**3. REPORT OF THE PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE ON POLICE ON THE 2018/19 BUDGET, ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLAN OF THE CIVILIAN SECRETARIAT FOR POLICE SERVICES (CSPS), DATED 9 MAY 2018**

The Committee examined the Budget, Annual Performance Plan of the Civilian Secretariat for Police Services (CSPS) for the 2018/19 financial year. The Committee reports as follows:

**1. INTRODUCTION**

The Civilian Secretariat for Police Services (CSPS) derives its mandate from section 208 of the Constitution of South Africa, 1996 (Act No. 106 of 1996), which states that a civilian secretariat for the police must be established by national legislation to function under the direction of the Cabinet member responsible for policing.

The legislative mandate of the Civilian Secretariat is laid out in the Civilian Secretariat for Police Services Service Act, 2011 (Act No. 2 of 2011). The Act was promulgated on 01 December 2011 and provides for the Secretariat to provide advice to the Minister of Police. The Civilian Secretariat became a designated department on 1 April 2014 in terms of the Act, but its 2018/9 budget was being presented as part of the SAPS budget in the Estimate of National Expenditure 2018.

**1.1 Structure**

The Report provides an overview of the 2018/19 Budget Hearings of the CSPS and is divided into the following sections:

**Section 1**: Introduction. This section provides an introduction to this Report as well as a summary of meetings held during the hearings.

**Section 2**: Key concerns of the Committee during the 2017/18 financial year. This section provides a summary of the key concerns raised by the Committee during the previous financial year.

**Section 3**: Strategic Priorities of the CSPS for the 2018/19 financial year. This section provides a summary of the strategic focus areas for the Secretariat for the year under review.

**Section 4**: CSPS Budget and Performance targets for 2018/19. This section provides an overall analysis of the estimates of national expenditure of the CSPS for the 2018/19 financial year. This section also provides a programme analysis of the CSPS.

**Section 5**: Committee observations. This section highlights selected observations made by the Portfolio Committee on Police on the annual performance targets and programme specific issues during the 2018/19 budget hearings and subsequent responses by the CSPS.

**Section 6**: Recommendations and additional information. This section summarises the recommendations made by the Portfolio Committee on Police, as well as the additional information requested from the CSPS.

**Section 7**: Conclusion. This section provides a conclusion to this Report.

The Committee received a briefing by CSPS on the, Annual Performance Plan and 2018/19 Budget on 20 April 2018.

**2. KEY CONCERNS RAISED BY THE COMMITTEE DURING THE 2017/18 FINANCIAL YEAR**

The following section provides a summary of the key observations/concerns raised by the Portfolio Committee on Police regarding performance and financial issues during the 2017/18 financial year:

**Strategic Direction:** The Committee noted that the strategic direction of the Civilian Secretariat for Police Services was to be repositioned as the Department of Police. This was due largely to the position of the Minister of Police and the Civilian Secretariat Act which places the Secretariat as the Minister’s Technical Adviser. The Minister is serviced by the Secretariat In this respect the Secretariat indicated that everything with respect to policy would have to come through the Secretariat. It would be repositioned and the process of engagement with the value chain of policing will be changed. The Committee was concerned if the Secretariat has the resources and the management team to make this happen in the remaining time of the MTSF. This is the penultimate year of the Medium Term Strategic Framework and delivery on the MTSF outcomes is expected.

**Declaration of Interest:** The Committee complimented the Secretariat for making the Declaration of Interest of senior management document available at short notice.

**Performance Indicators and Targets**: The Committee noted that after consultation with the Auditor General of South Africa, that some of the Secretariat performance indicators and targets were not well-defined such as visits to police stations. The purpose of the indicator was not clear. This was a matter which was previously raised with the Secretariat in terms of all its indicators in the Annual Performance Plan and the Committee cannot allow a repeat of this. The Secretariat was asked to remedy this situation.

**Legislation:** The Committee noted that the SAPS Amendment Bill is not on the horizon and raised its concerns. It was pointed out that if no Bill is forthcoming from the Secretariat, the Committee would have to table a Committee Bill. This appeared to be the case with other pieces of legislation that have not been tabled in Parliament. The legislative programme of the Committee will be affected by the non-delivery and postponement of tabling of legislation.

