Internal audit - No documented approval of adhoc audits (EX.17)		Internal Control: Policies not in place (EX.134)	
A lack of oversight by the audit committee Non-adherence to the internal audit charter		Management does not see the urgency to prioritise policies and procedures to ensure proper governance	
the Chairperson of the Audit Committee on: 08 April 2015 @ 09:20 AM via the e-mail. The chairperson received and read the request for approval on 08 April 2015 @ 10:03 AM. Internal Audit has submitted the proof of those e-mails to auditor general on: 03 September 2015 for audit. The previous Accounting Officer has indicated that AJ Mining informed him that they want to purchase equipment with that money therefore; the matter is urgently needed to be resolved. Auditor General should take into account that any delay on the construction	(1) Disagreed with the finding: The matter was communicated to	Not for Internal Audit. Please look @ Final Management Report as I only have Audit Report.	Procedures are submitted to Auditor General with supporting documents for audit. However, internal audit would partly agree with the fact that there was no follow up made and the comments on the report.
There is no specific completetion date. Scope of internal Audit differs from one of external audit.			
Internal Audit		Internal Audit	
	No adhoc requests were made to date		

exception 02 that was raised by Auditor General. Internal Audit had to provide assurance to the Accounting Officer. The review is classified as adhoc because the matter was already raised by AGSA and internal had to provide further assurance on the subject matter. SAB&T has also conducted its own review as well. Section 165 (2)(iii) states that internal audit must advise the accounting officer on accounting procedures and practices. Therefore, due to the substance of the transaction, the MFMA Act takes precedence over the internal audit plan. (3) Disagree with the finding: The review was classified as part of the adhoc reviews due to the following: Internal Audit did not sample and physically tested the inventory transactions that could be out of the scope of the approved audit plan. Internal Audit has only observed the yearend inventory count. It was an initiative to observe how the municipality performs its own yearend inventor and procedure checklist made by internal audit so that deficiencies				
	Internal Audit did not sample and physically tested the inventory transactions that could be out of the scope of the approved audit plan. Internal Audit has only observed the yearend inventory count. It was an initiative to observe how the municipality performs its own yearend inventory count. A report was drawn based on the observation and procedure checklist made by internal audit so that deficiencies	(3) Disagree with the finding: The review was classified as part of the adhoc reviews due to the following:	conducted its own review as well. Section 165 (2)(iii) states that internal audit must advise the accounting officer on accounting procedures and practices. Therefore, due to the substance of the transaction, the MFMA Act takes precedence over the internal audit plan.	exception 02 that was raised by Auditor General. Internal Audit had to provide assurance to the Accounting Officer. The review is classified as adhoc because the matter was already raised by AGSA and internal had to provide further assurance on the subject matter. SAB&T has also

	PREDE TERMIN ED OBJEC TIVES			
AOPO: Deficiencies identified in the annual report (EX.23)	AOPO: Planned performance target not reported (EX.127)	Internal Control: Lack of a centralised filling system for administrative matters (EX.45)	Internal audit: Adhoc projects of internal audit not pre-approved by the audit committee (EX.25)	
The cause of the above is due to lack of management oversight to ensure that draft annual report submitted for audit purposes is accurate	The municipality did not have performance management system and standard operating procedures that could have assisted municipality in preparing APR during the year.	The management of the Municipality did not timeously address the challenge on the lack of a filling system.	Failure by management to maintain an effective record keeping system to ensure that complete, relevant and accurate information is accessible and available for audit	
Draft audited annual report has been submitted to AG for audit purposes during 2014/2015 audit, comments of the AG were received and addressed . The Annual Report has been audited	Draft Procedure Manual for managing Performance Management System is in place and will be adopted by Council before the end of the financial year	Not for Internal Audit. Please look @ Final Management Report as I only have Audit Report.	Resolved.	can be communicated to appropriate level of management.
Арг-16	Jun-16		Resolved.	
PMS	PMS	Internal Audit	Internal Audit	
Draft Audited Annual Report 2014/2015 financial year will be tabled before Council	This is currently in progress as Directors are reporting on the planned targets as per the SDBIP 2015/2016 fly each quarter		Resolved.	

and correct
Council on the 22 January 2016.
on the 22nd January 2016. On the 18th January the Draft Audited Annual report was submitted to AG for perusal before Council adopt it. Comments were received and addressed and the Final document will be submitted to Council for approval during March 2016

AOPO: Performance targets not measurable (EX.33)	AOPO: PMS not in place (Ex.30)(CoA no.30) (EX.30)	
The municipality did not have a proper performance management system in place.	A lack of oversight and monitoring on development, implementation and the monitoring of the performance information system.	
Targets in the SDBIP were set using the SMART Principle as per the National Treasury Framework for Managing Performance Information and has been reviewed during January 2016 as part of Mid term assessment	The municipality have an approved PMS Framework and Policy adopted by Council during July 2015. PMS Policy is currently reveiwed.	
Feb-16	Jun-16	
PMS	PMS	
This is in progress as the municipality is improving in terms of applying its SMART principle. Targets were also reviewed	There is a Council approved PMS Framework and policy that is being implemented and the review of the PMS Policy is under progress	tabling to Council by January 2016 and submitted for final by March 2016. Quarterely reports are developed and submitted to Council for approval

