



# INGONYAMA TRUST BOARD

## **KWAZULU-NATAL INGONYAMA TRUST BOARD DRAFT ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLAN FOR 2022 - 2023**

## CONTENTS

Accounting Authority Statement

Official Sign – Off

PART A: OUR MANDATE

CONSTITUTIONAL MANDATE

LEGISLATIVE MANDATE

POLICY MANDATE

RELEVANT COURT RULINGS

PART B: OUR STRATEGIC FOCUS

UPDATED SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS

PART C: MEASURING OUR PERFORMANCE

Programme 1 : Administration

Programme 2 : Land and tenure management

UPDATED KEY RISKS

PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

PART D: TECHNICAL INDICATOR DESCRIPTIONS



### **Accounting Authority Statement**

Ingonyama Trust Board is a Schedule 3A entity in terms of the Public Finance Management Act, 1999 as amended (PFMA). The mandate of the Board is to administer Trust land and the affairs of the Trust. The KwaZulu-Natal Ingonyama Trust Amendment Act of 1997 created the Board. The objective of the Act, among others, provides that the amendment was to create "a Board" to administer the Trust and its assets in conjunction with the Ingonyama. The Amendment Act as such limits the mandate of the Board. It is thus questionable whether the Amendment Act is not open to legal challenge. This legal argument aside, there is a tendency among others to conflate Ingonyama Trust with the Ingonyama Trust Board. While these are related, they remain two separate entities.

The Ingonyama Trust is a legal entity created by legislation to own land for and on behalf of certain clans who are part of the Zulu Nation. The King is the sole Trustee. The Board is an entity created to administer the Trust land and the affairs of the Trust. The members thereof are not trustees and are appointed by the Minister (the Executive Authority) for a period of four years and unless there are adverse circumstances, members are eligible for reappointment. The Trust is not listed in terms of the PFMA.

There are many reasons why the Trust is not listed under the PFMA. Among others, the land owned by the Trust is administered in terms of Zulu customary law by Traditional Councils. Therefore, in my opinion if the Trust were to be listed, this will also require more responsibility and details as to how the Traditional Councils administer the land. This could be a tedious process. What all this points to is the complexity of Ingonyama Trust as well as the general lack of information about this institution by many people.

For the reasons and information narrated above, the preparation and drafting of the Strategic plan for the Ingonyama Trust Board is a challenge because there are conflicting and in some instances ill-founded expectations. Notwithstanding the aforesaid we shall try our best. The fundamental challenge of the ITB is that there are no funds to support the programs of the Trust. This issue requires further and broader engagement with the stakeholders, and this is one of the most critical issues which require urgent attention.

We remain optimistic that as we move forward there will be a better understanding of this institution and therefore a solution to the issues at hand which are considered problematic.



**MR S. J. NGWENYA**

**CHAIRPERSON: INGONYAMA TRUST BOARD**

**OFFICIAL SIGN – OFF**

It is hereby certified that this Annual Performance Plan:-

- Was developed by the Board of Ingonyama Trust and the Secretariat under the guidance of the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development.
- Was prepared in line with the Strategic Plan of the Ingonyama Trust Board 2020 – 2025.
- Accurately reflects the performance targets which Ingonyama Trust Board will endeavour to achieve given the resources made available in the budget for 2022/2023.

Mr S B Vilakazi  
Chief Financial Officer

Signature:



Mr V Z Mngwengwe  
Head of the Secretariat

Signature:



Mr S J Ngwenya  
Chairperson of the Board

Signature:



## PART A: OUR MANDATE

The KwaZulu-Natal Ingonyama Trust Board is a Schedule 3 Part A national public entity.

The Public Finance Management Act, 1999 (as amended), defines a national public entity as a national government business enterprise; or a board, commission, company, corporation, fund or other entity (other than a national government business enterprise) which is established in terms of national legislation; fully or substantially funded either from the National Revenue Fund, or by way of a tax, levy or other money imposed in terms of national legislation; and accountable to Parliament.