**State of Policing**: The Committee welcomed the announcement of the Secretariat that it would develop a State of Policing document. It would go a long way in pinpointing the requirements of policing around the country and what was required to fix the challenges of public policing. The Committee was exposed to a similar process and document in its International Study Tour to the United Kingdom. The Committee would await the final report and interact with it at the time.

**Process to appoint the SAPS National Commissioner:** The Committee was concerned about the leadership stability of the SAPS and noted that the process to appoint a new National Commissioner should be developed and included in the SAPS Amendment Act. In view of the legislation not being made available, the process to appoint a new National Commissioner as per the proposal from the National Development Plan cannot be implemented if a new National Commissioner is appointed in the immediate future. It remains a very important tenant in promoting public confidence in the SAPS as an institution and the process to appoint the National Commissioner of Police must be subjected to a parliamentary process.

**Use of Force Policy**: The Committee welcomed the new Use of Force Policy developed by the Civilian Secretariat. The Use of Force Policy would help in clearing up when force could be used by SAPS members and provide opportunity for reporting on the Use of Force by the SAPS to Parliament.

**Vetting of staff members**: The Committee noted that the majority of senior managers in the Civilian Secretariat are now vetted and that the vetting of lower level staff has not occurred. The performance indicators of the Department with respect to vetting of personnel does not indicate vetting as a performance indicator. The Committee is aware to the fact that the SAPS requires security clearance when it shares information with the Secretariat. The Secretariat is not getting the required co-operation from the State Security Agency in respect of this matter.

**Over-crowding of building space**: The Committee noted the concerns from the Secretariat that its building is overcrowded and the Department of Public Works has identified another building which the Secretariat intend to share with the Department of Arts and Culture. According the Secretariat, they should leave the Van Erkom building in June 2017 and are awaiting the final partitioning of the offices.

**Cyber-crime and digital policing:** The Committee noted that the Minister’s policy proposals include responding to cyber-crime through the use of ICT technology. The Committee has applauded the Secretariat’s commitment to use ICT and digital policing to fight cyber-crime. The Committee was concerned about the question of digital policing and that it requires substantial investment and will have consequences for the already stretched budget. The Committee has also noted that the Ministerial priorities have not been included in the APP and therefore not budgeted for, making it unattainable.

**Community Policing Forums (CPFs)**: The Committee has noted that the provision to deal with the community police forums are enshrined in the White Paper on Policing and the function of the CSPS is to support the CPF’s. However, this can only be effected if the SAPS Act is amended.

**Ring-fencing the budget of the DNA Board:** The Committee has noted that the DNA Board is financed from the Secretariat’s budget and this has been a drain on the resources. The Secretariat has reported to the Committee that the budget for the DNA Board should be provided by Department of Finance and be ring-fenced. The Committee is of the view that the DNA Board is a critical player with respect to the implementation of the provisions of the Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Amendment Act, 2013. The Committee therefore views the funding of the DNA Board as non-negotiable and has indicated to the Secretariat that it pursues the funding from Treasury.

**3. STRATEGIC PRIORITIES OF THE CSPS FOR 2018/19**

The overall strategic goal of the Secretariat is to conduct civilian oversight over the police and provide the Minister of Police with strategic support (police advice, legislative support, public participation and monitoring and evaluation of the SAPS).

**3.1 MINISTERIAL PRIORITIES**

The Minister of Police highlighted the following priorities for the 2018/19 financial year:

* The Department will strengthen community participation in building a society where people are living a peaceful existence, free from crime and violence;
* The Community Policing Forum Regulations will be finalised for promulgation to clear the uncertainty around the roles and responsibilities of communities and the police;
* The strengthening of CPFs will be supported with appropriate training and resources to fulfil their roles as force multipliers;
* The establishment of Community Safety Forums (CSFs) will be prioritised and will be facilitated with provincial secretariats and local government;
* The policies on Investigation and Management of Serial Rape and Serial Murder, Policy on Reducing Barriers to the Reporting on Sexual Offenders and Domestic
* Violence and Minister’s 6-point plan on addressing gender-based violence and the Policing on Enhancing the Quality and Functioning of the SAPS Detective Service.
* The Department will review the School Safety Protocol with particular focus on youth safety; and
* The transformation of the South African Police Service (SAPS).