AOPO: Differences between IDP priorities/objectives with SDBIP and APR (EX.83)	OPO: Predetermined objective documentation requested was not submitted (EX.53)	AOPO: Deficiencies identified on SDBIP, IDP and Budget (EX.38)	
Lack of review by management to ensure that the APR are aligned to the IDP and SDBIP	Failure by management to maintain an effective record keeping system to ensure that complete, relevant and accurate information is accessible and available for audit.	The cause of the above is due to lack of oversight by management to ensure that SDBIP, IDP and budget are properly reviewed in order to ensure that they are aligned.	
IDP priorities/objectives are aligned with the SDBIP 2015/2016 fly and will be aligned with the Annual Performance Report for 2015/2016 fly	Predetermined objectives are part of the IDP and are aligned with the SDBIP	Alignment of the IDP, SDBIP and Budget has been done during 2015/2016 financial year.	
Jun-16	Feb-16	Mar-16	
PMS	PMS	PMS	
IDP priorities/objecti ves are aligned with the SDBIP 2015/2016 and at the end of the	Predetermined objectives in the SDBIP are aligned with the IDP 2015/2016 financial year	During the development of the SDBIP, alignment was made with the IDP and Budget, this is also in progress as alignment must also be done continuously with the budget	during Januray 2016 inorder to comply with the SMART principle

AOPO: Performance indicators are not measurable or well defined (EX.98)	AOPO: Planned and reported performance target not done as per SMART criteria (EX.96)	AOPO: No consistency between planned indicators and reported performance indicators (EX.92)	
Management did not have a proper performance management system in place that could assist them in preparing measurable performance indicators	The performance management system was not structured and formal during the financial year.	Management did not have proper performance management system in place that could have assisted them in reporting on agreed strategic objectives and planned performance indicators.	
Performance indicators are developed using the SMART criteria as per the National Treasury Framework for Managing Performance Information. Performance indicators are measurable and well defined	Planned targets have been set using the SMART criteria as per National Framework for managing Performance information and reported performance target is aligned to the planned target.	Planned indicators have been set in the SDBIP 2015/2016 and reported indicators are as per the set indicators in the SDBIP	
Feb-16	Jun-16	Jun-16	
PMS	PMS	PMS	
This is currently in progress as the municipality is improving in terms of applying SMART criteria to its indicators. Performance indicators are	This is currently in progress as planned and reported targets are done using SMART criteria	There is consistency on the reported indicators and the planned indicators	they will be aligned with the Annual Performance Report

AOPO: Deficiencies identified in the mid-year performance assessment (EX.28)	AOPO: No approved operating procedures for measuring performance (EX.27)	AOPO: Risk assessment report and the approval and submission of the SDBIP not submitted (EX.26)	AOPO: Indicator not mandate of the municipality (EX.118)	
Management did not review the mid-year performance assessment after it was compiled by the consultant to ensure it is accurate and	A result of a lack of oversight from management to implement and develop procedures and policies on the reporting and monitoring of predetermined objectives	Failure by management to maintain an effective record keeping system to ensure that complete, relevant and accurate information is accessible and available for audit.	The review of the SDBIP did not detect these matters.	
Mid-Year Performance assessment is developed inhouse and is complying with the section 72 of the MFMA act	Draft Procedure Manual for PMS is in place and will be adopted by Council before the end of the financial year	Reviewed SDBIP 2015/2016 has been submitted to Mayor for approval and then submitted to Provincial Treasury and Cogta	All indicators are mandate of the municipality	
Jan-16	Jun-16	Nov-15	Oct-15	
PMS	PMS	PMS	PMS	
Deficiencies identified in the mid-year assessment report have	Standard operating procedures for managing performance is currently not developed	Reviewed SDBIP was submitted to Provincial Treasury and Cogta during October 2015	Indicators that are not mandate of the municipality are not part of the SDBIP 2015/2016 f/y	measurable

AOPO: Road, water and sanitation infrastructure: Priority list is not approved (EX.70)	AOPO: SDBIP submitted to Treasury not within prescribed times (EX.47)	AOPO: Adjustment Budget not submitted within prescribed period (EX.46)	AOPO: No monthly projections on SDBIP (EX.29)	
Management did not prioritised the matters relating to road, water and sanitation infrastructure. The position for director technical was also not filled and the person was	Due to lack of oversight by management to ensure that appropriate documents are submitted in time to the relevant Treasury.	There were no monitoring controls to ensure that the relevant laws and regulations are complied with	Management did not monitor the work of the consultants to ensure that the requirements in terms of the laws and regulations are adhered to	correct before submission.
Maintenance plans for different categories of assets are currently being developed.	Reviewed SDBIP was submitted as per the prescribed time period	Adjustment budget will be submitted within 10 working after adoption.	Monthly projections of revenue and expenditure by source are part of the SDBIP 2015/2016	
31-Mar-16	Feb-16	5-Feb-16	Nov-15	
Infrastructure and Technical services	PMS	PMS	PMS	
In Progress	Reviewed SDBIP will be submitted at the prescribed time period	The adjustment budget is awaiting adoption by the council which will take place on 22 January 2016.	Monthly projections are part of the SDBIP 2015/2016 f/y	been corrected in the 2015/2016 mid year report