	6 796	5 155	4 128	9 325	6 524	33 269
Share of country area (%)	0.6%	0.4%	0.3%	0.8%	0.5%	2.7%
Main town	**Theunissen**	**Welkom**	**Bothaville**	**Dealesville**	**Hoopstad**	**N/A[n]**
Population[b]	63 334	406 461	81 220	28 986	47 625	736 238
— African	91.6%	87.7%	93.1%	84.5%	91.2%	93.8%
— Coloured	1.1%	2.1%	0.6%	4.6%	1.2%	0.8%
— Indian	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.7%	0.4%	0.4%
— White	6.7%	9.6%	5.8%	9.9%	6.9%	4.8%
Age structure[b]						
0–14	29.8%	27.3%	32.7%	31.2%	33.8%	31.9%
15–64	64.4%	68.1%	61.6%	62.9%	60.8%	62.6%
65+	5.8%	4.7%	5.8%	5.9%	5.4%	5.5%
Households						
Number of households	17 575	123 195	21 703	8 698	11 992	217 884
Average household size	3.3	3.1	3.7	3.2	3.8	3.3
Poverty rate[c]	53.8%	61.7%	67.5%	64.6%	59.0%	46.2%
Settlement type						
Rural	84.6%	72.0%	88.4%	93.4%	99.3%	N/A[n]
Urban	15.4%	28.0%	11.6%	6.6%	0.7%	N/A[n]

Free State	*Masilonyana*	*Matjhabeng*	*Nala*	*Tokologo*	*Tswelopele*	*Thabo Mofutsanyana District municipality*
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	8.8%	4.6%	7.9%	20.8%	13.3%	9.1%
– Some primary schooling	21.1%	14.0%	22.1%	22.4%	20.7%	18.0%
– Completed primary school	7.6%	5.5%	7.4%	6.6%	7.1%	5.3%
– Some secondary schooling	34.7%	38.8%	34.7%	27.3%	33.0%	34.6%
– Grade 12/Std 10	23.2%	28.1%	22.2%	17.8%	20.5%	24.9%
– Higher	4.5%	9.0%	5.6%	5.1%	5.3%	8.1%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	40 777	276 624	49 997	18 237	28 958	461 195
Participation rate (supply)[e]	44.2%	55.6%	48.8%	49.8%	49.8%	47.7%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	26.8%	34.9%	31.2%	36.1%	32.7%	30.9%
Employed	10 930	96 678	15 613	6 583	9 458	142 625
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	1.6%	1.8%	5.9%	6.1%	6.7%	N/A[n]
Mining/quarrying	20.2%	10.7%	0.9%	0.7%	0.0%	N/A[n]
Manufacturing	1.5%	3.4%	3.1%	8.5%	2.8%	N/A[n]
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.2%	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%	N/A[n]
Construction	1.7%	1.9%	0.6%	1.5%	1.8%	N/A[n]
Wholesale/retail trade	2.1%	6.3%	4.1%	3.0%	3.2%	N/A[n]
Transport/storage/communication	13.3%	1.3%	0.5%	0.9%	0.3%	N/A[n]
Financial/insurance/real estate	1.4%	2.6%	1.8%	1.9%	1.9%	N/A[n]
Community/social/personal services	4.5%	6.4%	5.1%	4.4%	6.2%	N/A[n]
Private households/other	9.6%	8.5%	8.4%	11.0%	10.8%	N/A[n]
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	38.8%	37.0%	35.9%	27.5%	34.8%	35.1%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	49.8%	49.7%	47.6%	35.8%	46.2%	45.8%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	51 271	71 331	55 944	52 234	60 088	53 551
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	14.8%	16.3%	12.5%	10.2%	9.9%	N/A[n]
R1–R1 600	38.2%	30.1%	39.6%	41.2%	38.6%	N/A[n]
R1 601–R3 200	22.3%	18.2%	24.5%	24.7%	26.3%	N/A[n]
R3 201–R6 400	13.0%	15.3%	11.2%	11.1%	12.2%	N/A[n]
R6 401–R12 800	6.1%	9.5%	6.0%	6.3%	6.5%	N/A[n]
R12 801–R25 600	3.3%	6.5%	3.7%	4.1%	4.1%	N/A[n]
R25 601–R51 200	1.5%	3.1%	1.7%	1.9%	1.6%	N/A[n]
R51 201–R102 400	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	N/A[n]
R102 401–R204 800	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	N/A[n]
R204 801 or more	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	N/A[n]

Free State	*Masilonyana*	*Matjhabeng*	*Nala*	*Tokologo*	*Tswelopele*	*Thabo Mofutsanyana District municipality*
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	83.5%	79.6%	78.0%	84.5%	80.8%	77.8%
Informal	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	6.9%
Traditional	16.0%	20.0%	21.6%	15.0%	18.8%	15.4%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	56.5%	50.1%	58.9%	26.0%	55.8%	56.4%
Households owned but not paid off	7.9%	10.1%	7.2%	6.6%	6.0%	7.9%
Rented	19.8%	24.0%	12.4%	15.4%	18.1%	17.3%
Occupied rent free	15.8%	15.8%	21.5%	52.0%	20.1%	18.5%
Household goods						
Radio	72.6%	75.1%	68.4%	62.5%	70.3%	76.8%
Television	75.0%	81.5%	77.0%	65.0%	78.0%	74.6%
Refrigerator	71.2%	73.9%	71.7%	58.3%	70.3%	68.7%
Computer	11.0%	18.4%	11.8%	10.0%	11.5%	13.1%
Cellphone	82.7%	89.6%	83.6%	75.0%	86.2%	87.3%
Landline	6.9%	10.9%	7.3%	7.3%	9.5%	7.6%
Internet[i]	22.7%	30.2%	20.6%	19.0%	21.8%	27.5%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	93.2%	91.1%	90.3%	84.2%	91.9%	87.2%
Cooking	88.4%	87.7%	85.5%	78.9%	879.9%	77.9%
Heating	55.3%	64.8%	54.1%	58.8%	60.7%	48.2%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	93.2%	90.7%	91.2%	87.0%	90.5%	87.4%
On communal stand	4.4%	7.2%	7.6%	10.7%	6.8%	9.4%
No access	2.4%	2.0%	1.2%	2.3%	2.8%	3.2%
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/Private company	61.2%	87.3%	82.8%	47.2%	77.1%	50.1%
Communal/Own refuse dump	30.7%	7.9%	12.9%	45.4%	18.3%	43.6%
No refuse disposal	7.2%	4.0%	3.8%	4.7%	3.8%	5.6%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	75.8%	82.0%	71.7%	26.9%	82.4%	53.4%
Pit latrine	4.0%	8.9%	6.2%	41.9%	9.0%	35.7%
Bucket toilet	16.1%	4.4%	17.3%	18.1%	0.7%	6.4%
No Toilet	3.3%	2.5%	2.6%	11.0%	6.3%	3.0%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	12.8%	11.0%	18.6%	15.6%	13.5%	5.9%
Old age pension	4.6%	4.3%	5.8%	6.3%	6.2%	1.7%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	519.7	1 075.8	N/A[n]	36.2	1.9	N/A[n]
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	54.8	160.4	N/A[n]	5.2	2.1	3.1
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.8	76.4	N/A[n]	0.6	0.0	0.1

Free State	*Dihlabeng*	*Maluti-a-Phofung*	*Mantsopa*	*Nketoana*	*Phumelela*	*Setsoto*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	4 879	4 337	4 290	5 611	8 183	5 966
Share of country area (%)	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%	0.7%	0.5%
Main town	**Bethlehem**	**Phuthaditjhaba (QwaQwa)**	**Ladybrand**	**Reitz**	**Vrede**	**Senekal**
Population[b]	128 704	335 784	51 056	60 324	47 772	112 597
— African	87.4%	98.2%	88.4%	91.4%	91.6%	92.3%
— Coloured	1.5%	0.2%	3.9%	0.3%	0.4%	1.0%
— Indian	0.5%	0.2%	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%	0.8%
— White	10.4%	1.3%	6.6%	7.8%	7.3%	5.7%
Age structure[b]						
0–14	29.4%	32.7%	31.8%	32.3%	31.7%	32.1%
15–64	65.2%	62.0%	62.8%	61.9%	62.3%	62.1%
65+	5.4%	5.3%	5.4%	5.8%	6.0%	5.8%
Households						
Number of households	38 593	100 228	15 170	17 318	12 888	33 687
Average household size	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.6	3.3
Poverty rate[c]	55.1%	60.0%	42.6%	66.5%	11.1%	42.0%
Settlement type						
Rural	79.1%	81.8%	81.0%	96.3%	99.6%	97.4%
Urban	20.9%	18.2%	19.0%	3.7%	0.4%	2.6%
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	8.9%	8.9%	5.7%	12.8%	11.3%	8.7%
– Some primary schooling	15.4%	17.6%	19.3%	20.0%	24.1%	18.0%
– Completed primary school	4.9%	4.3%	7.4%	5.4%	6.0%	7.2%
– Some secondary schooling	33.8%	34.3%	35.9%	34.7%	32.6%	36.5%
– Grade 12/Std 10	26.4%	26.9%	23.0%	20.5%	19.4%	22.6%
– Higher	10.6%	7.9%	8.6%	6.7%	6.5%	6.9%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	83 852	208 296	32 064	37 330	29 765	69 887
Participation rate (supply)[e]	55.7%	43.4%	51.7%	51.3%	47.8%	47.5%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	39.5%	25.2%	36.6%	35.7%	35.6%	30.5%
Employed	33 151	52 501	11 725	13 327	10 606	21 315
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	7.1%	1.3%	7.2%	10.3%	13.9%	7.1%
Mining/quarrying	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%
Manufacturing	4.9%	4.2%	3.3%	2.0%	3.0%	5.5%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%
Construction	1.7%	1.7%	2.0%	0.4%	1.6%	1.4%
Wholesale/retail trade	8.8%	4.6%	5.9%	3.1%	3.5%	4.5%
Transport/storage/communication	1.2%	0.7%	1.8%	1.3%	0.8%	1.0%
Financial/insurance/real estate	2.6%	2.4%	3.4%	1.3%	1.2%	2.5%
Community/social/personal services	7.7%	4.8%	5.1%	4.5%	3.7%	4.9%
Private households/other	7.4%	6.3%	11.1%	4.1%	9.2%	7.3%

Free State	*Dihlabeng*	*Maluti-a-Phofung*	*Mantsopa*	*Nketoana*	*Phumelela*	*Setsoto*
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	28.7%	41.8%	29.2%	30.4%	25.3%	35.7%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	38.9%	53.0%	38.2%	41.6%	34.6%	46.1%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	79 650	42 643	62 287	57 743	52 839	50 225
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	6.3%	13.5%	9.4%	7.2%	9.4%	12.7%
R1–R1 600	34.9%	46.4%	38.6%	40.9%	39.2%	43.0%
R1 601–R3 200	24.5%	20.7%	24.6%	26.6%	25.5%	22.2%
R3 201–R6 400	14.1%	9.0%	12.2%	12.2%	13.7%	9.8%
R6 401–R12 800	8.9%	5.2%	7.0%	6.5%	6.3%	5.8%
R12 801–R25 600	6.4%	3.3%	4.9%	4.0%	3.6%	4.2%
R25 601–R51 200	3.6%	1.4%	2.3%	1.7%	1.6%	1.7%
R51 201–R102 400	0.9%	0.3%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%
R102 401–R204 800	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
R204 801 or more	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	77.1%	81.1%	82.3%	73.7%	73.4%	70.6%
Informal	4.9%	9.7%	3.0%	3.8%	9.9%	2.7%
Traditional	18.0%	9.2%	14.8%	22.5%	16.7%	26.7%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	37.7%	67.0%	52.1%	51.6%	47.8%	54.2%
Households owned but not paid off	10.7%	7.6%	4.9%	7.3%	4.0%	8.8%
Rented	30.8%	8.5%	27.2%	20.3%	23.8%	18.7%
Occupied rent free	20.8%	16.9%	15.9%	20.7%	24.4%	18.2%
Household goods						
Radio	79.2%	78.0%	76.2%	75.6%	68.7%	74.3%
Television	75.6%	76.0%	73.4%	72.2%	69.2%	73.3%
Refrigerator	71.4%	69.2%	68.6%	67.8%	63.4%	66.6%
Computer	18.7%	11.8%	13.3%	12.3%	11.6%	11.1%
Cellphone	87.9%	89.2%	82.4%	86.2%	88.9%	83.4%
Landline	11.6%	5.5%	8.1%	7.5%	9.6%	8.4%
Internet[i]	32.9%	28.1%	25.8%	25.3%	21.0%	23.7%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	84.8%	89.0%	91.0%	84.7%	74.9%	88.6%
Cooking	75.0%	81.0%	79.3%	74.1%	55.7%	81.5%
Heating	50.8%	49.4%	39.0%	54.3%	40.4%	45.8%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	88.4%	85.2%	95.5%	85.3%	85.0%	90.8%
On communal stand	9.4%	10.9%	3.3%	9.3%	11.0%	7.3%
No access	2.2%	3.9%	1.2%	5.5%	4.0%	1.9%

Free State	*Dihlabeng*	*Maluti-a-Phofung*	*Mantsopa*	*Nketoana*	*Phumelela*	*Setsoto*
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/Private company	81.3%	25.2%	78.6%	73.7%	65.5%	57.5%
Communal/Own refuse dump	15.5%	66.4%	19.2%	21.8%	30.4%	34.9%
No refuse disposal	2.8%	7.4%	1.9%	3.9%	3.6%	6.9%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	77.4%	35.6%	70.4%	64.8%	63.1%	61.6%
Pit latrine	17.6%	59.5%	9.8%	18.9%	25.6%	10.0%
Bucket toilet	2.0%	0.6%	16.7%	11.5%	0.7%	23.3%
No Toilet	2.1%	2.6%	2.6%	2.9%	6.2%	4.1%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	15.8%	20.8%	16.4%	20.2%	17.5%	17.5%
Old age pension	6.0%	5.6%	6.3%	5.5%	5.8%	5.0%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	0.0	29.6	18.6	21.4	20.8	N/A[n]
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	60.4	7.2	11.6	8.6	40.0	N/A[n]
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	9.9	3.9	0.3	0.1	0.5	N/A[n]

Free State	*Xhariep District municipality*	*Kopanong*	*Letsemeng*	*Mohokare*	*Naledi*	*Mangaung Metropolitan municipality*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	37 673	15 645	9 828	8 775	3 424	6 283
Share of country area (%)	3.1%	1.3%	0.8%	0.7%	0.3%	0.5%
Main town	**N/A[n]**	**Trompsburg**	**Koffiefontein**	**Zastron**	**Dewetsdorp**	**Bloemfontein**
Population[b]	146 259	49 171	38 628	34 146	24 314	747 431
— African	78.5%	71.5%	67.8%	90.8%	92.4%	83.3%
— Coloured	13.2%	18.2%	23.4%	2.3%	1.9%	5.0%
— Indian	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%
— White	7.6%	9.4%	8.1%	6.5%	4.9%	11.0%
Age structure[b]						
0–14	30.8%	29.7%	29.7%	32.2%	32.5%	26.9%
15–64	62.9%	63.5%	64.8%	61.4%	60.7%	67.8%
65+	6.3%	6.8%	5.4%	6.4%	6.8%	5.3%
Households						
Number of households	45 368	15 643	11 242	10 793	7 690	231 921
Average household size	3.1	3.0	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.1
Poverty rate[c]	52.4%	41.0%	49.0%	70.2%	62.5%	44.0%
Settlement type						
Rural	N/A[n]	69.3%	83.2%	98.3%	97.8%	74.4%
Urban	N/A[n]	30.7%	16.8%	1.7%	2.2%	25.6%
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	12.9%	13.4%	17.7%	11.0%	6.8%	4.4%
– Some primary schooling	22.5%	19.4%	20.2%	25.6%	28.0%	13.3%
– Completed primary school	7.1%	6.7%	6.8%	7.6%	7.7%	4.7%

Free State	*Xhariep District municipality*	*Kopanong*	*Letsemeng*	*Mohokare*	*Naledi*	*Mangaung Metropolitan municipality*
Education (contd)						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– Some secondary schooling	32.6%	33.3%	31.6%	31.7%	33.7%	33.2%
– Grade 12/Std 10	19.2%	20.7%	18.8%	17.9%	18.6%	30.3%
– Higher	5.7%	6.4%	4.8%	6.1%	5.2%	14.2%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	92 001	31 232	25 050	20 961	14 759	506 923
Participation rate (supply)[e]	48.4%	48.8%	46.9%	53.2%	43.3%	56.9%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	35.5%	35.7%	36.5%	36.4%	31.9%	41.0%
Employed	32 632	11 161	9 132	7 633	4 707	207 967
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	N/A[n]	7.2%	11.2%	7.3%	6.0%	2.2%
Mining/quarrying	N/A[n]	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%
Manufacturing	N/A[n]	3.2%	4.9%	1.8%	1.8%	5.7%
Electricity/gas/water supply	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.5%	0.3%	1.3%	0.4%
Construction	N/A[n]	3.9%	2.9%	1.6%	2.2%	3.2%
Wholesale/retail trade	N/A[n]	3.9%	2.3%	3.5%	4.8%	6.3%
Transport/storage/communication	N/A[n]	1.4%	0.9%	0.8%	1.3%	2.0%
Financial/insurance/real estate	N/A[n]	3.7%	3.1%	2.0%	2.2%	4.4%
Community/social/personal services	N/A[n]	7.5%	6.4%	6.2%	5.8%	9.3%
Private households/other	N/A[n]	6.6%	8.6%	5.5%	7.6%	9.5%
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	26.8%	27.0%	22.3%	31.4%	26.4%	27.7%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	33.8%	33.6%	27.7%	40.0%	34.8%	37.2%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	61 402	66 507	60 360	58 258	56 839	105 232
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	N/A[n]	11.3%	10.2%	11.0%	14.2%	11.4%
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	37.8%	35.5%	43.1%	42.9%	28.6%
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	22.5%	24.6%	21.9%	22.3%	20.2%
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	13.0%	14.1%	9.9%	8.9%	14.1%
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	7.6%	8.0%	7.2%	5.6%	10.3%
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	4.6%	4.5%	4.3%	3.8%	8.0%
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	1.9%	2.3%	1.8%	1.3%	5.0%
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.7%	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	1.6%
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	87.5%	91.8%	83.7%	87.0%	85.3%	84.4%
Informal	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.7%	0.4%	1.3%
Traditional	12.1%	7.8%	16.2%	12.3%	14.3%	14.2%

Free State	*Xhariep District municipality*	*Kopanong*	*Letsemeng*	*Mohokare*	*Naledi*	*Mangaung Metropolitan municipality*
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	49.1%	48.5%	53.7%	33.3%	65.9%	52.7%
Households owned but not paid off	5.6%	4.4%	2.7%	12.3%	3.1%	11.3%
Rented	21.5%	22.7%	19.3%	25.5%	16.9%	21.0%
Occupied rent free	23.7%	24.5%	24.3%	28.9%	14.1%	15.0%
Household goods						
Radio	69.4%	70.8%	57.8%	72.9%	78.5%	79.7%
Television	72.8%	73.0%	73.5%	71.3%	73.5%	80.9%
Refrigerator	68.1%	70.4%	67.6%	64.4%	69.3%	77.5%
Computer	11.3%	11.8%	11.9%	11.0%	9.6%	25.1%
Cellphone	80.4%	80.3%	77.0%	82.8%	82.4%	89.5%
Landline	8.8%	11.0%	9.0%	7.5%	6.1%	11.6%
Internet[i]	24.7%	26.7%	23.8%	22.9%	24.3%	38.1%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	92.2%	92.6%	92.8%	89.7%	93.8%	91.4%
Cooking	83.7%	86.3%	88.0%	76.0%	82.8%	88.3%
Heating	47.8%	52.3%	62.9%	28.6%	43.5%	52.7%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	94.5%	96.1%	90.8%	96.2%	94.3%	86.7%
On communal stand	3.8%	2.5%	7.0%	2.6%	3.5%	11.2%
No access	1.6%	1.3%	2.2%	1.2%	2.1%	2.1%
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/Private company	68.4%	77.7%	68.9%	69.5%	47.4%	81.1%
Communal/Own refuse dump	28.1%	18.6%	29.0%	26.7%	47.9%	14.5%
No refuse disposal	2.4%	2.4%	1.4%	2.4%	3.7%	3.5%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	80.5%	85.8%	76.0%	72.6%	87.1%	63.0%
Pit latrine	7.9%	4.2%	15.9%	6.9%	5.2%	29.7%
Bucket toilet	4.3%	1.6%	2.3%	11.9%	2.2%	2.9%
No Toilet	5.8%	6.3%	5.0%	7.6%	3.7%	3.5%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	5.5%	15.3%	15.7%	19.3%	16.5%	3.3%
Old age pension	2.3%	8.6%	5.8%	6.0%	7.3%	1.1%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	1.5	65.7	33.1	6.2	29.9	307.3
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	10.5	59.8	9.5	66.7	0.1	58.3
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.0	3.3	1.1	1.0	0.0	0.2

Gauteng	*Ekurhuleni Metropolitan municipality*	*City of Johannesburg Metropolitan municipality*	*Sedibeng District municipality*	*Emfuleni*	*Lesedi*	*Midvaal*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	1 975	1 644	4 172	965	1 484	1 722
Share of country area (%)	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Main town	**Germiston**	**Johannesburg**	**N/A[n]**	**Vereeniging**	**Heidelberg**	**Meyerton**
***Population*[b]**	3 178 470	4 434 827	916 484	721 663	99 520	95 301
— African	78.7%	76.4%	81.7%	85.4%	77.3%	58.4%
— Coloured	2.7%	5.6%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.6%
— Indian	2.1%	4.9%	1.0%	1.0%	1.3%	0.8%
— White	15.8%	12.3%	15.6%	12.0%	19.7%	38.7%
***Age structure*[b]**						
0–14	24.3%	23.2%	25.4%	25.6%	26.0%	23.2%
15–64	71.7%	72.7%	69.5%	69.5%	68.6%	70.5%
65+	4.0%	4.1%	5.1%	4.9%	5.4%	6.3%
Households						
Number of households	1 015 465	1 434 856	279 768	220 135	29 668	29 965
Average household size	2.9	2.8	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.0
Poverty rate[c]	27.3%	45.5%	44.9%	45.8%	42.9%	37.1%
Settlement type						
Rural	17.8%	0.1%	N/A[n]	47.7%	91.4%	96.8%
Urban	82.2%	99.9%	N/A[n]	52.3%	8.6%	3.2%
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	3.6%	2.9%	4.5%	4.0%	7.4%	5.2%
– Some primary schooling	7.5%	6.6%	10.1%	9.9%	12.3%	9.0%
– Completed primary school	3.3%	3.4%	3.6%	3.5%	4.3%	3.8%
– Some secondary schooling	35.3%	32.7%	36.7%	37.1%	36.4%	34.4%
– Grade 12/Std 10	35.5%	34.9%	32.1%	32.6%	28.5%	32.3%
– Higher	14.6%	19.4%	13.1%	13.0%	11.2%	15.3%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	2 279 453	3 222 606	637 220	501 784	68 254	67 182
Participation rate (supply)[e]	72.1%	72.7%	67.0%	67.7%	62.3%	66.4%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	49.4%	52.6%	42.6%	40.4%	46.2%	55.6%
Employed	1 126 844	1 696 520	271 398	202 543	31 518	37 336
***Employment by industry*[g]**						
Agriculture	1.2%	1.3%	2.7%	0.6%	4.5%	1.9%
Mining/quarrying	0.8%	0.9%	1.3%	0.4%	0.9%	0.9%
Manufacturing	11.4%	7.3%	21.4%	7.9%	7.5%	10.6%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.5%	0.5%	1.7%	0.5%	0.4%	1.8%
Construction	2.8%	2.9%	5.7%	1.9%	3.2%	3.7%
Wholesale/retail trade	7.4%	8.0%	15.0%	5.5%	6.1%	6.6%
Transport/storage/communication	3.0%	2.5%	3.5%	1.3%	1.5%	1.6%
Financial/insurance/real estate	6.6%	9.3%	10.8%	3.8%	5.6%	5.6%
Community/social/personal services	6.5%	7.3%	15.4%	5.6%	7.5%	6.4%
Private households/other	9.4%	12.0%	22.6%	8.0%	9.0%	12.9%

Gauteng	*Ekurhuleni Metropolitan municipality*	*City of Johannesburg Metropolitan municipality*	*Sedibeng District municipality*	*Emfuleni*	*Lesedi*	*Midvaal*
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	28.8%	25.0%	31.9%	34.7%	25.9%	18.8%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	36.9%	31.5%	41.7%	45.0%	33.8%	25.4%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	125 688	183 247	94 773	86 895	102 317	145 180
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	17.8%	16.7%	N/A[n]	17.7%	14.7%	14.5%
R1–R1 600	20.7%	18.1%	N/A[n]	27.2%	26.0%	22.9%
R1 601–R3 200	16.9%	16.8%	N/A[n]	17.4%	19.2%	16.4%
R3 201–R6 400	15.0%	14.2%	N/A[n]	13.5%	14.8%	12.4%
R6 401–R12 800	10.8%	10.5%	N/A[n]	10.5%	10.5%	10.3%
R12 801–R25 600	8.7%	9.1%	N/A[n]	7.6%	7.6%	10.9%
R25 601–R51 200	6.3%	7.7%	N/A[n]	4.2%	4.8%	8.3%
R51 201–R102 400	2.7%	4.5%	N/A[n]	1.2%	1.7%	3.1%
R102 401–R204 800	0.7%	1.6%	N/A[n]	0.3%	0.4%	0.6%
R204 801 or more	0.4%	0.8%	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.3%	0.5%
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	78.1%	82.1%	85.3%	85.7%	86.3%	81.3%
Informal	21.7%	17.6%	14.4%	14.0%	13.3%	18.2%
Traditional	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	28.0%	24.4%	36.6%	36.9%	45.0%	24.8%
Households owned but not paid off	17.1%	17.0%	13.8%	13.2%	12.5%	19.4%
Rented	38.2%	42.3%	28.7%	29.1%	29.1%	25.4%
Occupied rent free	16.6%	16.3%	21.0%	20.7%	13.4%	30.4%
Household goods						
Radio	67.1%	71.4%	72.7%	73.4%	70.7%	69.7%
Television	77.3%	83.8%	81.3%	82.1%	81.3%	75.4%
Refrigerator	68.0%	74.6%	77.4%	79.4%	73.0%	67.8%
Computer	25.8%	33.6%	25.7%	25.2%	22.8%	32.3%
Cellphone	93.3%	94.4%	91.4%	91.6%	90.0%	91.2%
Landline	15.3%	21.2%	13.2%	12.8%	11.9%	17.3%
Internet[i]	42.6%	49.6%	39.4%	40.6%	31.7%	37.8%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	82.2%	90.8%	90.6%	92.2%	89.9%	79.3%
Cooking	79.4%	87.4%	87.0%	90.3%	78.1%	71.9%
Heating	65.6%	82.1%	79.4%	84.7%	61.1%	59.1%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	25.6%	91.6%	92.8%	94.2%	92.2%	82.9%
On communal stand	11.7%	7.0%	6.2%	5.2%	6.6%	12.9%
No access	1.1%	1.4%	1.0%	0.6%	1.2%	4.2%

Gauteng	*Ekurhuleni Metropolitan municipality*	*City of Johannesburg Metropolitan municipality*	*Sedibeng District municipality*	*Emfuleni*	*Lesedi*	*Midvaal*
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/ Private company	89.4%	97.0%	89.4%	90.7%	86.2%	83.1%
Communal/Own refuse dump	7.8%	2.3%	8.2%	7.2%	11.0%	12.5%
No refuse disposal	2.5%	0.5%	1.9%	1.7%	2.1%	3.2%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	87.6%	90.5%	89.4%	90.4%	89.4%	82.5%
Pit latrine	7.9%	6.0%	7.6%	7.0%	7.3%	11.9%
Bucket toilet	2.3%	2.0%	1.1%	0.9%	1.2%	2.2%
No Toilet	1.2%	0.8%	1.1%	1.0%	1.1%	2.0%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	1.3%	1.2%	10.6%	10.9%	10.9%	7.7%
Old age pension	0.4%	0.5%	4.1%	4.5%	3.4%	2.1%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	N/A[n]	3.2	0.0	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	574.0	235.5	N/A[n]	4.1	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	112.5	N/A[n]	0.0	2.4	0.1	0.0

Gauteng	*City of Tshwane Metropolitan municipality*	*West Rand District municipality*	*Merafong*	*Mogale*	*Randfontein*	*Westonaria*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	6 297	4 087	1 630	1 342	474	639
Share of country area (%)	0.5%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
Main town	**Pretoria/Tshwane**	**N/A[n]**	**Carletonville**	**Krugersdorp**	**Randfontein**	**Westonaria**
Population[b]	2 921 488	820 995	197 520	362 422	149 286	111 767
— African	75.4%	79.2%	86.5%	75.6%	69.2%	91.4%
— Coloured	2.0%	2.5%	1.1%	0.8%	9.8%	0.7%
— Indian	1.8%	1.1%	0.3%	2.2%	0.4%	0.3%
— White	20.1%	16.7%	11.8%	21.0%	20.1%	7.0%
Age structure[b]						
0–14	23.2%	24.1%	24.1%	23.7%	24.9%	24.5%
15–64	71.9%	71.9%	72.5%	71.7%	70.2%	73.3%
65+	4.9%	4.0%	3.4%	4.6%	4.9%	2.2%
Households						
Number of households	911 536	267 397	66 624	117 373	43 299	40 101
Average household size	3.0	2.8	2.7	2.9	3.0	2.4
Poverty rate[c]	27.9%	32.9%	26.4%	33.8%	25.8%	47.1%
Settlement type						
Rural	75.6%	N/A[n]	61.8%	74.2%	63.2%	1.5%
Urban	24.4%	N/A[n]	38.2%	25.8%	36.8%	98.5%

Gauteng	*City of Tshwane Metropolitan municipality*	*West Rand District municipality*	*Merafong*	*Mogale*	*Randfontein*	*Westonaria*
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	4.2%	5.2%	6.5%	4.7%	4.0%	6.2%
– Some primary schooling	6.8%	11.3%	14.0%	9.3%	9.8%	15.3%
– Completed primary school	2.9%	4.9%	6.1%	4.1%	4.1%	6.8%
– Some secondary schooling	28.4%	37.4%	39.8%	35.0%	38.2%	40.1%
– Grade 12/Std 10	34.2%	30.2%	26.4%	32.7%	32.2%	26.3%
– Higher	23.6%	10.9%	7.1%	14.2%	11.8%	5.3%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	2 101 474	589 971	143 278	259 918	104 848	81 927
Participation rate (supply)[e]	66.9%	71.1%	69.3%	71.3%	71.4%	73.1%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	51.4%	49.7%	46.5%	51.8%	49.1%	49.5%
Employed	1 079 273	293 335	66 635	134 635	51 480	40 585
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	1.0%	3.8%	1.3%	2.5%	1.7%	0.5%
Mining/quarrying	0.2%	14.2%	29.5%	0.8%	3.4%	32.1%
Manufacturing	7.0%	15.2%	2.1%	8.7%	9.7%	2.6%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.4%	0.9%	0.2%	0.6%	0.2%	0.2%
Construction	3.6%	5.6%	1.6%	3.3%	2.5%	1.8%
Wholesale/retail trade	7.1%	13.3%	4.6%	7.9%	7.3%	2.9%
Transport/storage/communication	2.1%	3.9%	1.0%	2.1%	2.4%	1.1%
Financial/insurance/real estate	7.9%	11.2%	1.9%	7.1%	5.8%	1.5%
Community/social/personal services	9.9%	14.4%	4.6%	7.7%	8.8%	4.6%
Private households/other	12.7%	17.5%	7.5%	10.9%	7.1%	5.0%
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	24.2%	26.3%	27.2%	24.6%	27.1%	29.5%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	32.6%	35.2%	37.8%	32.3%	35.8%	39.3%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	182 822	100 812	78 686	123 591	107 185	63 945
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	14.9%	N/A[n]	15.3%	15.5%	12.3%	20.6%
R1–R1 600	17.6%	N/A[n]	21.0%	23.4%	23.6%	25.1%
R1 601–R3 200	15.5%	N/A[n]	14.7%	18.6%	17.8%	16.4%
R3 201–R6 400	13.3%	N/A[n]	26.6%	14.1%	15.5%	20.2%
R6 401–R12 800	11.8%	N/A[n]	11.3%	10.2%	12.3%	9.0%
R12 801–R25 600	11.3%	N/A[n]	6.8%	8.5%	10.5%	5.4%
R25 601–R51 200	9.3%	N/A[n]	3.1%	6.0%	5.9%	2.4%
R51 201–R102 400	4.5%	N/A[n]	0.8%	2.5%	1.6%	0.5%
R102 401–R204 800	1.2%	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.7%	0.3%	0.1%
R204 801 or more	0.6%	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	81.4%	73.9%	77.7%	74.2%	80.4%	60.1%
Informal	18.2%	25.8%	22.1%	25.5%	19.4%	39.6%
Traditional	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%

Gauteng	*City of Tshwane Metropolitan municipality*	*West Rand District municipality*	*Merafong*	*Mogale*	*Randfontein*	*Westonaria*
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	31.4%	25.0%	24.6%	24.6%	31.6%	19.6%
Households owned but not paid off	17.1%	12.0%	6.0%	15.4%	16.6%	7.0%
Rented	29.8%	42.2%	49.9%	37.6%	34.4%	51.3%
Occupied rent free	21.7%	20.8%	19.5%	22.4%	17.5%	22.1%
Household goods						
Radio	70.6%	66.2%	63.7%	69.2%	70.2%	57.4%
Television	81.8%	74.3%	70.7%	78.3%	151.0%	59.6%
Refrigerator	76.8%	63.5%	58.8%	68.1%	72.7%	47.5%
Computer	37.6%	20.8%	15.1%	26.0%	24.2%	11.2%
Cellphone	95.0%	91.5%	90.7%	92.4%	91.3%	90.6%
Landline	18.9%	12.7%	9.3%	16.3%	14.9%	5.5%
Internet[i]	51.4%	34.8%	28.8%	39.9%	39.2%	24.9%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	88.6%	81.7%	82.8%	85.9%	84.5%	64.3%
Cooking	84.2%	77.7%	75.9%	82.4%	81.2%	63.4%
Heating	73.5%	68.8%	66.8%	73.7%	65.8%	61.1%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	89.2%	83.2%	83.3%	87.2%	89.3%	64.9%
On communal stand	7.4%	14.8%	15.7%	9.8%	9.0%	34.3%
No access	3.4%	2.0%	1.0%	2.9%	1.8%	0.8%
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/ Private company	82.0%	79.5%	79.7%	81.5%	79.8%	73.0%
Communal/Own refuse dump	14.1%	16.3%	15.5%	14.3%	15.5%	24.2%
No refuse disposal	3.3%	3.6%	4.5%	3.5%	4.0%	2.0%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	79.4%	82.3%	83.7%	86.9%	85.1%	63.4%
Pit latrine	17.4%	13.4%	13.9%	7.2%	12.8%	31.3%
Bucket toilet	1.0%	1.8%	0.4%	3.2%	0.6%	1.4%
No Toilet	1.3%	1.7%	1.0%	2.0%	1.1%	2.6%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	8.3%	8.0%	8.3%	8.2%	7.2%	8.2%
Old age pension	2.8%	2.9%	1.9%	2.9%	4.1%	1.6%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	488.0	N/A[n]	16.4	49.4	21.9	N/A[n]
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	114.0	0.9	14.0	72.6	17.5	2.4
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	8.3	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	0.0	4.2	0.0