The priorities identified by the Minister of Police are aligned with the priorities highlighted by President Ramaphosa during his 2018 State of the Nation Address (SONA). The President highlighted the following:

* In improving the quality of life of all South Africans, efforts must be intensified to tackle crime and build safer communities.
* During the course of 2018, the Community Policing Strategy will be implemented, with the aim of gaining the trust of the community and to secure their full involvement in the fight against crime.
* The Youth Crime Prevention Strategy will be introduced to empower and support young people to be self-sufficient and become involved in crime fighting initiatives.
* A key focus in 2018 will be the distribution of resources to police station level. This will include personnel and other resources, to restore capacity and experience at the level at which crime is most effectively combated.

The Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) provides for the Secretariat’s strategic objectives to include the following:

1. Enhancing stakeholder and community participation in safety and crime prevention;
2. Developing policies for legislation for the effectiveness of the police service; and
3. Regular monitoring of the implementation of legislation, policies and regulations.

The National Development Plan proposes that crime prevention and detection should be carried out through an integrated approach between state and non-state institutions, with active involvement from civil society. The emphasis on community partnerships and citizen participation in the fight against crime is a strategic priority for the Secretariat.

The outputs (strategic objectives) of the CSPS are directly linked to the following Strategic outcome oriented goals (outcomes), as reflected in the CSPS Strategic Plan for 2015-2020:

* **Strategic Goal 1**: A well-advised and supported Minister for a service-delivery oriented police service that is accountable.
* **Strategic Goal 2**: Quality. Timeous evidence-based strategic research, policy advice and legislative support to the Minister.
* **Strategic Goal 3**: Deepened public participation in the fight against crime.
* **Strategic Goal 4**: Enhanced accountability and transformation of the South African Police Service.

**3.2 POLICY PRIORITIES FOR 2018/19**

The CSPS will focus on the following key priority projects for the 2018/19 – 2020/21 financial years:

* Strengthening community participation in building a peaceful and crime free society
* Supporting CPF and CSF formations in society
* Monitor implementation of policies by SAPS: Investigation and Management of Serial Rape & Serial Murder, Reducing Barriers to the Reporting of Sexual Offences and Domestic Violence, Enhancing the Quality and Functioning of SAPS Detective Service
* Review School Safety Protocol
* Effective oversight in the conduct and performance of SAPS

**4. CSPS BUDGET AND PERFORMANCE TARGETS FOR 2018/19**

**4.1 Overall analysis**

The manner in which the Department reports its budget allocation in the 2018/19 APP is problematic. The Department states the Revised Estimates as the 2017/18 Adjusted Appropriation. The Adjusted Appropriation is fixed in October (2017) as published in the Adjusted Estimates of National Expenditure (AENE), while the Revised Estimate is the latest available budget information as in January 2018. This reflects the final shifts made by the Department to mitigate against over or under expenditure at the end of the financial year. If there are significant changes between the Adjusted Appropriation and the Revised Estimate, it points to either bad financial management or managers holding on to budgets in the hope of spending the funds. The table below illustrates the difference between the Main Appropriation, Adjusted Appropriation and Revised Estimates for 2017/18.

**Table 1: Differences between Main/Adjusted Appropriation and Revised Estimates**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Programme** R’ million  | **2017/18** **Main Appropriation** **R’ 000** | **2017/18** **Adjusted Appropriation**  | **2017/18** **Revised Estimate**  |
| **Programme 1**  | 48.1 | 52.2 | 53.0 |
| **Programme 2**  | 24.9 | 24.9 | 23.8 |
| **Programme 3**  | 20.8 | 18.5 | 19.6 |
| **Programme 4**  | 30.9 | 29.0 | 28.3 |
| **Total**  | **124.7** | **124.7** | **124.7** |

 Source: National Treasury (2018)

 From the above table, it is clear that changes were made between October 2017 and January 2018. Although these shifts are allowed, it circumvents Parliamentary scrutiny during the Adjusted budget period (October 2017) after the publishing of the annual ENE.