The specific mandate of the Board is to administer the affairs of the Trust and the trust land.

## CONSTITUTIONAL MANDATE

The Ingonyama Trust is about land ownership, equality, human dignity, freedom of association and freedom of movement and residence in terms of the Constitution.

The Trust is a statutory legal instrument which was created prior to the current South African constitutional era to hold and preserve land which is collectively owned and communally settled by various tribes and communities which constitute part of the Zulu Nation. In a way this was a re-enactment of the Zulu Native Trust which was originally contrived and created by the British Colonial power in the early days of the colonization of the Zulu Kingdom. It is noteworthy that even at that time the colonial government recognized that under customary law, land is indivisible and inalienable. Furthermore it is worth recording that when the KwaZulu Ingonyama Trust Act (1994), was passed by the erstwhile KwaZulu Legislative Assembly, South Africa was not a constitutional state as it currently obtains. During the constitutional state, the administration of the Act was assigned to the Minister responsible for land affairs simply because the Trust is a landowner in law.

## LEGISLATIVE MANDATE

As stated above, the Trust predates the Constitution. Post the Interim Constitution, the modern constitutional State amended the founding original Act. The objectives of the amendment are stated as follows:

**"To amend the KwaZulu Ingonyama Trust Act, 1994, enacted by the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly, so as to redefine "INGONYAMA" and " REGISTRAR" and to include certain additional definitions; to redefine and extend the categories of beneficiaries of the Trust; to create a Board to administer the Trust and its assets in conjunction with the Ingonyama and in view thereof to repeal the Ingonyama's power to delegate; to provide that Trust land shall be subject to national land programme; to prohibit infringement of existing rights; to reassign functions in respect of certain land; to provide that the Act shall not apply to land in a township, in private ownership or intended for State Domestic purposes; to provide for the vesting and transfer of land so excluded; to validate certain transactions in respect of Trust land prior to the amendment of the Act; and to provide for matters connected therewith."**

The general nature of the KwaZulu-Natal Ingonyama Trust Amendment Act (1997) proved disastrous in its interpretation and implementation. The legal drafters ended up rewriting the whole Act calling it the KwaZulu-Natal Ingonyama Trust Amendment Act. Readers of this Act would be right to assume that this is the only Act. The Amendment Act among others created the Board (Ingonyama Trust Board) to administer the affairs of the Trust and Trust land. It is again misleading to conceive of a Board administering the Trust land in the situation that is obtained here. This provision overlooks the fact that on daily basis Trust land is administered by the various Traditional Councils. These in turn are accountable to the MEC for Co-operative Governance and Traditional Affairs. This is another reason for confusion and anomaly. As if this is not enough there is no budget for Traditional Councils to administer land in as much as there is none for the Ingonyama Trust.

The governance of Ingonyama Trust land starts with the application of Zulu customary law. The other laws of the country follow. In this context, Zulu customary law recognizes the King (in this context also the sole Trustee), to whom all Amakhosi owe allegiance from the time of King Shaka. Below Amakhosi are Izinduna and then families who are headed by family heads. Furthermore under Zulu customary law within a family an individual is either a family head or family inmate. It is among others

for this reason that land is communally owned. The system of Traditional leadership and therefore customary law is recognized by the South African Constitution. It is thus beyond question that the administration of Ingonyama Trust owned land in terms of Zulu customary law is protected by the Constitution.

#### **INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES AND STRATEGIES OVER THE FIVE YEAR PLANNING PERIOD**

Due to the complex nature of the Ingonyama Trust from a policy point of view, some consideration is required on possible amendments to the Ingonyama Trust Act, so as to position the Trust in a manner that would enable it to administer the Trust land for the benefit, material welfare and social well-being of the members of the tribes and communities.

The Board has previously identified certain priority matters that require attention. The said issues relate to proper funding of the Trust to enable it to accomplish its mandate; the implications of legislation relating to municipal property rates; ownership of mineral royalties; and constitutionality of some provisions of the Amendment Act which alienated land from the Trust without any consideration. These issues are still relevant hence the Board will continue to reflect on them with a view to determine an appropriate way forward.