KwaZulu-Natal	*Amajuba District municipality*	*Dannhauser*	*eMadlangeni*	*Newcastle*	*eThekwini Metropolitan municipality*	*Ilembe District municipality*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	6 910	1 515	3 539	1 855	2 291	3 269
Share of country area (%)	0.6%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%
Main town	**N/A[n]**	**Dannhauser**	**Utrecht**	**Newcastle**	**Durban**	**N/A[n]**
***Population*[b]**	363 236	102 161	34 442	363 236	3 442 361	231 187
— African	93.1%	97.5%	92.7%	91.9%	73.8%	90.8%
— Coloured	0.7%	0.3%	1.3%	0.8%	2.5%	0.5%
— Indian	2.6%	1.4%	0.1%	3.2%	16.7%	5.9%
— White	3.4%	0.8%	5.7%	3.9%	6.6%	2.4%
***Age structure*[b]**						
0–14	33.7%	38.2%	35.9%	32.2%	25.2%	33.8%
15–64	61.7%	56.7%	59.1%	63.3%	70.0%	61.3%
65+	4.7%	5.0%	5.1%	4.5%	4.8%	5.0%
Households						
Number of households	110 963	20 439	6 252	84 272	956 713	157 692
Average household size	4.4	4.9	5.2	4.2	3.4	3.8
Poverty rate[c]	65.3%	72.0%	56.8%	56.4%	19.1%	69.0%
Settlement type						
Rural	N/A[n]	86.8%	98.0%	91.7%	35.5%	N/A[n]
Urban	N/A[n]	13.2%	2.0%	8.3%	64.5%	N/A[n]
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	8.0%	8.9%	15.0%	7.1%	4.2%	15.4%
– Some primary schooling	14.6%	20.1%	24.7%	12.4%	9.5%	16.0%
– Completed primary school	4.2%	5.4%	5.6%	3.8%	3.5%	4.8%
– Some secondary schooling	32.8%	36.3%	29.6%	32.2%	33.2%	31.1%
– Grade 12/Std 10	31.0%	25.5%	20.1%	33.2%	37.2%	26.8%
– Higher	9.5%	3.7%	5.1%	11.2%	12.4%	6.0%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	308 194	57 948	20 346	229 901	2 410 688	371 924
Participation rate (supply)[e]	41.9%	35.5%	45.4%	43.2%	57.2%	43.8%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	25.4%	18.6%	28.2%	26.9%	40.0%	30.3%
Employed	78 414	10 756	5 733	6 1926	963 552	112 715
***Employment by industry*[g]**						
Agriculture	4.0%	1.7%	6.3%	0.6%	1.2%	14.6%
Mining/quarrying	1.1%	0.7%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.4%
Manufacturing	20.3%	3.9%	3.3%	6.6%	7.8%	18.9%
Electricity/gas/water supply	1.0%	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%
Construction	4.3%	2.7%	1.8%	0.8%	2.8%	5.7%
Wholesale/retail trade	13.3%	2.6%	3.6%	4.2%	6.6%	12.6%
Transport/storage/communication	3.6%	1.0%	2.9%	0.9%	2.1%	2.3%
Financial/insurance/real estate	8.4%	2.1%	2.4%	2.5%	5.7%	8.7%
Community/social/personal services	19.7%	1.7%	7.8%	6.6%	6.9%	14.1%
Private households/other	24.5%	6.8%	13.6%	6.7%	8.5%	22.5%

KwaZulu-Natal	*Amajuba District municipality*	*Dannhauser*	*eMadlangeni*	*Newcastle*	*eThekwini Metropolitan municipality*	*Ilembe District municipality*
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	39.1%	47.6%	37.6%	37.4%	30.2%	30.6%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	50.3%	58.2%	46.4%	49.0%	39.0%	37.2%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	66 785	38 289	58 099	74 320	112 830	61 587
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	N/A[n]	17.0%	11.5%	18.0%	17.1%	N/A[n]
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	39.5%	34.5%	32.7%	24.7%	N/A[n]
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	23.4%	25.0%	18.6%	16.9%	N/A[n]
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	11.7%	14.0%	11.1%	13.4%	N/A[n]
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	4.9%	7.6%	8.5%	10.7%	N/A[n]
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	2.2%	4.1%	6.5%	8.6%	N/A[n]
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	1.1%	2.5%	3.3%	5.7%	N/A[n]
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.3%	0.8%	2.0%	N/A[n]
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.6%	N/A[n]
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	N/A[n]
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	88.2%	83.3%	58.8%	91.5%	80.0%	65.4%
Informal	4.6%	2.4%	2.4%	5.3%	15.8%	8.5%
Traditional	7.2%	14.3%	38.8%	3.1%	4.2%	26.0%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	41.7%	41.7%	30.3%	42.5%	21.8%	48.8%
Households owned but not paid off	10.2%	5.0%	13.3%	11.3%	17.6%	9.2%
Rented	22.2%	18.6%	20.9%	23.2%	32.4%	24.4%
Occupied rent free	25.9%	34.7%	35.5%	23.1%	28.2%	17.6%
Household goods						
Radio	72.4%	72.1%	74.7%	72.3%	71.8%	61.8%
Television	74.6%	69.7%	52.7%	77.4%	78.5%	58.0%
Refrigerator	69.2%	61.9%	39.5%	73.1%	74.2%	53.0%
Computer	14.6%	6.4%	11.2%	16.8%	24.6%	10.6%
Cellphone	90.0%	87.6%	85.9%	90.8%	90.7%	83.8%
Landline	11.6%	4.6%	7.3%	13.6%	26.9%	9.6%
Internet[i]	30.1%	20.4%	23.2%	32.9%	41.2%	27.6%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	83.8%	80.7%	48.5%	87.2%	89.9%	71.4%
Cooking	60.9%	37.7%	32.0%	68.7%	75.9%	53.0%
Heating	74.8%	52.1%	40.2%	82.8%	85.7%	65.1%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	75.9%	49.8%	38.5%	85.0%	80.7%	44.2%
On communal stand	16.4%	37.2%	20.2%	11.1%	16.5%	36.7%
No access	7.7%	13.1%	41.3%	3.9%	2.8%	19.1%

KwaZulu-Natal	*Amajuba District municipality*	*Dannhauser*	*eMadlangeni*	*Newcastle*	*eThekwini Metropolitan municipality*	*Ilembe District municipality*
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/ Private company	57.9%	11.8%	25.6%	71.4%	87.9%	36.4%
Communal/Own refuse dump	37.0%	80.3%	68.0%	24.1%	9.9%	55.4%
No refuse disposal	4.7%	7.5%	5.5%	3.9%	1.5%	7.1%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	54.3%	23.3%	45.3%	62.6%	75.7%	43.0%
Pit latrine	39.3%	72.0%	34.4%	31.7%	16.5%	46.8%
Bucket toilet	0.7%	0.2%	0.6%	0.8%	2.7%	1.4%
No Toilet	3.5%	3.0%	15.4%	2.7%	2.1%	5.8%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	17.9%	23.8%	19.6%	16.1%	10.1%	16.8%
Old age pension	4.7%	5.6%	4.2%	4.5%	3.9%	5.7%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	32.9	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	0.0	10.1
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	17.2	N/A[n]	0.1	14.6	782.5	30.9
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.2	0.0	0.0

KwaZulu-Natal	*KwaDukuza*	*Mandeni*	*Maphumulo*	*Ndwedwe*	*Sisonke District municipality*	*Greater Kokstad*	*Ingwe*
Demographics							
Size (km^2)	734	545	00 895	1 092	10 547	2 679	1 976
Share of country area (%)	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.9%	0.2%	0.2%
Main town	**Stanger**	**Mandeni**	**Maphumulo**	**Ndwedwe**	**N/A[n]**	**Kokstad**	**Creighton**
Population[b]	231 187	138 327	96 724	140 820	461 419	65 981	100 548
— African	78.8%	96.7%	99.7%	98.4%	96.7%	87.1%	98.7%
— Coloured	1.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.2%	1.6%	8.2%	0.2%
— Indian	14.1%	1.7%	0.1%	0.7%	0.3%	1.1%	0.1%
— White	5.6%	1.0%	0.1%	0.3%	1.2%	3.3%	0.8%
Age structure[b]							
0–14	29.0%	33.5%	40.6%	37.1%	37.9%	30.6%	39.8%
15–64	66.7%	62.6%	52.9%	56.9%	57.2%	66.7%	55.2%
65+	4.3%	3.9%	6.5%	6.0%	4.9%	2.7%	5.0%
Households							
Number of households	70 284	38 235	19 973	29 200	112 282	19 140	23 073
Average household size	3.2	3.5	4.8	4.7	3.8	3.1	4.2
Poverty rate[c]	43.0%	45.4%	75.6%	66.6%	74.5%	43.1%	90.5%
Settlement type							
Rural	76.9%	94.4%	100.0%	100.0%	N/A[n]	98.1%	91.8%
Urban	23.1%	5.6%	0.0%	100.0%	N/A[n]	1.9%	8.2%

KwaZulu-Natal	*KwaDukuza*	*Mandeni*	*Maphumulo*	*Ndwedwe*	*Sisonke District municipality*	*Greater Kokstad*	*Ingwe*
Education							
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds							
– No schooling	9.8%	10.2%	31.3%	22.3%	9.8%	4.1%	13.8%
– Some primary schooling	14.5%	15.4%	16.5%	19.3%	23.9%	14.6%	25.4%
– Completed primary school	5.0%	4.7%	3.8%	5.0%	6.8%	5.7%	7.0%
– Some secondary schooling	33.6%	34.1%	22.4%	28.3%	34.5%	36.4%	32.0%
– Grade 12/Std 10	28.5%	30.7%	21.9%	22.3%	19.3%	28.4%	17.8%
– Higher	8.7%	5.0%	3.9%	2.9%	5.8%	10.8%	4.0%
Employment							
Working-age population[d]	154 157	86 474	51 129	80 164	263 781	44 030	55 499
Participation rate (supply)[e]	58.2%	47.1%	20.7%	27.2%	34.1%	56.1%	30.0%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	43.6%	33.6%	10.5%	13.8%	21.4%	39.8%	17.8%
Employed	67 168	29 064	5 388	11 096	56 385	17 528	9 861
Employment by industry[g]							
Agriculture	7.3%	2.4%	1.2%	5.7%	14.0%	7.8%	3.2%
Mining/quarrying	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%
Manufacturing	7.7%	11.8%	0.6%	1.9%	10.9%	7.3%	4.2%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%
Construction	3.3%	0.8%	0.5%	1.8%	4.6%	3.3%	1.7%
Wholesale/retail trade	6.2%	5.5%	0.6%	2.0%	8.0%	7.2%	2.5%
Transport/storage/communication	0.9%	0.8%	0.9%	0.4%	2.2%	0.9%	1.3%
Financial/insurance/real estate	3.1%	5.5%	0.9%	0.8%	5.5%	4.7%	1.0%
Community/social/personal services	6.4%	3.0%	5.1%	2.8%	13.3%	10.8%	3.7%
Private households/other	10.6%	5.8%	2.4%	7.1%	41.0%	9.5%	20.6%
Unemployment							
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	25.0%	28.6%	49.0%	48.7%	36.0%	28.9%	39.3%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	30.9%	34.6%	58.4%	58.3%	44.4%	36.3%	48.5%
Income							
Average annual household income (R)	87 784	44 023	36 948	38 406	45 903	77 016	39 608
Monthly income (% of population)[b]							
No income	12.8%	13.3%	13.2%	13.1%	N/A[n]	15.8%	13.8%
R1–R1 600	32.2%	41.5%	46.5%	44.2%	N/A[n]	31.5%	46.2%
R1 601–R3 200	23.0%	22.8%	24.3%	25.4%	N/A[n]	19.5%	23.4%
R3 201–R6 400	13.4%	11.5%	8.4%	10.3%	N/A[n]	11.7%	8.3%
R6 401–R12 800	7.1%	5.6%	3.9%	3.5%	N/A[n]	10.0%	4.3%
R12 801–R25 600	5.3%	3.2%	2.1%	1.9%	N/A[n]	6.7%	2.3%
R25 601–R51 200	3.9%	1.6%	1.2%	1.2%	N/A[n]	3.4%	1.2%
R51 201–R102 400	1.6%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	N/A[n]	0.9%	0.2%
R102 401–R204 800	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	N/A[n]	0.3%	0.1%
R204 801 or more	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.1%

KwaZulu-Natal	*KwaDukuza*	*Mandeni*	*Maphumulo*	*Ndwedwe*	*Sisonke District municipality*	*Greater Kokstad*	*Ingwe*
Assets (%)[b]							
Dwelling occupied							
Formal	83.2%	59.1%	40.9%	48.8%	41.7%	84.2%	30.3%
Informal	11.4%	12.4%	0.9%	2.0%	3.8%	6.4%	0.7%
Traditional	5.5%	28.5%	58.1%	49.2%	54.5%	9.5%	69.0%
Households by tenure status							
Households owned and fully paid off	33.9%	48.5%	68.8%	71.1%	52.6%	27.9%	55.1%
Households owned but not paid off	9.2%	5.5%	13.4%	10.8%	9.0%	9.2%	9.6%
Rented	33.6%	34.0%	4.3%	4.3%	14.9%	35.1%	6.6%
Occupied rent free	23.4%	11.9%	13.5%	13.9%	23.5%	27.8%	28.8%
Household goods							
Radio	61.3%	64.3%	61.6%	59.9%	59.2%	59.4%	61.5%
Television	71.6%	61.9%	36.1%	35.4%	51.8%	67.4%	41.6%
Refrigerator	64.6%	60.4%	33.0%	29.1%	41.0%	57.3%	32.4%
Computer	17.2%	8.1%	3.1%	3.1%	5.6%	12.2%	3.5%
Cellphone	86.4%	88.4%	76.8%	76.4%	82.0%	86.6%	79.0%
Landline	16.3%	5.7%	2.9%	3.0%	4.1%	7.9%	3.2%
Internet[i]	31.1%	29.0%	18.8%	23.4%	19.7%	28.3%	15.8%
Household access levels							
Electricity							
Lighting	90.2%	82.5%	33.7%	37.3%	62.4%	80.7%	49.9%
Cooking	71.8%	59.6%	19.5%	22.1%	21.0%	35.6%	15.2%
Heating	85.0%	77.7%	24.4%	28.3%	37.1%	70.8%	21.0%
Piped (tap) Water							
Inside yard/dwelling	50.0%	54.3%	14.1%	37.4%	32.7%	74.8%	31.9%
On communal stand	44.2%	28.4%	32.3%	32.6%	32.5%	22.9%	26.4%
No access	5.8%	17.3%	53.6%	30.0%	34.8%	2.4%	41.7%
Refuse removal							
Removed by local authority/ Private company	63.4%	29.2%	2.9%	3.8%	21.9%	77.0%	5.8%
Communal/Own refuse dump	30.6%	63.9%	84.4%	83.8%	67.9%	15.2%	80.2%
No refuse disposal	5.4%	5.0%	11.8%	10.9%	8.7%	6.9%	11.5%
Sanitation							
Flush/chemical toilet	46.6%	52.0%	21.1%	37.5%	26.0%	71.2%	15.9%
Pit latrine	46.4%	39.7%	59.4%	48.3%	64.9%	23.2%	68.6%
Bucket toilet	1.1%	1.2%	3.2%	1.3%	0.9%	0.3%	0.4%
No Toilet	4.4%	3.7%	13.5%	6.8%	3.1%	3.3%	3.2%
Social security recipients[j]							
Child support grant	13.9%	17.0%	19.0%	18.1%	21.3%	12.4%	21.8%
Old age pension	3.9%	4.3%	7.5%	7.5%	5.8%	3.1%	5.8%
Municipal Finance							
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	0.0	0.0	35.3	42.5	N/A[n]
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	16.8	5.5	14.9	3.1	200.2	8.6	3.3
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.0	N/A[n]	0.0	N/A[n]	0.0	0.1	0.0

KwaZulu-Natal	*Kwa Sani*	*Ubuhlebezwe*	*uMzimkhulu*	*Ugu District municipality*	*Ezinqoleni*	*Hibiscus Coast*	*Umdoni*
Demographics							
Size (km^2)	1 851	1 604	2 435	5 046	648	839	251
Share of country area (%)	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%
Main town	**Underberg**	**Ixopo**	**uMzimkhulu**	**N/A[n]**	**Izigolweni**	**Port Shepston**	**Scottburgh**
Population[b]	12 898	101 691	180 302	722 484	52 540	256 135	78 875
— African	87.9%	97.5%	99.3%	90.6%	98.7%	82.4%	76.7%
— Coloured	0.9%	1.2%	0.3%	0.8%	0.2%	1.4%	1.2%
— Indian	0.4%	0.4%	0.1%	3.4%	0.2%	5.1%	13.3%
— White	10.5%	0.8%	0.1%	4.9%	0.8%	10.8%	8.5%
Age structure[b]							
0–14	24.2%	37.4%	40.8%	33.3%	37.6%	28.2%	26.8%
15–64	70.3%	57.4%	53.7%	60.1%	56.7%	64.6%	65.5%
65+	5.5%	5.3%	5.5%	6.6%	5.7%	7.2%	7.7%
Households							
Number of households	3 673	23 487	42 909	179 440	11 472	72 175	22 869
Average household size	2.0	4.1	4.1	3.9	4.3	3.4	3.2
Poverty rate[c]	88.4%	78.3%	76.2%	62.2%	75.6%	47.5%	43.4%
Settlement type							
Rural	83.9%	99.7%	99.6%	N/A[n]	100.0%	84.6%	47.5%
Urban	16.1%	0.3%	0.4%	N/A[n]	0.0%	15.4%	52.5%
Education							
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds							
– No schooling	7.6%	16.0%	6.5%	12.8%	14.2%	7.6%	8.7%
– Some primary schooling	21.4%	24.1%	27.5%	19.4%	26.2%	15.0%	15.2%
– Completed primary school	7.0%	6.1%	7.7%	4.9%	5.5%	4.3%	4.6%
– Some secondary schooling	34.0%	29.5%	38.1%	31.4%	33.4%	33.1%	32.2%
– Grade 12/Std 10	21.8%	20.0%	15.4%	24.1%	16.6%	28.8%	31.0%
– Higher	8.8%	4.3%	5.0%	7.3%	4.2%	11.2%	8.3%
Employment							
Working-age population[d]	9 068	58 351	96 833	434 080	29 787	165 344	51 658
Participation rate (supply)[e]	40.9%	30.6%	27.9%	40.3%	31.7%	52.7%	47.2%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	34.0%	19.6%	14.9%	26.0%	17.7%	37.8%	31.3%
Employed	3 081	11 453	14 461	112 751	5 274	62 504	16 144
Employment by industry[g]							
Agriculture	10.6%	8.1%	1.0%	14.6%	1.5%	4.2%	5.3%
Mining/quarrying	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%
Manufacturing	2.9%	3.2%	1.2%	14.4%	1.1%	6.1%	5.9%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.7%	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%
Construction	1.7%	1.8%	0.4%	6.7%	1.0%	2.7%	2.7%
Wholesale/retail trade	3.3%	2.0%	0.8%	14.3%	1.9%	6.2%	6.6%
Transport/storage/communication	2.4%	0.4%	0.1%	3.4%	1.3%	1.4%	1.4%
Financial/insurance/real estate	2.1%	1.5%	0.9%	8.2%	0.5%	3.4%	3.3%
Community/social/personal services	4.3%	2.9%	2.1%	16.0%	2.3%	5.8%	6.4%
Private households/other	17.3%	6.7%	8.0%	21.5%	1.9%	9.8%	7.3%

KwaZulu-Natal	*Kwa Sani*	*Ubuhle-bezwe*	*uMzi-mkhulu*	*Ugu District municipality*	*Ezinqoleni*	*Hibiscus Coast*	*Umdoni*
Unemployment							
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	16.0%	34.0%	46.6%	35.2%	41.6%	28.0%	33.3%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	20.5%	42.1%	56.8%	45.1%	51.9%	37.3%	43.3%
Income							
Average annual household income (R)	92 849	41 051	34 198	61 337	34 766	86 383	73 147
Monthly income (% of population)[b]							
No income	12.3%	16.6%	15.6%	N/A[n]	11.7%	13.3%	16.8%
R1–R1 600	34.3%	43.8%	48.2%	N/A[n]	45.2%	30.7%	32.7%
R1 601–R3 200	22.9%	21.9%	21.9%	N/A[n]	26.3%	19.8%	18.0%
R3 201–R6 400	12.7%	8.7%	7.1%	N/A[n]	9.1%	13.4%	12.2%
R6 401–R12 800	8.3%	4.5%	3.8%	N/A[n]	4.6%	10.1%	9.4%
R12 801–R25 600	4.7%	2.6%	2.1%	N/A[n]	2.1%	7.3%	6.4%
R25 601–R51 200	2.6%	1.4%	1.0%	N/A[n]	0.8%	3.9%	3.3%
R51 201–R102 400	1.3%	0.2%	0.1%	N/A[n]	0.1%	1.0%	0.8%
R102 401–R204 800	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%
R204 801 or more	0.6%	0.1%	0.1%	N/A[n]	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%
Assets (%)[b]							
Dwelling occupied							
Formal	68.7%	30.5%	32.8%	65.6%	32.7%	84.5%	75.1%
Informal	9.2%	8.7%	1.1%	4.5%	1.4%	5.6%	12.7%
Traditional	22.1%	60.8%	66.1%	29.9%	65.9%	10.0%	12.2%
Households by tenure status							
Households owned and fully paid off	27.1%	56.9%	62.2%	57.7%	84.2%	49.9%	47.0%
Households owned but not paid off	12.4%	10.1%	7.7%	9.6%	2.3%	10.8%	12.3%
Rented	35.7%	14.3%	8.8%	16.6%	6.8%	25.4%	24.7%
Occupied rent free	24.8%	18.6%	21.2%	16.2%	6.6%	13.9%	16.1%
Household goods							
Radio	58.2%	58.0%	58.6%	62.9%	66.2%	68.4%	63.8%
Television	53.9%	46.4%	53.2%	60.8%	64.9%	72.1%	65.6%
Refrigerator	44.1%	38.2%	39.5%	54.6%	56.0%	67.0%	62.0%
Computer	17.2%	5.8%	2.7%	12.4%	4.1%	20.6%	18.5%
Cellphone	89.5%	79.8%	82.2%	82.7%	82.7%	87.3%	85.1%
Landline	14.7%	4.3%	1.9%	13.0%	3.4%	20.9%	22.7%
Internet[i]	32.5%	18.1%	17.7%	27.8%	20.9%	35.8%	32.6%
Household access levels							
Electricity							
Lighting	75.4%	53.9%	64.5%	71.9%	79.9%	85.6%	76.3%
Cooking	35.0%	19.8%	17.1%	44.7%	36.0%	62.4%	59.1%
Heating	54.0%	27.8%	34.4%	57.8%	62.6%	76.2%	68.7%
Piped (tap) Water							
Inside yard/dwelling	76.7%	21.2%	16.9%	34.4%	41.5%	5.5%	159.7%
On communal stand	6.9%	44.4%	35.6%	49.0%	124.5%	19.8%	144.0%
No access	16.4%	34.4%	47.5%	16.6%	140.5%	4.6%	11.9%

KwaZulu-Natal	*Kwa Sani*	*Ubuhle-bezwe*	*uMzi-mkhulu*	*Ugu District municipality*	*Ezinqoleni*	*Hibiscus Coast*	*Umdoni*
Refuse removal							
Removed by local authority/Private company	46.2%	13.0%	8.9%	25.9%	6.5%	5.4%	126.6%
Communal/Own refuse dump	49.6%	75.3%	82.2%	67.4%	259.4%	23.0%	176.2%
No refuse disposal	2.9%	9.8%	7.9%	5.8%	39.2%	1.2%	10.5%
Sanitation							
Flush/chemical toilet	54.1%	21.3%	11.4%	34.1%	7.2%	48.9%	50.2%
Pit latrine	33.4%	70.4%	81.1%	53.0%	84.1%	39.5%	31.3%
Bucket toilet	8.5%	1.9%	0.4%	1.7%	0.1%	0.8%	6.6%
No Toilet	1.6%	3.0%	3.2%	4.7%	5.9%	5.2%	2.3%
Social security recipients[j]							
Child support grant	15.0%	18.0%	24.3%	18.9%	18.7%	15.4%	15.9%
Old age pension	4.5%	5.9%	6.3%	6.4%	6.6%	4.8%	4.6%
Municipal Finance							
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	0.9	N/A[n]	33.2	45.2	3.1	50.5	9.6
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	7.6	6.9	0.7	18.6	0.8	7.2	0.4
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.1	0.2	0.0	1.0	N/A[n]	0.0	N/A[n]

KwaZulu-Natal	*Umuzi-wabantu*	*Umzumbe*	*Vula-mehlo*	*uMgungundlovu District municipality*	*Impendle*	*Mkham-bathini*	*Mpofana*
Demographics							
Size (km^2)	1 089	1 258	959	9 512	1 528	890	1 819
Share of country area (%)	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Main town	**Harding**	**Umzumbe**	**Dududu**	**N/A[n]**	**Impendle**	**Camperdown**	**Mooi River**
Population[b]	96 556	160 975	77 403	1 017 763	33 105	63 142	38 103
— African	97.9%	99.6%	98.9%	84.7%	98.9%	94.8%	92.1%
— Coloured	1.1%	0.1%	0.2%	2.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.6%
— Indian	0.4%	0.1%	0.5%	6.7%	0.1%	1.0%	1.8%
— White	0.5%	0.1%	0.3%	6.3%	0.5%	3.7%	5.2%
Age structure[b]							
0–14	40.5%	37.1%	36.9%	28.3%	37.7%	31.7%	30.2%
15–64	54.5%	56.3%	56.9%	66.4%	55.8%	63.5%	65.7%
65+	5.0%	6.6%	6.2%	5.3%	6.5%	4.8%	4.2%
Households							
Number of households	21 619	35 171	16 135	272 666	8 203	14 964	10 452
Average household size	4.3	4.5	4.7	3.5	4.0	3.7	3.4
Poverty rate[c]	72.8%	74.8%	68.2%	45.5%	85.1%	53.4%	54.0%
Settlement type							
Rural	96.9%	100.0%	100.0%	N/A[n]	99.7%	95.9%	98.6%
Urban	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A[n]	0.3%	4.1%	1.4%
Education							
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds							
– No schooling	16.4%	17.3%	24.2%	8.5%	15.0%	18.6%	15.2%
– Some primary schooling	26.7%	23.2%	20.8%	13.3%	21.9%	18.8%	16.0%
– Completed primary school	6.3%	5.5%	4.8%	4.3%	5.9%	5.2%	4.9%

KwaZulu-Natal	*Umuzi-wabantu*	*Umzumbe*	*Vula-mehlo*	*uMgungundlovu District municipality*	*Impendle*	*Mkham-bathini*	*Mpofana*
Education (contd)							
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds							
– Some secondary schooling	30.4%	30.0%	27.0%	32.8%	31.4%	31.7%	32.5%
– Grade 12/Std 10	15.3%	20.2%	20.9%	30.1%	22.2%	20.6%	25.6%
– Higher	4.9%	3.8%	2.3%	11.0%	3.6%	5.0%	5.7%
Employment							
Working-age population[d]	52 634	90 601	44 058	675 561	18 482	40 074	25 024
Participation rate (supply)[e]	30.6%	28.5%	27.8%	50.9%	23.0%	40.9%	51.5%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	20.4%	13.6%	13.2%	35.3%	12.6%	28.9%	39.0%
Employed	10 745	12 282	5 803	238 307	2 329	11 568	9 752
Employment by industry[g]							
Agriculture	2.6%	5.5%	2.0%	11.4%	4.2%	10.1%	12.3%
Mining/quarrying	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
Manufacturing	3.8%	2.0%	0.9%	14.5%	1.2%	3.9%	5.0%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.7%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Construction	1.0%	1.3%	0.8%	5.2%	0.8%	1.9%	2.5%
Wholesale/retail trade	1.7%	2.3%	1.2%	10.7%	2.0%	1.5%	5.5%
Transport/storage/communication	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	3.4%	0.4%	0.8%	1.2%
Financial/insurance/real estate	1.7%	1.6%	0.8%	9.0%	1.3%	1.7%	2.6%
Community/social/personal services	4.1%	3.1%	1.9%	18.5%	2.4%	2.5%	5.5%
Private households/other	4.6%	2.5%	3.5%	26.1%	24.6%	5.6%	13.6%
Unemployment							
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	33.0%	51.9%	52.6%	30.4%	45.1%	26.8%	23.9%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	42.2%	62.6%	62.8%	39.5%	56.2%	34.1%	29.3%
Income							
Average annual household income (R)	41 837	35 538	34 153	92 986	38 569	52 659	60 433
Monthly income (% of population)[b]							
No income	13.0%	15.7%	13.7%	N/A[n]	18.0%	9.1%	11.3%
R1–R1 600	46.3%	44.6%	45.8%	N/A[n]	46.1%	45.2%	36.3%
R1 601–R3 200	23.4%	23.6%	25.1%	N/A[n]	19.3%	24.3%	25.9%
R3 201–R6 400	8.4%	8.7%	9.5%	N/A[n]	8.4%	10.6%	13.0%
R6 401–R12 800	4.0%	3.8%	3.2%	N/A[n]	4.1%	4.7%	6.9%
R12 801–R25 600	2.9%	2.2%	1.6%	N/A[n]	2.4%	3.2%	3.4%
R25 601–R51 200	1.6%	1.0%	0.8%	N/A[n]	1.2%	2.0%	2.2%
R51 201–R102 400	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.6%	0.5%
R102 401–R204 800	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
R204 801 or more	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%
Assets (%)[b]							
Dwelling occupied							
Formal	48.3%	48.0%	30.7%	71.5%	44.2%	49.7%	76.9%
Informal	2.3%	1.0%	0.8%	6.8%	0.2%	3.2%	2.2%
Traditional	49.4%	50.9%	68.5%	21.6%	55.6%	47.2%	20.9%
Households by tenure status							
Households owned and fully paid off	56.7%	74.5%	52.5%	41.5%	26.7%	23.5%	40.1%
Households owned but not paid off	10.9%	4.8%	14.2%	13.3%	10.2%	4.5%	5.9%
Rented	10.7%	5.6%	4.4%	23.7%	14.0%	18.8%	20.2%
Occupied rent free	21.7%	15.1%	28.8%	21.5%	49.1%	53.2%	33.8%

KwaZulu-Natal	*Umuziwabantu*	*Umzumbe*	*Vulamehlo*	*uMgungundlovu District municipality*	*Impendle*	*Mkhambathini*	*Mpofana*
Household goods							
Radio	56.9%	57.5%	54.6%	69.0%	64.0%	53.2%	69.8%
Television	60.3%	44.0%	37.5%	72.2%	60.1%	47.9%	60.1%
Refrigerator	45.9%	39.7%	31.9%	67.2%	60.4%	41.3%	46.9%
Computer	4.6%	3.4%	3.4%	19.2%	4.0%	7.8%	11.4%
Cellphone	83.1%	75.8%	73.5%	86.8%	81.9%	78.9%	88.4%
Landline	4.3%	3.5%	3.5%	17.8%	3.6%	5.1%	8.4%
Internet[i]	19.0%	18.6%	21.3%	35.3%	20.0%	20.7%	24.8%
Household access levels							
Electricity							
Lighting	80.3%	49.0%	36.9%	86.1%	83.6%	65.2%	71.9%
Cooking	27.6%	24.0%	19.2%	67.3%	31.3%	43.0%	45.6%
Heating	46.9%	33.2%	25.1%	77.6%	47.1%	51.9%	60.3%
Piped (tap) Water							
Inside yard/dwelling	55.9%	7.7%	10.2%	78.3%	53.7%	52.9%	74.4%
On communal stand	47.7%	22.5%	50.6%	12.8%	31.9%	13.5%	8.3%
No access	2.2%	15.7%	10.3%	8.9%	14.4%	33.7%	17.3%
Refuse removal							
Removed by local authority/Private company	56.7%	1.2%	1.6%	46.3%	4.8%	7.1%	50.6%
Communal/Own refuse dump	46.5%	38.2%	67.6%	47.3%	85.0%	81.5%	39.8%
No refuse disposal	0.0%	5.8%	1.8%	4.9%	8.5%	10.3%	8.9%
Sanitation							
Flush/chemical toilet	26.8%	11.7%	22.5%	54.3%	14.4%	20.6%	60.8%
Pit latrine	58.4%	75.4%	65.5%	38.6%	73.3%	68.0%	24.6%
Bucket toilet	0.8%	1.0%	3.2%	0.9%	1.2%	0.6%	0.6%
No Toilet	5.1%	4.7%	4.3%	3.1%	1.6%	7.4%	10.1%
Social security recipients[j]							
Child support grant	20.4%	23.6%	19.5%	12.4%	20.7%	13.3%	16.7%
Old age pension	6.5%	8.3%	8.2%	4.6%	6.3%	4.6%	3.1%
Municipal Finance							
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	8.7	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	2.2	7.4	10.7	0.2	0.7	1.3	N/A[n]
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	N/A[n]	0.0	N/A[n]	0.1	0.1	N/A[n]	0.0

KwaZulu-Natal	*Msunduzi*	*Richmond*	*Umngeni*	*uMshwathi*	*uMkhanyakude District municipality*	*The Big 5 False Bay*	*Hlabisa*
Demographics							
Size (km^2)	634	1 255	1 566	1 817	13 855	2 486	1 555
Share of country area (%)	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	1.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Main town	**Pietermaritzburg**	**Richmond**	**Howick**	**Wartburg**	**N/A[n]**	**Hluhluwe**	**Hlabisa**

KwaZulu-Natal	*Msunduzi*	*Richmond*	*Umngeni*	*uMshwathi*	*uMkhanyakude District municipality*	*The Big 5 False Bay*	*Hlabisa*
Demographics (contd)							
Population[b]	618 536	65 793	92 710	106 374	625 846	35 258	71 925
— African	81.1%	95.2%	75.0%	95.1%	98.8%	95.8%	99.4%
— Coloured	2.9%	0.9%	1.5%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%
— Indian	9.8%	1.1%	3.8%	1.7%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
— White	6.0%	2.6%	19.4%	2.7%	0.7%	3.2%	0.1%
Age structure[b]							
0–14	26.6%	33.5%	24.3%	32.8%	40.3%	37.5%	41.4%
15–64	68.4%	61.7%	67.4%	62.0%	55.3%	58.1%	53.8%
65+	5.0%	4.7%	8.3%	5.2%	4.5%	4.4%	4.8%
Households							
Number of households	163 993	16 440	30 490	28 124	128 195	7 998	12 586
Average household size	3.6	3.8	2.8	3.7	4.7	3.8	5.4
Poverty rate[c]	43.1%	50.8%	17.1%	58.0%	64.0%	58.8%	60.5%
Settlement type							
Rural	50.6%	96.8%	95.5%	96.9%	N/A[n]	100.0%	99.6%
Urban	49.4%	3.2%	4.6%	3.1%	N/A[n]	0.0%	0.4%
Education							
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds							
– No schooling	5.5%	16.1%	6.4%	15.7%	25.3%	26.1%	21.9%
– Some primary schooling	10.6%	20.2%	12.3%	20.8%	15.1%	14.9%	16.8%
– Completed primary school	3.7%	5.6%	4.4%	5.7%	4.2%	3.9%	4.8%
– Some secondary schooling	33.3%	32.1%	32.1%	31.8%	25.0%	25.7%	26.8%
– Grade 12/Std 10	33.8%	21.7%	29.2%	21.3%	25.5%	24.4%	26.6%
– Higher	13.1%	4.3%	15.6%	4.7%	4.9%	5.0%	3.2%
Employment							
Working-age population[d]	422 936	40 609	62 467	65 970	345 865	20 497	38 711
Participation rate (supply)[e]	53.3%	43.5%	62.2%	42.6%	29.0%	31.8%	28.3%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	35.7%	31.8%	47.6%	32.0%	16.5%	23.3%	13.1%
Employed	150 887	12 930	29 727	21 114	56 900	4 773	5 060
Employment by industry[g]							
Agriculture	1.5%	8.8%	9.9%	10.5%	10.3%	5.1%	0.6%
Mining/quarrying	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.6%	0.1%	0.3%
Manufacturing	6.0%	4.9%	6.7%	5.0%	8.1%	3.0%	0.5%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%
Construction	1.8%	1.3%	4.0%	2.0%	3.9%	0.9%	0.4%
Wholesale/retail trade	4.5%	2.5%	6.4%	2.4%	11.2%	7.1%	0.9%
Transport/storage/communication	1.6%	0.4%	1.1%	0.9%	1.7%	0.4%	0.2%
Financial/insurance/real estate	4.0%	2.9%	4.0%	1.8%	4.4%	0.8%	0.4%
Community/social/personal services	8.3%	4.7%	8.5%	4.9%	15.9%	4.2%	2.2%
Private households/other	9.5%	16.8%	13.0%	4.3%	43.8%	10.2%	9.6%
Unemployment							
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	33.0%	26.3%	23.9%	24.9%	42.8%	26.5%	52.6%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	43.1%	33.2%	32.0%	31.5%	51.2%	31.6%	61.9%
Income							
Average annual household income (R)	108 926	45 925	117 881	50 058	47 201	57 218	47 263

