**NATIONAL ASSEMBLY**

**QUESTION 2302-2020**

**FOR WRITTEN REPLY**

**INTERNAL QUESTION PAPER NO: 38-2020: DATE OF PUBLICATION 16 OCTOBER 2020:**

**“Ms V Van Dyk (DA) to ask the Minister of Sports, Arts and Culture”:**

1. What are the reasons that the money from Relief Fund was reduced from R20,000.00 to R2,200.00 (b) why did some artists receive R53,000.00;
2. whether he stated on 3 August 2020 that the rationale of expanded public works rate structure is used to determine the R2, 200, 00; (b) if not, what is the position in this regard, if so, why is the allocated amount R2, 200.00 and not at least R3, 000.00- R3, 500.00 per month when the government self-stipulated that the minimum wage is the bare minimum living wage of R3, 500.00.

**REPLY:**

(1).     a) There was a difference in approach between the first wave and the second wave of the Covid-19 Relief Funding. In the first wave the amounts were based on loss of confirmed income by art practitioners and this was capped at R20 000, 00 per application to accommodate the demand. The second wave approach was open to all arts practitioners regardless of whether they had confirmed gigs or not. The intention was to reach as many art practitioners as possible in an attempt to respond to the outcry from the sector that, many did not have the opportunity in the first wave due to the indicated criteria.

b) The first wave Relief Fund had two categories, first was for loss of income and the second was for new digital solutions projects. The loss of income category was capped at R20,000.00 and the new Digital Solutions projects at R75 000,00 per application. In administering all approved Digital Solutions applications the disbursement of funds was divided into two tranches. All applicants awarded the maximum of R75 000,00 grant received R53,000,00 as the first tranche and R22,000,00 as second tranche. This accounts for the figure in question.

(2).    Yes.  The EPWP guidelines for wages were used with slight adjustments. That is, R100 per day on a 22-day month period. It is to be noted that this was not remuneration as no work or services were performed by the applicants. In this case, the Department’s intention was to, within the available resources, provide relief to as many practitioners as was anticipated due to the relaxation of criteria.