SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHALLENGES OF MPUMALANGA
PURPOSE OF PRESENTATION & DATA CHALLENGES

• To inform the House about the socio-economic situation/challenges of Mpumalanga – based on Finance’s SERO & PERO reports

• Essential reference for policy makers – to inform the budget & planning process as well as to evaluate public policy and programmes

• Presentation based mainly on latest Statistics South Africa and Global Insight information
IMPORTANCE & RELEVANCE

Socio-economic research
- Demographics
- Labour
- Education & health
- Basic service delivery/infrastructure
- Development & income
- Economic sectors & performance
- International trade

Inform budget & planning process

Provincial budget
- Provincial priorities & spending

Economic impact
- Service delivery
- Economic growth
- Poverty
- Unemployment

Socio-economic framework
- National priorities
- 12 Outcomes
- MTSF
- National budget
- SONA
- National Department Policies
- PGDS
- SOPA
SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHALLENGES OF MPUMALANGA

- 1. Unemployment
- 2. Job creation
- 3. Education
- 4. HIV prevalence
- 5. Basic service delivery
- 6. HDI
- 7. Poverty
- 8. Inequality
- 9. Economic growth
- 10. Sectoral dependency
- 11. Economic distribution
- 12. Inflation

MEGDP objectives

1. Reduce unemployment
2. Reduce inequality
3. Reduce poverty
CHALLENGE 1 - INCREASING AND VERY HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT

• 2nd highest strict unemployment rate of the 9 provinces
• Strict unemployment rate decreased to 27.7% in Q4 2011
• 354 000 unemployed by 31 December 2011
• Gender unemployment rate - females 33.0% and males 23.3%
• Youth (15-34 years) unemployment rate 38.5%
• Youth – 72.8% of the total number of unemployed
**CHALLENGE 1 - INCREASING AND VERY HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT**

### Strict unemployment rate per region, Q3 2008-Q4 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHALLENGE 1 - INCREASING AND VERY HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT

• 3rd highest expanded (including discouraged workers) unemployment rate of the 9 provinces
• Expanded unemployment rate increased to 42.8% in Q4 2011
• 691,000 unemployed by 31 December 2011
• Gender unemployment rate - females 50.3% and males 35.6%
• Youth (15-34 years) unemployment rate 55.2%
## CHALLENGE 2 - JOB CREATION/EMPLOYMENT

### Changes in employment in South Africa & provinces, Q4 2010–Q4 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Q4 2010 '000</th>
<th>Q3 2011 '000</th>
<th>Q4 2011 '000</th>
<th>Q to Q change '000</th>
<th>Year-on-year change '000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>1 772</td>
<td>1 806</td>
<td>1 842</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>1 328</td>
<td>1 298</td>
<td>1 326</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Cape</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free State</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>-73</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal</td>
<td>2 439</td>
<td>2 510</td>
<td>2 562</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>3 953</td>
<td>3 983</td>
<td>4 115</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>1 026</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>13 132</td>
<td>13 318</td>
<td>13 497</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHALLENGE 2 - JOB CREATION/EMPLOYMENT

**Employment by industry in Mpumalanga, Q4 2011**

- Trade: 24.1%
- Construction: 8.5%
- Manufacturing: 8.2%
- Utilities: 2.4%
- Community services: 17.7%
- Private households: 10.3%
- Agriculture: 8.1%
- Mining: 7.5%
- Finance: 9.1%
- Transport: 4.2%
## CHALLENGE 3 - EDUCATION & LITERACY

**Improving - Remain relatively low**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>2008 % Pass rate</th>
<th>2009 % Pass rate</th>
<th>2010 % Pass rate</th>
<th>2011 % Pass rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free State</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Cape</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Matric pass rate by Local Municipal Area, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Municipal Area</th>
<th>% of matriculants passed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nkomaiz</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emalahleni</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umjindi</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emakhazeni</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Tshwete</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Albert Luthuli</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govan Mbeki</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekwa</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msukaligwa</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Khanye</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaba Chweu</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbombela</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thembisele Hani</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr JS Moroka</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mkhondo</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushbuckridge</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Pixley ka Isaka Seme</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipaleseng</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **CRDP areas**
CHALLENGE 3 – EDUCATION & LITERACY
IMPROVING – REMAIN RELATIVELY LOW

Level of education, 2001-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No schooling</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 0-9</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10-11</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than matric &amp; certif/dip</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matric only</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post matric</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
% of population (15+) with no schooling by Local Municipal Area, 2010