Treasury uses the Adjusted Appropriation figures for comparative analysis and growth trends in the 2018 Estimates of National Expenditure (ENE) for the 2018/19 financial year and medium term and not the Revised Estimates. Although Treasury uses the Revised Expenditure Estimates in certain circumstances, it is clearly stated as such. The use of the Revised Estimates by the Secretariat creates confusion, as there now exists two official documents, the ENE and the APP, stating different figures for the Adjusted Appropriation (2017/18). The 2017/18 Annual Report will use the Final Appropriation for the 2017/18 financial year. It is thus important to keep a close eye on whether the Final Appropriation differs from the Revised Estimates and critically the expenditure at year-end.

For the purpose for this budget analysis, the Adjusted Appropriation for 2017/18 as provided by National Treasury in the 2018 ENE will be used for comparative analyses between the allocations of 2018/19 and 2017/18.

The overall budget allocation of the CSPS receives a nominal increase of R6.7 million in 2018/19 compared to the previous financial year. The Legislation and Policy Development and Civilian Oversight, Monitoring and Evaluations Programmes receive the highest nominal increases of 15.68% and 5.86%, respectively.

**Table 2: CSPS Medium term expenditure estimates**

|  |
| --- |
| **Programmes** 1. Administration 2. Intersectoral Coordination and Strategic Partnerships 3. Legislation and Policy Development 4. Civilian Oversight, Monitoring and Evaluations  |
| **Programme**  | **Budget** | **Nominal Rand change**  | **Real Rand change**  | **Nominal % change**  | **Real % change**  |
| R million  | **2017/18** **Adjusted Appropriation**  | **2018/19** **Main Appropriation**  | **2019/20**  | **2020/21**  | **2017/18-2018/19**  | **2017/18-2018/19**  |
| Programme 1  | 52.2.0 | 54.7 | 58.5 | 62.6 | 2.5 | - 0.4 | 4.79% | -0.67% |
| Programme 2  | 24.9 | 24.5 | 26.2 | 28.0 | -0.4 | - 1.7 | -1.61% | -6.74% |
| Programme 3  | 18.5 | 21.4 | 22.9 | 24.5 | 2.9 | 1.8 | 15.68% | 9.65% |
| Programme 4  | 29.0 | 30.7 | 32.9 | 35.2 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 5.86% | 0.34% |
| **TOTAL**  | **124.7** | **131.3** | **140.5** | **150.3** | **6.7** | **- 0.1** | **5.38%** | **-0.12%** |

 Source: National Treasury (2018)

**4.2 Programme Analysis**

**4.2.1 Programme 1: Administration**

The programme provides administrative support, strategic leadership and management for the Secretariat. Its strategic objective is to enhance corporate governance in ensuring that the Secretariat achieve its mandate.

The programme consists of the following sub-programmes: Department Management, Internal Audit, Finance Services, and Corporate Services.

The overall budget allocation of the Administration Programme increased from R52.2 million in 2017/18 to R54.7 million in 2018/19, which is a nominal increase of 4.7%. The Corporate Services sub programme received the largest budgetary allocation of R 21.7 million in 2018/19 while the Finance administration sub programme receives an allocation of R17.0 million. The lack of funding made to the Office Accommodation sub programme is a concern, as the Secretariat notes that their current office accommodation is unsafe and is a key risk indicator, and there is no indication that the lack of suitable accommodation will be addressed over the medium-term period.

For the 2018/19 financial year, the following performance indicators/targets were identified:

**Sub-Programme: Department Management**

1) Four joint consultative IPID/ Secretariat forum meetings held per year in compliance with the Civilian Secretariat for Police Services Service Act, 2011;

2) Four quarterly performance reports against predetermined objectives submitted within 30 days after end of the quarter;

**Sub-Programme: Corporate Services**

3) One Workplace Skills Plans approved by the Secretary for Police Service;

4) Maintain vacancy rate to 10% of the total post establishment;

**Sub-Programme: Finance Administration**

5) 100% of payments made to creditors within 30 days;

6) 100% of Internal Audit recommendations implemented;

7) 100% of external audit recommendations implemented; and

8) 95% of expenditure in relation to Budget allocated.