#### **RELEVANT LEGISLATION**

Intergovernmental Relations Framework 13 of 2005	National Environmental Management Act 107 of 1998
Public Finance Management Act 1 of 1999	Traditional and Khoi-San Leadership Act, 2019
Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Act 16 of 2013	KwaZulu-Natal Traditional Leadership and Governance Act 5 of 2005
Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act 28 of 2002	Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act 43 of 1983
Local Government Municipal System Act 32 of 2000	National Forests Act 84 of 1998
Local Government; Municipal Property Rates Act 6 of 2004	National Water Act 36 of 1998
National Veld and Forest Fire Act 101 of 1998	KwaZulu-Natal Heritage Act 4 of 2008
Fencing Act 31 of 1963	World Heritage Convention Act 41 of 1999
Mineral and Petroleum Royalty Act 28 of 2008	KwaZulu-Natal Roads Act 4 of 2001
Deeds Registries Act 47 of 1937	Land Survey Act 8 of 1997
KwaZulu-Natal Ingonyama Trust Act No. 3KZ of 1994, as amended	

#### **POLICY MANDATE**

The broad policy Mandate of the Ingonyama Trust and the Board is derived from the Constitution. The Constitution is the supreme law of the Republic; law or conduct inconsistent with it is invalid; and the obligations imposed by it must be fulfilled. Furthermore any land policy of general application and subject to the Constitution applies to land owned by the Ingonyama Trust.

#### **RELEVANT COURT RULINGS**

##### **Mandeni Municipality v Ingonyama Trust 6894/2015**

In the Mandeni Municipality v Ingonyama Trust, the Municipality instituted a claim against Ingonyama Trust in the KwaZulu Natal High Court (Pietermaritzburg) for the rates that were in arrears in terms of the Local Government: Municipal Property Rates Act ("the Rates Act"). In terms of the Rates Act, the



Municipality has powers to levy rates on all rateable property within its jurisdiction. The court however held that for the Municipality to have complied, it must show that it had satisfied a number of statutory provisions of the Act. The Municipality had to set out in a succinct statement, the grounds upon which the claim is based. Once this is done, it will enable a party (i.e. Ingonyama Trust) to know the grounds upon which a claim is based.

**Duduzile Baleni & Others v Minister of Mineral Resources 73768/2016**

In the *Duduzile Baleni & Others v Minister of Mineral Resources* (Gauteng High Court, Pretoria) the community was opposing mining activity on their ancestral land without their consent as would amount to deprivation. The Respondents which included a company that had applied for a mining right argued that in terms of the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act ("the MPRDA"), the Community had to be just consulted before the mineral right is awarded to the applicant therefore consent was not required. However, the community argued that this interpretation fails to recognize the difference between customary communities and common law owners.

The court held that the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act and the Interim Protection of Informal Land Rights Act (IPILRA) had to be read together. In keeping with the purpose of the IPILRA to protect the informal rights of customary communities that were previously not protected by the law, the Court held that the applicants in the matter had the right to decide what happens with their land. Further, the court held that the Minister of Mineral Resources does not have any lawful authority to award a mining right in terms of MPRDA unless a full and informed consent from the community has been obtained.

**Rahube v Rahube and Others [2018] ZACC 42**

In the case of *Rahube v Rahube and others*, pursuant the provisions of section 2(1) of ULTRA, the first respondent had his deed of grant converted into a full right to ownership of the subject property. The applicant challenged the constitutionality of section 2(1) of ULTRA. Applicant raised a number of claims on the property. The High Court and Constitutional Court confirmed the constitutional challenge to section 2(1) of ULTRA in so far as it provides for the automatic conversion of land tenure rights into ownership without any procedures to hear and consider competing claims. The court order was made retrospective to 27 April 1994.