KwaZulu-Natal	*Msunduzi*	*Richmond*	*Umngeni*	*uMshwathi*	*uMkhanyakude District municipality*	*The Big 5 False Bay*	*Hlabisa*
Monthly income (% of population)[b]							
No income	16.1%	11.1%	12.8%	9.9%	N/A[n]	12.4%	12.3%
R1–R1 600	27.6%	44.9%	26.3%	42.5%	N/A[n]	44.4%	39.2%
R1 601–R3 200	16.5%	23.5%	20.4%	26.2%	N/A[n]	22.9%	24.7%
R3 201–R6 400	12.6%	10.4%	13.4%	11.8%	N/A[n]	8.5%	12.9%
R6 401–R12 800	10.3%	4.6%	10.2%	4.6%	N/A[n]	6.3%	6.0%
R12 801–R25 600	8.8%	3.0%	7.8%	2.7%	N/A[n]	3.4%	3.1%
R25 601–R51 200	5.7%	1.9%	5.8%	1.7%	N/A[n]	1.4%	1.4%
R51 201–R102 400	1.8%	0.3%	2.4%	0.4%	N/A[n]	0.3%	0.2%
R102 401–R204 800	0.5%	0.1%	0.6%	0.1%	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.1%
R204 801 or more	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	N/A[n]	0.4%	0.1%
Assets (%)[b]							
Dwelling occupied							
Formal	74.9%	55.0%	86.5%	63.2%	72.5%	81.0%	66.5%
Informal	8.4%	2.7%	9.0%	3.7%	1.6%	1.2%	0.8%
Traditional	16.7%	42.3%	4.5%	33.1%	25.9%	17.7%	32.7%
Households by tenure status							
Households owned and fully paid off	44.8%	38.2%	38.5%	41.4%	39.1%	17.0%	28.6%
Households owned but not paid off	15.2%	9.8%	10.8%	15.1%	10.8%	14.2%	14.8%
Rented	26.8%	18.7%	25.1%	13.5%	12.1%	24.5%	8.3%
Occupied rent free	13.2%	33.3%	25.7%	30.0%	38.0%	44.2%	48.3%
Household goods							
Radio	73.0%	55.2%	70.8%	61.7%	67.7%	68.2%	68.8%
Television	80.6%	57.4%	71.3%	53.5%	43.2%	39.9%	45.5%
Refrigerator	76.6%	49.3%	66.4%	47.0%	40.6%	38.4%	48.2%
Computer	23.2%	7.9%	27.2%	7.0%	5.3%	6.9%	3.5%
Cellphone	89.3%	81.7%	88.2%	79.1%	86.3%	87.2%	88.6%
Landline	21.8%	5.1%	26.8%	6.0%	3.3%	3.8%	3.2%
Internet[i]	38.2%	19.4%	39.8%	38.7%	25.4%	29.1%	28.6%
Household access levels							
Electricity							
Lighting	91.9%	81.5%	85.5%	72.7%	38.4%	42.6%	55.4%
Cooking	79.3%	47.1%	66.6%	40.9%	25.8%	30.1%	28.4%
Heating	88.1%	61.1%	76.1%	56.9%	32.0%	37.6%	37.3%
Piped (tap) Water							
Inside yard/dwelling	86.6%	44.1%	86.6%	63.3%	37.0%	43.5%	34.3%
On communal stand	9.5%	38.9%	8.5%	16.9%	24.9%	52.5%	9.5%
No access	3.9%	16.9%	4.9%	19.8%	38.2%	4.0%	56.2%
Refuse removal							
Removed by local authority/ Private company	54.9%	17.1%	69.9%	19.8%	10.5%	24.7%	7.6%
Communal/Own refuse dump	39.3%	74.8%	25.7%	74.8%	75.0%	63.7%	73.6%
No refuse disposal	4.2%	6.8%	3.2%	4.5%	12.5%	9.9%	17.7%
Sanitation							
Flush/chemical toilet	60.2%	38.7%	75.1%	33.8%	29.3%	39.0%	34.7%
Pit latrine	34.1%	53.4%	19.8%	55.9%	45.3%	45.4%	54.8%

KwaZulu-Natal	*Msunduzi*	*Richmond*	*Umngeni*	*uMshwathi*	*uMkhanyakude District municipality*	*The Big 5 False Bay*	*Hlabisa*
Sanitation (contd)							
Bucket toilet	1.0%	0.5%	0.9%	0.6%	1.2%	0.9%	1.8%
No Toilet	2.0%	3.0%	1.6%	6.3%	18.4%	13.2%	7.1%
Social security recipients[j]							
Child support grant	10.7%	18.4%	8.7%	17.0%	23.6%	20.6%	23.8%
Old age pension	4.5%	4.3%	4.3%	4.9%	5.3%	4.4%	7.4%
Municipal Finance							
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	21.1	0.0	0.0	N/A[n]	30.2	5.1	7.1
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	27.5	N/A[n]	3.6	0.4	27.9	0.9	19.1
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.9	0.0	0.3	N/A[n]	0.2	0.5	0.3

KwaZulu-Natal	*Jozini*	*Mtubatuba*	*Umhlabuyalingana*	*Umzinyathi District municipality*	*Endumeni*	*Msinga*	*Nquthu/ Nqutu*
Demographics							
Size (km^2)	3 442	1 969	4 401	8 589	1 610	2 501	1 962
Share of country area (%)	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.7%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%
Main town	**Jozini**	**Mtubatuba**	**Kwangwanase**	**N/A[n]**	**Dundee**	**Pomeroy**	**Nquthu**
Population[b]	186 502	175 425	156 736	510 838	64 862	177 577	165 307
— African	99.2%	98.1%	99.3%	96.6%	83.9%	99.6%	99.7%
— Coloured	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.5%	2.6%	0.1%	0.1%
— Indian	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%	1.3%	5.9%	0.1%	0.1%
— White	0.3%	1.1%	0.3%	1.4%	7.2%	0.2%	0.1%
Age structure[b]							
0–14	41.3%	39.4%	40.2%	40.2%	31.4%	43.7%	42.4%
15–64	54.8%	56.2%	54.8%	54.6%	63.8%	50.8%	52.5%
65+	3.9%	4.4%	5.1%	5.2%	4.8%	5.5%	5.1%
Households							
Number of households	38 849	34 905	33 857	113 469	16 851	37 724	31 612
Average household size	4.7	4.8	4.5	4.4	3.7	4.6	5.1
Poverty rate[c]	75.7%	49.6%	74.6%	75.0%	48.3%	76.8%	80.9%
Settlement type							
Rural	100.0%	99.6%	100.0%	N/A[n]	95.4%	100.0%	100.0%
Urban	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	N/A[n]	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Education							
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds							
– No schooling	27.4%	19.9%	30.5%	25.7%	7.0%	41.2%	18.2%
– Some primary schooling	14.2%	15.0%	15.7%	17.6%	14.4%	15.9%	22.1%
– Completed primary school	4.1%	4.1%	4.2%	4.6%	4.1%	4.0%	5.5%
– Some secondary schooling	24.0%	26.9%	22.8%	25.7%	31.9%	18.7%	30.1%
– Grade 12/Std 10	25.2%	28.4%	22.2%	21.6%	31.9%	17.0%	20.3%
– Higher	5.1%	5.7%	4.5%	4.9%	10.7%	3.2%	3.8%
Employment							
Working-age population[d]	102 223	98 564	85 872	279 066	41 360	90 231	86 742
Participation rate (supply)[e]	27.7%	32.8%	25.9%	28.2%	49.6%	18.8%	20.2%

KwaZulu-Natal	*Jozini*	*Mtubatuba*	*Umhlabuyalingana*	*Umzinyathi District municipality*	*Endumeni*	*Msinga*	*Nquthu/ Nqutu*
Employment (contd)							
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	15.5%	19.8%	13.6%	17.8%	36.5%	9.5%	11.1%
Employed	15 814	19 548	11 705	49 737	15 078	8 556	9 587
Employment by industry[g]							
Agriculture	2.5%	9.2%	4.2%	16.4%	6.0%	0.9%	2.4%
Mining/quarrying	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.9%	1.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Manufacturing	1.8%	7.1%	3.9%	10.7%	5.0%	0.7%	1.5%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.6%	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%
Construction	0.9%	2.8%	2.1%	4.6%	4.0%	0.8%	0.4%
Wholesale/retail trade	4.0%	7.7%	3.2%	11.6%	5.1%	0.8%	2.1%
Transport/storage/communication	0.9%	1.4%	0.2%	2.5%	1.4%	0.5%	0.3%
Financial/insurance/real estate	1.4%	2.5%	1.9%	5.3%	2.3%	0.4%	0.9%
Community/social/personal services	5.7%	11.3%	4.9%	20.0%	8.8%	3.1%	3.5%
Private households/other	14.8%	15.5%	16.7%	27.2%	7.7%	9.4%	3.4%
Unemployment							
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	44.1%	39.0%	47.1%	36.6%	26.4%	49.5%	44.4%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	52.7%	46.9%	56.5%	45.6%	36.2%	58.2%	53.3%
Income							
Average annual household income (R)	47 018	55 920	36 164	46 637	87 430	35 939	35 104
Monthly income (% of population)[b]							
No income	15.4%	13.5%	13.9%	N/A[n]	12.4%	11.8%	12.4%
R1–R1 600	45.1%	38.8%	50.5%	N/A[n]	31.5%	52.5%	43.2%
R1 601–R3 200	19.1%	23.0%	18.9%	N/A[n]	18.7%	22.4%	27.8%
R3 201–R6 400	8.4%	11.1%	7.8%	N/A[n]	13.5%	6.6%	9.8%
R6 401–R12 800	6.6%	6.3%	5.1%	N/A[n]	10.2%	3.4%	4.0%
R12 801–R25 600	3.4%	4.4%	2.7%	N/A[n]	8.0%	1.9%	1.9%
R25 601–R51 200	1.4%	2.2%	0.9%	N/A[n]	4.2%	0.9%	0.8%
R51 201–R102 400	0.3%	0.4%	0.2%	N/A[n]	1.0%	0.1%	0.1%
R102 401–R204 800	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
R204 801 or more	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
Assets (%)[b]							
Dwelling occupied							
Formal	77.4%	81.1%	58.2%	54.5%	87.8%	32.7%	63.5%
Informal	1.0%	4.0%	0.4%	2.4%	5.3%	0.4%	0.6%
Traditional	21.6%	14.9%	41.4%	43.1%	6.9%	67.0%	35.9%
Households by tenure status							
Households owned and fully paid off	34.1%	49.7%	36.8%	52.2%	47.4%	61.3%	43.0%
Households owned but not paid off	6.5%	14.7%	10.5%	9.1%	9.7%	10.5%	8.0%
Rented	13.7%	12.0%	9.5%	12.1%	32.6%	5.1%	4.7%
Occupied rent free	45.7%	23.5%	43.2%	26.6%	10.4%	23.1%	44.3%
Household goods							
Radio	69.4%	66.4%	66.5%	66.7%	74.0%	62.9%	72.2%
Television	39.8%	54.5%	35.2%	45.1%	71.6%	27.6%	51.0%
Refrigerator	35.3%	56.4%	28.2%	38.3%	63.7%	22.7%	41.5%
Computer	4.1%	8.4%	3.9%	6.2%	17.9%	2.6%	3.4%

KwaZulu-Natal	*Jozini*	*Mtubatuba*	*Umhlabuyalingana*	*Umzinyathi District municipality*	*Endumeni*	*Msinga*	*Nquthu/ Nqutu*
Household goods							
Cellphone	85.7%	88.6%	83.6%	81.2%	88.9%	75.4%	86.9%
Landline	2.2%	5.6%	1.9%	5.4%	16.9%	2.3%	2.0%
Internet[i]	22.6%	30.0%	22.1%	19.3%	29.0%	13.4%	19.0%
Household access levels							
Electricity							
Lighting	29.1%	65.1%	14.2%	48.9%	79.1%	25.1%	53.0%
Cooking	23.2%	43.2%	9.0%	26.5%	53.7%	12.7%	18.9%
Heating	25.6%	55.5%	11.9%	36.7%	67.8%	13.8%	40.9%
Piped (tap) Water							
Inside yard/dwelling	30.3%	50.7%	29.9%	34.4%	83.4%	11.9%	32.0%
On communal stand	27.9%	18.2%	27.4%	31.5%	9.0%	33.7%	46.5%
No access	41.7%	31.0%	42.7%	34.1%	7.6%	54.4%	21.5%
Refuse removal							
Removed by local authority/ Private company	11.9%	14.7%	2.3%	21.3%	77.6%	2.0%	9.1%
Communal/Own refuse dump	70.6%	71.9%	86.2%	63.5%	18.8%	74.0%	82.9%
No refuse disposal	15.7%	9.9%	10.1%	13.6%	2.9%	21.8%	6.6%
Sanitation							
Flush/chemical toilet	32.4%	29.1%	21.9%	27.5%	80.8%	10.8%	8.1%
Pit latrine	38.8%	38.7%	55.9%	55.2%	13.2%	61.5%	77.9%
Bucket toilet	1.4%	0.8%	1.4%	0.7%	0.2%	0.5%	1.0%
No Toilet	23.1%	18.5%	18.4%	13.0%	4.1%	23.4%	8.7%
Social security recipients[j]							
Child support grant	25.0%	18.6%	23.9%	24.9%	16.6%	29.7%	25.8%
Old age pension	4.0%	2.3%	6.2%	5.9%	2.5%	7.7%	5.5%
Municipal Finance							
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	1.3	13.9	1.6	N/A[n]	7.3	8.5	0.4
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	44.9	15.3	4.3	2.0	3.3	0.1	3.1
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	N/A[n]	0.5	0.3	0.4	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	0.0

KwaZulu-Natal	*Umvotu*	*uThukela District municipality*	*Emnambithi-Ladysmith*	*Imbabazane*	*Indaka*	*Okhahlamba*	*Umtshezi*
Demographics							
Size (km^2)	2 515	11 326	2 964	1 426	991	3 970	1 972
Share of country area (%)	0.2%	0.9%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%
Main town	**Greytown**	**N/A[n]**	**Ladysmith**	**Loskop**	**Indaka**	**Bergville**	**Estcourt**
Population[b]	103 093	668 848	237 437	113 073	103 116	132 068	83 153
— African	94.6%	95.1%	91.8%	99.5%	99.6%	97.1%	90.2%
— Coloured	0.8%	0.6%	1.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	1.4%
— Indian	2.2%	2.4%	4.4%	0.1%	0.2%	0.4%	5.8%
— White	2.2%	1.7%	2.7%	0.2%	0.1%	2.1%	2.3%

KwaZulu-Natal	*Umvotu*	*uThukela District municipality*	*Emnambithi-Ladysmith*	*Imbabazane*	*Indaka*	*Okhahlamba*	*Umtshezi*
Age structure[b]							
0–14	35.8%	36.8%	33.3%	37.5%	43.1%	39.2%	34.4%
15–64	58.9%	58.5%	62.2%	57.9%	51.6%	55.9%	61.5%
65+	5.3%	4.7%	4.5%	4.6%	5.3%	4.9%	4.2%
Households							
Number of households	27 282	1 472 860	58 058	22 365	20 035	27 576	19 252
Average household size	3.7	4.4	4.0	5.0	5.1	4.6	4.2
Poverty rate[c]	79.4%	66.2%	54.1%	76.8%	82.5%	70.7%	53.1%
Settlement type							
Rural	98.4%	N/A[n]	96.7%	100.0%	100.0%	96.9%	90.2%
Urban	1.7%	N/A[n]	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	9.8%
Education							
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds							
– No schooling	26.6%	14.0%	8.1%	15.5%	22.0%	17.2%	17.0%
– Some primary schooling	15.9%	16.5%	14.1%	17.5%	19.4%	20.2%	14.6%
– Completed primary school	4.5%	4.9%	4.6%	5.3%	5.5%	5.3%	4.5%
– Some secondary schooling	25.3%	31.5%	33.2%	32.1%	30.1%	29.8%	29.4%
– Grade 12/Std 10	22.8%	26.8%	31.0%	26.2%	20.5%	23.2%	26.8%
– Higher	4.8%	6.2%	9.0%	3.4%	2.4%	4.4%	7.8%
Employment							
Working-age population[d]	60 734	391 369	147 789	65 483	53 212	73 780	51 105
Participation rate (supply)[e]	39.2%	37.5%	48.3%	31.5%	19.0%	32.2%	41.1%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	27.2%	22.6%	31.8%	16.2%	8.1%	18.1%	26.0%
Employed	16 516	88 527	46 965	10 613	4 332	13 352	13 264
Employment by industry[g]							
Agriculture	8.8%	9.7%	2.4%	2.4%	0.3%	5.8%	3.7%
Mining/quarrying	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	5.3%
Manufacturing	5.1%	14.5%	5.4%	3.0%	1.0%	5.8%	1.5%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.3%	0.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%	0.3%	2.3%
Construction	0.9%	5.4%	1.4%	1.0%	0.6%	2.6%	3.4%
Wholesale/retail trade	4.9%	12.9%	4.6%	2.7%	1.2%	3.8%	2.0%
Transport/storage/communication	0.8%	3.6%	1.4%	0.8%	0.4%	1.1%	3.3%
Financial/insurance/real estate	2.4%	6.5%	2.7%	0.8%	0.6%	2.2%	2.6%
Community/social/personal services	6.7%	14.5%	5.3%	2.1%	2.2%	4.6%	12.3%
Private households/other	7.1%	32.0%	11.6%	5.3%	7.6%	7.5%	6.6%
Unemployment							
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	30.4%	39.6%	34.0%	48.6%	57.2%	43.4%	36.9%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	38.0%	49.3%	43.4%	58.6%	66.8%	52.3%	47.0%
Income							
Average annual household income (R)	49 695	56 316	70 561	39 062	34 599	44 522	72 937
Monthly income (% of population)[b]							
No income	12.3%	N/A[n]	14.8%	16.9%	15.0%	15.6%	12.8%
R1–R1 600	44.6%	N/A[n]	34.2%	43.7%	47.8%	44.3%	37.8%
R1 601–R3 200	23.5%	N/A[n]	19.9%	22.3%	243.0%	21.5%	19.5%
R3 201–R6 400	9.1%	N/A[n]	12.4%	9.5%	7.2%	9.2%	10.9%

KwaZulu-Natal	*Umvotu*	*uThukela District municipality*	*Emnambithi-Ladysmith*	*Imbabazane*	*Indaka*	*Okhahlamba*	*Umtshezi*
Monthly income (% of population)[b] (contd)							
R6 401–R12 800	5.1%	N/A[n]	8.5%	3.9%	3.2%	4.6%	8.5%
R12 801–R25 600	3.1%	N/A[n]	6.0%	2.1%	1.4%	2.8%	6.0%
R25 601–R51 200	1.6%	N/A[n]	3.2%	1.1%	0.7%	1.4%	3.3%
R51 201–R102 400	0.4%	N/A[n]	0.6%	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.6%
R102 401–R204 800	0.2%	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%
R204 801 or more	0.2%	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%
Assets (%)[b]							
Dwelling occupied							
Formal	53.9%	66.3%	80.9%	58.8%	61.2%	43.0%	69.5%
Informal	5.5%	1.4%	2.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	2.0%
Traditional	40.6%	32.3%	16.8%	40.7%	38.4%	56.6%	28.4%
Households by tenure status							
Households owned and fully paid off	53.2%	42.9%	39.9%	59.1%	42.4%	34.1%	46.0%
Households owned but not paid off	8.2%	9.8%	11.2%	8.0%	7.5%	9.0%	11.5%
Rented	17.9%	14.6%	20.4%	1.7%	7.0%	17.6%	15.5%
Occupied rent free	20.6%	32.7%	28.6%	31.2%	43.1%	39.3%	27.0%
Household goods							
Radio	61.2%	6.9%	72.0%	63.6%	66.6%	67.0%	69.7%
Television	46.1%	6.4%	72.1%	57.8%	53.5%	58.6%	65.3%
Refrigerator	40.5%	5.7%	66.0%	50.5%	48.5%	50.9%	57.6%
Computer	7.1%	0.9%	13.4%	3.6%	3.7%	6.4%	13.7%
Cellphone	77.9%	8.7%	89.0%	85.2%	82.5%	86.8%	85.2%
Landline	6.6%	0.7%	10.1%	3.0%	3.8%	3.7%	13.6%
Internet[i]	22.0%	2.9%	31.0%	27.5%	20.8%	28.7%	31.1%
Household access levels							
Electricity							
Lighting	58.3%	7.4%	82.1%	69.2%	58.2%	75.4%	73.2%
Cooking	37.3%	4.1%	55.5%	22.4%	28.0%	31.7%	45.6%
Heating	44.2%	5.7%	72.1%	35.0%	40.9%	48.2%	64.2%
Piped (tap) Water							
Inside yard/dwelling	37.8%	5.0%	68.0%	13.9%	56.1%	29.1%	62.4%
On communal stand	25.0%	3.0%	23.5%	60.6%	11.9%	38.5%	17.5%
No access	37.2%	2.0%	8.4%	25.5%	32.0%	32.3%	20.1%
Refuse removal							
Removed by local authority/ Private company	27.5%	3.4%	58.7%	2.1%	14.0%	10.4%	51.4%
Communal/Own refuse dump	54.0%	5.4%	33.7%	88.5%	60.6%	77.2%	35.7%
No refuse disposal	16.8%	1.1%	6.8%	8.0%	24.9%	11.2%	10.2%
Sanitation							
Flush/chemical toilet	40.2%	3.9%	59.8%	6.4%	16.6%	24.3%	57.4%
Pit latrine	46.2%	4.9%	34.5%	87.0%	59.0%	63.0%	19.9%
Bucket toilet	1.0%	0.1%	1.1%	1.5%	0.9%	0.8%	1.0%
No Toilet	9.1%	0.8%	2.9%	2.9%	18.9%	10.4%	17.5%

KwaZulu-Natal	*Umvotu*	*uThukela District municipality*	*Emnambithi-Ladysmith*	*Imbabazane*	*Indaka*	*Okhahlamba*	*Umtshezi*
Social security recipients[j]							
Child support grant	20.6%	22.6%	19.5%	24.2%	32.0%	20.9%	20.5%
Old age pension	5.4%	5.3%	5.1%	5.1%	7.3%	5.4%	4.0%
Municipal Finance							
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	N/A[n]	62.1	0.0	N/A[n]	1.2	0.4	N/A[n]
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	0.0	14.6	18.4	N/A[n]	15.9	22.7	0.0
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	N/A[n]	2.1	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	N/A[n]

KwaZulu-Natal	*uThungulu District municipality*	*Mfolozi*	*Mthonjaneni*	*Nkandla*	*Ntambanana*	*uMhlathuze*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	8 213	1 209	1 085	1 827	1 082	793
Share of country area (%)	0.7%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Main town	**[?]**	**KwaMbonambi**	**Melmoth**	**Nkandla**	**Ntambanana**	**Richards Bay**
Population[b]	907 519	122 889	47 818	114 416	74 336	334 459
— African	94.4%	98.8%	98.5%	99.6%	99.4%	87.7%
— Coloured	0.6%	0.2%	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	0.9%
— Indian	1.6%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	3.8%
— White	3.2%	0.8%	0.7%	0.1%	0.2%	7.3%
Age structure[b]						
0–14	34.8%	36.1%	38.3%	40.3%	39.2%	29.3%
15–64	60.7%	59.5%	56.9%	53.6%	55.8%	67.5%
65+	4.5%	4.4%	4.7%	6.1%	5.0%	3.2%
Households						
Number of households	202 976	25 584	10 433	22 463	12 826	86 609
Average household size	4.2	4.6	4.1	4.9	5.6	3.5
Poverty rate[c]	63.7%	55.8%	57.8%	72.8%	56.7%	60.1%
Settlement type						
Rural	N/A[n]	100.0%	98.8%	100.0%	100.0%	56.7%
Urban	N/A[n]	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	43.3%
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	16.1%	14.6%	23.3%	29.1%	21.3%	7.5%
– Some primary schooling	14.1%	16.1%	18.7%	17.2%	19.7%	9.3%
– Completed primary school	3.8%	4.1%	5.2%	4.2%	4.3%	3.0%
– Some secondary schooling	27.3%	31.9%	26.2%	23.5%	28.9%	26.9%
– Grade 12/Std 10	30.1%	30.3%	22.1%	21.2%	23.2%	38.7%
– Higher	8.6%	3.0%	4.5%	4.8%	2.6%	14.6%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	550 871	73 077	27 229	61 327	41 466	225 670
Participation rate (supply)[e]	39.5%	38.0%	34.5%	19.6%	30.8%	53.0%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	25.4%	22.0%	23.7%	10.8%	15.5%	36.3%
Employed	140 045	16 057	6 446	6 637	6 438	81 902

KwaZulu-Natal	*uThungulu District municipality*	*Mfolozi*	*Mthonjaneni*	*Nkandla*	*Ntambanana*	*uMhlathuze*
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	12.3%	4.0%	8.7%	0.4%	6.1%	3.0%
Mining/quarrying	1.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.0%	0.1%	1.0%
Manufacturing	13.2%	5.5%	1.2%	0.4%	1.6%	6.0%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.6%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%
Construction	6.2%	1.7%	1.0%	0.7%	2.3%	2.6%
Wholesale/retail trade	12.0%	3.3%	1.6%	0.6%	2.0%	5.4%
Transport/storage/communication	4.7%	1.4%	0.6%	0.2%	0.8%	2.0%
Financial/insurance/real estate	8.7%	1.5%	1.7%	0.8%	1.3%	4.3%
Community/social/personal services	16.9%	1.8%	3.8%	4.8%	2.0%	7.3%
Private households/other	23.5%	12.2%	4.2%	5.6%	8.7%	7.0%
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	34.7%	42.0%	28.5%	43.9%	49.2%	31.0%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	44.4%	50.4%	35.7%	53.5%	59.5%	40.8%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	80 054	46 130	44 783	39 679	56 483	121 177
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	N/A[n]	14.7%	12.3%	11.0%	11.7%	15.2%
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	38.4%	42.3%	41.9%	42.1%	25.8%
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	23.7%	23.7%	26.8%	27.4%	15.5%
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	12.6%	10.4%	10.4%	11.6%	12.0%
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	5.8%	5.3%	5.5%	4.0%	11.1%
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	2.8%	3.5%	2.7%	1.8%	10.1%
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	1.5%	1.9%	1.3%	1.1%	7.3%
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.3%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	2.2%
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.5%
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	70.6%	73.5%	55.0%	31.9%	53.3%	96.6%
Informal	2.4%	3.4%	3.0%	0.4%	0.9%	3.2%
Traditional	27.0%	23.2%	42.0%	67.7%	45.8%	0.1%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	40.2%	52.6%	29.2%	36.0%	39.2%	38.1%
Households owned but not paid off	13.9%	6.4%	8.9%	22.1%	9.9%	15.9%
Rented	21.8%	11.6%	20.7%	10.7%	4.2%	34.7%
Occupied rent free	24.1%	29.4%	41.2%	31.2%	46.8%	11.3%
Household goods						
Radio	65.7%	64.4%	58.4%	63.4%	61.3%	71.0%
Television	60.2%	61.7%	46.5%	38.1%	49.2%	75.4%
Refrigerator	60.1%	62.7%	42.6%	31.4%	52.5%	76.8%
Computer	13.5%	6.3%	4.7%	2.7%	2.8%	24.4%
Cellphone	88.7%	89.0%	78.5%	84.5%	86.3%	93.4%
Landline	8.7%	3.9%	3.9%	2.2%	2.2%	14.5%
Internet[i]	34.8%	28.5%	22.0%	22.8%	15.7%	48.0%

KwaZulu-Natal	*uThungulu District municipality*	*Mfolozi*	*Mthonjaneni*	*Nkandla*	*Ntambanana*	*uMhlathuze*
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	75.8%	83.7%	68.9%	44.6%	62.0%	93.5%
Cooking	52.8%	54.4%	26.5%	16.7%	28.4%	77.4%
Heating	63.3%	64.3%	48.4%	23.1%	41.1%	87.8%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	65.0%	55.4%	47.5%	49.9%	22.3%	92.4%
On communal stand	18.8%	27.7%	24.2%	17.1%	45.5%	4.7%
No access	16.2%	16.8%	28.3%	33.0%	32.2%	2.9%
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/Private company	31.2%	8.9%	29.6%	8.6%	3.2%	55.0%
Communal/Own refuse dump	56.2%	82.4%	59.0%	67.7%	85.6%	40.9%
No refuse disposal	10.9%	8.1%	7.2%	21.7%	9.7%	3.4%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	41.9%	21.7%	39.3%	27.5%	6.2%	64.4%
Pit latrine	39.9%	59.8%	41.8%	52.6%	62.9%	27.4%
Bucket toilet	1.8%	1.9%	0.5%	1.5%	2.1%	1.6%
No Toilet	11.5%	12.8%	10.7%	12.2%	24.3%	3.4%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	19.2%	18.4%	18.9%	23.9%	24.5%	14.5%
Old age pension	4.8%	4.8%	5.6%	6.6%	5.8%	3.2%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	N/A[n]	3.9	1.2	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	N/A[n]	9.8	N/A[n]	29.8	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	N/A[n]	2.8	N/A[n]	0.0	N/A[n]	N/A[n]

KwaZulu-Natal	*uMlalazi*	*Zululand District municipality*	*Abaqulusi*	*èDumbe*	*Nongoma*	*Ulundi*	*uPhongolo*
Demographics							
Size (km^2)	2 213	14 798	4 184	1 942	2 182	3 250	3 239
Share of country area (%)	0.2%	1.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%
Main town	**Eshowe**	**N/A[n]**	**Vryheid**	**Paulpietersburg**	**Nongoma**	**Ulundi**	**uPhongolo**
Population[b]	213 601	803 575	211 060	82 053	194 908	188 317	127 238
— African	97.1%	98.0%	95.4%	97.8%	99.5%	99.5%	98.1%
— Coloured	0.6%	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
— Indian	0.7%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
— White	1.5%	1.4%	3.5%	1.8%	0.1%	0.2%	1.5%
Age structure[b]							
0–14	37.2%	39.5%	40.0%	39.3%	42.0%	40.2%	36.7%
15–64	57.2%	55.8%	55.0%	56.4%	53.2%	55.2%	58.6%
65+	5.6%	4.7%	5.0%	4.3%	4.8%	4.6%	4.7%
Households							
Number of households	45 062	157 748	43 299	16 138	34 341	35 198	28 772
Average household size	4.5	4.9	4.6	5.0	5.5	5.1	4.3
Poverty rate[c]	71.8%	63.5%	34.5%	68.0%	71.6%	67.0%	84.0%

KwaZulu-Natal	*uMlalazi*	*Zululand District municipality*	*Abaqulusi*	*èDumbe*	*Nongoma*	*Ulundi*	*uPhongolo*
Settlement type							
Rural	98.5%	N/A[n]	93.0%	97.9%	99.6%	98.1%	99.3%
Urban	1.5%	N/A[n]	7.0%	2.1%	0.4%	1.9%	0.7%
Education							
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds							
– No schooling	22.6%	19.2%	16.9%	18.3%	20.5%	20.7%	20.0%
– Some primary schooling	17.2%	16.3%	15.2%	19.7%	17.3%	15.3%	16.0%
– Completed primary school	4.5%	4.4%	4.1%	5.0%	4.2%	4.1%	5.2%
– Some secondary schooling	27.0%	27.1%	29.0%	30.8%	25.3%	24.0%	28.5%
– Grade 12/Std 10	23.1%	27.5%	28.1%	22.2%	27.8%	30.0%	25.7%
– Higher	5.7%	5.5%	6.6%	4.1%	4.8%	5.9%	4.7%
Employment							
Working-age population[d]	122 103	448 330	45 153	71 752	103 673	103 979	123 773
Participation rate (supply)[e]	29.3%	30.9%	91.9%	21.2%	24.1%	27.9%	22.3%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	18.5%	18.1%	58.9%	13.2%	12.2%	14.1%	14.3%
Employed	22 566	80 996	26 596	9 455	12 659	14 617	17 668
Employment by industry[g]							
Agriculture	4.2%	12.7%	4.0%	4.1%	0.9%	1.2%	4.5%
Mining/quarrying	0.1%	2.9%	0.2%	0.1%	0.5%	1.7%	0.2%
Manufacturing	2.6%	9.7%	3.1%	2.2%	1.0%	1.9%	1.9%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.1%	0.6%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%
Construction	1.1%	5.8%	1.7%	0.5%	0.8%	1.0%	1.7%
Wholesale/retail trade	3.1%	13.4%	4.3%	2.8%	1.7%	2.8%	2.1%
Transport/storage/communication	1.4%	3.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%
Financial/insurance/real estate	1.8%	4.9%	1.7%	0.7%	0.5%	1.0%	0.9%
Community/social/personal services	4.3%	23.0%	4.8%	3.8%	3.0%	7.3%	5.1%
Private households/other	4.1%	24.0%	4.9%	5.0%	4.4%	2.9%	9.5%
Unemployment							
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	35.2%	41.1%	35.4%	37.7%	49.3%	49.4%	35.5%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	45.1%	51.2%	45.1%	45.4%	59.9%	61.8%	43.9%
Income							
Average annual household income (R)	49 096	53 400	62 278	45 411	47 171	55 804	48 984
Monthly income (% of population)[b]							
No income	12.6%	N/A[n]	14.7%	11.9%	10.5%	12.8%	13.7%
R1–R1 600	40.6%	N/A[n]	37.8%	44.7%	41.0%	36.4%	44.4%
R1 601–R3 200	23.8%	N/A[n]	20.9%	23.8%	27.0%	24.8%	21.8%
R3 201–R6 400	10.5%	N/A[n]	10.9%	10.2%	11.5%	11.9%	9.2%
R6 401–R12 800	5.6%	N/A[n]	7.2%	4.7%	5.6%	6.9%	5.5%
R12 801–R25 600	3.7%	N/A[n]	5.0%	2.6%	2.8%	4.5%	3.3%
R25 601–R51 200	2.3%	N/A[n]	2.6%	1.4%	1.1%	2.0%	1.4%
R51 201–R102 400	0.6%	N/A[n]	0.6%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%
R102 401–R204 800	0.2%	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%
R204 801 or more	0.1%	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%