Nkomazi 21.3%
Dr Pixley ka Isaka Seme 17.5%
Bushbuckridge 17.4%
Mkhondo 16.1%
Chief Albert Luthuli 15.9%
Thembisile Hani 14.9%
Dr JS Moroka 14.9%
Dipaleseng 14.2%
Victor Khanye 14.9%
Msukaligwa 14.2%
Emakhazeni 13.5%
Mbombela 13.0%
Thaba Chweu 12.5%
Umjindi 12.0%
Lekwa 11.5%
Steve Tshwete 11.0%
Govan Mbeki 10.5%
Emalahleni 10.0%

% with no schooling
Functional literacy rate (20 years+ and grade 7), 1996-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mpumalanga</th>
<th>Gert Sibande</th>
<th>Nkangala</th>
<th>Ehlanzeni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHALLENGE 3 – EDUCATION & LITERACY
IMPROVING – REMAIN RELATIVELY LOW

Functional literacy rate (20 years+ & grade 7) by Local Municipal Area, 2010

- Emalahleni
- Steve Tshwete
- Govan Mbeki
- Umjindi
- Thaba Chweu
- Mbombela
- Emakhzeni
- Lekwa
- Msukaligwa
- Dr JS Moroka
- Thembisile Hani
- Victor Khanye
- Dipaleseng
- Chief Albert Luthuli
- Bushbuckridge
- Mkhondo
- Dr Pixley ka Isaka Seme
- Nkomazi

Functional literacy rate

- Emalahleni: 63.0%
- Steve Tshwete: 61.4%
- Govan Mbeki: 56.1%
- Umjindi: 55.7%
- Thaba Chweu: 52.8%
- Mbombela: 52.7%
- Emakhzeni: 50.0%
- Lekwa: 49.4%
- Msukaligwa: 50.0%
- Dr JS Moroka: 50.0%
- Thembisile Hani: 50.0%
- Victor Khanye: 50.0%
- Dipaleseng: 50.0%
- Chief Albert Luthuli: 50.0%
- Bushbuckridge: 50.0%
- Mkhondo: 50.0%
- Dr Pixley ka Isaka Seme: 50.0%
- Nkomazi: 50.0%

Note: CRDP areas are highlighted in red.
HIV prevalence of 15-49 year old antenatal women in Mpumalanga, 1990-2010
### CHALLENGE 4 – VERY HIGH HIV PREVALENCE RATE

**HIV prevalence of 15-49 year old antenatal women by region, 2007-2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZN</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HIV prevalence rate**

- NC: Northern Cape
- WC: Western Cape
- LP: Limpopo
- NW: North West
- EC: Eastern Cape
- RSA: Republic of South Africa
- GP: Gauteng
- FS: Free State
- MP: Mpumalanga
- KZN: KwaZulu-Natal
## CHALLENGE 4 - VERY HIGH HIV PREVALENCE RATE

HIV prevalence 15-49 yr old antenatal women by District, 2007-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ehlanzeni</th>
<th>Gert Sibande</th>
<th>Nkangala</th>
<th>Mpumalanga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HIV prevalence rate among antenatal clients tested by Local Municipal Area, 2009/10

- Umjindi: 36.6%
- Msukaligwa: 34.5%
- Mbombela: 33.1%
- Albert Luthuli: 30.6%
- Lekwa: 30.6%
- Nkomazi: 30.6%
- Mkhondo: 30.6%
- Thaba Chweu: 30.6%
- Govan Mbeki: 30.6%
- Pixley Ka Seme: 30.6%
- Victor Khanye: 30.6%
- Dipaleseng: 30.6%
- Emakhazeni: 30.6%
- Steve Tshwete: 30.6%
- Emalahleni: 30.6%
- Bushbuckridge: 23.5%
- Thembisile: 20.6%
- Dr JS Moroka: 17.2%

Prevalence rate
Access to basic service delivery by region, 2002-2010

- % of households in informal dwellings:
  - 2002: 13.0%, 2010: 13.9%
  - 2002: 13.0%, 2010: 9.9%
  - 2002: 12.6%, 2010: 7.5%
  - 2002: 5.9%, 2010: 6.6%

- % of households with no toilets or with bucket system:
  - 2002: 84.5%, 2010: 90.6%
  - 2002: 89.3%, 2010: 87.4%
  - 2002: 76.8%, 2010: 76.2%
  - 2002: 82.0%, 2010: 85.8%

- % of households with access to piped water in dwelling, on-site or off-site:
  - 2002: 57.8%, 2010: 57.7%
  - 2002: 38.9%, 2010: 35.4%