**eThekweni Municipality v Ingonyama Trust 2014 (3) SA 240 (CC)**

In the *eThekweni Municipality v Ingonyama Trust*, the Court reaffirmed that the Subdivision of Agricultural Land Act, 1970, does not apply to Ingonyama Trust land. Furthermore, that the Rating of State Property Act, 1984, which came to an end in July 2005, was applicable to the land owned by the Ingonyama Trust. Therefore based on this piece of legislation, Ingonyama Trust land was not rateable up to July 2005.

**Ingonyama Trust v Radebe and others [2012] 2 All SA 212 (KZP)**

In *Ingonyama Trust v Radebe and others*, the Court found that Inkosi and his Council has jurisdiction only on land which falls within his proclaimed jurisdiction. Furthermore where the land is owned by Ingonyama Trust but no proclaimed tribal jurisdiction, Ingonyama Trust/Board has exclusive jurisdiction even if there may be a neighbouring proclaimed tribal jurisdiction. In this case the Court further concluded that the Traditional Council concerned was irregularly established. Instead the court established that the said Traditional Council (Amahlubi Traditional Council) has erroneously assumed the role of the Community Authority (Ubuhlebonzinyathi) which was still legally valid.

**BHE and others v Magistrate, Khayelitsha and others 2005 (1) BCLR1 (CC)**

In *BHE and others v Magistrate, Khayelitsha and others 2005 (1) BCLR1 (CC)* the Court confirmed that in matters of inheritance a Black female can no longer be discriminated on grounds of gender.

**Council for the Advancement of the South African Constitution & Others v Ingonyama Trust & Others 12745/2018P**

The Council for the Advancement of the South African Constitution (CASAC), acting with other eight applicants, launched an application in the Pietermaritzburg High Court against the Ingonyama Trust (ITB) and four other respondents. CASAC alleges that the IT and Ingonyama Trust Board (ITB) have persuaded and or induced occupiers of Trust held land to conclude leases, which action is unlawful and constitutionally invalid as the IT and ITB do not have the power to do so as since such power vests with the Minister and or her delegate (Member of Executive Council for Cooperative

Governance and Traditional Affairs in KwaZulu-Natal). Furthermore, that the Ingonyama Trust and ITB have deprived the PTO holders and other informal land rights held in Trust of their security of tenure and property rights vested under customary law and statutory law. The Minister, MEC, IT and ITB are alleged to have acted unlawfully and in violation of the Constitution.

The judgement was delivered on the 11 June 2021 and found the IT and ITB to have acted unlawfully and violated the constitution by; concluding residential lease agreements with persons living on the land held in trust by the Ingonyama who are the true and beneficial owners of Trust held land under Zulu Customary Law; and concluding residential lease agreements with persons who held or were entitled to hold Permissions to Occupy (PTOs) or other informal rights to land protected under IPILRA in the land subject to leases, without complying with the requirements in s2 of IPILRA. All residential lease agreements concluded with persons described in this paragraph were declared to be unlawful and invalid. The Court further declared that money paid to the IT in terms of the leases referred to here was refundable.

The Minister was, amongst other things, directed to reinstate the administrative capacity to implement Chapter X1 of the KwaZulu Land Affairs Act, 1992, until such time that an alternative systems of recording customary and other informal rights to land of persons and communities residing on Trust-held land, was implemented.

The implications of the judgement are that; persons who reside on Trust-held land who, for whatever legitimate reasons, seek a residential lease agreement or lease agreement on arable land are precluded from obtaining one; validly concluded lease agreements where lessees have obtained capital from financial institutions are now unlawful and the financial institution's security has been diminished; and the Trust-held land can be disposed through Chapter XI without the involvement of the IT or ITB, thereby creating dual and conflicting authority between the IT or ITB and the Minister.