KwaZulu-Natal	*uMlalazi*	*Zululand District municipality*	*Abaqulusi*	*èDumbe*	*Nongoma*	*Ulundi*	*uPhongolo*
Assets (%)[b]							
Dwelling occupied							
Formal	61.4%	73.6%	79.5%	74.2%	65.0%	65.6%	84.3%
Informal	1.9%	1.2%	2.2%	0.9%	0.6%	0.8%	1.2%
Traditional	36.7%	25.2%	18.3%	24.9%	34.4%	33.6%	14.5%
Households by tenure status							
Households owned and fully paid off	41.9%	52.5%	58.8%	54.8%	50.5%	46.6%	51.6%
Households owned but not paid off	12.6%	10.1%	10.6%	9.7%	13.9%	8.8%	6.5%
Rented	12.9%	13.9%	17.3%	11.5%	8.2%	12.3%	18.9%
Occupied rent free	32.6%	23.5%	13.3%	24.0%	27.4%	32.3%	23.0%
Household goods							
Radio	60.4%	68.9%	27.2%	110.8%	66.2%	67.6%	112.7%
Television	47.4%	57.9%	20.8%	96.4%	52.2%	60.1%	96.0%
Refrigerator	47.1%	55.7%	17.6%	92.0%	53.3%	63.8%	85.4%
Computer	7.4%	7.2%	2.2%	11.2%	4.0%	6.7%	17.0%
Cellphone	84.5%	87.6%	31.6%	153.7%	86.2%	89.1%	134.5%
Landline	6.3%	4.6%	1.5%	6.2%	2.4%	4.3%	11.3%
Internet[i]	27.3%	29.0%	10.8%	40.8%	30.8%	30.8%	45.1%
Household access levels							
Electricity							
Lighting	58.2%	6.4%	72.1%	62.8%	63.6%	73.4%	73.0%
Cooking	35.5%	2.8%	45.7%	26.9%	31.3%	49.7%	40.1%
Heating	45.5%	3.6%	62.0%	35.0%	46.3%	60.3%	58.0%
Piped (tap) Water							
Inside yard/dwelling	41.7%	53.2%	70.7%	64.4%	27.5%	52.6%	52.2%
On communal stand	32.7%	16.1%	12.8%	13.7%	18.6%	14.8%	21.1%
No access	25.6%	30.7%	16.6%	21.9%	53.9%	32.6%	26.6%
Refuse removal							
Removed by local authority/Private company	17.7%	23.9%	42.5%	22.4%	5.0%	20.5%	23.5%
Communal/Own refuse dump	56.0%	62.9%	49.1%	66.0%	76.3%	67.6%	60.3%
No refuse disposal	22.7%	11.3%	6.3%	10.4%	17.0%	10.7%	13.2%
Sanitation							
Flush/chemical toilet	28.1%	32.0%	48.9%	33.3%	15.7%	38.5%	17.0%
Pit latrine	39.1%	43.3%	33.8%	54.3%	47.8%	37.9%	52.8%
Bucket toilet	2.2%	1.0%	0.5%	0.3%	2.0%	1.2%	0.7%
No Toilet	22.6%	19.8%	12.7%	9.7%	29.1%	17.9%	27.5%
Social security recipients[j]							
Child support grant	22.5%	23.1%	21.0%	25.2%	23.0%	24.4%	24.1%
Old age pension	5.9%	5.3%	4.8%	5.6%	5.8%	5.9%	4.1%
Municipal Finance							
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	2.6	7.0	19.2	47.3	12.7	3.1	10.8
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	0.5	11.4	10.9	29.3	38.9	0.0	7.7
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.9	1.3

Limpopo	*Capricorn District municipality*	*Aganang*	*Blouberg*	*Lepele-Nkumpi*	*Molemole*	*Polokwane*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	21 705	1 880	9 248	3 463	3 347	3 765
Share of country area (%)	1.8%	0.2%	0.8%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
Main town	**N/A[n]**	**Matlala**	**Senwabarwana (Bochum)**	**Lebowakgomo**	**Mogwadi (Dendron)**	**Pietersburg**
***Population*[b]**	1 261 463	131 164	162 629	230 350	108 321	628 999
— African	96.1%	99.6%	99.0%	99.6%	98.4%	92.9%
— Coloured	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.9%
— Indian	0.4%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%
— White	2.8%	0.1%	0.6%	0.1%	1.1%	5.2%
***Age structure*[b]**						
0–14	33.6%	37.4%	39.0%	36.0%	35.6%	30.1%
15–64	59.9%	52.7%	53.7%	56.2%	56.9%	64.8%
65+	6.6%	10.0%	7.3%	7.8%	7.6%	5.1%
Households						
Number of households	342 838	33 918	41 192	59 682	30 043	178 001
Average household size	3.6	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.4
Poverty rate[c]	61.6%	72.1%	73.5%	65.5%	68.7%	51.8%
Settlement type						
Rural	N/A[n]	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	91.5%
Urban	N/A[n]	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.5%
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	13.2%	15.6%	28.3%	18.5%	20.3%	6.8%
– Some primary schooling	11.0%	16.4%	13.9%	11.3%	11.2%	9.3%
– Completed primary school	4.2%	6.0%	5.4%	3.9%	4.7%	3.6%
– Some secondary schooling	33.5%	34.0%	31.9%	32.9%	36.5%	33.4%
– Grade 12/Std 10	25.0%	21.4%	15.3%	22.3%	18.5%	29.6%
– Higher	13.2%	6.6%	5.2%	11.1%	8.9%	17.4%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	755 220	69 062	87 358	129 487	61 598	407 716
Participation rate (supply)[e]	46.8%	33.1%	29.2%	40.5%	42.9%	55.6%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	29.3%	16.4%	17.5%	20.9%	24.5%	37.4%
Employed	221 464	11 314	15 296	27 061	15 106	152 687
***Employment by industry*[g]**						
Agriculture	7.4%	1.8%	0.7%	1.0%	10.3%	1.5%
Mining/quarrying	1.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.8%	0.2%	0.2%
Manufacturing	11.6%	1.8%	0.4%	2.6%	2.4%	4.4%
Electricity/gas/water supply	1.5%	0.9%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.5%
Construction	6.2%	1.0%	0.2%	1.8%	1.9%	2.1%
Wholesale/retail trade	14.4%	3.7%	1.2%	2.7%	3.5%	5.2%
Transport/storage/communication	3.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.6%	1.0%	1.2%
Financial/insurance/real estate	9.4%	1.0%	0.6%	1.2%	1.9%	4.0%
Community/social/personal services	25.1%	5.3%	3.3%	6.5%	6.4%	8.2%
Private households/other	20.3%	4.0%	2.0%	3.2%	5.2%	7.6%

Limpopo	*Capricorn District municipality*	*Aganang*	*Blouberg*	*Lepele-Nkumpi*	*Molemole*	*Polokwane*
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	37.2%	50.4%	39.2%	48.1%	42.7%	32.4%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	47.4%	65.0%	47.2%	62.4%	52.5%	42.0%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	69 220	34 823	34 138	51 086	43 538	94 311
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	N/A[n]	13.2%	15.8%	15.4%	14.6%	13.8%
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	45.2%	47.1%	42.5%	45.6%	32.6%
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	25.2%	22.7%	21.1%	21.9%	19.7%
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	8.8%	6.8%	7.7%	7.8%	11.7%
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	4.2%	3.7%	5.9%	4.9%	8.1%
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	2.3%	2.6%	4.5%	3.3%	7.2%
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	0.8%	0.8%	2.2%	1.4%	4.6%
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%	0.3%	1.6%
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.4%
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	92.4%	96.8%	93.3%	94.7%	96.1%	89.9%
Informal	6.2%	2.7%	4.1%	2.8%	2.7%	9.1%
Traditional	1.5%	0.5%	2.5%	2.5%	1.3%	1.1%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	8.5%	4.2%	6.5%	6.3%	5.6%	10.5%
Households owned but not paid off	71.1%	90.8%	80.0%	85.1%	81.3%	61.2%
Rented	20.4%	4.9%	13.5%	8.6%	13.1%	28.3%
Occupied rent free	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Household goods						
Radio	63.9%	63.1%	52.5%	62.3%	64.0%	67.3%
Television	72.2%	78.1%	67.3%	74.4%	78.5%	70.4%
Refrigerator	68.6%	76.6%	64.0%	76.3%	72.7%	64.9%
Computer	15.2%	6.7%	5.9%	10.9%	9.9%	21.3%
Cellphone	88.8%	86.5%	81.7%	86.4%	87.3%	91.8%
Landline	5.1%	1.1%	1.4%	4.7%	3.2%	7.1%
Internet[i]	28.2%	15.1%	15.3%	22.3%	30.2%	35.3%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	87.4%	94.6%	88.0%	91.9%	95.7%	83.0%
Cooking	62.6%	53.8%	32.4%	59.5%	70.8%	70.9%
Heating	55.1%	42.5%	31.4%	55.2%	67.3%	60.8%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	62.2%	59.2%	44.9%	51.9%	56.3%	71.3%
On communal stand	27.0%	35.2%	37.7%	23.8%	22.0%	24.8%
No access	10.8%	5.6%	17.3%	24.3%	21.6%	3.9%

Limpopo	*Capricorn District municipality*	*Aganang*	*Blouberg*	*Lepele-Nkumpi*	*Molemole*	*Polokwane*
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/Private company	30.4%	0.9%	22.0%	21.1%	6.1%	45.2%
Communal/Own refuse dump	62.7%	88.9%	64.7%	69.2%	87.3%	51.0%
No refuse disposal	6.2%	9.9%	12.3%	9.1%	6.2%	3.2%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	29.1%	3.0%	9.0%	19.6%	16.2%	44.1%
Pit latrine	65.1%	90.7%	77.3%	76.0%	78.2%	51.5%
Bucket toilet	0.6%	0.9%	0.9%	0.2%	0.6%	0.6%
No Toilet	4.2%	5.0%	11.2%	3.0%	3.8%	2.8%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	21.6%	22.0%	28.8%	23.0%	23.8%	18.0%
Old age pension	7.6%	10.5%	8.7%	9.2%	8.2%	5.7%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	0.0	0.0	8.9	13.9	N/A[n]	140.4
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	26.8	20.1	26.7	42.5	N/A[n]	208.4
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	13.0	0.1	0.1	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	1.8

Limpopo	*Greater Sekhukhune District municipality*	*Elias Motsoaledi*	*Ephraim*	*Fetakgomo*	*Greater Tubatse*	*Makhudu-thamaga*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	13 527	3 713	2 011	1 104	4 601	2 096
Share of country area (%)	1.1%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%
Main town	**N/A[n]**	**Groblersdal**	**Marble Hall**	**Apek**	**Burgersfort**	**Sekhukhune**
Population[b]	1 076 840	249 363	123 648	93 795	335 676	274 358
— African	98.6%	97.9%	97.8%	99.4%	98.3%	99.7%
— Coloured	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%
— Indian	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
— White	1.0%	1.6%	1.6%	0.4%	1.3%	0.1%
Age structure[b]						
0–14	36.0%	36.1%	35.5%	35.4%	34.5%	38.1%
15–64	57.3%	56.8%	57.6%	56.5%	60.4%	53.9%
65+	6.7%	7.0%	6.9%	8.1%	5.1%	8.0%
Households						
Number of households	263 802	60 251	32 284	22 851	83 199	65 217
Average household size	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.1	3.9	4.2
Poverty rate[c]	69.0%	66.3%	57.0%	71.1%	70.2%	75.4%
Settlement type						
Rural	N/A[n]	84.8%	83.2%	100.0%	75.6%	100.0%
Urban	N/A[n]	15.2%	16.8%	0.0%	24.4%	0.0%
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	20.9%	24.2%	22.7%	24.3%	15.1%	23.4%
– Some primary schooling	11.4%	11.7%	13.9%	10.7%	10.0%	11.8%
– Completed primary school	4.0%	4.3%	5.4%	3.0%	3.8%	3.7%

Limpopo	*Greater Sekhukhune District municipality*	*Elias Motsoaledi*	*Ephraim*	*Fetakgomo*	*Greater Tubatse*	*Makhudu-thamaga*
Education (contd)						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– Some secondary schooling	36.5%	33.5%	34.0%	33.3%	41.8%	34.9%
– Grade 12/Std 10	21.0%	20.1%	18.8%	22.0%	22.6%	20.5%
– Higher	6.1%	6.2%	5.1%	6.6%	6.6%	5.7%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	616 525	141 694	71 170	52 973	202 724	147 965
Participation rate (supply)[e]	41.5%	37.7%	43.2%	41.8%	48.3%	35.1%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	20.1%	20.9%	25.1%	17.2%	23.8%	13.0%
Employed	124 065	29 669	17 876	9 111	48 154	19 254
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	6.5%	2.3%	2.6%	0.1%	1.0%	1.0%
Mining/quarrying	10.2%	0.1%	0.2%	4.0%	5.3%	0.1%
Manufacturing	6.6%	2.0%	2.2%	0.2%	1.5%	0.7%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.7%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Construction	5.5%	1.4%	1.4%	0.5%	1.0%	1.3%
Wholesale/retail trade	12.5%	4.1%	2.3%	1.0%	2.6%	2.2%
Transport/storage/communication	3.4%	1.2%	0.7%	0.1%	0.8%	0.4%
Financial/insurance/real estate	5.3%	1.9%	1.7%	0.0%	1.4%	0.2%
Community/social/personal services	17.0%	4.3%	5.2%	3.3%	2.9%	3.3%
Private households/other	32.4%	9.7%	5.7%	2.9%	7.0%	6.4%
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	50.9%	42.9%	41.4%	58.9%	50.3%	62.7%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	60.6%	52.7%	48.8%	70.5%	59.6%	74.0%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	45 977	44 354	41 398	47 755	54 546	38 109
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	N/A[n]	14.0%	15.5%	15.0%	15.7%	13.1%
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	42.9%	46.0%	39.5%	37.0%	47.3%
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	23.0%	22.3%	21.0%	17.7%	23.7%
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	9.6%	7.9%	11.1%	13.8%	7.2%
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	5.2%	4.1%	7.5%	8.8%	4.4%
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	3.4%	2.8%	4.0%	4.5%	2.9%
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	1.5%	1.0%	1.4%	1.9%	1.0%
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	89.3%	91.0%	93.8%	95.0%	84.0%	90.4%
Informal	6.8%	5.2%	3.8%	3.0%	11.4%	5.2%
Traditional	3.9%	3.8%	2.4%	2.0%	4.6%	4.3%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	5.0%	4.1%	3.3%	6.1%	6.4%	4.6%
Households owned but not paid off	79.1%	81.7%	73.5%	80.7%	70.2%	89.3%
Rented	15.8%	14.3%	23.2%	13.2%	23.4%	6.1%
Occupied rent free	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]

Limpopo	*Greater Sekhukhune District municipality*	*Elias Motsoaledi*	*Ephraim*	*Fetakgomo*	*Greater Tubatse*	*Makhudu-thamaga*
Household goods						
Radio	59.8%	64.5%	53.2%	63.3%	57.2%	60.6%
Television	67.7%	73.2%	67.8%	71.6%	59.5%	71.7%
Refrigerator	66.9%	71.8%	65.2%	71.9%	61.2%	68.8%
Computer	8.5%	10.1%	7.9%	7.1%	9.4%	6.7%
Cellphone	86.2%	88.0%	82.8%	87.0%	88.9%	83.9%
Landline	2.0%	2.5%	2.4%	1.7%	2.0%	1.6%
Internet[i]	19.2%	22.1%	15.7%	16.1%	19.9%	18.4%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	85.9%	91.1%	89.6%	91.5%	75.7%	90.4%
Cooking	54.5%	62.8%	46.7%	57.8%	54.5%	49.5%
Heating	42.2%	50.5%	41.3%	48.3%	39.3%	36.4%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	40.1%	47.0%	70.5%	35.7%	31.1%	31.9%
On communal stand	35.0%	19.8%	13.5%	52.8%	44.6%	41.4%
No access	24.8%	33.3%	16.0%	11.5%	24.3%	26.7%
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/ Private company	8.8%	10.8%	11.5%	18.4%	8.5%	2.5%
Communal/Own refuse dump	77.4%	73.9%	73.8%	71.8%	73.2%	89.9%
No refuse disposal	13.0%	14.1%	13.5%	9.3%	17.8%	7.1%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	8.6%	12.9%	12.6%	3.5%	8.4%	4.6%
Pit latrine	83.5%	79.1%	78.5%	91.1%	81.6%	89.8%
Bucket toilet	1.0%	0.8%	1.9%	0.2%	1.5%	0.3%
No Toilet	5.1%	4.4%	5.2%	4.1%	6.8%	3.9%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	22.7%	22.6%	24.9%	22.1%	22.2%	22.8%
Old age pension	7.3%	6.5%	8.1%	9.0%	5.7%	9.2%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	4.3	50.2	35.6	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	0.9
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	209.0	138.1	108.6	2.4	24.0	14.2
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.6	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A[n]

Limpopo	*Mopani District municipality*	*Ba-Phalaborwa*	*Greater Giyani*	*Greater Letaba*	*Greater Tzaneen*	*Maruleng*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	20 010	7 461	4 171	1 890	3 242	3 244
Share of country area (%)	1.6%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%
Main town	**N/A[n]**	**Phalaborwa**	**Giyani**	**Modjadjiskloof (Duiwelskloof)**	**Tzaneen**	**Hoedspruit**
Population[b]	1 092 507	150 637	244 217	212 701	390 095	94 857
— African	97.0%	93.0%	99.5%	98.8%	96.4%	95.5%
— Coloured	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%
— Indian	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%
— White	2.5%	6.4%	0.1%	0.8%	3.0%	3.8%

Limpopo	*Mopani District municipality*	*Ba-Phalaborwa*	*Greater Giyani*	*Greater Letaba*	*Greater Tzaneen*	*Maruleng*
Age structure[b]						
0–14	33.8%	32.9%	36.8%	34.5%	31.8%	34.4%
15–64	60.5%	63.2%	57.4%	58.6%	62.4%	60.3%
65+	5.7%	3.9%	5.8%	6.9%	5.7%	5.3%
Households						
Number of households	296 320	41 115	63 548	58 261	108 926	24 470
Average household size	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.6	3.5	3.7
Poverty rate[c]	58.3%	45.7%	68.5%	48.7%	60.7%	63.8%
Settlement type						
Rural	N/A[n]	91.2%	100.0%	95.8%	92.8%	100.0%
Urban	N/A[n]	8.8%	0.0%	4.2%	7.2%	0.0%
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	21.2%	14.7%	25.0%	27.1%	18.8%	21.0%
– Some primary schooling	11.3%	10.1%	11.4%	10.9%	11.6%	13.2%
– Completed primary school	4.1%	3.8%	4.2%	3.9%	4.4%	4.1%
– Some secondary schooling	34.3%	36.0%	31.5%	34.5%	34.6%	36.2%
– Grade 12/Std 10	20.8%	23.3%	20.8%	17.7%	21.9%	18.5%
– Higher	8.2%	12.1%	7.1%	6.0%	8.7%	7.0%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	660 866	95 224	140 226	124 599	243 596	57 221
Participation rate (supply)[e]	42.8%	56.6%	34.1%	36.3%	47.1%	37.0%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	25.8%	35.4%	18.0%	21.3%	29.8%	21.5%
Employed	170 348	33 695	25 278	26591	72 485	12 299
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	12.8%	1.0%	1.2%	6.5%	3.5%	4.9%
Mining/quarrying	3.4%	5.9%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%
Manufacturing	10.1%	2.9%	2.0%	2.6%	3.2%	2.6%
Electricity/gas/water supply	1.1%	0.9%	0.3%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%
Construction	5.0%	2.0%	0.8%	1.0%	1.7%	0.9%
Wholesale/retail trade	14.5%	4.8%	4.0%	3.2%	3.5%	5.7%
Transport/storage/communication	3.1%	2.0%	0.5%	0.6%	0.8%	0.7%
Financial/insurance/real estate	6.5%	2.2%	2.0%	1.6%	1.9%	0.4%
Community/social/personal services	20.0%	6.8%	6.8%	4.7%	5.0%	2.8%
Private households/other	23.5%	8.7%	5.9%	3.9%	7.5%	5.7%
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	39.4%	37.4%	47.0%	40.3%	36.7%	39.9%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	51.4%	50.2%	61.2%	49.9%	48.5%	51.2%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	51 121	75 585	40 819	39 615	54 627	48 715
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	N/A[n]	12.5%	15.7%	14.4%	13.4%	15.9%
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	34.8%	48.6%	50.3%	43.9%	46.8%
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	18.9%	18.7%	21.0%	22.0%	20.2%
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	11.9%	7.2%	6.5%	8.8%	6.3%

Limpopo	*Mopani District municipality*	*Ba-Phalaborwa*	*Greater Giyani*	*Greater Letaba*	*Greater Tzaneen*	*Maruleng*
Monthly income (% of population)[b] (contd)						
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	10.0%	4.3%	3.7%	5.0%	4.6%
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	7.1%	3.3%	2.4%	3.9%	3.8%
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	3.7%	1.6%	1.1%	2.1%	1.6%
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.8%	0.3%	0.2%	0.5%	0.4%
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	92.7%	96.7%	88.2%	92.5%	93.0%	96.5%
Informal	2.2%	0.5%	2.3%	3.4%	2.5%	0.9%
Traditional	5.1%	2.8%	9.4%	4.2%	4.5%	2.6%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	8.0%	8.9%	9.7%	6.8%	7.2%	7.7%
Households owned but not paid off	76.2%	70.0%	84.5%	76.7%	75.3%	60.7%
Rented	15.8%	21.1%	5.8%	16.6%	17.5%	31.6%
Occupied rent free	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Household goods						
Radio	59.8%	62.3%	56.8%	58.3%	62.9%	49.5%
Television	70.1%	73.1%	71.3%	70.5%	68.8%	66.6%
Refrigerator	68.6%	72.4%	72.3%	67.0%	66.2%	67.1%
Computer	11.1%	17.1%	10.0%	8.0%	11.5%	8.9%
Cellphone	88.5%	92.2%	90.3%	85.5%	87.9%	87.3%
Landline	3.5%	6.9%	2.7%	2.1%	3.7%	2.4%
Internet[i]	24.1%	29.7%	25.0%	23.3%	23.5%	16.7%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	88.7%	90.8%	89.0%	90.8%	86.2%	90.6%
Cooking	40.3%	67.6%	23.2%	31.2%	47.3%	29.8%
Heating	37.7%	55.6%	29.1%	31.5%	42.0%	26.3%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	50.4%	82.6%	43.9%	45.1%	45.5%	47.7%
On communal stand	33.8%	14.4%	41.1%	45.6%	30.3%	34.4%
No access	15.8%	3.0%	15.0%	9.3%	24.2%	17.9%
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/Private company	17.6%	49.4%	12.2%	9.3%	15.6%	6.8%
Communal/Own refuse dump	68.6%	45.1%	72.0%	73.7%	70.0%	80.3%
No refuse disposal	12.8%	4.7%	14.9%	16.2%	13.0%	11.6%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	19.3%	43.6%	13.4%	11.0%	19.3%	13.0%
Pit latrine	65.8%	42.7%	62.7%	76.3%	67.4%	80.0%
Bucket toilet	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%
No Toilet	12.5%	11.4%	19.6%	10.8%	11.2%	5.8%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	21.2%	18.8%	20.7%	24.1%	20.0%	23.3%
Old age pension	6.0%	3.5%	6.0%	7.0%	6.6%	5.0%

Limpopo	*Mopani District municipality*	*Ba-Phalaborwa*	*Greater Giyani*	*Greater Letaba*	*Greater Tzaneen*	*Maruleng*
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	75.3	20.6	N/A[n]	0.0	91.0	N/A[n]
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	153.1	48.9	75.9	36.1	90.6	12.5
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.8	N/A[n]	1.2	0.0	0.2	0.0

Limpopo	*Vhembe District municipality*	*Makhado*	*Musina*	*Mutale*	*Thulamela*	*Waterberg District municipality*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	25 596	8 299	7 576	3 886	5 833	44 913
Share of country area (%)	2.1%	0.7%	0.6%	0.3%	0.5%	3.7%
Main town	**N/A[n]**	**Louis Trichardt**	**Mesina**	**Masisi**	**Thohoyandou**	**N/A[n]**
Population[b]	1 294 722	516 031	68 359	91 870	618 462	679 336
— African	98.2%	97.3%	94.0%	99.3%	99.3%	91.2%
— Coloured	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.5%
— Indian	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%	0.1%	0.5%	0.4%
— White	1.1%	2.0%	4.8%	0.5%	0.1%	7.6%
Age structure[b]						
0–14	34.9%	34.8%	28.2%	38.2%	35.2%	29.9%
15–64	58.9%	58.1%	69.2%	55.6%	58.8%	64.3%
65+	6.3%	7.1%	2.6%	6.2%	6.0%	5.8%
Households						
Number of households	335 276	134 889	20 042	23 751	156 594	179 866
Average household size	3.8	3.7	3.0	3.8	3.9	3.4
Poverty rate[c]	65.1%	64.3%	24.2%	66.1%	68.8%	54.0%
Settlement type						
Rural	N/A[n]	94.4%	98.6%	100.0%	86.4%	N/A[n]
Urban	N/A[n]	5.7%	1.4%	0.0%	13.6%	N/A[n]
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	17.8%	18.9%	11.3%	18.8%	17.5%	12.5%
– Some primary schooling	11.2%	10.7%	9.6%	13.8%	11.5%	13.9%
– Completed primary school	4.6%	4.5%	7.9%	5.3%	4.1%	5.1%
– Some secondary schooling	34.9%	34.9%	42.7%	35.6%	33.7%	36.1%
– Grade 12/Std 10	21.7%	21.8%	21.6%	18.8%	22.0%	23.3%
– Higher	9.9%	9.2%	6.8%	7.8%	11.2%	9.0%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	761 968	300 041	47 316	51 079	363 533	436 861
Participation rate (supply)[e]	39.9%	40.9%	61.9%	35.8%	36.8%	50.0%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	24.3%	25.7%	50.2%	18.2%	20.7%	35.6%
Employed	185 452	77 154	23 754	9 321	75 224	155 652
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	8.3%	2.3%	14.1%	1.9%	1.1%	11.1%
Mining/quarrying	1.7%	0.2%	4.4%	1.4%	0.2%	15.7%
Manufacturing	10.1%	2.7%	4.3%	2.1%	2.8%	8.9%

Limpopo	*Vhembe District municipality*	*Makhado*	*Musina*	*Mutale*	*Thulamela*	*Waterberg District municipality*
Employment by industry[g] (contd)						
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	1.0%
Construction	5.5%	1.8%	2.9%	1.5%	1.2%	6.1%
Wholesale/retail trade	18.1%	4.3%	8.7%	5.3%	5.1%	13.2%
Transport/storage/communication	3.1%	0.9%	2.1%	0.9%	0.7%	3.2%
Financial/insurance/real estate	6.5%	1.7%	3.6%	2.4%	1.6%	6.2%
Community/social/personal services	22.0%	5.3%	6.6%	6.4%	6.6%	15.7%
Private households/other	24.0%	8.7%	11.9%	4.6%	4.7%	19.0%
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	38.7%	36.7%	18.7%	48.8%	43.8%	28.1%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	50.6%	49.6%	22.5%	62.2%	58.3%	35.5%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	49 440	51 429	61 026	43 094	47 184	72 421
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	N/A[n]	12.4%	12.0%	13.2%	11.9%	N/A[n]
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	44.7%	43.0%	50.3%	49.2%	N/A[n]
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	22.1%	20.3%	19.1%	19.8%	N/A[n]
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	8.7%	10.3%	7.4%	7.6%	N/A[n]
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	5.3%	6.6%	4.9%	5.3%	N/A[n]
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	4.1%	4.4%	3.3%	3.8%	N/A[n]
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	2.1%	2.5%	1.3%	1.8%	N/A[n]
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	N/A[n]
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	N/A[n]
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	N/A[n]
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	88.0%	92.4%	75.5%	87.9%	85.9%	87.6%
Informal	2.4%	2.6%	14.6%	0.7%	1.0%	11.2%
Traditional	9.5%	5.0%	9.8%	11.4%	13.0%	1.2%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	6.0%	6.1%	4.5%	9.1%	5.6%	7.9%
Households owned but not paid off	82.4%	82.9%	37.4%	85.2%	87.3%	60.7%
Rented	11.6%	11.0%	58.0%	5.7%	7.0%	31.3%
Occupied rent free	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Household goods						
Radio	64.6%	67.0%	48.5%	63.9%	64.7%	60.8%
Television	72.2%	73.9%	58.9%	66.6%	73.3%	71.7%
Refrigerator	67.5%	70.4%	52.5%	63.8%	67.5%	68.2%
Computer	12.1%	12.6%	12.8%	7.7%	12.2%	15.2%
Cellphone	89.7%	89.7%	83.1%	88.4%	90.8%	89.0%
Landline	2.9%	3.4%	4.3%	1.3%	2.5%	6.5%
Internet[i]	23.7%	21.9%	21.4%	21.4%	25.9%	26.1%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	87.2%	89.4%	76.4%	83.3%	87.2%	86.7%
Cooking	33.8%	35.7%	65.7%	17.0%	30.6%	65.5%
Heating	35.6%	39.5%	53.5%	19.5%	32.4%	59.3%

Limpopo	*Vhembe District municipality*	*Makhado*	*Musina*	*Mutale*	*Thulamela*	*Waterberg District municipality*
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	43.5%	43.5%	75.6%	26.9%	41.9%	70.6%
On communal stand	44.8%	43.4%	17.7%	61.3%	47.0%	23.7%
No access	11.7%	13.1%	6.8%	11.8%	11.1%	5.7%
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/Private company	14.3%	10.1%	63.6%	5.7%	12.9%	45.1%
Communal/Own refuse dump	74.0%	79.6%	25.1%	81.3%	74.3%	46.9%
No refuse disposal	11.0%	9.3%	10.8%	12.8%	12.3%	7.1%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	16.3%	14.5%	66.6%	5.1%	13.1%	48.9%
Pit latrine	73.2%	77.4%	18.6%	92.5%	73.7%	44.6%
Bucket toilet	0.4%	0.6%	0.6%	0.2%	0.2%	1.0%
No Toilet	8.9%	6.7%	13.2%	2.0%	11.4%	4.0%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	22.0%	21.2%	16.5%	27.6%	22.3%	19.8%
Old age pension	6.7%	7.4%	2.7%	5.8%	6.7%	6.5%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	N/A[n]	157.4	3.1	0.3	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	186.0	1.6	19.6	5.7	28.0	0.0
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.5	0.2	0.0	2.2	0.7	0.0

Limpopo	*Bela-Bela*	*Lephalale*	*Modimolle*	*Mogala-kwena*	*Mookgophong*	*Thabazimbi*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	3 406	13 784	4 677	6 166	5 688	11 190
Share of country area (%)	0.3%	1.1%	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.9%
Main town	**Bela-Bela (Warmbaths)**	**Lephalale (Ellisras)**	**Nylstroom**	**Mokopane (Potgietersrus)**	**Naboomspruit**	**Thabazimbi**
Population[b]	66 500	115 767	68 513	307 682	35 640	85 234
— African	84.8%	90.7%	88.1%	96.1%	85.6%	84.3%
— Coloured	1.5%	0.9%	0.4%	0.1%	0.4%	0.6%
— Indian	0.6%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%
— White	12.9%	7.9%	10.8%	3.0%	13.2%	14.4%
Age structure[b]						
0–14	28.1%	26.2%	30.8%	34.3%	25.7%	21.1%
15–64	66.0%	69.7%	63.8%	58.3%	67.6%	76.4%
65+	5.9%	4.1%	5.4%	7.4%	6.7%	2.4%
Households						
Number of households	18 068	29 880	17 525	79 395	9 918	25 080
Average household size	3.4	3.3	3.6	3.8	3.1	2.8
Poverty rate[c]	41.1%	65.6%	44.7%	60.0%	59.9%	37.4%
Settlement type						
Rural	91.1%	98.7%	95.4%	98.4%	94.8%	99.8%
Urban	8.9%	1.3%	4.6%	1.6%	5.2%	0.2%

Limpopo	*Bela-Bela*	*Lephalale*	*Modimolle*	*Mogala-kwena*	*Mookgophong*	*Thabazimbi*
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	9.8%	9.9%	10.7%	16.0%	12.0%	8.8%
– Some primary schooling	13.4%	12.8%	17.5%	13.8%	13.7%	13.6%
– Completed primary school	5.1%	5.0%	6.4%	4.4%	6.1%	5.9%
– Some secondary schooling	35.9%	37.0%	34.7%	35.6%	37.7%	37.4%
– Grade 12/Std 10	26.3%	23.6%	22.0%	21.7%	23.2%	26.1%
– Higher	9.5%	11.6%	8.7%	8.5%	7.3%	8.2%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	43 878	80 691	43 681	179 363	24 095	65 153
Participation rate (supply)[e]	58.5%	51.0%	54.0%	43.3%	56.5%	57.1%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	45.1%	39.1%	42.0%	25.8%	42.2%	45.9%
Employed	19 787	31 537	18 344	46 210	10 169	29 903
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	6.0%	8.1%	7.8%	1.8%	13.1%	4.9%
Mining/quarrying	0.8%	5.4%	0.1%	1.6%	0.3%	35.3%
Manufacturing	2.6%	1.9%	6.6%	3.6%	9.3%	1.5%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.6%	0.4%	0.6%	0.3%	0.4%	0.2%
Construction	7.5%	1.2%	3.7%	1.6%	2.9%	2.1%
Wholesale/retail trade	8.2%	3.4%	8.8%	4.1%	7.2%	5.9%
Transport/storage/communication	1.2%	1.1%	1.9%	1.0%	2.3%	1.8%
Financial/insurance/real estate	4.2%	1.1%	4.3%	1.9%	7.6%	1.9%
Community/social/personal services	7.9%	4.0%	9.8%	5.8%	9.6%	4.7%
Private households/other	10.6%	7.5%	13.2%	6.2%	10.4%	4.8%
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	22.5%	22.2%	22.2%	40.2%	23.5%	20.6%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	29.8%	26.9%	28.9%	51.7%	29.2%	26.9%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	73 229	98 055	72 593	54 737	62 393	101 058
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	12.8%	12.5%	10.4%	15.4%	11.5%	14.0%
R1–R1 600	28.3%	25.8%	29.3%	38.8%	34.3%	19.5%
R1 601–R3 200	24.5%	20.2%	23.7%	22.1%	24.9%	16.1%
R3 201–R6 400	15.5%	15.4%	16.0%	10.2%	14.2%	20.0%
R6 401–R12 800	9.2%	11.2%	10.4%	6.4%	7.5%	14.0%
R12 801–R25 600	6.0%	7.9%	6.6%	4.4%	4.5%	9.9%
R25 601–R51 200	2.5%	4.7%	2.6%	1.9%	2.1%	4.6%
R51 201–R102 400	0.7%	1.5%	0.7%	0.4%	0.6%	1.2%
R102 401–R204 800	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%
R204 801 or more	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	87.0%	83.2%	88.2%	94.0%	90.1%	71.8%
Informal	12.4%	15.4%	11.4%	4.9%	8.8%	26.3%
Traditional	0.6%	1.4%	0.5%	1.1%	1.1%	1.9%

