



Media Enquiry

Received from: Raymond Joseph
Publication/Media House: GroundUp
Date: 15 January 2026
Deadline: 23 January 2026

NLC Responses to Media Questions: Netball South Africa Grant (Project M56060)

1. Why was Project M56060 allocated R66 million when NSA applied for substantially less?

The forensic investigation confirms that Netball South Africa initially applied for approximately R5–R11.9 million for infrastructure and training activities. However, the allocation of R66 million arose from a targeted call approved by the Sports and Recreation Distribution Agency (SRDA), linked to the Netball World Cup 2023 legacy programme. The SRDA expanded the scope to support a national footprint across multiple provinces, which materially increased the approved amount.

2. How was the R66 million allocation divided?

The approved allocation comprised of infrastructure development (construction and refurbishment of all-weather netball courts) and capacity-building interventions, including training of administrators, coaches, umpires, and technical officials.

The allocation was made as follows:

Item	Amount	Restrictions
Capacity Building / Skills Training costs	R500,000.00	Training of Umpires
Capacity Building: Training of administrators	R500,00.00	District Administrators
Capacity Building: Training of coaches	R1,500,000.00	Players Coaches
Capacity Building: Training of Technical Officials	R500,000.00	Technical Officials and Facilitators
Other Amount	R63,000,000.00	Construction of Courts – Netball World Cup Legacy – R60,000,000.00

		NLC Publicity – Netball World Cup Legacy – R3,000,000.00
Sum:	R66,000,000.00	

3. Did NSA apply for the higher amount?

The forensic report confirms that NSA did not formally apply for R66 million in its original application. The increased allocation resulted from the SRDA-approved targeted call and subsequent scope expansion aligned to national legacy objectives.

4–5. How was the increase justified?

The increase was justified on the basis of national sporting legacy objectives linked to the Netball World Cup, with the intention to expand infrastructure access across provinces. The SRDA exercised its discretion under the targeted call framework to approve a broader intervention than originally proposed by NSA.

6. In how many tranches were funds released?

Funds were released in tranches in line with the Grant Agreement. The first tranche was paid in June 2023, followed by a second tranche in March 2024. Subsequent tranches were conditional upon satisfactory monitoring, evaluation, and verification.

Tranche	Amount	Dispersed
1	R3,000,000.00	Yes
2	R21,000,000.00	Yes
3	R21,000,000.00	No
4	R21,000,000.00	No
Sum	R66,000,000.00	

7–9. Have further payments been made or halted?

No further payments have been released beyond approximately R24 million. The forensic investigation and monitoring reports indicate that subsequent tranches were delayed pending verification of infrastructure delivery, quality assurance, land permissions, and governance concerns.

10. Has the NLC investigated this grant?

Yes. The NLC commissioned an independent forensic to conduct the investigation. The investigation identified governance and control weaknesses, deviations from standard funding requirements, and deficiencies in monitoring and oversight.

11. SIU or law-enforcement referral?

The NLC notes the expanded Presidential Proclamation relating to SIU investigations. Any referrals to the SIU or law-enforcement agencies will be guided by the forensic findings, legal advice, and applicable statutory requirements.

12. Recovery of funds

The forensic report recommends that recovery actions be considered where expenditure cannot be adequately supported or where contractual obligations were not met. The NLC is assessing recovery options in line with legal advice.

13. Why was only one quote accepted?

The forensic report confirms that only one quotation for infrastructure was submitted with the application, which was inconsistent with standard NLC requirements. This control weakness was identified as a deviation and forms part of the investigation findings.

14. Was contractor capacity assessed?

The investigation found that insufficient evidence was provided at application stage to demonstrate contractor capacity for a multi-million-rand infrastructure rollout. This deficiency was highlighted as a governance and due-diligence gap.

15. Conflict of interest issues

The forensic investigation identified weaknesses in the identification and management of potential conflicts of interest relating to service providers. These matters were reviewed and informed recommendations for strengthening conflict-of-interest controls.

16–17. Were courts built and how many?

Site verification confirmed that progress varied across locations. Some courts were constructed or refurbished, while others were incomplete, delayed, or not handed over. Quality and compliance issues were identified at several sites, and formal handovers remain outstanding in certain instances.