## **PART B: OUR STRATEGIC FOCUS**

### **UPDATED SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS**

#### **External Environmental Analysis**

Communities living on Ingonyama Trust land as tribes are part of the South African Citizenry. Whatever affects the country, affects them in the same way as all South Africans. The added disadvantage is the apartheid legacy where tribal land was treated with disrespect and African people as non-human. The current bad state of the economy, lack of resources and relevant skills coupled with lack of job opportunities make the task of executing the mandate of the ITB even more daunting. The legal complexity, unfair adverse publicity and attack on the Institution of Ingonyama Trust and Traditional Leadership do not make the situation any better. In this context among others the ITB must come out with a strategy of warding off the relentless attacks on the Ingonyama Trust. This will have the effect of changing the perception on what Ingonyama Trust is. The exercise here is aimed at dealing with what the true nature of Ingonyama Trust is.

#### **Internal Environment Factors**

Currently the ITB is treated almost like a sub-program of the Land Redistribution and Tenure Reform Branch of the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development. This results in a general lack of appreciation of the nature and mandate of the ITB on the part of the Department. This in turn impacts on resource allocation and general lack of support in areas where the Department may have better capacity and able to support the ITB.

Whilst there's clear appreciation on the part of the Board that the administrative capacity of the ITB needs to be organized in a manner that responds to the requirements of the mandate of the Ingonyama Trust, the ITB is however constrained by the lack of financial resources to improve the situation. Unless the underlying cause of the problem is adequately addressed, the production of strategic documents will inevitably remain a matter of compliance.



## PART C: MEASURING OUR PERFORMANCE

### INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

#### PROGRAMME 1: ADMINISTRATION

**Purpose:** The purpose of this programme is to provide administrative support to the Board in order to execute and discharge its mandate.

#### ANNUAL AND MTEF TARGETS: OUTCOMES, OUTPUTS, PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND TARGETS

OUTCOME	OUTPUTS	OUTPUT INDICATORS	ANNUAL TARGETS					ESTIMATED PERFORMANCE	MTEF PERIOD		
			AUDITED PERFORMANCE								
			2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23		2023/24	2024/25	
Improved corporate governance and service excellence	Management action plan for external and internal audit implemented	% of external audits management action plan implemented	New indicator	New Indicator	New Indicator	100%	100%	100%	100%		
		% of internal audits management action plan implemented	New indicator	New indicator	New indicator	100%	100%	100%			
	Unqualified external audit opinion	Unqualified external audit opinion	New indicator	New indicator	Not yet audited	Unqualified external audit opinion	Unqualified external audit opinion	Unqualified external audit opinion			
Stakeholder Relations Improved	Stakeholder Engagement Strategy approved	New indicator	New indicator	New indicator	New indicator	Stakeholder engagement strategy approved	Stakeholder engagement strategy implemented	Stakeholder engagement strategy implemented			

*[Handwritten signature]*

## OUTPUT INDICATORS, ANNUAL AND QUARTERLY TARGETS

OUTPUT INDICATORS	ANNUAL TARGET	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
% of external audits management action plan implemented	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% of internal audits management action plan implemented	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Unqualified external audit opinion	Unqualified external audit opinion	-	Unqualified external audit opinion	-	-
Stakeholder Engagement Strategy approved	Stakeholder Engagement Strategy approved	Stakeholder tracker	-	Draft Stakeholder Engagement Strategy	Stakeholder Engagement Strategy approved

### Explanation of Planned Performance over the Medium-Term Period

- Regulate how the Board (public entity) deals with the stakeholders.
- Better understanding between the parties in order for the Ingonyama Trust Board to execute its mandate.
- Promote understanding of the procedures regulating access to Ingonyama Trust communal land and development opportunities on Trust land.
- The planned performance is expected to be achieved in phases due to the initial expected challenges

### Programme Resource Considerations

- Internal and external resources where necessary will be utilized to achieve the planned performance with assistance / consultation with traditional councils.
- Funding will be sourced in various ways.