Limpopo	*Bela-Bela*	*Lephalale*	*Modimolle*	*Mogala-kwena*	*Mookgophong*	*Thabazimbi*
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	8.5%	9.8%	6.3%	6.4%	5.6%	12.2%
Households owned but not paid off	52.6%	49.7%	66.9%	78.7%	55.5%	22.5%
Rented	38.9%	40.5%	26.7%	14.9%	38.9%	65.3%
Occupied rent free	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Household goods						
Radio	63.1%	56.7%	63.0%	61.8%	61.9%	59.1%
Television	72.9%	63.5%	72.1%	77.2%	70.8%	63.6%
Refrigerator	66.8%	65.0%	63.8%	75.1%	60.4%	57.2%
Computer	18.3%	17.2%	17.0%	11.9%	15.1%	19.7%
Cellphone	88.6%	89.8%	88.4%	88.1%	86.8%	92.2%
Landline	9.9%	5.0%	10.3%	5.0%	11.6%	6.0%
Internet[i]	26.6%	29.8%	26.8%	22.5%	29.1%	31.2%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	85.0%	85.0%	83.3%	91.8%	85.3%	76.8%
Cooking	75.6%	60.4%	74.6%	59.4%	76.0%	73.1%
Heating	65.9%	60.4%	65.3%	53.0%	61.7%	68.0%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	85.0%	67.0%	85.9%	62.5%	91.4%	71.2%
On communal stand	11.8%	30.3%	10.4%	29.3%	6.0%	22.6%
No access	3.2%	2.7%	3.7%	8.2%	2.6%	6.2%
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/Private company	65.6%	42.1%	74.1%	27.2%	65.1%	62.2%
Communal/Own refuse dump	26.2%	46.9%	20.8%	64.6%	29.6%	30.9%
No refuse disposal	6.1%	10.5%	3.7%	7.7%	4.3%	5.5%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	80.8%	46.3%	72.9%	28.7%	67.6%	68.6%
Pit latrine	13.7%	46.8%	19.1%	66.8%	22.5%	20.9%
Bucket toilet	1.8%	0.6%	1.3%	0.9%	2.0%	0.8%
No Toilet	2.4%	5.3%	3.0%	3.1%	5.3%	6.3%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	19.4%	23.6%	16.8%	22.3%	8.6%	6.8%
Old age pension	5.7%	6.7%	4.2%	7.9%	5.4%	1.4%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	49.5	N/A[n]	16.4	N/A[n]	4.0	61.2
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	3.6	53.9	6.8	15.1	5.2	2.1
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.3	0.2	0.7	0.0	0.2	0.9

Mpumalanga	*Ehlanzeni District municipality*	*Bushbuck-ridge*	*Mbombela*	*Nkomazi*	*Thaba Chweu*	*Umjindi*	*Gert Sibande District municipality*
Demographics							
Size (km^2)	27 895	10 249	5 394	4 786	5 719	1 745	31 840
Share of country area (%)	2.3%	0.8%	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%	0.1%	2.6%
Main town	**N/A[n]**	**Bushbuckridge**	**Nelspruit**	**Malelane**	**Lydenburg**	**Barberton**	**N/A[n]**
***Population*[b]**	1 688 615	541 248	588 794	390 610	98 387	69 577	1 043 194
— African	94.0%	99.5%	89.4%	97.7%	81.6%	87.0%	88.6%
— Coloured	0.6%	0.1%	0.9%	0.2%	2.6%	2.0%	1.0%
— Indian	0.4%	0.1%	0.7%	0.3%	0.6%	1.0%	1.1%
— White	4.7%	0.2%	8.7%	1.6%	14.5%	9.8%	9.0%
***Age structure*[b]**							
0–14	33.1%	37.0%	29.8%	35.4%	25.2%	27.4%	31.6%
15–64	62.4%	57.7%	66.0%	60.5%	69.9%	68.4%	63.9%
65+	4.6%	5.3%	4.2%	4.1%	4.9%	4.2%	4.5%
Households							
Number of households	445 087	134 197	161 773	95 509	33 352	20 255	273 490
Average household size	3.7	4.0	3.5	4.0	2.7	3.1	3.7
Poverty rate[c]	65.0%	79.8%	58.6%	65.7%	38.3%	43.5%	45.0%
Settlement type							
Rural	N/A[n]	100.0%	85.2%	63.3%	98.2%	98.2%	N/A[n]
Urban	N/A[n]	0.0%	14.8%	36.7%	1.8%	1.8%	N/A[n]
Education							
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds							
– No schooling	16.7%	18.7%	11.9%	25.7%	9.7%	10.0%	13.4%
– Some primary schooling	11.1%	12.0%	9.7%	11.8%	12.2%	12.4%	13.1%
– Completed primary school	4.0%	4.0%	3.6%	4.6%	4.5%	4.5%	4.4%
– Some secondary schooling	29.6%	32.2%	28.7%	25.6%	33.7%	32.2%	32.0%
– Grade 12/Std 10	29.1%	25.7%	33.4%	25.8%	30.3%	31.7%	28.0%
– Higher	9.5%	7.4%	12.7%	6.5%	9.6%	9.1%	9.2%
Employment							
Working-age population[d]	1 052 933	312 225	388 321	237 677	68 781	45 930	666 693
Participation rate (supply)[e]	50.4%	40.8%	57.8%	46.5%	62.8%	62.2%	53.9%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	32.9%	19.4%	41.4%	30.5%	49.6%	45.5%	37.8%
Employed	346 437	60 459	160 823	72 588	34 112	20 894	252 045
***Employment by industry*[g]**							
Agriculture	8.9%	1.0%	3.7%	4.4%	4.5%	5.8%	5.1%
Mining/quarrying	2.5%	0.2%	0.6%	0.6%	4.1%	5.0%	6.1%
Manufacturing	14.5%	2.3%	6.2%	3.8%	15.1%	7.5%	7.0%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.8%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%	0.7%
Construction	6.0%	0.8%	3.8%	0.9%	2.4%	2.8%	3.3%

Mpumalanga	*Ehlanzeni District municipality*	*Bushbuck-ridge*	*Mbombela*	*Nkomazi*	*Thaba Chweu*	*Umjindi*	*Gert Sibande District municipality*
Employment by industry[g] (contd)							
Wholesale/retail trade	12.1%	2.4%	6.8%	2.4%	5.6%	3.7%	12.3%
Transport/storage/communication	3.5%	0.5%	1.7%	1.2%	2.6%	1.5%	2.3%
Financial/insurance/real estate	10.7%	0.9%	6.1%	3.7%	3.6%	5.3%	4.2%
Community/social/personal services	16.7%	3.9%	7.7%	5.4%	5.4%	8.0%	7.9%
Private households/other	24.3%	5.5%	12.0%	5.6%	11.2%	12.8%	51.1%
Unemployment							
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	34.4%	52.1%	28.1%	34.2%	20.5%	27.3%	29.7%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	44.2%	64.6%	37.6%	42.3%	27.1%	36.5%	38.4%
Income							
Average annual household income (R)	64 403	36 569	92 663	45 731	82 354	81 864	84 177
Monthly income (% of population)[b]							
No income	N/A[n]	17.0%	13.0%	16.8%	12.0%	11.3%	N/A[n]
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	46.4%	31.0%	42.8%	29.7%	30.3%	N/A[n]
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	19.1%	20.6%	19.8%	22.4%	21.7%	N/A[n]
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	8.2%	13.3%	9.4%	14.9%	15.1%	N/A[n]
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	4.9%	8.7%	5.6%	9.6%	9.4%	N/A[n]
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	3.0%	6.8%	3.5%	6.2%	7.3%	N/A[n]
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	1.1%	4.4%	1.5%	3.7%	3.5%	N/A[n]
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.2%	1.4%	0.3%	1.0%	0.8%	N/A[n]
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%	N/A[n]
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	N/A[n]
Assets (%)[b]							
Dwelling occupied							
Formal	92.3%	96.1%	93.4%	92.9%	75.4%	83.4%	73.0%
Informal	4.8%	1.2%	4.9%	2.9%	20.6%	12.2%	17.0%
Traditional	2.8%	2.7%	1.7%	4.1%	4.0%	4.4%	10.0%
Households by tenure status							
Households owned and fully paid off	61.9%	72.0%	59.9%	63.8%	33.5%	46.4%	41.8%
Households owned but not paid off	5.3%	2.1%	7.8%	5.1%	5.3%	6.8%	10.5%
Rented	14.6%	3.7%	17.7%	10.9%	47.1%	26.5%	27.6%
Occupied rent free	18.3%	22.1%	14.6%	20.2%	14.0%	20.3%	20.2%
Household goods							
Radio	65.2%	61.0%	71.3%	62.4%	60.5%	66.1%	70.6%
Television	73.9%	77.7%	77.8%	67.2%	63.7%	66.1%	75.3%
Refrigerator	72.7%	76.4%	77.7%	66.3%	57.7%	62.3%	67.0%
Computer	14.0%	8.6%	20.2%	9.6%	16.0%	16.5%	16.4%
Cellphone	90.8%	90.5%	92.2%	90.1%	90.3%	86.1%	90.1%
Landline	4.8%	2.1%	7.8%	2.5%	7.1%	6.8%	7.6%
Internet[i]	29.3%	24.7%	35.7%	25.1%	28.0%	32.3%	31.7%

Mpumalanga	*Ehlanzeni District municipality*	*Bushbuck-ridge*	*Mbombela*	*Nkomazi*	*Thaba Chweu*	*Umjindi*	*Gert Sibande District municipality*
Household access levels							
Electricity							
Lighting	88.9%	93.9%	90.2%	83.9%	84.3%	75.4%	83.4%
Cooking	70.2%	57.8%	83.8%	64.9%	71.7%	66.8%	62.9%
Heating	60.3%	51.6%	73.1%	51.0%	61.9%	57.1%	49.4%
Piped (tap) Water							
Inside yard/dwelling	57.8%	41.4%	64.8%	58.1%	79.8%	72.2%	81.3%
On communal stand	23.2%	37.6%	13.1%	23.7%	15.0%	19.0%	9.9%
No access	19.0%	21.0%	22.1%	18.9%	5.2%	5.4%	8.9%
Refuse removal							
Removed by local authority/ Private company	26.1%	8.1%	30.7%	21.6%	64.4%	67.2%	64.6%
Communal/Own refuse dump	63.7%	79.3%	61.3%	66.0%	29.4%	25.0%	26.8%
No refuse disposal	9.2%	11.8%	7.2%	11.3%	5.3%	4.0%	8.0%
Sanitation							
Flush/chemical toilet	26.2%	9.1%	33.8%	14.6%	68.8%	62.9%	69.7%
Pit latrine	61.7%	77.1%	56.9%	67.7%	26.3%	27.2%	24.4%
Bucket toilet	0.6%	0.5%	0.8%	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%	0.8%
No Toilet	10.2%	12.6%	7.2%	15.6%	2.9%	4.2%	5.0%
Social security recipients[j]							
Child support grant	21.2%	24.9%	18.6%	24.0%	12.7%	10.4%	17.7%
Old age pension	4.8%	6.1%	3.9%	4.7%	4.3%	4.1%	4.2%
Municipal Finance							
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	0.0	216.2	6.2	100.9	5.7	N/A[n]	29.2
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	0.0	5.5	1.3	11.4	44.4	0.9	4.4
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	4.4	0.7	3.7	0.2	N/A[n]

Mpumalanga	*Albert Luthuli*	*Dipaleseng*	*Dr Pixley ka Seme*	*Govan Mbeki*	*Lekwa*	*Mkhondo*	*Msukaligwa*
Demographics							
Size (km^2)	5 559	2 616	5 227	2 954	4 585	4 882	6 015
Share of country area (%)	0.5%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%
Main town	**Carolina**	**Balfour**	**Seme (Volksrust)**	**Secunda**	**Standerton**	**Mkhondo (Piet Retief)**	**Ermelo**
Population[b]	186 010	42 390	83 235	294 538	115 662	171 982	124 812
— African	97.6%	89.8%	90.5%	80.5%	84.2%	94.7%	88.1%
— Coloured	0.2%	0.5%	0.6%	1.5%	2.9%	0.5%	0.6%
— Indian	0.4%	0.9%	1.2%	1.5%	1.2%	0.8%	1.1%
— White	1.6%	8.6%	7.4%	16.0%	11.4%	3.7%	9.8%
Age structure[b]							
0–14	36.5%	28.2%	34.9%	26.9%	28.6%	36.6%	30.4%
15–64	58.2%	66.0%	59.4%	69.4%	66.4%	59.2%	65.5%
65+	5.3%	5.8%	5.7%	3.7%	5.0%	4.2%	4.1%

Mpumalanga	*Albert Luthuli*	*Dipaleseng*	*Dr Pixley ka Seme*	*Govan Mbeki*	*Lekwa*	*Mkhondo*	*Msukaligwa*
Households							
Number of households	47 705	12 637	19 838	83 874	31 071	37 433	40 932
Average household size	3.8	3.3	4.1	3.3	3.6	4.5	3.5
Poverty rate[c]	49.3%	71.1%	40.5%	41.4%	43.9%	51.4%	32.7%
Settlement type							
Rural	41.6%	76.7%	96.7%	88.4%	98.9%	97.1%	94.0%
Urban	58.4%	23.3%	3.3%	11.6%	1.1%	2.9%	6.0%
Education							
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds							
– No schooling	19.9%	12.0%	19.4%	7.9%	11.2%	18.1%	12.3%
– Some primary schooling	13.5%	17.1%	14.9%	10.3%	14.6%	16.6%	11.7%
– Completed primary school	4.4%	5.0%	4.5%	3.9%	4.6%	5.2%	4.5%
– Some secondary schooling	28.8%	36.0%	29.2%	33.9%	34.1%	29.1%	32.7%
– Grade 12/Std 10	27.0%	24.1%	24.7%	31.4%	25.1%	25.6%	29.3%
– Higher	6.3%	5.7%	7.3%	12.6%	10.3%	5.4%	9.6%
Employment							
Working-age population[d]	108 342	27 962	49 452	204 474	76 783	101 779	97 901
Participation rate (supply)[e]	41.0%	59.7%	44.0%	63.3%	58.6%	46.0%	56.4%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	26.4%	37.5%	28.1%	46.6%	43.4%	29.4%	41.4%
Employed	28 593	10 483	13 904	95 324	33 334	29 888	40 519
Employment by industry[g]							
Agriculture	2.9%	1.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.5%	0.6%	5.0%
Mining/quarrying	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%	0.1%	0.3%	1.3%
Manufacturing	2.8%	0.9%	0.0%	4.8%	0.3%	0.5%	4.5%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	1.1%
Construction	1.3%	0.6%	0.7%	2.0%	0.4%	0.1%	2.4%
Wholesale/retail trade	4.7%	0.6%	0.3%	9.2%	0.5%	0.6%	7.1%
Transport/storage/communication	0.9%	0.3%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.1%	2.6%
Financial/insurance/real estate	2.4%	0.2%	0.0%	2.3%	0.4%	0.3%	2.9%
Community/social/personal services	4.8%	0.1%	0.2%	4.3%	0.2%	0.6%	6.2%
Private households/other	6.2%	37.7%	27.2%	20.0%	44.4%	29.6%	15.1%
Unemployment							
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	35.4%	37.2%	36.1%	26.2%	25.9%	35.9%	26.8%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	45.1%	45.2%	45.1%	34.4%	35.2%	44.6%	34.5%
Income							
Average annual household income (R)	48 790	61 492	64 990	125 480	88 440	53 398	82 167
Monthly income (% of population)[b]							
No income	14.9%	12.9%	15.4%	16.2%	10.7%	15.1%	12.3%
R1–R1 600	42.2%	31.3%	37.4%	21.6%	27.6%	37.9%	29.0%
R1 601–R3 200	20.5%	22.9%	20.4%	16.5%	22.5%	21.6%	20.9%
R3 201–R6 400	10.0%	15.4%	11.1%	15.0%	15.6%	11.8%	15.4%

Mpumalanga	*Albert Luthuli*	*Dipaleseng*	*Dr Pixley ka Seme*	*Govan Mbeki*	*Lekwa*	*Mkhondo*	*Msukaligwa*
Monthly income (% of population)[b] (contd)							
R6 401–R12 800	6.6%	9.4%	6.9%	11.7%	10.4%	6.6%	10.5%
R12 801–R25 600	3.9%	5.3%	5.1%	9.1%	7.8%	4.2%	7.1%
R25 601–R51 200	1.3%	2.2%	2.7%	6.4%	3.9%	2.1%	3.5%
R51 201–R102 400	0.3%	0.4%	0.6%	2.5%	1.0%	0.4%	0.8%
R102 401–R204 800	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.7%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%
R204 801 or more	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%
Assets (%)[b]							
Dwelling occupied							
Formal	77.1%	67.8%	77.0%	71.5%	74.1%	66.7%	76.1%
Informal	6.0%	31.7%	7.3%	28.1%	24.0%	3.1%	14.1%
Traditional	16.9%	0.6%	15.7%	0.4%	1.8%	30.2%	9.9%
Households by tenure status							
Households owned and fully paid off	52.5%	52.3%	33.3%	39.4%	40.3%	41.6%	36.4%
Households owned but not paid off	5.6%	5.5%	7.7%	13.9%	11.0%	13.4%	8.9%
Rented	11.4%	20.6%	30.9%	36.7%	29.4%	19.2%	34.2%
Occupied rent free	30.5%	21.5%	28.1%	10.0%	19.3%	25.9%	20.5%
Household goods							
Radio	70.3%	65.0%	75.6%	67.7%	70.5%	71.1%	75.4%
Television	71.8%	74.6%	76.9%	80.6%	81.4%	64.1%	73.7%
Refrigerator	65.2%	66.0%	66.7%	73.6%	75.1%	52.7%	63.0%
Computer	9.1%	14.2%	13.5%	24.3%	17.4%	9.2%	16.5%
Cellphone	89.3%	86.8%	89.5%	92.4%	91.7%	86.0%	90.1%
Landline	2.7%	6.7%	8.4%	11.6%	9.1%	4.4%	6.6%
Internet[i]	23.8%	27.0%	28.2%	37.7%	34.9%	26.0%	34.6%
Household access levels							
Electricity							
Lighting	87.5%	83.1%	85.2%	90.3%	88.6%	66.8%	74.7%
Cooking	50.8%	73.4%	52.3%	80.6%	80.5%	41.3%	49.6%
Heating	38.4%	57.6%	39.2%	63.3%	60.5%	33.4%	42.7%
Piped (tap) Water							
Inside yard/dwelling	70.2%	84.5%	84.4%	94.5%	90.6%	58.6%	78.1%
On communal stand	11.5%	10.0%	8.5%	4.4%	7.1%	19.9%	12.5%
No access	18.2%	5.4%	0.0%	1.1%	2.4%	21.5%	9.4%
Refuse removal							
Removed by local authority/ Private company	20.3%	82.1%	63.2%	92.8%	83.1%	34.5%	66.9%
Communal/Own refuse dump	65.1%	11.8%	26.4%	5.3%	12.7%	45.9%	24.0%
No refuse disposal	13.7%	5.5%	10.2%	1.5%	3.9%	17.9%	8.1%
Sanitation							
Flush/chemical toilet	22.5%	77.5%	65.8%	90.9%	86.6%	44.4%	73.6%
Pit latrine	68.7%	14.7%	27.9%	5.4%	6.4%	37.3%	15.0%
Bucket toilet	1.0%	0.8%	0.5%	0.6%	1.0%	0.6%	1.1%
No Toilet	5.2%	6.1%	4.6%	1.8%	4.1%	12.9%	4.9%

Mpumalanga	*Albert Luthuli*	*Dipaleseng*	*Dr Pixley ka Seme*	*Govan Mbeki*	*Lekwa*	*Mkhondo*	*Msukaligwa*
Social security recipients[j]							
Child support grant	25.4%	13.6%	22.8%	10.6%	13.1%	24.3%	17.1%
Old age pension	5.5%	6.2%	5.9%	2.6%	4.0%	4.5%	3.9%
Municipal Finance							
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	N/A[n]	65.0	2.8	122.0	196.3	N/A[n]	0.0
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	55.0	8.0	2.8	24.4	6.0	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.7	0.6	N/A[n]	11.0	4.2	N/A[n]	N/A[n]

Mpumalanga	*Nkangala District municipality*	*Dr JS Moroka*	*Emakhazeni*	*Emalahleni*	*Steve Tshwete*	*Thembisile*	*Victor Khanyi*
Demographics							
Size (km^2)	16 758	1 416	4 735	2 677	3 976	2 384	1 567
Share of country area (%)	1.4%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%
Main town	**N/A[n]**	**Siyabuswa**	**Belfast**	**Witbank**	**Middleburg**	**Kwamhlanga**	**Delmas**
Population[b]	1 308 129	249 705	47 216	395 466	229 831	310 458	75 452
— African	87.4%	87.9%	87.2%	81.3%	73.6%	99.2%	82.3%
— Coloured	1.0%	1.1%	1.2%	1.7%	2.6%	0.2%	1.1%
— Indian	0.5%	0.7%	0.7%	0.9%	1.6%	0.3%	0.3%
— White	11.0%	9.9%	10.8%	15.7%	21.8%	0.1%	16.0%
Age structure[b]							
0–14	28.5%	32.6%	28.0%	25.2%	25.0%	32.1%	28.2%
15–64	66.5%	59.5%	66.2%	71.2%	70.7%	62.9%	67.1%
65+	5.0%	7.9%	5.8%	3.6%	4.3%	4.9%	4.7%
Households							
Number of households	356 911	62 162	13 722	119 874	64 971	75 634	20 548
Average household size	3.5	4.0	3.3	3.2	3.3	4.1	3.6
Poverty rate[c]	45.7%	66.0%	40.2%	18.6%	39.3%	60%	56.3%
Settlement type							
Rural	N/A[n]	1.1%	98.8%	85.5%	81.6%	25.2%	92.8%
Urban	N/A[n]	98.9%	1.2%	14.5%	18.4%	74.8%	7.2%
Education							
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds							
– No schooling	11.5%	17.5%	15.0%	5.8%	7.5%	18.0%	11.9%
– Some primary schooling	11.4%	15.1%	11.2%	9.0%	8.8%	13.9%	13.2%
– Completed primary school	4.2%	4.7%	4.9%	4.0%	3.4%	4.4%	4.8%
– Some secondary schooling	33.1%	31.0%	32.8%	35.7%	30.8%	32.4%	35.6%
– Grade 12/Std 10	29.5%	25.2%	28.7%	31.5%	35.1%	26.2%	26.8%
– Higher	10.2%	6.6%	7.4%	14.0%	14.4%	5.2%	7.7%

Mpumalanga	*Nkangala District municipality*	*Dr JS Moroka*	*Emakhazeni*	*Emalahleni*	*Steve Tshwete*	*Thembisile*	*Victor Khanyi*
Employment							
Working-age population[d]	869 924	148 457	31 271	281 768	162 413	195 410	50 605
Participation rate (supply)[e]	57.1%	42.5%	57.7%	66.2%	62.9%	49.8%	59.3%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	39.9%	22.7%	42.7%	48.0%	50.4%	31.4%	42.5%
Employed	346 935	33 688	13 360	135 277	81 810	61 291	21 510
Employment by industry[g]							
Agriculture	4.1%	1.0%	5.0%	1.2%	3.3%	0.5%	6.1%
Mining/quarrying	8.9%	0.1%	2.1%	6.4%	5.4%	0.2%	3.2%
Manufacturing	11.2%	2.1%	5.4%	5.3%	7.7%	2.2%	8.3%
Electricity/gas/water supply	2.1%	0.3%	0.3%	1.2%	2.0%	0.2%	0.1%
Construction	6.7%	1.1%	2.7%	2.3%	4.3%	3.8%	2.8%
Wholesale/retail trade	9.0%	1.2%	5.8%	4.6%	5.6%	2.0%	4.3%
Transport/storage/communication	3.4%	1.0%	3.1%	1.3%	1.9%	0.9%	2.9%
Financial/insurance/real estate	8.1%	3.1%	4.1%	3.0%	4.3%	3.4%	2.8%
Community/social/personal services	11.2%	4.9%	7.4%	4.7%	5.1%	3.3%	4.5%
Private households/other	35.5%	12.1%	10.6%	18.7%	12.1%	12.2%	12.0%
Unemployment							
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	30.0%	46.6%	25.9%	27.3%	19.7%	37.0%	28.2%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	39.6%	61.4%	34.2%	36.0%	27.1%	49.4%	35.8%
Income							
Average annual household income (R)	89 006	40 421	72 310	120 492	134 026	45 864	80 239
Monthly income (% of population)[b]							
No income	N/A[n]	15.9%	12.0%	13.5%	12.8%	13.8%	14.9%
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	40.1%	29.4%	19.3%	18.2%	35.6%	27.6%
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	21.9%	22.1%	16.8%	16.1%	23.6%	21.4%
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	11.3%	15.9%	17.5%	17.0%	15.2%	16.3%
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	6.2%	10.9%	13.5%	14.3%	7.4%	9.5%
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	3.2%	5.9%	10.5%	11.4%	3.0%	5.7%
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	1.1%	2.7%	6.1%	7.0%	1.0%	3.2%
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.7%	2.0%	2.3%	0.2%	0.8%
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.3%	0.5%	0.5%	0.1%	0.3%
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%
Assets (%)[b]							
Dwelling occupied							
Formal	83.5%	91.1%	83.2%	78.2%	84.0%	86.0%	81.6%
Informal	14.0%	7.8%	11.4%	19.5%	14.3%	10.2%	15.8%
Traditional	2.4%	1.1%	5.5%	2.3%	1.7%	3.8%	2.6%
Households by tenure status							
Households owned and fully paid off	52.0%	81.9%	46.8%	33.0%	33.0%	76.5%	47.4%
Households owned but not paid off	8.8%	2.9%	8.8%	13.5%	12.7%	2.8%	8.3%
Rented	23.8%	4.5%	29.8%	33.8%	42.8%	6.1%	23.8%
Occupied rent free	15.4%	10.7%	14.6%	19.6%	11.5%	14.7%	20.5%

Mpumalanga	*Nkangala District municipality*	*Dr JS Moroka*	*Emakhazeni*	*Emalahleni*	*Steve Tshwete*	*Thembisile*	*Victor Khanyi*
Household goods							
Radio	72.3%	73.0%	74.2%	69.1%	76.6%	77.0%	57.3%
Television	76.1%	80.1%	71.3%	70.0%	82.0%	78.7%	75.1%
Refrigerator	71.6%	81.1%	67.0%	63.9%	74.7%	76.6%	63.3%
Computer	19.1%	12.3%	16.8%	22.7%	26.3%	14.3%	15.1%
Cellphone	92.3%	88.7%	91.8%	93.4%	94.1%	92.8%	89.3%
Landline	7.3%	2.5%	8.0%	10.0%	12.8%	2.4%	5.8%
Internet[i]	33.8%	26.1%	33.2%	38.6%	37.3%	31.2%	27.8%
Household access levels							
Electricity							
Lighting	85.7%	96.7%	83.6%	73.4%	90.8%	92.3%	84.9%
Cooking	73.2%	69.2%	49.5%	70.8%	81.7%	79.9%	63.5%
Heating	60.4%	63.6%	37.1%	63.0%	63.0%	60.2%	43.9%
Piped (tap) Water							
Inside yard/dwelling	81.6%	69.9%	87.9%	80.3%	85.7%	88.4%	83.2%
On communal stand	11.0%	7.9%	7.4%	14.5%	12.5%	7.0%	12.5%
No access	7.3%	22.1%	4.7%	5.2%	1.8%	4.6%	4.3%
Refuse removal							
Removed by local authority/ Private company	49.7%	15.4%	73.5%	68.6%	86.3%	5.1%	75.7%
Communal/Own refuse dump	43.4%	77.1%	20.8%	23.8%	11.0%	85.1%	20.1%
No refuse disposal	6.3%	7.2%	4.3%	6.8%	2.4%	9.1%	3.5%
Sanitation							
Flush/chemical toilet	52.1%	15.6%	78.6%	71.5%	84.9%	10.1%	81.8%
Pit latrine	42.8%	81.8%	10.8%	23.4%	8.9%	85.2%	10.1%
Bucket toilet	1.3%	0.4%	1.3%	0.6%	3.2%	0.9%	3.4%
No Toilet	2.5%	2.0%	6.5%	2.5%	2.1%	2.6%	2.3%
Social security recipients[j]							
Child support grant	16.7%	21.3%	11.0%	12.5%	9.0%	24.7%	17.7%
Old age pension	4.6%	7.7%	4.0%	2.8%	2.7%	6.5%	2.9%
Municipal Finance							
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	2.9	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	12.8	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	0.0	71.7	0.3
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	N/A[n]	0.3	1.0	N/A[n]	0.3	N/A[n]	N/A[n]

North West	*Bojanala Platinum District municipality*	*Kgetleng-rivier*	*Madibeng*	*Moretele*	*Moses Kotane*	*Rustenburg*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	18 333	3 973	3 839	1 378	5 719	3 423
Share of country area (%)	1.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%	0.5%	0.3%
Main town	**N/A[n]**	**Koster**	**Brits**	**Makapanstad**	**Mogwase**	**Rustenburg**
***Population*[b]**	1 507 505	51 049	477 381	186 947	242 554	549 575
— African	91.4%	80.1%	89.3%	99.4%	98.3%	88.5%
— Coloured	0.7%	1.7%	0.9%	0.2%	0.3%	0.9%
— Indian	0.6%	0.9%	0.5%	0.1%	0.5%	0.8%
— White	7.0%	16.8%	8.9%	0.2%	0.8%	9.4%
***Age structure*[b]**						
0–14	26.4%	28.5%	25.7%	30.9%	29.2%	24.1%
15–64	68.3%	65.6%	69.2%	60.9%	63.1%	72.5%
65+	5.3%	5.9%	5.1%	8.2%	7.7%	3.4%
Households						
Number of households	501 696	14 673	160 724	52 063	75 193	199 044
Average household size	2.8	3.1	2.9	3.6	3.2	3.1
Poverty rate[c]	48.2%	75.0%	47.2%	60.0%	59.8%	36.9%
Settlement type						
Rural	N/A[n]	99.1%	91.5%	100.0%	100.0%	86.4%
Urban	N/A[n]	0.9%	8.5%	0.0%	0.0%	13.6%
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	7.6%	15.8%	7.8%	9.1%	9.4%	5.4%
– Some primary schooling	14.7%	18.9%	14.3%	16.7%	17.1%	13.0%
– Completed primary school	5.4%	6.4%	5.4%	5.5%	5.4%	5.4%
– Some secondary schooling	36.3%	29.7%	37.5%	36.9%	35.3%	36.2%
– Grade 12/Std 10	28.6%	22.7%	27.3%	27.2%	27.5%	31.1%
– Higher	7.4%	6.3%	7.7%	4.6%	5.4%	8.9%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	1 029 388	33 471	330 505	113 837	152 972	398 603
Participation rate (supply)[e]	59.0%	53.1%	64.2%	45.1%	48.4%	62.4%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	40.9%	42.7%	44.5%	25.8%	30.0%	46.1%
Employed	420 520	14 290	147 117	29 371	45 839	183 902
***Employment by industry*[g]**						
Agriculture	4.5%	7.4%	2.9%	1.5%	0.4%	1.3%
Mining/quarrying	27.0%	7.8%	6.3%	0.2%	8.1%	19.6%
Manufacturing	11.1%	3.3%	8.0%	5.6%	2.5%	2.5%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%
Construction	4.3%	1.3%	1.9%	2.3%	1.0%	1.8%
Wholesale/retail trade	10.9%	5.7%	5.1%	3.7%	4.1%	4.2%
Transport/storage/communication	4.2%	1.1%	2.0%	1.0%	1.8%	1.8%
Financial/insurance/real estate	6.6%	2.3%	3.0%	2.2%	2.4%	2.8%
Community/social/personal services	11.4%	2.7%	4.8%	5.1%	4.3%	4.7%
Private households/other	19.7%	6.3%	7.6%	6.4%	5.8%	9.9%

North West	*Bojanala Platinum District municipality*	*Kgetleng-rivier*	*Madibeng*	*Moretele*	*Moses Kotane*	*Rustenburg*
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	30.7%	20.5%	30.4%	45.9%	37.9%	26.4%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	39.1%	26.7%	38.2%	57.2%	47.4%	34.7%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	73 020	68 909	75 103	35 467	50 289	90 092
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	N/A[n]	15.4%	16.2%	19.9%	19.2%	16.8%
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	35.4%	26.2%	37.6%	33.3%	18.0%
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	22.2%	20.0%	21.7%	17.5%	17.2%
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	11.1%	19.3%	12.1%	14.7%	23.1%
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	6.7%	9.4%	5.6%	9.5%	12.1%
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	5.2%	4.8%	2.2%	4.0%	7.1%
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	2.4%	2.6%	0.7%	1.4%	4.0%
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	1.0%	0.9%	0.1%	0.3%	1.2%
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	69.4%	73.6%	59.6%	84.7%	79.1%	69.3%
Informal	29.8%	25.8%	39.7%	14.4%	19.5%	30.0%
Traditional	0.8%	0.6%	0.7%	1.0%	1.4%	0.6%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	53.8%	53.0%	59.8%	95.4%	77.9%	28.9%
Households owned but not paid off	7.8%	15.5%	5.7%	1.4%	4.6%	12.1%
Rented	38.4%	31.5%	34.6%	3.2%	17.5%	59.1%
Occupied rent free	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Household goods						
Radio	63.4%	64.6%	61.3%	66.0%	65.9%	63.5%
Television	72.4%	62.0%	70.6%	79.5%	73.4%	72.1%
Refrigerator	65.0%	56.2%	61.0%	76.1%	73.2%	62.8%
Computer	14.3%	16.5%	15.1%	11.5%	9.7%	15.9%
Cellphone	89.4%	81.8%	89.4%	86.2%	85.9%	92.2%
Landline	4.6%	7.1%	4.8%	1.6%	2.9%	5.7%
Internet[i]	26.8%	24.7%	27.0%	20.6%	24.0%	29.4%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	84.2%	78.0%	81.0%	92.2%	89.9%	83.0%
Cooking	66.4%	54.6%	63.0%	63.1%	63.5%	71.9%
Heating	77.2%	65.8%	75.6%	76.7%	75.1%	80.2%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	73.4%	82.0%	67.9%	71.2%	56.3%	84.3%
On communal stand	16.8%	11.8%	17.2%	17.3%	36.6%	9.4%
No access	9.7%	6.2%	14.9%	11.5%	7.2%	6.3%

North West	*Bojanala Platinum District municipality*	*Kgetleng-rivier*	*Madibeng*	*Moretele*	*Moses Kotane*	*Rustenburg*
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/ Private company	50.9%	45.9%	27.0%	1.3%	82.9%	71.4%
Communal/Own refuse dump	41.2%	42.2%	62.7%	90.7%	13.1%	21.4%
No refuse disposal	6.8%	9.7%	9.2%	7.9%	3.2%	5.7%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	38.3%	67.9%	33.0%	6.6%	14.8%	57.5%
Pit latrine	55.2%	17.5%	57.2%	91.5%	81.1%	37.0%
Bucket toilet	0.9%	1.0%	1.9%	0.3%	0.2%	0.6%
No Toilet	4.3%	10.4%	5.8%	1.4%	3.3%	3.9%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	12.8%	16.4%	13.0%	18.6%	16.6%	8.0%
Old age pension	5.6%	5.1%	5.2%	8.7%	8.0%	3.5%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	8.4	17.3	7.5	9.9	13.4	449.8
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	3.1	5.6	71.3	25.2	71.3	73.5
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.5	0.0	2.1	0.1	3.4	0.0

North West	*Dr Ruth Segomotsi Mompati District municipality*	*Greater Taung*	*Kagisano-Molopo*	*Lekwa-Tee-mane*	*Mamusa*	*Naledi*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	43 699	5 635	23 827	3 681	3 614	6 941
Share of country area (%)	3.6%	0.5%	2.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.6%
Main town	**N/A**[n]	**Reivilo**	**Ganyesa/ Pomfret**	**Christiana**	**Schweizer-Reneke**	**Vryburg (Huhudi)**
Population[b]	463 815	177 642	105 789	53 248	60 355	66 781
— African	91.4%	98.2%	96.0%	81.2%	91.5%	74.0%
— Coloured	4.0%	1.0%	1.4%	7.4%	2.2%	14.7%
— Indian	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.6%	0.5%	1.1%
— White	3.9%	0.4%	2.1%	10.4%	5.5%	9.5%
Age structure[b]						
0–14	35.2%	35.8%	37.6%	31.8%	36.5%	31.0%
15–64	58.4%	56.3%	56.5%	62.1%	58.5%	64.0%
65+	6.4%	7.9%	5.9%	6.1%	5.0%	5.0%
Households						
Number of households	125 270	48 613	28 531	14 930	14 625	18 572
Average household size	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.4	4.0	3.4
Poverty rate[c]	66.6%	70.5%	72.0%	51.8%	63.1%	53.5%
Settlement type						
Rural	N/A[n]	74.2%	100.0%	96.9%	98.7%	90.3%
Urban	N/A[n]	25.8%	0.0%	3.1%	1.3%	9.7%