- % of households with electricity connections to mains:
  - 2002: 0%, 2010: 25%
  - 2002: 25%, 2010: 50%
  - 2002: 75%, 2010: 100%

- % of households with municipal refuse removal:

Basic service according to year:

- South Africa: Blue
- Mpumalanga: Red
Infrastructure Index by Local Municipal Area, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Municipal Area</th>
<th>Infrastructure Index Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emakhazeni</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Tshwete</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekwa</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govan Mbeki</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msukaligwa</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umjindi</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Khanye</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaba Chweu</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Pixley ka Isaka Seme</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emalahleni</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipaleseng</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbombela</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mkhondo</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nkomazi</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thembisile Hani</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Albert Luthuli</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr JS Moroka</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushbuckridge</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CHALLENGE 6 – RELATIVELY LOW LEVEL OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT (HDI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gert Sibande</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nkangala</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehlanzeni</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population group</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHALLENGE 6 - RELATIVELY LOW LEVEL OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT (HDI)

HDI level by Local Municipal Area, 2010

Emalahleni 0.49
Steve Tshwete 0.47
Govan Mbeki 0.47
Thaba Chweu 0.46
Umjindi 0.45
Emakhazeni 0.45
Mbombela 0.45
Lekwa 0.45
Msukaligwa 0.45
Victor Khanye 0.44
Dr JS Moroka 0.44
Dipaleseng 0.44
Thembisile Hani 0.44
Dr Pixley ka Isaka Seme 0.44
Bushbuckridge 0.44
Chief Albert Luthuli 0.44
Mkhondo 0.44
Nkomazi 0.40

= CRDP areas

HDI level

CHALLENGE 6 - RELATIVELY LOW LEVEL OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT (HDI)

Emalahleni 0.49
Steve Tshwete 0.47
Govan Mbeki 0.47
Thaba Chweu 0.46
Umjindi 0.45
Emakhazeni 0.45
Mbombela 0.45
Lekwa 0.45
Msukaligwa 0.45
Victor Khanye 0.44
Dr JS Moroka 0.44
Dipaleseng 0.44
Thembisile Hani 0.44
Dr Pixley ka Isaka Seme 0.44
Bushbuckridge 0.44
Chief Albert Luthuli 0.44
Mkhondo 0.44
Nkomazi 0.40

= CRDP areas

HDI level
• SA has one of the highest imbalanced income distributions in the world
• National Gini-coefficient was 0.64 in 2010
• Target of 0.59 by 2014
• Provincial inequality increased from 0.61 in 1996 to 0.64 in 2010
• Highest inequality - Steve Tshwete (0.68) & the lowest inequality - Nkomazi (0.57)
CHALLENGE 8 – HIGH POVERTY

- Poverty rate of 45.6% in 2010 which was 5th highest among provinces – SA @ 39.9%
- 1.72 million people lived in households with an income less than the poverty income
- Ehlanzeni (49.1%) registered highest & Nkangala (37.6%) lowest poverty rates
- 46.9% of households earn less than R3 500 pm
CHALLENGE 8 – HIGH POVERTY

• Pensions & grants important sources of income – 23.8% of total income
• Social grant beneficiaries increased from 703 400 in March 2005 to 1.34 million people in December 2011
• Child support grant beneficiaries totalled to 74.5% of all social assistance beneficiaries in 2011
CHALLENGE 8 - HIGH POVERTY

Poverty rate by Local Municipal Area, 2010

- Emalahleni: 65.1%
- Emakhazeni: 52.5%
- Thaba Chweu: 50.8%
- Dr JS Moroka: 46.0%
- Dipaleseng: 44.0%
- Mbombela: 44.0%
- Umjindi: 42.3%
- Dr Pixley ka Isaka Seme: 45.2%
- Chief Albert Luthuli: 43.8%
- Nkomazi: 43.1%
- Mkhondo: 69.3%

Dd = CRDP areas
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Historic and forecasted GDP growth by region, 1996-2015

- Emerging & developing economies
- South Africa
- Mpumalanga

CHALLENGE 9 - PROVINCIAL ECONOMIC GROWTH BELOW NATIONAL RATE & TARGET
CHALLENGE 9 - PROVINCIAL ECONOMIC GROWTH BELOW NATIONAL RATE AND TARGET