*[Handwritten signature]*

**PROGRAMME 2: LAND AND TENURE MANAGEMENT**

**Purpose:** The purpose of this programme is to provide property management, land tenure administration and valuation services to the Board

**OUTCOMES, OUTPUTS, PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND TARGETS**

OUTCOME	OUTPUTS	OUTPUT INDICATORS	ANNUAL TARGETS				ESTIMATED PERFORMANCE	MTEF PERIOD			
			AUDITED PERFORMANCE					2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25
			2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22					
Improved security of land tenure	Secured Tenure Rights on Ingonyama Trust land	Number of Tenure Rights approved by the Board	1 713	1 409	600	1 000	800	1 000	1 200		
	Immovable Asset Register Maintained	Number of quarterly updates in the Immovable Asset Register	4	4	-	-	4	4	4		
	Capacity Building to TCs provided	Number of Traditional Councils exposed to capacity building	5	6	6	10	24	40	50		
	Human Settlement Plans approved	Number of Human Settlement Plans approved by the Board	4	-	5	5	6	6	6		

## OUTPUT INDICATORS, ANNUAL AND QUARTERLY TARGETS

OUTPUT INDICATOR	ANNUAL TARGET	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Number of Tenure Rights approved by the Board	800	200	200	200	200
Number of quarterly updates of the Immovable Asset Register.	4	1	1	1	1
Number of Traditional Councils exposed to capacity building	24	4	8	8	4
Number of Human Settlement Plans approved	6	1	2	2	1

### Explanation of Planned Performance over the Medium-Term Period

- This programme performance will assist in the development of functional and effective traditional councils that will be able to utilize land for the benefit of the tribes and communities living on Ingonyama Trust land.
- It will also enhance understanding of administering the communal land both in terms of Zulu customary law and other laws of the country.

### Programme Resource Considerations

- Internal and external resources where necessary will be utilized to achieve the planned performance with the assistance / consultation of the Traditional Councils.



### UPDATED KEY RISKS

The greatest risk facing the Ingonyama Trust is the threat to disestablish it. The Board has a fiduciary duty to ensure that adequate information is publicly available regarding its mandate and governance. Potential risks have been identified in the following areas:

RISKS	MITIGATE
Uncertainty of laws that impact on the ITB	Engaging the relevant stakeholders to find amicable solutions.
Lack of adequate human and financial resources	Identify better income generating activities or avenues

- (i) Where there is a dispute on a legal interpretation of a piece or pieces of legislation, the ITB will take a legal opinion, and where necessary approach the courts for an appropriate relief,
- (ii) In some instances intergovernmental dispute will be declared with the relevant government departments and / or state institutions.

### PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

There are no Public Private Partnerships that the ITB is involved in.



**PART D: TECHNICAL INDICATOR DESCRIPTIONS**

<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>% of external audit management action plan implemented</b>
<b>Definition</b>	External audit management action plans developed from AG audit findings and implemented by the entity.
<b>Source of data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Auditor General's Management report,</li> <li>- Action plan register developed for 2021/22</li> </ul>
<b>Method of calculation or assessment</b>	Number of action plans implemented in that quarter / Total number of action plans due in that quarter X100
<b>Means of verification/ POE</b>	Signed external audit management action plan report by the CEO
<b>Assumptions</b>	AG Management report received within legislated timeframes
<b>Disaggregation of beneficiaries (where applicable)</b>	N/A
<b>Spatial transformation (where applicable)</b>	N/A
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative year to date
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>Desired performance</b>	100% of the action plans
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	CFO

*[Handwritten signature]*

Indicator Title	% of Internal audit management action plan Implemented
Definition	Internal audit management action plans developed from audit findings and implemented by the entity
Source of data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Internal Audit report,</li> <li>- Action plan register developed for 2021/22</li> </ul>
Method of calculation or assessment	Number of action plans implemented in that quarter / Total number of action plans due in that quarter x 100
Means of verification	Internal audit management action plan report signed by the CEO
Assumptions	Internal audit conducts audits in line with the approved audit plan
Disaggregation of beneficiaries (where applicable)	N/A
Spatial transformation (where applicable)	N/A
Calculation type	Cumulative year to date
Reporting cycle	Quarterly
Desired performance	100% of the action plans
Indicator responsibility	CFO