North West	*Dr Ruth Segomotsi Mompati District municipality*	*Greater Taung*	*Kagisano-Molopo*	*Lekwa-Tee-mane*	*Mamusa*	*Naledi*
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	21.4%	19.2%	28.6%	17.9%	25.0%	16.7%
– Some primary schooling	22.4%	24.9%	25.2%	19.0%	20.1%	17.4%
– Completed primary school	5.5%	5.6%	5.2%	5.5%	6.0%	5.3%
– Some secondary schooling	28.1%	29.9%	22.6%	31.7%	26.9%	29.3%
– Grade 12/Std 10	17.2%	15.7%	14.0%	20.8%	17.4%	22.2%
– Higher	5.4%	4.7%	4.5%	5.1%	4.6%	9.1%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	270 825	99 999	59 744	33 053	35 288	42 741
Participation rate (supply)[e]	40.7%	32.6%	35.0%	355.4%	47.0%	55.8%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	26.0%	16.4%	24.4%	340.4%	30.4%	41.2%
Employed	70 505	16 378	14 572	112 508	10 739	17 607
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	16.8%	0.6%	15.9%	4.7%	9.0%	4.0%
Mining/quarrying	2.5%	0.2%	0.3%	1.4%	1.4%	0.1%
Manufacturing	6.3%	0.9%	1.3%	3.2%	0.9%	2.4%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.6%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%
Construction	5.2%	0.9%	0.3%	1.2%	0.8%	2.6%
Wholesale/retail trade	11.2%	1.3%	2.0%	3.2%	3.7%	4.6%
Transport/storage/communication	3.1%	0.2%	0.6%	1.0%	0.4%	1.5%
Financial/insurance/real estate	5.9%	0.9%	0.8%	1.4%	1.9%	2.4%
Community/social/personal services	23.5%	5.2%	4.0%	4.5%	4.7%	7.3%
Private households/other	25.1%	3.5%	3.6%	14.9%	8.5%	6.2%
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	35.8%	49.8%	30.2%	30.5%	35.1%	26.1%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	46.0%	61.7%	38.8%	39.3%	45.8%	35.5%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	48 063	34 031	42 427	59 222	53 754	80 170
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	N/A[n]	20.5%	17.7%	12.8%	14.7%	13.0%
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	41.9%	44.8%	33.0%	37.7%	32.1%
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	21.6%	20.4%	24.5%	23.6%	21.8%
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	8.1%	7.7%	15.2%	11.6%	12.7%
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	4.1%	4.6%	8.1%	6.1%	9.1%
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	2.6%	3.2%	4.3%	3.9%	6.4%
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	0.9%	1.0%	1.3%	1.7%	3.4%
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	1.0%
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	86.4%	88.8%	89.9%	79.7%	83.5%	82.3%
Informal	10.2%	5.5%	6.9%	19.9%	15.1%	16.3%
Traditional	3.4%	5.7%	3.2%	0.3%	1.4%	1.3%

North West	*Dr Ruth Segomotsi Mompati District municipality*	*Greater Taung*	*Kagisano-Molopo*	*Lekwa-Tee-mane*	*Mamusa*	*Naledi*
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	76.1%	89.3%	77.9%	70.9%	67.6%	45.8%
Households owned but not paid off	6.7%	2.7%	7.0%	5.0%	12.8%	14.3%
Rented	17.3%	8.0%	15.0%	24.1%	19.6%	39.9%
Occupied rent free	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Household goods						
Radio	59.3%	62.6%	50.1%	59.6%	63.0%	61.9%
Television	64.3%	65.2%	54.7%	71.1%	69.1%	67.2%
Refrigerator	59.0%	62.5%	49.0%	64.6%	61.0%	59.1%
Computer	8.3%	5.6%	5.5%	12.0%	9.2%	15.8%
Cellphone	81.9%	80.7%	78.9%	85.1%	83.8%	85.6%
Landline	4.1%	2.2%	2.2%	7.5%	4.4%	9.3%
Internet[i]	20.3%	16.5%	17.0%	21.5%	22.8%	32.1%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	82.2%	88.5%	73.8%	86.1%	80.8%	76.7%
Cooking	45.9%	40.3%	38.3%	55.2%	64.3%	50.7%
Heating	67.9%	72.5%	51.9%	81.1%	74.6%	64.5%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	47.9%	20.3%	35.2%	96.5%	76.0%	78.1%
On communal stand	47.8%	77.3%	53.9%	2.1%	19.8%	19.9%
No access	4.4%	2.4%	10.8%	1.3%	4.2%	2.1%
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/ Private company	28.3%	7.6%	1.3%	75.2%	49.7%	69.7%
Communal/Own refuse dump	62.8%	83.2%	90.4%	16.9%	38.0%	23.0%
No refuse disposal	7.7%	8.6%	6.8%	7.5%	8.8%	6.1%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	36.3%	10.6%	15.8%	90.7%	64.2%	69.3%
Pit latrine	49.8%	77.8%	66.4%	3.0%	20.3%	11.8%
Bucket toilet	0.9%	0.1%	0.3%	0.5%	0.6%	4.5%
No Toilet	11.3%	10.4%	15.2%	4.8%	11.6%	12.5%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	22.7%	22.7%	24.2%	17.4%	18.7%	19.4%
Old age pension	7.5%	9.5%	5.0%	8.1%	5.1%	5.1%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	87.0	3.8	0.0	33.7	N/A[n]	55.8
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	0.3	36.9	5.4	18.1	2.0	14.2
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	N/A[n]	1.0	N/A[n]	4.3	1.1	9.3

North West	*Dr Kenneth Kaunda District municipality*	*City of Matlosana*	*Maquassi Hills*	*Tlokwe*	*Ventersdorp*
Demographics					
Size (km^2)	14 642	3 561	4 643	2 673	3 764
Share of country area (%)	1.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%
Main town	**N/A[n]**	**Klerksdorp**	**Womaransstad**	**Potchefstroom**	**Ventersdorp**
***Population*[b]**	695 933	398 676	77 794	162 762	56 702
— African	80.3%	81.0%	88.7%	71.3%	90.1%
— Coloured	4.1%	3.5%	2.3%	6.8%	2.7%
— Indian	0.7%	0.8%	0.4%	0.9%	0.3%
— White	14.5%	14.5%	8.2%	20.6%	5.9%
***Age structure*[b]**					
0–14	28.5%	28.2%	33.0%	25.2%	33.6%
15–64	66.0%	66.4%	61.8%	69.1%	60.2%
65+	5.5%	5.4%	5.2%	5.7%	6.1%
Households					
Number of households	208 047	120 442	20 505	52 537	14 562
Average household size	3.2	3.2	3.6	2.9	3.8
Poverty rate[c]	63.7%	74.0%	61.2%	36.1%	59.8%
Settlement type					
Rural	N/A[n]	78.6%	91.4%	94.8%	98.3%
Urban	N/A[n]	21.4%	8.6%	5.2%	1.7%
Education					
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds					
– No schooling	10.0%	7.9%	23.5%	7.0%	17.3%
– Some primary schooling	14.6%	13.6%	18.8%	12.4%	23.4%
– Completed primary school	5.0%	4.7%	5.8%	4.5%	7.3%
– Some secondary schooling	34.0%	36.4%	28.2%	31.5%	33.0%
– Grade 12/Std 10	26.9%	28.3%	19.0%	30.4%	15.1%
– Higher	9.5%	9.0%	4.7%	14.3%	4.0%
Employment					
Working-age population[d]	459 353	264 626	48 078	112 499	34 150
Participation rate (supply)[e]	56.0%	58.7%	46.5%	56.9%	46.2%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	39.3%	39.4%	30.8%	44.5%	33.8%
Employed	180 703	104 288	14 814	50 062	11 538
***Employment by industry*[g]**					
Agriculture	6.2%	1.6%	4.8%	5.7%	10.3%
Mining/quarrying	30.2%	11.2%	3.5%	0.9%	0.5%
Manufacturing	6.6%	3.3%	1.6%	4.2%	3.4%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.6%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%	0.5%
Construction	4.3%	1.9%	1.5%	3.0%	1.2%
Wholesale/retail trade	11.5%	6.0%	4.8%	4.5%	2.8%
Transport/storage/communication	2.2%	1.1%	0.6%	1.1%	0.7%

North West	*Dr Kenneth Kaunda District municipality*	*City of Matlosana*	*Maquassi Hills*	*Tlokwe*	*Ventersdorp*
Employment by industry[g] (contd)					
Financial/insurance/real estate	5.4%	2.5%	1.2%	4.4%	1.0%
Community/social/personal services	13.6%	5.8%	3.7%	11.4%	4.9%
Private households/other	19.4%	9.2%	6.0%	11.2%	8.4%
Unemployment					
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	29.7%	32.7%	33.4%	21.6%	27.0%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	39.2%	52.5%	42.6%	29.5%	34.0%
Income					
Average annual household income (R)	82 266	79 400	52 541	110 910	44 553
Monthly income (% of population)[b]					
No income	N/A[n]	15.9%	14.5%	17.6%	13.8%
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	27.9%	40.0%	23.3%	39.0%
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	18.3%	22.8%	18.9%	25.0%
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	15.9%	10.2%	14.2%	12.2%
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	10.2%	6.3%	10.8%	5.2%
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	7.0%	4.1%	8.0%	2.9%
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	3.4%	1.5%	4.7%	1.4%
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.8%	0.3%	1.6%	0.3%
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.1%
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%
Assets (%)[b]					
Dwelling occupied					
Formal	82.2%	83.7%	83.4%	81.7%	69.6%
Informal	17.2%	15.7%	15.8%	17.9%	28.9%
Traditional	0.6%	0.6%	0.8%	0.3%	1.5%
Households by tenure status					
Households owned and fully paid off	54.7%	53.9%	71.3%	47.7%	71.7%
Households owned but not paid off	12.1%	12.4%	9.9%	13.2%	8.1%
Rented	33.1%	33.7%	18.9%	39.1%	20.2%
Occupied rent free	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Household goods					
Radio	69.2%	70.0%	61.9%	72.5%	60.3%
Television	79.1%	81.3%	72.4%	79.6%	68.5%
Refrigerator	72.3%	73.8%	62.5%	77.5%	55.3%
Computer	20.6%	18.7%	10.2%	32.3%	8.6%
Cellphone	87.6%	89.0%	80.9%	89.8%	78.1%
Landline	12.1%	12.5%	8.3%	14.9%	5.0%
Internet[i]	29.6%	27.4%	22.5%	39.6%	20.8%
Household access levels					
Electricity					
Lighting	88.6%	90.3%	82.8%	90.5%	76.1%
Cooking	67.2%	71.7%	60.9%	65.6%	44.8%
Heating	82.6%	85.6%	77.5%	82.0%	66.8%

North West	*Dr Kenneth Kaunda District municipality*	*City of Matlosana*	*Maquassi Hills*	*Tlokwe*	*Ventersdorp*
Piped (tap) Water					
Inside yard/dwelling	91.9%	96.0%	85.7%	91.2%	68.9%
On communal stand	6.5%	2.8%	12.1%	6.7%	28.4%
No access	1.6%	1.1%	2.1%	2.0%	2.8%
Refuse removal					
Removed by local authority/Private company	76.6%	90.1%	56.6%	64.4%	36.9%
Communal/Own refuse dump	18.0%	7.0%	32.6%	28.0%	52.4%
No refuse disposal	4.8%	2.6%	9.5%	6.7%	10.1%
Sanitation					
Flush/chemical toilet	86.9%	94.3%	79.7%	84.3%	45.2%
Pit latrine	6.9%	2.5%	4.2%	6.7%	48.5%
Bucket toilet	1.0%	1.0%	1.5%	1.0%	0.2%
No Toilet	4.4%	1.8%	12.7%	7.0%	4.9%
Social security recipients[j]					
Child support grant	12.3%	13.6%	18.5%	9.3%	18.7%
Old age pension	3.3%	3.1%	4.7%	4.3%	6.7%
Municipal Finance					
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	N/A[n]	0.0	8.6	152.5	9.1
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	2.6	25.3	5.7	142.7	21.9
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.2	9.7	5.6	2.8	10.8

North West	*Ngaka Modiri Molema District municipality*	*Ditsobotla*	*Mafikeng*	*Ramotshere*	*Ratlou*	*Tswaing*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	28 206	6 464	3 698	7 192	4 883	5 966
Share of country area (%)	2.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%	0.5%
Main town	**N/A[n]**	**Lichtenburg**	**Mafikeng**	**Zeerust**	**Setlagole**	**Delareyville**
Population[b]	842 699	168 902	291 527	150 713	107 339	124 218
— African	93.9%	89.1%	95.5%	94.4%	98.2%	92.4%
— Coloured	1.6%	1.9%	2.3%	0.9%	0.7%	1.4%
— Indian	0.6%	0.6%	0.8%	0.7%	0.2%	0.3%
— White	3.7%	8.2%	1.3%	3.8%	0.7%	5.6%
Age structure[b]						
0–14	33.3%	32.6%	30.8%	32.9%	38.7%	36.0%
15–64	60.8%	61.9%	64.4%	59.7%	53.9%	58.0%
65+	5.9%	5.5%	4.8%	7.5%	7.4%	6.0%
Households						
Number of households	227 001	44 500	84 239	40 740	26 889	30 634
Average household size	3.6	3.7	3.3	3.6	3.9	4.0
Poverty rate[c]	55.4%	55.3%	37.7%	64.7%	75.4%	64.2%
Settlement type						
Rural	N/A[n]	98.1%	92.9%	98.7%	100.0%	89.3%
Urban	N/A[n]	1.9%	7.1%	1.3%	0.0%	10.7%

North West	*Ngaka Modiri Molema District municipality*	*Ditsobotla*	*Mafikeng*	*Ramotshere*	*Ratlou*	*Tswaing*
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	17.0%	14.7%	10.3%	20.8%	28.9%	23.0%
– Some primary schooling	20.2%	22.6%	15.9%	19.1%	26.9%	23.5%
– Completed primary school	5.2%	6.0%	4.6%	5.0%	5.3%	5.6%
– Some secondary schooling	28.7%	29.9%	30.6%	27.5%	25.8%	26.7%
– Grade 12/Std 10	20.7%	20.0%	26.0%	21.2%	11.2%	15.7%
– Higher	8.1%	6.8%	12.5%	6.4%	3.1%	5.6%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	512 167	104 602	187 743	89 930	57 827	72 066
Participation rate (supply)[e]	43.4%	48.9%	49.0%	38.5%	27.0%	40.1%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	28.7%	34.9%	31.5%	24.5%	15.1%	28.6%
Employed	146 936	36 497	59 081	22 050	8 728	20 581
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	12.3%	5.4%	1.4%	1.5%	3.2%	7.6%
Mining/quarrying	1.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%
Manufacturing	9.3%	3.9%	2.2%	1.6%	1.0%	2.0%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.6%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%
Construction	4.9%	1.6%	1.5%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%
Wholesale/retail trade	15.9%	5.1%	4.0%	4.5%	2.7%	3.6%
Transport/storage/communication	2.7%	0.9%	0.8%	0.5%	0.1%	1.2%
Financial/insurance/real estate	7.2%	2.2%	2.7%	1.1%	0.4%	0.9%
Community/social/personal services	18.8%	4.6%	6.1%	4.2%	2.1%	5.5%
Private households/other	27.0%	6.9%	10.6%	3.9%	1.4%	5.2%
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	33.7%	28.3%	35.7%	36.2%	43.9%	28.7%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	44.1%	37.0%	47.1%	45.8%	52.4%	40.1%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	63 770	65 613	81 940	51 024	32 154	55 829
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	N/A[n]	12.5%	16.3%	14.9%	19.0%	13.3%
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	35.0%	33.5%	39.3%	45.0%	40.1%
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	24.4%	18.2%	22.4%	22.4%	24.9%
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	12.1%	11.1%	10.3%	7.5%	10.0%
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	7.2%	8.7%	6.9%	3.1%	5.5%
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	5.1%	6.9%	4.1%	2.0%	3.6%
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	2.5%	3.5%	1.5%	0.6%	1.7%
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.7%	1.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.5%
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%

North West	*Ngaka Modiri Molema District municipality*	*Ditsobotla*	*Mafikeng*	*Ramotshere*	*Ratlou*	*Tswaing*
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	83.7%	75.1%	87.8%	84.0%	91.1%	77.9%
Informal	12.8%	16.8%	10.5%	12.2%	5.3%	20.4%
Traditional	3.6%	8.1%	1.8%	3.9%	3.6%	1.7%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	71.6%	69.9%	62.3%	80.7%	84.1%	76.2%
Households owned but not paid off	8.0%	7.2%	10.7%	7.4%	4.9%	4.9%
Rented	20.5%	22.9%	27.0%	11.9%	11.0%	18.9%
Occupied rent free	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Household goods						
Radio	65.3%	63.9%	68.7%	64.9%	60.1%	63.0%
Television	68.3%	68.0%	73.0%	65.3%	62.2%	65.1%
Refrigerator	62.1%	58.8%	67.6%	63.4%	55.6%	55.7%
Computer	12.5%	12.9%	17.2%	9.9%	4.5%	9.6%
Cellphone	82.9%	81.7%	87.5%	80.7%	77.6%	79.8%
Landline	5.5%	7.8%	6.1%	3.8%	2.1%	5.4%
Internet[i]	25.6%	24.9%	33.7%	19.5%	13.4%	22.9%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	80.4%	74.0%	84.5%	81.9%	83.7%	73.7%
Cooking	55.3%	52.6%	61.7%	52.8%	48.7%	50.6%
Heating	68.3%	67.2%	77.0%	58.1%	61.3%	66.0%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	51.3%	66.0%	52.8%	57.2%	15.9%	49.0%
On communal stand	34.8%	23.2%	26.9%	34.5%	71.7%	41.1%
No access	13.9%	10.9%	20.3%	8.3%	12.4%	9.9%
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/Private company	36.8%	39.3%	61.8%	20.6%	1.3%	16.9%
Communal/Own refuse dump	55.5%	52.4%	32.1%	72.4%	89.0%	74.2%
No refuse disposal	6.2%	6.6%	5.0%	5.9%	8.8%	6.6%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	32.1%	47.9%	32.8%	27.0%	4.9%	37.7%
Pit latrine	57.3%	35.5%	61.6%	65.5%	79.9%	46.1%
Bucket toilet	1.2%	4.9%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	1.0%
No Toilet	7.5%	9.2%	4.7%	5.7%	12.6%	10.8%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	19.7%	20.9%	16.9%	21.1%	22.8%	21.1%
Old age pension	5.9%	4.1%	4.6%	8.6%	8.2%	7.8%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	74.4	30.3	24.4	N/A[n]	8.1	13.4
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	271.8	2.5	24.1	2.2	23.0	16.5
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.1	N/A[n]	4.4	N/A[n]	0.0	1.0

Northern Cape	*Frances Baard District municipality*	*Dikgatlong*	*Magareng*	*Phokwane*	*Sol Plaaitje*	*John Taolo Gaetsewe District municipality*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	12 835	7 314	1 541	833	3 145	27 283
Share of country area (%)	1.1%	0.6%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	2.2%
Main town	**N/A[n]**	**Barkley West**	**Warrenton**	**Hartswater**	**Kimberley**	**N/A[n]**
***Population*[b]**	382 086	46 841	24 204	63 000	248 041	224 799
— African	65.5%	58.5%	80.0%	81.9%	61.2%	84.8%
— Coloured	24.0%	28.5%	13.9%	11.0%	27.4%	9.3%
— Indian	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%	0.4%	1.2%	0.4%
— White	6.7%	3.6%	5.1%	6.3%	7.5%	5.0%
***Age structure*[b]**						
0–14	29.6%	31.6%	31.4%	32.3%	28.3%	34.0%
15–64	64.9%	63.1%	62.2%	61.9%	66.2%	61.2%
65+	5.5%	5.3%	6.4%	5.7%	5.5%	4.8%
Households						
Number of households	95 929	11 967	6 120	17 544	60 297	61 331
Average household size	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.9	3.5
Poverty rate[c]	46.1%	65.0%	46.2%	53.9%	38.7%	62.3%
Settlement type						
Rural	N/A[n]	93.0%	97.8%	95.2%	40.3%	N/A[n]
Urban	N/A[n]	7.0%	2.2%	4.8%	59.7%	N/A[n]
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	10.6%	17.7%	16.6%	17.7%	7.1%	14.7%
– Some primary schooling	13.7%	19.8%	18.4%	18.9%	10.9%	19.4%
– Completed primary school	4.9%	6.8%	5.0%	4.7%	4.6%	5.2%
– Some secondary schooling	35.5%	32.5%	32.6%	30.2%	37.6%	31.7%
– Grade 12/Std 10	26.8%	20.3%	24.0%	22.0%	29.3%	20.6%
– Higher	8.5%	2.7%	3.5%	6.6%	10.4%	8.4%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	247 921	29 555	15 058	39 021	164 287	137 671
Participation rate (supply)[e]	52.1%	42.9%	40.9%	51.4%	54.9%	44.1%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	34.3%	25.8%	23.9%	32.1%	37.4%	30.8%
Employed	85 097	7 612	3 594	12 508	61 384	42 440
***Employment by industry*[g]**						
Agriculture	6.2%	3.2%	2.4%	8.1%	0.7%	4.7%
Mining/quarrying	4.5%	7.0%	1.1%	0.4%	1.0%	18.7%
Manufacturing	9.4%	4.2%	2.0%	3.8%	3.4%	8.5%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.6%	0.0%	0.4%	0.8%	0.2%	0.8%
Construction	5.1%	2.9%	1.1%	1.6%	1.8%	4.4%
Wholesale/retail trade	12.2%	3.3%	3.6%	3.4%	5.0%	15.3%
Transport/storage/communication	4.1%	1.5%	1.5%	1.1%	1.6%	4.4%
Financial/insurance/real estate	9.3%	1.4%	2.6%	1.7%	4.1%	7.1%
Community/social/personal services	22.4%	3.7%	6.1%	4.6%	9.9%	17.4%
Private households/other	26.2%	6.3%	7.6%	12.6%	9.8%	18.9%

Northern Cape	*Frances Baard District municipality*	*Dikgatlong*	*Magareng*	*Phokwane*	*Sol Plaaitje*	*John Taolo Gaetsewe District municipality*
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	34.0%	39.7%	41.2%	37.6%	31.9%	29.7%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	43.9%	49.0%	51.8%	48.3%	41.7%	37.2%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	94 708	47 672	50 589	66 544	116 609	72 983
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	N/A[n]	15.2%	15.3%	14.2%	11.7%	N/A[n]
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	36.7%	36.1%	35.8%	24.7%	N/A[n]
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	23.4%	23.4%	21.9%	18.7%	N/A[n]
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	12.7%	11.8%	11.5%	14.9%	N/A[n]
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	6.6%	7.2%	7.7%	12.0%	N/A[n]
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	3.4%	4.1%	5.6%	9.6%	N/A[n]
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	1.5%	1.6%	2.3%	5.8%	N/A[n]
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.3%	0.2%	0.5%	1.8%	N/A[n]
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	N/A[n]
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.4%	N/A[n]
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	83.0%	81.1%	87.3%	84.8%	82.3%	77.5%
Informal	16.4%	17.4%	12.1%	14.0%	17.4%	10.7%
Traditional	0.6%	1.5%	0.6%	1.2%	0.3%	11.8%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	63.2%	78.3%	76.9%	77.2%	56.1%	68.3%
Households owned but not paid off	15.5%	3.8%	5.4%	3.7%	21.2%	7.4%
Rented	21.3%	17.9%	17.6%	19.1%	22.7%	24.2%
Occupied rent free	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Household goods						
Radio	66.3%	58.6%	69.3%	66.7%	67.3%	61.7%
Television	76.5%	66.5%	72.8%	71.0%	80.4%	68.7%
Refrigerator	70.8%	58.1%	70.8%	63.6%	75.4%	67.4%
Computer	18.4%	9.4%	11.5%	12.4%	22.7%	12.6%
Cellphone	83.3%	76.2%	82.0%	81.0%	85.4%	87.2%
Landline	14.3%	5.6%	9.4%	9.0%	18.1%	5.0%
Internet[i]	30.7%	26.0%	23.4%	23.0%	34.6%	23.8%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	83.3%	75.9%	85.0%	82.3%	84.9%	87.0%
Cooking	66.5%	55.9%	68.0%	66.9%	68.3%	54.3%
Heating	78.0%	70.0%	79.4%	76.3%	80.0%	72.5%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	85.2%	80.3%	86.3%	78.0%	88.1%	40.6%
On communal stand	13.3%	17.0%	9.2%	18.8%	11.5%	55.6%
No access	1.5%	2.8%	4.5%	3.2%	0.4%	3.9%

Northern Cape	*Frances Baard District municipality*	*Dikgatlong*	*Magareng*	*Phokwane*	*Sol Plaaitje*	*John Taolo Gaetsewe District municipality*
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/Private company	77.5%	57.8%	65.5%	67.3%	85.7%	26.8%
Communal/Own refuse dump	15.5%	27.9%	27.3%	25.2%	8.9%	61.6%
No refuse disposal	5.4%	11.8%	6.4%	7.1%	3.6%	7.4%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	80.1%	70.1%	83.7%	70.1%	84.6%	30.9%
Pit latrine	6.7%	13.1%	11.4%	16.7%	2.0%	56.2%
Bucket toilet	4.6%	1.8%	0.3%	1.8%	6.4%	1.6%
No Toilet	6.5%	13.7%	4.3%	9.3%	4.5%	9.5%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	10.9%	13.9%	15.8%	16.7%	8.9%	20.1%
Old age pension	5.9%	5.0%	7.4%	6.0%	5.9%	5.9%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	4.9	N/A[n]	20.9	21.8	0.4	79.8
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	11.1	N/A[n]	1.6	10.2	47.4	4.3
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	0.6	0.3	0.6	0.0

Northern Cape	*Gamagara*	*Ga-Segonyana*	*Joe Morolong*	*Namakwa District municipality*	*Hantam*	*Kamiesberg*	*Karoo Hoogland*
Demographics							
Size (km^2)	2 619	4 491	20 172	126 836	36 128	14 210	32 273
Share of country area (%)	0.2%	0.4%	1.7%	10.4%	3.0%	1.2%	2.6%
Main town	**Kathu**	**Kuruman**	**Joe Morolong**	**N/A[n]**	**Calvinia**	**Garies**	**Fraserburg**
Population[b]	41 617	93 651	89 530	115 842	21 578	10 187	12 588
— African	55.0%	87.0%	96.4%	6.8%	4.4%	5.3%	5.5%
— Coloured	28.7%	7.6%	2.0%	83.2%	82.2%	85.6%	78.9%
— Indian	0.6%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.7%	0.5%	0.7%
— White	14.0%	4.6%	1.2%	8.7%	12.1%	8.1%	14.6%
Age structure[b]							
0–14	25.5%	32.5%	39.4%	25.8%	27.5%	26.5%	27.7%
15–64	71.9%	63.2%	54.2%	66.1%	64.3%	63.3%	62.3%
65+	2.6%	4.3%	6.4%	8.1%	8.3%	10.2%	10.0%
Households							
Number of households	10 808	26 816	23 707	33 856	6 340	3 143	3 842
Average household size	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.2	3.2	3.0	3.0
Poverty rate[c]	31.5%	59.0%	73.8%	44.9%	38.2%	66.7%	39.8%
Settlement type							
Rural	75.1%	98.8%	92.1%	N/A[n]	62.4%	27.9%	99.4%
Urban	24.9%	1.2%	7.9%	N/A[n]	37.6%	72.1%	0.6%
Education							
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds							
– No schooling	10.6%	9.7%	22.9%	6.6%	14.4%	5.2%	18.5%
– Some primary schooling	11.3%	17.4%	26.6%	17.7%	19.7%	21.4%	22.1%
– Completed primary school	5.5%	4.9%	5.2%	10.1%	8.4%	12.2%	7.4%

Northern Cape	*Gamagara*	*Ga-Segonyana*	*Joe Morolong*	*Namakwa District municipality*	*Hantam*	*Kamiesberg*	*Karoo Hoogland*
Education (contd)							
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds							
– Some secondary schooling	33.3%	34.3%	27.8%	39.4%	30.6%	40.5%	26.5%
– Grade 12/Std 10	26.6%	23.7%	13.4%	18.8%	18.8%	16.4%	16.9%
– Higher	12.6%	10.0%	4.1%	7.4%	8.1%	4.3%	8.7%
Employment							
Working-age population[d]	29 937	59 226	48 509	76 598	13 866	6 452	7 842
Participation rate (supply)[e]	61.4%	50.2%	26.0%	54.2%	50.6%	48.8%	53.6%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	50.3%	33.2%	15.9%	43.2%	44.6%	33.7%	45.8%
Employed	15 064	19 639	7 737	33 106	6 185	2 174	3 590
Employment by industry[g]							
Agriculture	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%	11.1%	7.7%	4.7%	4.6%
Mining/quarrying	16.7%	2.7%	1.0%	14.2%	0.2%	8.3%	0.0%
Manufacturing	3.9%	3.0%	1.1%	6.3%	4.5%	3.9%	2.3%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Construction	3.3%	1.1%	0.4%	6.7%	2.4%	3.0%	0.6%
Wholesale/retail trade	5.5%	6.0%	2.1%	10.8%	3.9%	5.1%	2.5%
Transport/storage/communication	3.4%	0.8%	0.5%	4.1%	1.0%	0.9%	0.8%
Financial/insurance/real estate	2.8%	2.8%	0.7%	6.1%	4.0%	2.5%	0.7%
Community/social/personal services	4.5%	8.0%	1.9%	17.1%	7.4%	8.4%	4.1%
Private households/other	6.9%	7.6%	2.1%	23.3%	15.6%	5.8%	10.5%
Unemployment							
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	17.7%	33.7%	38.6%	20.1%	11.8%	30.8%	14.6%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	22.4%	43.2%	49.5%	25.4%	15.3%	40.4%	30.0%
Income							
Average annual household income (R)	146 044	72 508	40 442	89 460	98 353	77 511	97 961
Monthly income (% of population)[b]							
No income	10.1%	16.1%	18.3%	N/A[n]	6.8%	10.8%	6.3%
R1–R1 600	17.0%	30.1%	43.6%	N/A[n]	28.5%	32.2%	32.3%
R1 601–R3 200	16.8%	17.9%	20.6%	N/A[n]	24.8%	23.9%	26.2%
R3 201–R6 400	16.6%	13.7%	7.8%	N/A[n]	16.2%	14.7%	13.7%
R6 401–R12 800	15.1%	11.1%	4.8%	N/A[n]	10.3%	9.3%	9.2%
R12 801–R25 600	12.5%	7.0%	3.2%	N/A[n]	8.0%	6.1%	6.2%
R25 601–R51 200	8.3%	2.9%	1.2%	N/A[n]	3.4%	1.9%	3.8%
R51 201–R102 400	2.7%	0.8%	0.3%	N/A[n]	1.2%	0.6%	1.4%
R102 401–R204 800	0.6%	0.2%	0.1%	N/A[n]	0.6%	0.2%	0.4%
R204 801 or more	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	N/A[n]	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%
Assets (%)[b]							
Dwelling occupied							
Formal	76.1%	81.8%	73.2%	95.5%	97.6%	97.9%	97.7%
Informal	23.5%	11.4%	4.3%	2.5%	1.5%	1.3%	1.9%
Traditional	0.4%	6.8%	22.6%	2.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.4%

Northern Cape	*Gamagara*	*Ga-Segonyana*	*Joe Morolong*	*Namakwa District municipality*	*Hantam*	*Kamiesberg*	*Karoo Hoogland*
Households by tenure status							
Households owned and fully paid off	27.6%	75.6%	82.3%	69.0%	58.7%	82.3%	62.6%
Households owned but not paid off	15.1%	5.4%	5.8%	6.2%	12.1%	2.9%	7.5%
Rented	57.2%	19.0%	11.9%	24.9%	29.3%	14.7%	29.9%
Occupied rent free	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Household goods							
Radio	61.4%	67.7%	55.1%	70.1%	71.8%	68.1%	69.0%
Television	71.4%	75.4%	59.9%	74.4%	69.3%	69.9%	58.1%
Refrigerator	69.3%	74.1%	59.0%	72.3%	64.7%	68.0%	53.0%
Computer	26.5%	13.5%	5.2%	19.2%	18.4%	13.6%	16.4%
Cellphone	93.0%	89.5%	81.9%	74.3%	68.4%	61.3%	60.3%
Landline	10.4%	5.5%	1.9%	21.9%	23.0%	26.2%	25.0%
Internet[i]	40.6%	22.1%	18.0%	24.1%	27.4%	11.2%	22.1%
Household access levels							
Electricity							
Lighting	87.9%	91.2%	81.8%	86.5%	76.9%	87.4%	64.9%
Cooking	72.9%	63.3%	35.7%	65.7%	57.3%	56.5%	46.4%
Heating	82.4%	85.6%	53.2%	81.3%	71.3%	75.6%	58.5%
Piped (tap) Water							
Inside yard/dwelling	96.3%	40.1%	15.7%	95.4%	95.6%	94.7%	97.2%
On communal stand	3.2%	58.5%	76.1%	2.2%	3.3%	1.2%	2.2%
No access	0.5%	1.4%	8.2%	2.4%	1.0%	4.2%	0.6%
Refuse removal							
Removed by local authority/ Private company	92.8%	18.0%	6.7%	82.2%	73.4%	84.5%	63.0%
Communal/Own refuse dump	4.0%	67.9%	80.8%	13.9%	20.2%	12.2%	34.2%
No refuse disposal	1.5%	6.1%	11.4%	2.6%	5.0%	2.1%	1.6%
Sanitation							
Flush/chemical toilet	88.3%	27.2%	9.0%	71.7%	77.0%	45.6%	57.5%
Pit latrine	6.7%	57.8%	77.0%	19.9%	11.4%	47.4%	32.0%
Bucket toilet	0.6%	1.7%	2.0%	1.4%	2.9%	0.9%	1.1%
No Toilet	3.5%	11.3%	10.3%	5.5%	6.0%	5.3%	7.8%
Social security recipients[j]							
Child support grant	7.3%	17.0%	29.4%	10.8%	9.8%	13.9%	11.0%
Old age pension	3.4%	4.7%	8.4%	7.4%	6.6%	9.5%	8.0%
Municipal Finance							
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	15.8	45.1	N/A[n]	1.1	7.6	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	40.8	32.0	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	0.8	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	N/A[n]	0.8	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]

Northern Cape	*Khai-Ma*	*Nama Khoi*	*Richtersveld*	*Pixley Ka Seme District municipality*	*Emthanjeni*	*Kareeberg*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	16 627	17 988	9 607	103 409	13 472	17 701
Share of country area (%)	1.4%	1.5%	0.8%	8.5%	1.1%	1.4%
Main town	**Pofadder**	**Springbok**	**Port Nolloth**	**N/A[n]**	**De Aar**	**Carnarvon**