GDP growth forecast by Local Municipal Area, 2010-2015

- Govan Mbeki: 4.4%
- Dr Pixley ka Isaka Seme: 3.8%
- Emakheseni: 3.7%
- Mbombela: 3.4%
- Thembisile Hani: 3.4%
- Emalahleni: 3.3%
- Dr JS Moroka: 3.3%
- Chief Albert Luthuli: 3.3%
- Victor Khanye: 3.3%
- Steve Tshwete: 3.3%
- Bushbuckridge: 3.3%
- Umjindi: 3.3%
- Msukaligwa: 3.3%
- Thaba Chweu: 2.7%
- Lekwa: 2.4%
- Nkomazi: 2.4%
- Mkhondo: 2.4%
- Dipaleseng: 2.4%

% GDP growth forecasted
CHALLENGE 10 - DECLINE IN CONTRIBUTION TO SA ECONOMY & HIGH DEPENDANCE ON A FEW SECTORS

1996

- GP 32.8%
- KZN 16.2%
- NW 7.2%
- FS 5.8%
- EC 8.3%
- NC 2.4%
- WC 14.4%
- MP 6.9%

2010

- GP 35.0%
- NW 6.1%
- KZN 16.4%
- FS 5.0%
- EC 7.8%
- NC 2.0%
- WC 14.9%
- LP 6.4%
- MP 6.4%
CHALLENGE 10 - DECLINE IN CONTRIBUTION TO SA ECONOMY & HIGH DEPENDANCE ON A FEW SECTORS

1996

Agriculture 4.2%
Mining 24.1%
Manufacturing 18.6%
Utilities 5.9%
Trade 10.6%
Construction 1.9%
Finance 11.0%
Transport 6.7%
Community services 17.1%

2010

Agriculture 3.5%
Mining 18.8%
Manufacturing 20.6%
Utilities 4.7%
Construction 2.5%
Trade 11.2%
Finance 13.2%
Transport 9.6%
Community services 16.0%
% GDP contribution to Mpumalanga economy by Local Municipal Area, 2010

- Govan Mbeki
- Mbombela
- Emalahleni
- Steve Tshwete
- Msukaligwa
- Thaba Chweu
- Bushbuckridge
- Lekwa
- Thembisle Hani
- Nkomazi
- Victor Khanye
- Umjindi
- Mkhondo
- Chief Albert Luthuli
- Dr JS Moroka
- Emakhaseni
- Dr Pixley ka Isaka Seme
- Dipaleseng

% GDP contribution to Mpumalanga economy by Local Municipal Area, 2010

- Govan Mbeki: 3.5%
- Mbombela: 2.2%
- Emalahleni: 2.0%
- Steve Tshwete: 1.6%
- Msukaligwa: 1.6%
- Thaba Chweu: 1.6%
- Bushbuckridge: 1.4%
- Lekwa: 1.2%
- Thembisle Hani: 1.6%
- Nkomazi: 1.6%
- Victor Khanye: 1.6%
- Umjindi: 1.6%
- Mkhondo: 1.6%
- Chief Albert Luthuli: 1.6%
- Dr JS Moroka: 1.6%
- Emakhaseni: 1.6%
- Dr Pixley ka Isaka Seme: 1.6%
- Dipaleseng: 1.6%
CHALLENGE 12 – RISING INFLATION RATE

Inflation rate per region, January 2003-Feb 2012

Month

CPI year-on-year

National

Mpumalanga

Jan-03, Jul-03, Jan-04, Jul-04, Jan-05, Jul-05, Jan-06, Jul-06, Jan-07, Jul-07, Jan-08, Jul-08, Jan-09, Jul-09, Jan-10, Jul-10, Jan-11, Jul-11, Jan-12

0% 3% 6% 9% 12% 15% 18%
## COMPARATIVE SOCIO-ECONOMIC INDICATORS OF MPUMALANGA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-economic indicators</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Trend: improve (+) or deteriorate (-)</th>
<th>Better (+) or worse (-) than South Africa</th>
<th>Provincial ranking: best (1) – worst (9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate (Q4 2011)</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No schooling (2010)</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary education (2010)</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional literacy rate (2010)</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV+ rate (15-49) (2010)</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure index (2010)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI (2010)</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gini-coefficient (2010)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty rate (2010)</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita personal income (2010)</td>
<td>R26 623</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household personal income (2010)</td>
<td>R102 674</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita disposable income (2010)</td>
<td>R17 613</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household disposable income (2010)</td>
<td>R67 927</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP growth forecast 2012</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP growth forecast 2010-15</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP % contribution (2010)</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

• The importance to use the same socio-economic data in the province for decision purposes
• Provincial Departments’ plans/budgets must be in line with the provincial socio-economic situation
• The budget must be used as a tool for growth and development in the province
• The importance of efficient & effective government spending by Provincial Departments to impact positively on the life of provincial citizens
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