<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Unqualified external audit opinion</b>
<b>Definition</b>	This Indicator aims to ensure that the Entity receives an unqualified external audit opinion
<b>Source of data</b>	AGSA audit report
<b>Method of calculation or assessment</b>	N/A
<b>Means of verification</b>	AGSA audit report
<b>Assumptions</b>	The audit report will be issued within the legislated timeframe
<b>Disaggregation of beneficiaries (where applicable)</b>	N/A
<b>Spatial transformation (where applicable)</b>	N/A
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>Desired performance</b>	Unqualified audit opinion
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	CEO

Indicator Title	Stakeholder Engagement Strategy Approved
Definition	The Indicator refers to the development of framework for stakeholder engagement aimed at stakeholder identification, analysis and engagement methodologies
Source of data	Approved Stakeholder Engagement Strategy
Method of calculation or assessment	Simple count
Means of verification/POE	Q1: Database Q3: Draft stakeholder engagement strategy Q4: Approved stakeholder engagement strategy and signed minutes or Board resolution by the Authorised signatory of the Board
Assumptions	An approved strategy
Disaggregation of beneficiaries (where applicable)	N/A
Spatial transformation (where applicable)	N/A
Calculation type	Non-cumulative
Reporting cycle	Annual
Desired performance	Approved Stakeholder Engagement Strategy
Indicator responsibility	CEO

Indicator Title	Number of Tenure Rights approved by the Board
Definition	The indicator refers to the number of tenure rights approved by the Board.
Source of data	- Signed Tenure EXCO Minutes
Method of calculation or assessment	Simple count of approved tenure rights
Means of verification/ POE	Signed Tenure EXCO Minutes
Assumptions	All prerequisite supporting document are provided with the application Lease applications received The assigned signatory of the Tenure Committee signs the Tenure EXCO minutes
Disaggregation of beneficiaries (where applicable)	N/A
Spatial transformation (where applicable)	N/A
Calculation type	Non-Cumulative
Reporting cycle	Quarterly
Desired performance	800 tenure rights
Indicator responsibility	CEO



<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Number of quarterly updates on Immovable Asset Register</b>
<b>Definition</b>	The indicator refers to the number of quarterly updates of the Immovable Asset register – IT land under the jurisdiction of TC – IT land Non- TC
<b>Method of calculation or assessment</b>	Simple count of the number of updates per quarter x 4
<b>Means of verification/ POE</b>	Updated Immovable Asset Register Version
<b>Assumptions</b>	Non
<b>Disaggregation of beneficiaries (where applicable)</b>	N/A
<b>Spatial transformation (where applicable)</b>	N/A
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>Desired performance</b>	Quarterly updates
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	CEO



Indicator Title	Number of Traditional Councils exposed to capacity building
Definition	The indicator refers to the number of TC's targeted for capacity building.
Method of calculation or assessment	simple count of TCs exposed to capacity building
Means of verification/ POE	Attendance Register
Assumptions	Representatives of TCs targeted for capacity building avail themselves
Disaggregation of beneficiaries (where applicable)	N/A
Spatial transformation (where applicable)	N/A
Calculation type	Non-Cumulative
Reporting cycle	Quarterly
Desired performance	24
Indicator responsibility	CEO

<b>Indicator Title</b>	<b>Number of Human Settlement Plans approved by the Board</b>
<b>Definition</b>	The indicator refers to the number of Human Settlement Plans approved by the Board
<b>Method of calculation or assessment</b>	Simple count of the number of Human Settlement Plans
<b>Means of verification/ POE</b>	Signed Board minutes
<b>Assumptions</b>	Identified TCs cooperate
<b>Disaggregation of beneficiaries (where applicable)</b>	N/A
<b>Spatial transformation (where applicable)</b>	N/A
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>Desired performance</b>	6
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	CEO