Northern Cape	*Khai-Ma*	*Nama Khoi*	*Richtersveld*	*Pixley Ka Seme District municipality*	*Emthanjeni*	*Kareeberg*
Demographics (contd)						
Population[b]	12 465	47 041	11 982	186 351	42 356	11 673
— African	17.6%	4.2%	13.1%	31.5%	33.2%	4.8%
— Coloured	75.1%	88.1%	76.6%	59.2%	57.7%	85.1%
— Indian	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%
— White	6.0%	6.6%	8.5%	8.1%	8.0%	9.1%
Age structure[b]						
0–14	25.9%	24.9%	23.8%	31.6%	31.7%	29.4%
15–64	68.6%	66.9%	70.2%	62.4%	62.5%	62.5%
65+	5.5%	8.2%	6.0%	6.1%	5.8%	8.1%
Households						
Number of households	3 796	13 193	3 543	49 193	10 457	3 222
Average household size	3.2	3.4	3.1	3.7	3.9	3.4
Poverty rate[c]	75.0%	30.1%	68.0%	48.1%	43.5%	65.9%
Settlement type						
Rural	69.2%	44.1%	21.2%	N/A[n]	98.6%	57.6%
Urban	30.8%	55.9%	78.8%	N/A[n]	1.4%	42.4%
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	3.9%	2.2%	2.5%	14.7%	11.0%	18.0%
– Some primary schooling	17.5%	15.7%	15.1%	20.1%	16.9%	19.4%
– Completed primary school	8.4%	10.6%	13.5%	7.0%	6.8%	7.2%
– Some secondary schooling	46.3%	43.6%	42.7%	31.7%	34.0%	32.1%
– Grade 12/Std 10	18.1%	20.0%	18.9%	20.5%	24.7%	17.5%
– Higher	5.8%	7.9%	7.3%	6.1%	6.6%	5.7%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	8 553	31 477	8 408	116 211	26 463	7 298
Participation rate (supply)[e]	68.4%	50.1%	65.4%	51.6%	50.9%	50.4%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	53.2%	38.6%	53.1%	37.0%	36.7%	37.7%
Employed	4 547	12 149	4 461	42 974	9 709	2 751
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	9.4%	3.3%	2.8%	21.8%	6.4%	1.5%
Mining/quarrying	9.2%	6.2%	17.3%	0.6%	0.3%	0.0%
Manufacturing	3.4%	2.4%	2.0%	7.4%	3.0%	1.7%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.8%	0.7%	0.0%
Construction	2.9%	3.3%	4.8%	4.5%	1.0%	1.0%
Wholesale/retail trade	2.8%	6.0%	5.7%	9.7%	5.3%	2.4%
Transport/storage/communication	3.9%	1.9%	2.7%	2.3%	1.2%	0.5%
Financial/insurance/real estate	2.0%	2.8%	3.3%	7.3%	3.5%	1.1%
Community/social/personal services	7.1%	8.9%	7.0%	17.4%	8.4%	5.8%
Private households/other	9.7%	10.1%	9.5%	28.3%	12.1%	14.5%
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	22.1%	22.9%	18.6%	28.3%	28.0%	25.0%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	23.6%	30.1%	22.4%	35.4%	37.2%	32.1%

Northern Cape	*Khai-Ma*	*Nama Khoi*	*Richtersveld*	*Pixley Ka Seme District municipality*	*Emthanjeni*	*Kareeberg*
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	80 114	91 017	79 872	75 237	88 244	71 465
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	8.4%	9.5%	9.7%	N/A[n]	8.8%	8.7%
R1–R1 600	25.3%	25.0%	22.7%	N/A[n]	26.1%	34.2%
R1 601–R3 200	22.3%	20.8%	17.7%	N/A[n]	22.5%	24.3%
R3 201–R6 400	18.7%	18.3%	19.2%	N/A[n]	16.8%	13.4%
R6 401–R12 800	13.4%	13.2%	16.4%	N/A[n]	12.1%	9.5%
R12 801–R25 600	7.0%	8.2%	10.2%	N/A[n]	9.0%	5.9%
R25 601–R51 200	4.0%	3.9%	3.3%	N/A[n]	3.5%	2.9%
R51 201–R102 400	0.6%	0.9%	0.4%	N/A[n]	0.6%	0.6%
R102 401–R204 800	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	N/A[n]	0.3%	0.3%
R204 801 or more	0.1%	0.3%	0.0%	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.2%
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	87.5%	96.2%	92.6%	87.3%	96.3%	92.0%
Informal	3.5%	2.7%	4.7%	12.0%	3.0%	7.7%
Traditional	9.0%	1.1%	2.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.3%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	53.6%	78.1%	61.0%	64.6%	57.4%	64.0%
Households owned but not paid off	1.6%	5.2%	7.0%	9.7%	17.1%	6.9%
Rented	44.8%	16.7%	32.1%	25.8%	25.6%	29.1%
Occupied rent free	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Household goods						
Radio	48.3%	78.1%	63.5%	60.1%	66.6%	69.3%
Television	63.7%	83.0%	84.8%	69.4%	78.1%	64.3%
Refrigerator	64.3%	82.4%	81.4%	64.7%	72.5%	58.5%
Computer	14.5%	22.3%	22.0%	14.3%	17.9%	14.2%
Cellphone	73.9%	81.5%	85.4%	74.1%	77.5%	68.6%
Landline	14.1%	22.0%	20.6%	12.7%	13.7%	15.7%
Internet[i]	22.2%	25.7%	27.9%	21.9%	21.2%	22.6%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	89.6%	93.7%	96.0%	85.1%	92.6%	73.6%
Cooking	50.7%	79.9%	73.0%	53.7%	66.2%	50.2%
Heating	84.2%	91.0%	89.7%	78.0%	87.1%	65.2%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	92.0%	95.9%	95.2%	88.8%	95.6%	88.6%
On communal stand	5.3%	1.2%	1.6%	9.9%	3.7%	10.2%
No access	2.6%	3.0%	3.3%	1.4%	0.7%	1.1%
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/ Private company	80.2%	89.7%	90.6%	74.2%	85.4%	71.4%
Communal/Own refuse dump	12.7%	7.7%	6.5%	20.2%	10.9%	24.1%
No refuse disposal	2.6%	2.2%	1.2%	4.5%	1.3%	3.4%

Northern Cape	*Khai-Ma*	*Nama Khoi*	*Richtersveld*	*Pixley Ka Seme District municipality*	*Emthanjeni*	*Kareeberg*
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	76.9%	76.2%	78.4%	73.5%	85.3%	68.7%
Pit latrine	15.5%	17.0%	13.0%	11.9%	4.6%	18.4%
Bucket toilet	0.8%	1.2%	1.0%	5.4%	6.0%	2.9%
No Toilet	5.6%	4.8%	5.0%	8.0%	3.2%	9.6%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	14.1%	10.5%	8.2%	14.3%	13.2%	16.0%
Old age pension	5.7%	7.9%	6.1%	5.6%	5.6%	7.2%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	5.6	N/A[n]	0.5	N/A[n]	95.3	0.3
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	21.4	N/A[n]	1.5	14.6	25.1	4.1
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.0	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	0.4	N/A[n]	N/A[n]

Northern Cape	*Renosterberg*	*Siyancuma*	*Siyathemba*	*Thembelihle*	*Ubuntu*	*Umsobomvu*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	5 527	16 752	14 724	8 023	10 389	6 818
Share of country area (%)	0.5%	1.4%	1.2%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%
Main town	**Philipstown**	**Griquatown (Griekwastad)**	**Prieska**	**Hopetown**	**Victoria West**	**Colesberg**
Population[b]	10 978	37 076	21 591	15 701	18 601	28 376
— African	32.9%	33.0%	18.8%	15.2%	21.3%	62.6%
— Coloured	57.4%	57.5%	71.9%	70.7%	69.3%	30.6%
— Indian	0.5%	0.7%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%
— White	8.6%	7.5%	8.5%	13.1%	7.6%	5.7%
Age structure[b]						
0–14	32.8%	31.8%	30.8%	30.9%	33.3%	31.4%
15–64	61.0%	62.2%	63.2%	62.8%	61.1%	62.8%
65+	6.2%	6.0%	6.0%	6.4%	5.6%	5.8%
Households						
Number of households	2 995	5 831	9 578	4 140	5 129	7 841
Average household size	3.4	3.8	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.5
Poverty rate[c]	60.7%	46.9%	54.7%	42.6%	44.8%	44.6%
Settlement type						
Rural	52.2%	99.1%	81.2%	50.0%	81.2%	99.0%
Urban	47.8%	0.9%	18.8%	50.0%	18.8%	1.0%
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	16.0%	16.8%	11.5%	15.1%	16.4%	16.3%
– Some primary schooling	20.0%	23.3%	22.4%	21.5%	21.1%	17.6%
– Completed primary school	6.1%	7.2%	8.2%	7.0%	8.0%	5.9%
– Some secondary schooling	29.4%	30.3%	34.5%	29.8%	29.7%	30.7%
– Grade 12/Std 10	21.8%	16.9%	18.0%	19.9%	18.8%	23.1%
– Higher	6.6%	5.4%	5.3%	6.6%	6.0%	6.3%

Northern Cape	*Renosterberg*	*Siyancuma*	*Siyathemba*	*Thembelihle*	*Ubuntu*	*Umsobomvu*
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	6 695	23 059	13 652	9 855	11 373	17 816
Participation rate (supply)[e]	50.3%	47.7%	51.7%	54.2%	61.6%	50.6%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	37.1%	34.2%	39.0%	38.8%	43.6%	33.8%
Employed	2 485	7 893	5 327	3 820	4 963	6 027
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	6.6%	9.5%	7.0%	9.0%	7.5%	6.4%
Mining/quarrying	0.2%	0.5%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Manufacturing	2.1%	2.5%	2.9%	3.7%	2.7%	2.2%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%
Construction	2.0%	0.7%	2.6%	1.9%	3.3%	2.1%
Wholesale/retail trade	1.4%	2.4%	3.0%	4.7%	2.4%	4.2%
Transport/storage/communication	0.5%	1.0%	0.3%	0.8%	0.2%	1.1%
Financial/insurance/real estate	1.0%	1.8%	2.7%	4.0%	3.2%	2.6%
Community/social/personal services	4.9%	6.5%	4.8%	4.7%	5.3%	6.3%
Private households/other	11.6%	6.6%	16.1%	5.5%	12.6%	6.0%
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	26.8%	28.2%	24.3%	28.4%	29.1%	33.0%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	29.8%	35.2%	30.2%	35.2%	34.8%	40.4%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	77 133	71 274	71 007	71 390	71 986	70 216
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	11.2%	13.7%	7.8%	10.4%	11.5%	13.5%
R1–R1 600	33.5%	30.0%	31.8%	26.8%	33.8%	31.9%
R1 601–R3 200	23.4%	24.1%	26.0%	25.8%	24.0%	21.7%
R3 201–R6 400	13.5%	15.2%	16.4%	17.8%	13.5%	14.4%
R6 401–R12 800	8.8%	7.6%	8.8%	9.2%	7.8%	9.8%
R12 801–R25 600	6.5%	5.4%	5.5%	6.2%	5.3%	5.4%
R25 601–R51 200	1.8%	2.8%	2.8%	2.9%	2.8%	2.3%
R51 201–R102 400	0.7%	0.8%	0.5%	0.6%	0.8%	0.6%
R102 401–R204 800	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%
R204 801 or more	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	95.1%	74.0%	88.9%	78.4%	88.4%	89.0%
Informal	4.8%	25.2%	10.6%	21.3%	9.0%	10.7%
Traditional	0.1%	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	2.7%	0.2%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	70.7%	66.1%	70.4%	58.3%	73.9%	64.7%
Households owned but not paid off	5.4%	6.3%	4.0%	17.7%	4.5%	7.9%
Rented	23.9%	27.6%	25.6%	24.0%	21.6%	27.4%
Occupied rent free	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Household goods						
Radio	48.4%	92.3%	34.6%	51.7%	58.3%	65.2%
Television	67.2%	109.8%	43.0%	60.2%	67.0%	69.1%
Refrigerator	64.6%	105.1%	40.6%	58.7%	57.3%	64.4%

Northern Cape	*Renosterberg*	*Siyancuma*	*Siyathemba*	*Thembelihle*	*Ubuntu*	*Umsobomvu*
Household goods (contd)						
Computer	14.5%	21.1%	8.3%	16.2%	12.9%	11.6%
Cellphone	72.5%	125.2%	44.2%	72.2%	71.2%	73.7%
Landline	15.2%	17.6%	7.4%	14.1%	13.8%	10.8%
Internet[i]	20.8%	29.7%	13.5%	24.2%	22.0%	25.9%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	88.1%	135.0%	52.5%	75.2%	84.8%	86.7%
Cooking	66.7%	87.7%	31.9%	43.9%	62.0%	34.5%
Heating	82.4%	123.1%	50.0%	63.1%	76.6%	78.8%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	94.5%	125.4%	57.1%	77.3%	92.5%	92.3%
On communal stand	4.8%	33.3%	3.1%	22.3%	6.5%	6.4%
No access	0.7%	5.6%	0.7%	0.4%	1.0%	1.2%
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/ Private company	76.0%	104.1%	45.6%	69.2%	67.4%	79.8%
Communal/Own refuse dump	21.0%	46.0%	12.6%	18.2%	25.3%	18.2%
No refuse disposal	2.7%	12.7%	2.5%	11.6%	6.0%	1.7%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	83.1%	99.3%	43.5%	65.8%	74.9%	76.8%
Pit latrine	8.0%	23.9%	10.2%	22.7%	5.7%	11.8%
Bucket toilet	2.0%	19.8%	2.2%	0.3%	7.9%	1.5%
No Toilet	5.5%	20.0%	4.6%	10.3%	9.5%	8.0%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	15.5%	13.5%	13.3%	14.4%	17.0%	16.2%
Old age pension	5.8%	4.9%	5.7%	6.8%	5.5%	5.8%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	N/A[n]	11.2	20.7	3.6	5.8	33.4
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	N/A[n]	9.3	13.4	39.1	10.4	6.5
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	N/A[n]	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.0

Northern Cape	*Siyanda District municipality*	*Kai !Garib*	*Kgatelopele*	*//Khara Hais*	*!Kheis*	*Mier*	*Tsantsabane*
Demographics							
Size (km^2)	102 524	26 357	2 477	21 779	11 107	22 468	18 332
Share of country area (%)	8.4%	2.2%	0.2%	1.8%	0.9%	1.8%	1.5%
Main town	**N/A[n]**	**Keimoes**	**Danielskuil**	**Upington**	**Groblershoop**	**Rietfontein**	**Postmasburg**
Population[b]	236 783	65 869	18 687	93 494	16 637	7 003	35 093
— African	29.4%	28.3%	49.9%	23.1%	6.9%	4.0%	52.8%
— Coloured	60.4%	62.2%	38.9%	65.2%	85.4%	90.4%	37.6%
— Indian	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	1.0%	0.6%	0.6%
— White	8.2%	6.3%	9.8%	9.9%	5.4%	4.4%	8.4%
Age structure[b]							
0–14	28.4%	24.4%	29.5%	29.8%	35.0%	31.6%	27.9%
15–64	66.4%	70.5%	66.4%	64.6%	60.3%	61.2%	67.6%
65+	5.1%	5.1%	4.1%	5.5%	4.7%	7.1%	4.4%

Northern Cape	*Siyanda District municipality*	*Kai !Garib*	*Kgatelopele*	*//Khara Hais*	*!Kheis*	*Mier*	*Tsantsabane*
Households							
Number of households	61 097	16 703	5 381	23 245	4 146	1 784	9 839
Average household size	3.5	2.9	3.4	3.9	3.9	3.7	3.5
Poverty rate[c]	35.9%	32.1%	39.9%	36.8%	47.8%	28.7%	36.7%
Settlement type							
Rural	N/A[n]	91.2%	90.8%	99.4%	97.0%	80.5%	99.6%
Urban	N/A[n]	8.8%	9.2%	0.6%	3.0%	19.5%	0.4%
Education							
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds							
– No schooling	9.6%	9.0%	12.2%	7.2%	13.5%	9.1%	13.7%
– Some primary schooling	18.1%	23.6%	14.6%	14.7%	25.9%	22.1%	13.9%
– Completed primary school	7.3%	8.7%	5.1%	6.8%	9.8%	10.7%	5.3%
– Some secondary schooling	37.0%	39.1%	33.3%	37.5%	32.3%	38.2%	35.4%
– Grade 12/Std 10	21.7%	15.5%	25.6%	26.0%	14.0%	14.9%	25.4%
– Higher	6.3%	3.9%	9.2%	7.9%	4.5%	5.1%	6.4%
Employment							
Working-age population[d]	157 317	46 422	12 412	60 424	10 031	4 289	23 739
Participation rate (supply)[e]	52.8%	48.7%	55.2%	52.6%	55.4%	43.4%	60.4%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	41.7%	42.3%	42.8%	41.0%	39.8%	29.9%	44.6%
Employed	65 546	19 617	5 313	24 748	3 995	1 284	10 589
Employment by industry[g]							
Agriculture	27.3%	30.3%	1.3%	6.5%	12.6%	7.2%	2.2%
Mining/quarrying	4.6%	0.0%	13.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	5.8%
Manufacturing	9.4%	2.8%	7.7%	5.2%	2.7%	2.1%	3.2%
Electricity/gas/water supply	1.1%	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%	0.3%	0.0%	0.5%
Construction	5.5%	2.0%	5.5%	2.7%	0.7%	4.9%	1.6%
Wholesale/retail trade	11.2%	2.4%	5.3%	7.7%	3.5%	4.4%	3.4%
Transport/storage/communication	3.6%	0.3%	1.5%	2.2%	0.6%	0.8%	3.4%
Financial/insurance/real estate	4.6%	1.1%	1.6%	2.7%	1.7%	1.0%	3.0%
Community/social/personal services	12.8%	3.1%	5.7%	7.7%	3.2%	5.4%	7.3%
Private households/other	19.9%	8.4%	10.8%	9.1%	12.6%	4.8%	6.6%
Unemployment							
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	19.2%	10.0%	22.3%	22.1%	28.0%	30.9%	26.1%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	22.7%	10.0%	29.1%	29.0%	34.3%	35.2%	32.3%
Income							
Average annual household income (R)	92 878	71 739	105 452	103 547	73 986	63 196	110 329
Monthly income (% of population)[b]							
No income	N/A[n]	6.1%	9.8%	10.5%	7.7%	9.0%	12.9%
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	32.5%	23.4%	23.3%	32.5%	34.4%	21.0%
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	26.7%	19.7%	21.2%	28.3%	24.4%	18.5%
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	18.1%	16.2%	16.5%	16.2%	14.5%	16.5%
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	8.1%	14.4%	12.5%	7.1%	8.7%	14.2%
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	4.9%	9.8%	9.8%	4.6%	5.6%	9.6%
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	2.6%	4.7%	4.5%	2.3%	2.8%	5.1%
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.6%	1.3%	1.1%	0.7%	0.4%	1.4%
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	0.5%
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%

Northern Cape	*Siyanda District municipality*	*Kai !Garib*	*Kgatelopele*	*//Khara Hais*	*!Kheis*	*Mier*	*Tsantsabane*
Assets (%)[b]							
Dwelling occupied							
Formal	80.7%	91.1%	90.0%	76.1%	66.9%	92.3%	72.9%
Informal	18.0%	6.5%	9.5%	23.3%	32.1%	4.1%	26.2%
Traditional	1.2%	2.4%	0.5%	0.6%	1.0%	3.6%	0.9%
Households by tenure status							
Households owned and fully paid off	55.1%	51.0%	42.8%	56.1%	64.4%	76.6%	58.6%
Households owned but not paid off	11.8%	6.1%	9.4%	18.2%	16.9%	4.4%	6.2%
Rented	33.1%	43.0%	47.8%	25.7%	18.7%	19.0%	35.2%
Occupied rent free	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Household goods							
Radio	50.1%	34.6%	65.4%	56.4%	53.9%	24.4%	56.4%
Television	68.9%	57.1%	75.9%	78.4%	56.0%	52.8%	71.0%
Refrigerator	66.3%	54.6%	70.8%	76.1%	49.9%	65.9%	67.1%
Computer	17.9%	13.0%	21.1%	22.1%	10.6%	11.1%	18.8%
Cellphone	80.8%	75.9%	87.8%	83.1%	68.0%	76.5%	86.1%
Landline	12.7%	13.0%	12.7%	16.1%	7.1%	5.0%	8.2%
Internet[i]	25.0%	18.5%	34.9%	27.1%	22.3%	18.6%	27.8%
Household access levels							
Electricity							
Lighting	86.6%	87.4%	91.7%	91.1%	64.0%	74.3%	83.5%
Cooking	68.2%	66.2%	78.9%	72.0%	49.6%	42.2%	69.1%
Heating	81.9%	82.5%	88.9%	87.0%	55.3%	66.8%	79.1%
Piped (tap) Water							
Inside yard/dwelling	86.2%	82.9%	98.5%	90.4%	74.2%	90.8%	79.3%
On communal stand	9.5%	10.3%	0.8%	7.2%	14.0%	2.9%	17.4%
No access	4.3%	6.8%	0.7%	2.4%	11.8%	6.4%	3.3%
Refuse removal							
Removed by local authority/Private company	72.9%	57.7%	92.2%	89.2%	54.5%	65.7%	58.6%
Communal/Own refuse dump	19.9%	32.7%	6.3%	7.2%	26.9%	23.4%	31.8%
No refuse disposal	5.8%	7.5%	1.2%	2.4%	15.8%	10.1%	8.3%
Sanitation							
Flush/chemical toilet	72.6%	72.1%	93.9%	74.8%	49.0%	51.8%	70.1%
Pit latrine	10.6%	14.7%	1.5%	8.9%	20.8%	33.2%	4.6%
Bucket toilet	5.5%	0.5%	1.2%	10.9%	2.0%	3.1%	5.6%
No Toilet	10.3%	11.9%	2.3%	5.0%	24.7%	11.3%	18.3%
Social security recipients[j]							
Child support grant	9.5%	11.7%	7.9%	7.6%	13.9%	16.7%	9.2%
Old age pension	5.2%	6.9%	3.1%	5.2%	5.1%	5.4%	3.9%
Municipal Finance							
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	16.2	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	123.5	3.6	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	3.6	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	18.4	14.3	N/A[n]	N/A[n]
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	0.1	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	0.2	0.2	N/A[n]	N/A[n]

Western Cape	*City of Cape Town Metropolitan municipality*	*Cape Winelands District municipality*	*Breede Valley*	*Drakenstein*	*Langeberg*	*Stellen-bosch*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	2 444	21 472	3 833	1 537	4 517	831
Share of country area (%)	0.2%	1.8%	0.3%	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%
Main town	**Cape Town**	**N/A[n]**	**Worcester**	**Paarl**	**Robertson**	**Stellenbosch**
***Population*[b]**	3 740 026	787 490	166 825	251 262	97 724	155 733
— African	38.6%	23.7%	24.3%	22.7%	16.3%	28.1%
— Coloured	42.4%	62.1%	63.3%	62.5%	70.3%	52.2%
— Indian	1.4%	0.4%	0.6%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%
— White	15.7%	12.9%	10.7%	13.5%	12.3%	18.5%
***Age structure*[b]**						
0–14	24.8%	25.8%	27.8%	25.6%	28.4%	22.8%
15–64	69.6%	69.0%	66.9%	69.2%	65.5%	72.3%
65+	5.5%	5.1%	5.3%	5.2%	6.1%	4.9%
Households						
Number of households	1 068 573	198 265	42 527	59 774	25 125	43 420
Average household size	3.3	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.3
Poverty rate[c]	38.6%	27.6%	28.9%	31.6%	27.6%	16.8%
Settlement type						
Rural	5.8%	N/A[n]	76.4%	89.4%	97.1%	54.9%
Urban	94.2%	N/A[n]	23.6%	10.6%	2.9%	45.1%
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	1.8%	4.4%	4.9%	3.3%	6.0%	3.2%
– Some primary schooling	8.1%	15.4%	14.7%	13.1%	20.7%	13.0%
– Completed primary school	4.6%	7.2%	7.1%	6.5%	8.4%	6.2%
– Some secondary schooling	38.9%	37.9%	40.1%	37.7%	36.8%	35.0%
– Grade 12/Std 10	29.9%	24.4%	25.0%	27.5%	21.6%	25.3%
– Higher	16.7%	10.7%	8.3%	11.9%	6.5%	17.4%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	2 604 211	543 600	111 569	173 838	64 028	112 533
Participation rate (supply)[e]	63.2%	59.0%	60.7%	58.2%	59.8%	58.3%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	48.3%	50.6%	51.9%	48.2%	53.1%	49.5%
Employed	1 257 020	275 322	57 956	83 824	34 027	55 662
***Employment by industry*[g]**						
Agriculture	1.7%	24.2%	16.5%	8.7%	13.1%	6.7%
Mining/quarrying	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%
Manufacturing	7.6%	14.6%	6.7%	7.8%	7.1%	10.7%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.4%	0.5%	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	0.3%
Construction	3.3%	5.1%	2.6%	2.6%	1.9%	4.1%
Wholesale/retail trade	7.5%	11.7%	7.6%	5.8%	3.8%	8.7%
Transport/storage/communication	2.0%	2.7%	2.0%	1.3%	1.2%	1.0%
Financial/insurance/real estate	6.6%	6.7%	2.3%	4.7%	1.6%	4.4%
Community/social/personal services	7.3%	13.8%	9.2%	6.9%	4.2%	9.2%
Private households/other	14.4%	20.7%	6.4%	13.3%	30.9%	7.8%

Western Cape	*City of Cape Town Metropolitan municipality*	*Cape Winelands District municipality*	*Breede Valley*	*Drakenstein*	*Langeberg*	*Stellen-bosch*
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	23.9%	14.1%	14.4%	17.6%	11.3%	15.2%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	31.9%	19.4%	20.2%	24.6%	15.1%	21.5%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	161 762	119 536	94 923	141 001	86 307	154 617
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	13.7%	N/A[n]	12.0%	13.0%	N/A[n]	20.6%
R1–R1 600	17.3%	N/A[n]	19.6%	15.6%	N/A[n]	15.8%
R1 601–R3 200	16.0%	N/A[n]	22.2%	17.2%	N/A[n]	16.5%
R3 201–R6 400	14.5%	N/A[n]	19.0%	18.4%	N/A[n]	15.5%
R6 401–R12 800	13.0%	N/A[n]	12.6%	13.9%	N/A[n]	11.5%
R12 801–R25 600	11.8%	N/A[n]	8.5%	11.0%	N/A[n]	8.5%
R25 601–R51 200	8.7%	N/A[n]	4.7%	7.4%	N/A[n]	6.6%
R51 201–R102 400	3.6%	N/A[n]	1.0%	2.5%	N/A[n]	3.3%
R102 401–R204 800	0.9%	N/A[n]	0.3%	0.7%	N/A[n]	1.0%
R204 801 or more	0.5%	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.4%	N/A[n]	0.7%
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	79.0%	83.2%	79.0%	85.9%	91.5%	76.2%
Informal	20.6%	16.2%	20.2%	13.5%	8.1%	23.2%
Traditional	0.4%	0.6%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%	0.6%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	34.2%	31.6%	30.3%	33.6%	40.8%	27.1%
Households owned but not paid off	21.5%	11.6%	11.2%	15.0%	8.2%	10.5%
Rented	30.8%	32.3%	32.5%	35.9%	30.3%	31.7%
Occupied rent free	13.4%	24.4%	25.9%	15.4%	20.7%	30.6%
Household goods						
Radio	70.1%	65.7%	64.5%	71.1%	65.1%	67.6%
Television	87.3%	83.2%	82.0%	88.2%	82.5%	83.0%
Refrigerator	82.1%	79.1%	75.1%	84.8%	78.3%	81.1%
Computer	37.9%	28.6%	22.8%	33.0%	24.2%	37.7%
Cellphone	91.3%	84.7%	82.3%	86.7%	80.5%	89.2%
Landline	34.0%	23.7%	20.9%	28.2%	22.1%	25.9%
Internet[i]	49.3%	34.8%	29.6%	38.9%	28.0%	45.3%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	94.0%	92.8%	88.3%	95.0%	94.2%	92.9%
Cooking	87.6%	87.8%	85.3%	88.7%	89.3%	87.5%
Heating	63.0%	68.0%	65.8%	72.9%	70.0%	67.5%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	87.3%	89.1%	87.5%	93.5%	94.4%	80.3%
On communal stand	12.0%	10.1%	11.1%	5.9%	5.0%	18.6%
No access	0.7%	0.8%	1.4%	0.6%	0.6%	0.9%

Western Cape	*City of Cape Town Metropolitan municipality*	*Cape Winelands District municipality*	*Breede Valley*	*Drakenstein*	*Langeberg*	*Stellen-bosch*
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/ Private company	94.9%	83.9%	80.5%	88.9%	74.3%	89.4%
Communal/Own refuse dump	4.1%	13.1%	16.2%	8.6%	22.2%	7.8%
No refuse disposal	0.7%	1.6%	2.9%	1.0%	2.1%	1.0%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	91.4%	91.5%	89.1%	93.7%	89.3%	91.7%
Pit latrine	0.4%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.9%
Bucket toilet	4.5%	2.6%	2.7%	2.9%	2.5%	2.6%
No Toilet	2.7%	2.9%	5.3%	1.3%	3.3%	2.4%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	6.9%	7.9%	9.2%	9.1%	6.9%	6.8%
Old age pension	3.3%	4.1%	5.1%	3.6%	3.8%	4.0%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	0.0	48.6	2.4	N/A[n]
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	14.9	0.2	3.9	0.1	0.0	0.0
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	0.0	N/A[n]	N/A[n]

Western Cape	*Witzenberg*	*Central Karoo District municipality*	*Beufort West*	*Laingsberg*	*Prince Albert*	*Eden District municipality*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	10 752	38 854	21 916	8 784	8 152	24 121
Share of country area (%)	0.9%	3.2%	1.8%	0.7%	0.7%	2.0%
Main town	**Ceres**	**N/A[n]**	**Beufort West**	**Laingsberg**	**Prince Albert**	**N/A[n]**
Population[b]	115 946	71 011	49 586	8 289	13 136	574 265
— African	25.3%	12.7%	16.3%	7.0%	2.8%	24.7%
— Coloured	65.9%	76.2%	73.5%	79.0%	84.5%	53.2%
— Indian	0.2%	0.4%	0.5%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%
— White	7.7%	10.1%	9.2%	13.3%	11.8%	19.2%
Age structure[b]						
0–14	25.4%	30.5%	31.5%	26.5%	29.6%	25.9%
15–64	70.4%	63.3%	62.6%	66.3%	64.0%	66.3%
65+	4.2%	6.2%	5.9%	7.2%	6.4%	7.8%
Households						
Number of households	27 419	19 076	13 089	2 408	3 578	164 110
Average household size	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.3
Poverty rate[c]	26.8%	47.1%	43.7%	66.4%	43.4%	35.0%
Settlement type						
Rural	98.3%	N/A[n]	92.9%	99.8%	90.2%	N/A[n]
Urban	1.7%	N/A[n]	7.1%	0.2%	9.8%	N/A[n]
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	6.6%	10.2%	10.2%	11.7%	9.1%	3.7%
– Some primary schooling	20.1%	19.1%	17.6%	21.3%	23.3%	14.8%
– Completed primary school	9.2%	7.7%	7.5%	6.9%	9.1%	6.8%

Western Cape	*Witzenberg*	*Central Karoo District municipality*	*Beufort West*	*Laingsberg*	*Prince Albert*	*Eden District municipality*
Education (contd)						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– Some secondary schooling	40.2%	34.3%	34.6%	34.6%	33.0%	35.7%
– Grade 12/Std 10	18.2%	21.5%	23.7%	16.7%	16.9%	28.1%
– Higher	5.8%	7.1%	6.5%	8.7%	8.5%	11.0%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	81 632	44 953	31 051	5 493	8 410	380 944
Participation rate (supply)[e]	58.8%	50.1%	47.2%	64.6%	51.5%	57.7%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	53.7%	38.6%	35.2%	53.0%	41.5%	44.8%
Employed	43 852	17 332	10 932	2 912	3 488	170 612
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	39.0%	15.7%	3.2%	12.9%	11.3%	10.8%
Mining/quarrying	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
Manufacturing	5.7%	8.7%	3.8%	3.6%	2.4%	11.8%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.3%	0.8%	0.2%	1.0%	0.2%	0.7%
Construction	1.2%	8.6%	2.8%	2.5%	8.9%	13.9%
Wholesale/retail trade	4.2%	13.9%	6.4%	5.4%	4.4%	15.5%
Transport/storage/communication	1.3%	4.0%	2.1%	0.6%	0.6%	2.7%
Financial/insurance/real estate	3.7%	7.6%	3.4%	2.3%	3.0%	7.8%
Community/social/personal services	6.4%	16.9%	8.0%	5.4%	5.4%	15.0%
Private households/other	4.8%	23.7%	8.7%	14.2%	7.7%	21.5%
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	7.6%	23.1%	25.5%	17.9%	19.4%	22.5%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	9.9%	30.9%	34.5%	22.0%	25.4%	29.9%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	85 818	77 979	76 227	77 871	84 608	107 483
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	6.4%	N/A[n]	9.5%	5.3%	6.3%	N/A[n]
R1–R1 600	24.4%	N/A[n]	30.8%	25.7%	29.1%	N/A[n]
R1 601–R3 200	25.8%	N/A[n]	23.8%	25.4%	26.7%	N/A[n]
R3 201–R6 400	20.9%	N/A[n]	15.3%	21.8%	17.1%	N/A[n]
R6 401–R12 800	10.4%	N/A[n]	9.5%	11.0%	9.4%	N/A[n]
R12 801–R25 600	6.7%	N/A[n]	6.9%	6.6%	6.5%	N/A[n]
R25 601–R51 200	3.9%	N/A[n]	3.2%	2.9%	3.6%	N/A[n]
R51 201–R102 400	0.9%	N/A[n]	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	N/A[n]
R102 401–R204 800	0.3%	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.5%	0.3%	N/A[n]
R204 801 or more	0.2%	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%	N/A[n]
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	87.4%	97.7%	98.4%	97.9%	94.8%	84.8%
Informal	11.7%	1.9%	1.2%	1.3%	4.7%	14.5%
Traditional	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	0.8%	0.6%	0.7%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	28.0%	45.3%	47.7%	29.5%	47.5%	47.2%
Households owned but not paid off	9.8%	12.6%	14.2%	7.2%	10.1%	10.1%
Rented	26.2%	22.5%	21.5%	28.3%	22.4%	26.0%
Occupied rent free	35.9%	19.6%	16.6%	35.0%	20.0%	16.7%

Western Cape	*Witzenberg*	*Central Karoo District municipality*	*Beufort West*	*Laingsberg*	*Prince Albert*	*Eden District municipality*
Household goods						
Radio	53.3%	72.7%	74.0%	67.1%	71.7%	71.6%
Television	74.9%	76.6%	78.6%	71.2%	72.6%	82.4%
Refrigerator	70.3%	70.8%	72.2%	67.3%	68.1%	76.6%
Computer	17.4%	17.5%	16.7%	18.0%	20.2%	28.7%
Cellphone	81.1%	74.8%	75.4%	70.2%	75.8%	84.7%
Landline	16.3%	19.7%	18.7%	23.8%	20.4%	26.0%
Internet[i]	23.6%	24.5%	23.4%	25.4%	27.9%	34.1%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	93.4%	89.4%	92.0%	79.4%	86.4%	91.1%
Cooking	89.1%	81.6%	84.7%	73.5%	76.1%	82.6%
Heating	59.7%	66.0%	67.1%	65.0%	62.7%	58.0%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	90.8%	97.1%	97.4%	97.2%	95.8%	88.9%
On communal stand	8.7%	2.3%	2.0%	2.1%	3.6%	8.9%
No access	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	2.2%
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/ Private company	78.4%	79.8%	84.0%	65.7%	73.8%	87.2%
Communal/Own refuse dump	18.2%	18.2%	14.7%	32.4%	21.6%	9.2%
No refuse disposal	1.1%	1.4%	0.8%	1.5%	3.2%	2.3%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	92.2%	89.5%	92.7%	83.8%	81.6%	85.8%
Pit latrine	0.9%	5.0%	3.7%	9.5%	6.6%	6.1%
Bucket toilet	1.9%	1.3%	0.6%	1.4%	4.1%	1.9%
No Toilet	2.6%	3.2%	2.6%	4.9%	4.1%	4.0%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	6.1%	16.5%	17.2%	15.3%	15.9%	9.1%
Old age pension	4.3%	5.5%	5.0%	5.5%	7.0%	4.2%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	13.7	1.8	15.9	5.3	2.2	0.1
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	0.0	0.6	0.0	8.5	0.0	15.0
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	0.0	0.3	N/A[n]

Western Cape	*Bitou*	*George*	*Hessequa*	*Kannaland*	*Knysna*	*Mossel Bay*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	1 782	5 191	5 733	4 758	1 108	2 010
Share of country area (%)	0.1%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%
Main town	**Plettenberg**	**George**	**Riversdale**	**Ladismith**	**Knysna**	**Mossel Bay**
Population[b]	49 162	193 672	52 624	24 767	68 659	89 430
— African	45.2%	28.2%	7.4%	4.7%	36.1%	29.5%
— Coloured	31.2%	50.4%	68.5%	84.6%	40.9%	43.5%
— Indian	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%
— White	16.9%	19.7%	23.2%	9.9%	21.0%	25.5%

Western Cape	*Bitou*	*George*	*Hessequa*	*Kannaland*	*Knysna*	*Mossel Bay*
Age structure[b]						
0–14	25.2%	26.3%	24.4%	28.7%	24.8%	23.1%
15–64	68.4%	67.3%	64.6%	63.5%	66.9%	66.8%
65+	6.4%	6.4%	11.1%	7.8%	8.3%	10.1%
Households						
Number of households	16 645	53 551	15 873	6 212	21 893	28 025
Average household size	2.8	3.4	3.2	3.8	2.9	3.0
Poverty rate[c]	32.2%	54.2%	27.4%	20.0%	25.9%	24.3%
Settlement type						
Rural	44.4%	95.6%	97.6%	75.7%	84.4%	28.9%
Urban	55.6%	4.4%	2.4%	24.3%	15.6%	71.1%
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	2.4%	3.9%	4.6%	6.0%	2.6%	2.9%
– Some primary schooling	12.4%	13.8%	18.5%	24.1%	13.0%	12.0%
– Completed primary school	6.1%	6.0%	8.3%	10.0%	5.8%	5.6%
– Some secondary schooling	38.7%	35.4%	34.6%	37.1%	36.1%	33.8%
– Grade 12/Std 10	28.3%	29.3%	23.6%	18.5%	29.9%	32.1%
– Higher	12.1%	11.7%	10.5%	4.3%	14.7%	13.6%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	33 648	130 348	33 987	15 727	45 922	59 727
Participation rate (supply)[e]	68.6%	59.3%	57.9%	47.9%	61.3%	56.1%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	47.8%	47.0%	49.7%	39.6%	46.0%	43.6%
Employed	16 078	61 236	16 901	6 229	21 116	26 022
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	4.2%	3.6%	9.2%	19.8%	4.7%	4.1%
Mining/quarrying	0.1%	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%	0.4%	0.1%
Manufacturing	6.0%	6.8%	4.8%	7.2%	7.1%	6.5%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%	0.7%
Construction	10.3%	7.6%	5.1%	4.1%	8.9%	9.5%
Wholesale/retail trade	12.3%	8.7%	4.9%	4.6%	11.8%	8.2%
Transport/storage/communication	1.1%	2.5%	0.9%	0.6%	1.4%	1.0%
Financial/insurance/real estate	4.5%	4.8%	2.8%	2.5%	4.4%	5.0%
Community/social/personal services	5.8%	8.7%	6.4%	6.4%	7.1%	7.9%
Private households/other	15.4%	12.9%	11.2%	7.2%	11.5%	11.9%
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	30.1%	20.7%	14.1%	17.3%	24.8%	22.9%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	37.9%	27.6%	18.9%	22.7%	32.3%	29.9%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	97 710	114 483	97 048	72 377	119 619	117 216
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	18.1%	12.1%	7.9%	8.0%	16.4%	17.4%
R1–R1 600	26.3%	20.2%	18.8%	27.2%	21.4%	19.4%
R1 601–R3 200	19.7%	19.4%	22.5%	28.1%	18.8%	16.0%
R3 201–R6 400	13.8%	17.3%	22.5%	18.6%	15.0%	15.4%
R6 401–R12 800	9.0%	12.7%	14.3%	9.3%	11.1%	13.2%

Western Cape	*Bitou*	*George*	*Hessequa*	*Kannaland*	*Knysna*	*Mossel Bay*
Monthly income (% of population)[b] (contd)						
R12 801–R25 600	6.7%	9.8%	9.0%	5.8%	8.8%	10.5%
R25 601–R51 200	4.0%	6.0%	3.6%	2.1%	5.6%	5.5%
R51 201–R102 400	1.5%	1.7%	0.9%	0.5%	1.9%	1.7%
R102 401–R204 800	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.6%	0.5%
R204 801 or more	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.4%
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	74.0%	84.8%	94.6%	96.9%	74.9%	86.9%
Informal	25.0%	14.6%	4.6%	2.6%	24.4%	12.4%
Traditional	1.0%	0.6%	0.8%	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	37.7%	40.2%	55.9%	46.1%	53.7%	53.3%
Households owned but not paid off	10.7%	10.5%	6.6%	13.0%	7.3%	11.1%
Rented	31.6%	28.6%	22.0%	20.6%	24.1%	24.9%
Occupied rent free	20.0%	20.6%	15.6%	20.3%	15.0%	10.6%
Household goods						
Radio	65.4%	71.7%	77.8%	66.0%	70.4%	76.4%
Television	77.9%	82.6%	86.4%	77.7%	80.3%	86.6%
Refrigerator	70.4%	75.9%	83.4%	70.6%	73.6%	83.1%
Computer	24.2%	30.3%	28.4%	19.4%	30.3%	32.6%
Cellphone	87.0%	84.6%	84.2%	76.6%	86.7%	89.1%
Landline	20.3%	24.9%	31.8%	20.0%	27.3%	31.7%
Internet[i]	39.1%	36.9%	30.3%	21.7%	36.4%	35.7%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	94.0%	91.0%	94.9%	89.7%	88.8%	93.8%
Cooking	84.5%	83.8%	84.2%	80.8%	78.4%	85.9%
Heating	47.3%	56.9%	66.4%	65.0%	59.4%	56.1%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	82.6%	90.9%	95.0%	91.3%	79.4%	92.4%
On communal stand	15.9%	6.6%	3.0%	4.5%	19.0%	5.8%
No access	1.5%	2.4%	2.0%	4.2%	1.6%	1.7%
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/Private company	88.5%	88.7%	79.3%	67.6%	93.7%	93.1%
Communal/Own refuse dump	9.0%	7.1%	17.1%	24.8%	4.1%	3.9%
No refuse disposal	1.1%	2.6%	1.6%	4.8%	1.3%	2.3%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	84.2%	88.6%	90.8%	74.6%	76.4%	91.1%
Pit latrine	11.6%	3.5%	5.2%	15.5%	8.8%	2.0%
Bucket toilet	0.8%	2.0%	1.0%	1.8%	2.1%	1.6%
No Toilet	2.5%	4.8%	1.9%	4.7%	5.8%	3.5%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	8.7%	7.8%	6.2%	18.9%	7.9%	7.4%
Old age pension	2.6%	3.9%	5.0%	6.9%	3.2%	3.7%

Western Cape	*Bitou*	*George*	*Hessequa*	*Kannaland*	*Knysna*	*Mossel Bay*
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	43.0	31.9	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	239.6	464.4
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	0.5	0.0	0.1	N/A[n]	0.5	0.8
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	4.5	0.0	0.0	N/A[n]	0.2	N/A[n]

Western Cape	*Oudtshoorn*	*Overberg District municipality*	*Cape Agulhas*	*Overstrand*	*Swellendam*	*Theewater-skloof*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	3 537	12 240	3 466	1 707	3 835	3 231
Share of country area (%)	0.3%	1.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%
Main town	**Oudtshoorn**	**N/A[n]**	**Bredasdorp**	**Hermanus**	**Swellendam**	**Caledon**
Population[b]	95 933	258 176	33 038	80 432	35 916	108 790
— African	9.1%	25.6%	11.5%	36.2%	12.4%	26.4%
— Coloured	77.3%	54.2%	65.6%	31.0%	68.8%	62.9%
— Indian	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%
— White	12.5%	18.9%	21.6%	31.2%	17.4%	9.4%
Age structure[b]						
0–14	28.7%	21.5%	23.4%	24.1%	26.1%	25.5%
15–64	64.2%	65.6%	67.6%	67.6%	66.6%	69.4%
65+	7.2%	12.9%	8.9%	8.3%	7.3%	5.1%
Households						
Number of households	21 910	77 196	10 162	28 010	10 139	28 884
Average household size	4.2	3.1	3.2	2.6	3.4	3.5
Poverty rate[c]	16.2%	19.5%	26.3%	10.7%	27.4%	20.5%
Settlement type						
Rural	98.6%	N/A[n]	87.6%	47.3%	87.8%	82.6%
Urban	1.4%	N/A[n]	12.4%	52.7%	12.2%	17.4%
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	4.5%	4.0%	3.6%	2.5%	5.5%	5.0%
– Some primary schooling	17.7%	15.6%	16.1%	10.1%	21.9%	17.9%
– Completed primary school	9.0%	7.7%	9.1%	5.0%	7.9%	9.3%
– Some secondary schooling	36.8%	37.9%	35.7%	37.7%	34.0%	40.1%
– Grade 12/Std 10	25.2%	23.1%	22.5%	27.9%	20.8%	20.2%
– Higher	6.7%	11.6%	13.0%	16.9%	10.0%	7.4%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	61 585	52 803	22 344	52 803	23 906	75 464
Participation rate (supply)[e]	49.9%	203.1%	64.5%	19.0%	59.1%	60.5%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	37.4%	169.6%	55.7%	14.6%	52.3%	51.8%
Employed	23 031	89 554	12 444	25 501	12 496	39 113
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	6.0%	21.3%	8.9%	4.5%	8.8%	19.3%
Mining/quarrying	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Manufacturing	5.4%	10.2%	7.7%	5.9%	6.9%	4.6%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.2%	0.5%	0.6%	0.1%	0.7%	0.3%

Western Cape	*Oudtshoorn*	*Overberg District municipality*	*Cape Agulhas*	*Overstrand*	*Swellendam*	*Theewaterskloof*
Employment by industry[g] (contd)						
Construction	4.2%	11.8%	9.7%	8.5%	4.8%	4.6%
Wholesale/retail trade	6.3%	10.9%	6.6%	7.9%	9.0%	3.7%
Transport/storage/communication	1.2%	2.2%	1.0%	1.6%	1.9%	0.8%
Financial/insurance/real estate	2.9%	9.2%	6.1%	6.0%	2.2%	4.8%
Community/social/personal services	11.1%	12.5%	11.3%	6.8%	7.4%	5.6%
Private households/other	7.7%	21.4%	13.3%	12.3%	17.7%	9.7%
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	25.3%	17.0%	13.8%	23.3%	11.4%	14.9%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	35.9%	22.9%	19.5%	31.1%	15.0%	19.8%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	90 844	97 575	103 257	111 179	100 615	81 318
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	9.0%	N/A[n]	9.6%	16.4%	7.9%	11.8%
R1–R1 600	23.1%	N/A[n]	16.5%	19.0%	18.8%	23.0%
R1 601–R3 200	23.7%	N/A[n]	22.8%	17.4%	25.3%	22.9%
R3 201–R6 400	18.9%	N/A[n]	19.9%	15.6%	20.5%	19.1%
R6 401–R12 800	11.5%	N/A[n]	14.2%	13.7%	13.4%	11.4%
R12 801–R25 600	8.4%	N/A[n]	10.6%	10.3%	8.2%	7.0%
R25 601–R51 200	4.2%	N/A[n]	4.7%	5.2%	4.4%	3.6%
R51 201–R102 400	0.8%	N/A[n]	1.2%	1.7%	0.9%	0.9%
R102 401–R204 800	0.3%	N/A[n]	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%
R204 801 or more	0.2%	N/A[n]	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	89.2%	83.5%	86.4%	81.5%	89.3%	82.2%
Informal	10.1%	15.2%	12.8%	17.2%	10.0%	16.0%
Traditional	0.7%	1.3%	0.8%	1.2%	0.7%	1.8%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	51.1%	45.7%	55.6%	46.3%	50.9%	39.4%
Households owned but not paid off	12.1%	8.3%	9.1%	8.9%	7.8%	7.5%
Rented	22.8%	25.3%	23.5%	32.0%	21.4%	20.3%
Occupied rent free	14.0%	20.7%	11.8%	12.8%	20.0%	32.7%
Household goods						
Radio	68.3%	65.2%	73.4%	66.8%	63.8%	61.3%
Television	80.5%	82.5%	88.1%	83.5%	81.0%	80.2%
Refrigerator	74.8%	76.9%	84.5%	77.3%	77.1%	73.7%
Computer	24.5%	27.9%	30.7%	34.4%	26.2%	21.1%
Cellphone	78.0%	87.7%	90.0%	91.2%	83.8%	84.8%
Landline	21.8%	27.0%	31.3%	34.3%	24.4%	19.2%
Internet[i]	25.1%	34.8%	33.7%	37.4%	39.4%	31.1%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	85.3%	91.2%	96.7%	90.4%	94.0%	89.0%
Cooking	77.8%	81.4%	88.1%	73.9%	85.2%	84.9%
Heating	61.6%	61.1%	65.1%	50.4%	67.7%	67.8%

Western Cape	*Oudtshoorn*	*Overberg District municipality*	*Cape Agulhas*	*Overstrand*	*Swellendam*	*Theewaterskloof*
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	88.7%	88.7%	90.7%	89.3%	90.8%	86.8%
On communal stand	8.5%	10.5%	8.6%	10.3%	7.7%	12.4%
No access	2.9%	0.8%	0.7%	0.5%	1.5%	0.8%
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/Private company	79.4%	85.1%	81.4%	92.2%	77.0%	82.5%
Communal/Own refuse dump	16.1%	11.9%	16.9%	5.6%	20.5%	13.3%
No refuse disposal	3.3%	1.0%	0.9%	0.4%	1.2%	1.6%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	82.0%	89.7%	90.7%	93.7%	85.8%	87.0%
Pit latrine	9.2%	1.6%	0.7%	0.9%	3.1%	2.0%
Bucket toilet	3.7%	1.3%	1.5%	0.9%	2.5%	1.1%
No Toilet	3.4%	4.7%	5.6%	1.5%	3.1%	8.0%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	12.8%	5.9%	5.3%	5.4%	7.3%	6.1%
Old age pension	5.5%	4.7%	5.5%	6.5%	3.8%	3.2%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	N/A[n]	7.5	10.4	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	71.2
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	N/A[n]	3.9	2.0	0.3	N/A[n]	5.3
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	N/A[n]	0.0	N/A[n]	0.1	N/A[n]	N/A[n]

Western Cape	*West Coast District municipality*	*Bergrivier*	*Cederberg*	*Matzikama*	*Saldanha*	*Swartland*
Demographics						
Size (km^2)	31 118	4 407	8 007	12 981	2 015	3 707
Share of country area (%)	2.5%	0.4%	0.7%	1.1%	0.2%	0.3%
Main town	**N/A[n]**	**Velddrif**	**Citrusdal**	**Vredendal**	**Vredenburg**	**Malmesbury**
Population[b]	391 766	61 897	49 768	67 147	99 193	113 762
— African	16.4%	11.3%	12.7%	8.5%	24.5%	18.3%
— Coloured	66.6%	70.9%	75.7%	74.7%	55.8%	64.8%
— Indian	0.6%	0.4%	0.3%	0.6%	0.8%	0.5%
— White	15.7%	16.9%	11.0%	14.8%	18.0%	15.6%
Age structure[b]						
0–14	25.5%	24.9%	25.6%	26.8%	25.3%	25.0%
15–64	68.5%	68.1%	68.0%	66.9%	69.5%	69.1%
65+	6.0%	7.0%	6.4%	6.3%	5.2%	5.9%
Households						
Number of households	106 781	16 275	13 513	18 835	28 835	29 324
Average household size	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.5
Poverty rate[c]	21.9%	25.0%	28.8%	21.8%	17.9%	19.8%
Settlement type						
Rural	N/A[n]	95.7%	73.0%	88.2%	50.5%	95.5%
Urban	N/A[n]	4.3%	27.0%	11.8%	49.5%	4.5%

Western Cape	*West Coast District municipality*	*Bergrivier*	*Cederberg*	*Matzikama*	*Saldanha*	*Swartland*
Education						
Highest education levels of over-21 year olds						
– No schooling	5.4%	6.4%	7.7%	6.2%	2.4%	6.0%
– Some primary schooling	16.6%	18.7%	20.8%	18.5%	11.5%	17.0%
– Completed primary school	8.2%	9.3%	10.1%	8.9%	6.4%	7.8%
– Some secondary schooling	38.0%	35.5%	37.0%	39.1%	41.9%	35.4%
– Grade 12/Std 10	23.7%	22.3%	19.4%	20.3%	28.5%	24.2%
– Higher	8.2%	7.7%	5.1%	6.9%	9.3%	9.6%
Employment						
Working-age population[d]	268 478	42 138	33 857	44 947	68 905	78 631
Participation rate (supply)[e]	60.4%	59.1%	60.4%	61.1%	63.1%	58.3%
Absorption rate (demand)[f]	51.6%	55.0%	54.0%	52.5%	48.6%	50.9%
Employed	138 587	23 193	18 292	23 594	33 477	40 031
Employment by industry[g]						
Agriculture	28.0%	17.9%	25.0%	17.6%	12.0%	15.2%
Mining/quarrying	1.4%	0.2%	0.8%	1.1%	1.5%	0.0%
Manufacturing	12.3%	7.1%	4.4%	5.5%	7.1%	9.4%
Electricity/gas/water supply	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.5%
Construction	6.8%	4.5%	4.1%	3.7%	3.3%	4.2%
Wholesale/retail trade	12.0%	9.5%	7.2%	5.8%	6.6%	6.3%
Transport/storage/communication	3.4%	1.0%	1.6%	2.8%	2.9%	1.0%
Financial/insurance/real estate	8.9%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	8.2%	6.5%
Community/social/personal services	12.9%	5.4%	8.4%	6.7%	10.6%	5.4%
Private households/other	14.0%	11.0%	9.7%	8.4%	6.3%	7.5%
Unemployment						
Unemployment rate (official)[h]	14.6%	6.8%	10.5%	14.0%	23.4%	12.7%
Youth unemployment (official)[h]	19.9%	9.6%	13.8%	19.3%	30.4%	17.9%
Income						
Average annual household income (R)	104 969	107 117	79 892	97 735	117 118	108 000
Monthly income (% of population)[b]						
No income	N/A[n]	9.3%	9.5%	8.2%	13.9%	10.5%
R1–R1 600	N/A[n]	16.8%	22.9%	22.8%	17.1%	17.7%
R1 601–R3 200	N/A[n]	22.3%	25.5%	24.7%	17.4%	21.7%
R3 201–R6 400	N/A[n]	22.4%	21.1%	17.8%	16.7%	20.1%
R6 401–R12 800	N/A[n]	14.0%	10.6%	11.8%	15.2%	13.0%
R12 801–R25 600	N/A[n]	9.1%	6.4%	8.6%	11.5%	9.5%
R25 601–R51 200	N/A[n]	4.5%	3.0%	4.4%	6.1%	5.5%
R51 201–R102 400	N/A[n]	0.8%	0.8%	1.0%	1.5%	1.5%
R102 401–R204 800	N/A[n]	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
R204 801 or more	N/A[n]	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%

Western Cape	*West Coast District municipality*	*Bergrivier*	*Cederberg*	*Matzikama*	*Saldanha*	*Swartland*
Assets (%)[b]						
Dwelling occupied						
Formal	89.0%	95.7%	88.1%	89.7%	82.3%	92.0%
Informal	10.4%	3.6%	11.0%	9.8%	17.3%	7.6%
Traditional	0.6%	0.7%	0.9%	0.6%	0.5%	0.3%
Households by tenure status						
Households owned and fully paid off	44.2%	42.1%	43.1%	40.5%	47.7%	44.7%
Households owned but not paid off	10.4%	7.7%	10.1%	6.8%	15.9%	8.8%
Rented	27.5%	27.1%	19.3%	26.1%	31.0%	28.7%
Occupied rent free	17.9%	23.0%	27.6%	26.5%	5.3%	17.7%
Household goods						
Radio	64.7%	67.2%	60.6%	62.1%	68.0%	63.5%
Television	81.1%	82.6%	71.5%	72.8%	86.1%	85.1%
Refrigerator	77.3%	79.2%	70.6%	67.7%	81.9%	80.9%
Computer	25.8%	24.9%	18.0%	20.9%	31.2%	27.7%
Cellphone	81.6%	82.2%	72.2%	70.8%	90.7%	83.5%
Landline	23.8%	26.7%	21.3%	21.1%	24.6%	24.2%
Internet[i]	29.0%	25.8%	19.3%	25.3%	36.4%	30.4%
Household access levels						
Electricity						
Lighting	94.4%	94.9%	88.8%	88.7%	97.0%	97.8%
Cooking	89.4%	89.3%	82.7%	84.4%	92.4%	92.9%
Heating	70.0%	74.0%	65.8%	57.4%	75.4%	72.4%
Piped (tap) Water						
Inside yard/dwelling	96.0%	97.3%	94.6%	91.3%	97.3%	97.5%
On communal stand	3.0%	2.0%	4.5%	5.9%	2.0%	2.0%
No access	1.0%	0.7%	0.9%	2.7%	0.6%	0.5%
Refuse removal						
Removed by local authority/ Private company	78.2%	70.6%	61.4%	69.6%	97.1%	77.2%
Communal/Own refuse dump	19.5%	27.5%	35.4%	25.8%	2.3%	20.8%
No refuse disposal	1.2%	1.2%	1.5%	2.5%	0.4%	1.1%
Sanitation						
Flush/chemical toilet	87.5%	89.7%	82.7%	70.3%	96.3%	91.0%
Pit latrine	1.4%	0.9%	1.3%	2.5%	0.2%	2.3%
Bucket toilet	1.7%	2.0%	1.7%	2.3%	0.8%	2.1%
No Toilet	4.3%	4.1%	7.1%	9.1%	1.9%	2.5%
Social security recipients[j]						
Child support grant	6.6%	6.3%	8.1%	13.5%	3.4%	4.4%
Old age pension	3.8%	3.1%	4.2%	4.4%	2.8%	4.5%
Municipal Finance						
Unauthorised expenditure[k] (Rm)	N/A[n]	27.6	N/A[n]	34.7	N/A[n]	8.3
Irregular expenditure[l] (Rm)	N/A[n]	1.2	N/A[n]	5.9	0.2	N/A[n]
Fruitless and wasteful expenditure[m] (Rm)	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	N/A[n]	0.0	2.6	0.0

NOTES

a. The municipalities for which indicators are provided include the eight metropolitan municipalities, 44 district municipalities, and 226 local municipalities. In the table metropolitan and district municipalities are named as such. District municipalities are followed by the local municipalities that fall under each district.

b. The proportions in these sections should add up vertically to 100% but may not, owing to rounding.

c. The proportion of households in the municipality with a monthly income below R2 300 in 2011. A household is a group of people who live together and who provide for themselves jointly with food or other essentials for living, or a single person who lives alone. A household is not necessarily the same as a family. In 2011, the average household size for South Africa was 3.4.

d. The working-age population, that is persons aged 15 – 64 years.

e. The proportion of the working-age population that is economically active, since it distinguishes between economic activity (the employed plus the unemployed) and non-activity (including full-time students, homemakers, and pensioners).

f. The proportion of the working-age population that is employed – in other words, all those who do any work for pay, profit, or family gain.

g. Employment as a proportion of all people aged between 15 to 64 in that municipality.

h. The number of unemployed as a proportion of the labour force. It excludes people who are not economically active and discouraged work-seekers. Youth unemployment refers to the number of people aged between 15 and 34 who are unemployed.

i. The proportion of households that have access to the internet through a fixed line connection or via mobile access using cellular phones.

j. The figure shows child support grant and old-age pension recipients as a proportion of municipal population.

k. Overspending on the amount that was previously agreed to by Parliament or a provincial legislature.

l. Expenditure, other than unauthorised expenditure, incurred in contravention of, or that is not in accordance with, the requirements of any applicable legislation.

m. Expenditure made in vain and which would have been avoided had reasonable care been exercised.

n. Not available.

Service delivery rankings by municipality

EASTERN CAPE

	Score out of 10[a]
Alfred Nzo District municipality	3.11
Matatiele	3.48
Mbizana	2.73
Ntabankulu	2.56
Umzimvubu	3.35
Amathole District municipality	2.91
Amahlathi	3.43
Great Kei	3.84
Mbhashe	2.61
Mnquma	3.56
Ngqushwa	3.11
Nkonkobe	4.17
Nxuba	5.38
Cacadu District municipality	5.79
Baviaans	5.88
Blue Crane	5.77
Camdeboo	6.06
Ikwezi	6.06
Kouga	6.03
Kou-Kamma	5.88
Makana	5.86
Ndlambe	5.54
Sunday's River Valley	5.18
Chris Hani District municipality	3.64
Emalahleni	2.95
Engcobo	2.88
Inkwanca	5.80
Intsika Yethu	3.10
Inxuba Yethemba	6.13
Lukhanji	5.20
Sakhisizwe	3.61
Tsolwana	3.96
Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan municipality	6.33
O R Tambo District municipality	2.56
Ingquza/Ngquza Hill	3.00
King Sabata Dalindyebo	3.83
Mhlontlo	3.18
Nyandeni	3.07
Port St Johns	2.96

EASTERN CAPE (contd)

	Score out of 10[a]
Joe Gqabi District municipality	3.40
Elundini	3.17
Gariep	5.55
Maletswai	5.62
Senqu	3.27
Buffalo City Metropolitan municipality	5.23

FREE STATE

	Score out of 10[a]
Fezile Dabi District municipality	6.95
Mafube	6.62
Metsimaholo	7.04
Moqhaka	6.94
Ngwathe	6.78
Lejweleputswa District municipality	6.73
Masilonyana	6.56
Matjhabeng	6.86
Nala	6.58
Tokologo	5.64
Tswelopele	6.65
Thabo Mofutsanyana District municipality	5.96
Dihlabeng	6.81
Maluti-a-Phofung	5.61
Mantsopa	6.88
Nketoana	6.31
Phumelela	6.65
Setsoto	6.46
Xhariep District municipality	6.74
Kopanong	7.02
Letsemeng	6.72
Mohokare	6.48
Naledi	6.50
Mangaung Metropolitan municipality	6.86

GAUTENG

	Score out of 10[a]
Ekurhuleni Metropolitan municipality	6.79
City of Johannesburg Metropolitan municipality	7.49
Sedibeng District municipality	7.29
Emfuleni	7.31
Lesedi	7.28
Midvaal	7.17
City of Tshwane Metropolitan municipality	7.34
West Rand District municipality	6.32
Merafong	7.08
Mogale	7.26
Randfontein	7.32
Westonaria	6.19

KWAZULU-NATAL

	Score out of 10[a]
Amajuba District municipality	5.97
Dannhauser	4.60
eMadlangeni	4.40
Newcastle	6.50
eThekwini Metropolitan municipality	7.35
Ilembe District municipality	5.06
KwaDukuza	6.10
Mandeni	5.59
Maphumulo	3.16
Ndwedwe	3.97
Sisonke District municipality	4.23
Greater Kokstad	6.64
Ingwe	3.56
Kwa Sani	5.64
Ubuhlebezwe	3.90
uMzimkhulu	3.51
Ugu District municipality	4.81
Ezinqoleni	2.90
Hibiscus Coast	5.00
Umdoni	7.65
Umuziwabantu	5.33
Umzumbe	3.48
Vulamehlo	3.71

KWAZULU-NATAL (contd)

	Score out of 10[a]
uMgungundlovu District municipality	6.21
Impendle	4.43
Mkhambathini	4.50
Mpofana	6.04
Msunduzi	6.60
Richmond	5.16
Umngeni	7.09
uMshwathi	5.17
uMkhanyakude District municipality	3.88
The Big 5 False Bay	4.86
Hlabisa	3.97
Jozini	3.51
Mtubatuba	4.65
Umhlabuyalingana	3.18
Umzinyathi District municipality	4.04
Endumeni	6.76
Msinga	2.73
Nquthu/Nqutu	3.75
Umvotu	4.39
uThukela District municipality	3.48
Emnambithi-Ladysmith	6.11
Imbabazane	3.72
Indaka	3.82
Okhahlamba	4.15
Umtshezi	5.55
uThungulu District municipality	5.32
Mfolozi	4.79
Mthonjaneni	4.91
Nkandla	4.12
Ntambanana	3.64
uMhlathuze	6.62
uMlalazi	4.26
Zululand District municipality	3.98
Abaqulusi	5.74
èDumbe	4.78
Nongoma	3.50
Ulundi	4.57
uPhongolo	4.24

LIMPOPO

	Score out of 10[a]
Capricorn District municipality	5.92
Aganang	5.37
Blouberg	5.18
Lepele-Nkumpi	5.51
Molemole	5.37
Polokwane	6.43
Greater Sekhukhune District municipality	4.94
Elias Motsoaledi	5.17
Ephraim	5.57
Fetakgomo	5.06
Greater Tubatse	4.65
Makhuduthamaga	4.71
Mopani District municipality	5.47
Ba-Phalaborwa	6.62
Greater Giyani	5.14
Greater Letaba	5.41
Greater Tzaneen	5.31
Maruleng	5.10
Vhembe District municipality	5.41
Makhado	5.41
Musina	6.78
Mutale	4.96
Thulamela	5.29
Waterberg District municipality	6.43
Bela-Bela	7.26
Lephalale	6.18
Modimolle	7.32
Mogalakwena	5.99
Mookgophong	6.97
Thabazimbi	6.57

MPUMALANGA

	Score out of 10[a]
Ehlanzeni District municipality	5.05
Bushbuckridge	4.15
Mbombela	5.45
Nkomazi	4.75
Thaba Chweu	6.66
Umjindi	6.36
Gert Sibande District municipality	6.49
Albert Luthuli	5.62
Dipaleseng	6.37
Dr Pixley ka Seme	6.50
Govan Mbeki	7.43
Lekwa	7.09
Mkhondo	5.64
Msukaligwa	6.58
Nkangala District municipality	6.22
Dr JS Moroka	5.33
Emakhazeni	6.84
Emalahleni	6.85
Steve Tshwete	7.33
Thembisile	5.21
Victor Khanyi	6.70

NORTH WEST

	Score out of 10[a]
Bojanala Platinum District municipality	5.90
Kgetlengrivier	6.00
Madibeng	5.44
Moretele	4.81
Moses Kotane	5.68
Rustenburg	6.66
Dr Ruth Segomotsi Mompati District municipality	5.01
Greater Taung	4.12
Kagisano-Molopo	4.19
Lekwa-Teemane	6.86
Mamusa	5.87
Naledi	6.40
Dr Kenneth Kaunda District municipality	6.84
City of Matlosana	7.02
Maquassi Hills	6.24
Tlokwe	7.07
Ventersdorp	5.56
Ngaka Modiri Molema District municipality	5.19
Ditsobotla	5.51
Mafikeng	5.70
Ramotshere	5.00
Ratlou	3.78
Tswaing	4.84

NORTHERN CAPE

	Score out of 10[a]
Frances Baard District municipality	6.80
Dikgatlong	5.87
Magareng	6.54
Phokwane	6.19
Sol Plaaitje	7.18
John Taolo Gaetsewe District municipality	5.08
Gamagara	7.54
Ga-Segonyana	5.00
Joe Morolong	4.01
Namakwa District municipality	6.88
Hantam	6.97
Kamiesberg	6.25
Karoo Hoogland	6.44
Khai-Ma	6.53
Nama Khoi	7.20
Richtersveld	6.91
Pixley Ka Seme District municipality	6.66
Emthanjeni	7.25
Kareeberg	6.25
Renosterberg	6.75
Siyancuma	7.86
Siyathemba	5.36
Thembelihle	6.44
Ubuntu	6.59
Umsobomvu	6.80
Siyanda District municipality	6.82
Kai !Garib	6.61
Kgatelopele	7.46
//Khara Hais	7.23
!Kheis	5.60
Mier	6.24
Tsantsabane	6.39

WESTERN CAPE

	Score out of 10[a]
City of Cape Town Metropolitan municipality	7.53
Cape Winelands District municipality	7.48
Breede Valley	7.31
Drakenstein	7.62
Langeberg	7.39
Stellenbosch	7.55
Witzenberg	7.45
Central Karoo District municipality	7.16
Beufort West	7.32
Laingsberg	6.60
Prince Albert	6.97
Eden District municipality	7.27
Bitou	7.22
George	7.17
Hessequa	7.45
Kannaland	7.08
Knysna	7.17
Mossel Bay	7.61
Oudtshoorn	7.25
Overberg District municipality	7.44
Cape Agulhas	7.45
Overstrand	7.66
Swellendam	7.33
Theewaterskloof	7.29
West Coast District municipality	7.48
Bergrivier	7.46
Cederberg	7.10
Matzikama	6.99
Saldanha	7.88
Swartland	7.61

a 10 being the best and 0 being the worst

SOURCES

Narrative sources

Numerous reports in various newspapers, plus

South Africa Survey 2013

Fast Facts July 2012

John Kane Berman: *Political Violence in South Africa*, SAIRR, Johannesburg, 1993

John Kane-Berman: *Soweto – black revolt, white reaction*, Ravan Press, Johannesburg, 1978

John Kane-Berman: *Shoes without laces? – The financing of urban black townships with special reference to Soweto and the Soweto Community Council*, SAIRR, 1980

WJP Carr: *Soweto – its creation, life, and decline*, SAIRR, Johannesburg, 1990

Ellen Hellmann: *Soweto – Johannesburg's African City*, SAIRR, 1971

Patrick Lewis: *A 'City' within a City – the creation of Soweto*, Non-European Affairs Department of the City Council of Johannesburg, 1973

Peter Leon: *Transforming South African Local Government – what does it mean for business?* Johannesburg, 2001, mimeographed

South African Cities Network: *State of City Finances 2013 – towards sustainable municipal finances*, April 2013

Note: Some of the data in this last chapter may differ from that in earlier parts of this report. The reason may be that different sources or updated official documents may have been used in different sections of the report written at different times.

30th April 2014

Data sources

The Gaffney Group, *Local Government in South Africa 2011–2013*, November 2011

Auditor-General South Africa, *Consolidated General Report on the Local Government Audit Outcomes 2011/12*, August 2013

Statistics South Africa (Stats SA), *Census 2011 Municipal Fact Sheet*, October 2012

Stats SA Interactive data, *Superweb*, accessed 22 August 2013

Stats SA, *Census 2011 Municipal Report Eastern Cape*, 03-01-50, October 2012

Stats SA, *Census 2011 Municipal Report Free State*, 03-01-52, October 2012

Stats SA, *Census 2011 Municipal Report Gauteng*, 03-01-55, October 2012

Stats SA, *Census 2011 Municipal Report KwaZulu-Natal*, 03-01-53, October 2012

Stats SA, *Census 2011 Municipal Report Limpopo*, 03-01-57, October 2012

Stats SA, *Census 2011 Municipal Report Mpumalanga*, 03-01-56, October 2012

Stats SA, *Census 2011 Municipal Report North West*, 03-01-54, October 2012

Stats SA, *Census 2011 Municipal Report Northern Cape*, 03-01-51, October 2012

Stats SA, *Census 2011 Municipal Report Western Cape*, 03-01-49, October 2012