**Table: 3: Budget Allocation- Administration Programme**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Programme**  | **Adjusted Appropriation** | **Medium –Term Expenditure Estimate** |
| *R thousand*  | **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/2021** |
| Sub-programme 1: Department Management  | 9 304 | 10 905  | 11 654  | 12 459 |
| Sub-programme 2: Corporate Services  | 21 191  | 21 799  | 23 304  | 24 826 |
| Sub-programme 3: Finance Administration  | 17 820  | 17 044  | 18 305  | 19 655 |
| Sub-programme 4: Office Accommodation  | 701  | 774  | 829  | 849 |
| Sub-programme 5: Internal Audit  | 3 990  | 4 149  | 4 452  | 4 776 |
| **TOTAL**  | 53 006  | 54 671  | 58 544  | 62 565 |

 Source: CSPS (2018)

In terms of economic classification, the following should be noted:

* The allocation of assets less than the capitalisation threshold increases from R257 thousand in 2016/17 to R361 thousand in 2017/18, which is a nominal increase of 40.4%.
* The allocation for bursaries increases nominally by 61.29%.
* The allocation for computer services increases nominally by 76.7%.
* The allocation for consultants decreases nominally by 66.6%.
* The allocation for operating leases should be concerning, as effectively no funds were made available for operating leases in 2017/18.

The table below provides a summary of the programme performance indicators and targets of the Administration Programme for the 2017/18 financial year:

**Table 4: Programme Performance Indicators and Targets: Administration Programme**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Performance Indicator**  | **2018/19 Target**  |
| Number of joint consultative IPID/ Secretariat forum meetings held per year in compliance with the Civilian Secretariat for Police Services Service Act, 2011  | 4 |
| Number of quarterly performance reports against predetermined objectives submitted within 30 days after end of the quarter  | 4 |
| **Sub programme: Corporate Services** The purpose of the sub programme is to provide reliable and efficient corporate services to the CSPSS |
| **Performance Indicator**  | **2018/19 Target**  |
| Number of Workplace Skills Plans approved by the Secretary for Police Service  | 1 |
| Maintain vacancy rate to 10% of the total post Establishment (New Indicator)  | Not more than 10% of total post establishment  |
| An approved corporate governance of ICT Framework  | 1 |
| **Sub programme: Finance Administration** Provide Public Finance Management Act (PFMA)-compliant financial, accounting and supply chain services to the CSPSS |
| **Performance Indicator**  | **2018/19 Target**  |
| Percentage of payments made to creditors within 30 days  | 100% |
| Percentage of Internal Audit recommendations implemented | 100%  |
| Percentage of external audit recommendations implemented | 100% |
| Percentage of expenditure in relation to Budget allocated | 95% |

 Source: CSPS 2018/19 APP

**4.2.2 Programme 2: Inter-sectoral Coordination and Strategic Partnerships**

**2018/19 Budget allocations**

The purpose of the Inter-sectoral Coordination and Strategic Partnerships Programme is to manage and encourage national dialogue on community safety and crime prevention.

The overall budget allocation of the Inter-sectoral Coordination and Strategic Partnerships Programme increases from R22.2 million in 2017/18 to R24.9 million in 20018/19, which is a nominal increase of 12.2%. The Inter-governmental, Civil Society and Public-Private Partnerships sub programme receives the bulk of the funding of Programme 2 at R22.1 million of the total allocation of R24.9 million, which is 88.7% of the total allocation of the programme. The Community Outreach sub-programme receives a significantly smaller allocation of R2.7 million in 2018/19.

**Table 5: 2016 Inter-sectoral Coordination and Strategic Partnerships Expenditure Estimates**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Programme**  | **Adjusted Appropriation** | **Medium –Term Expenditure Estimate** |
| *R thousand*  | **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/2021** |
| Inter-govermental ,Civil Society and Public Private Partnerships | 19 765 | 20 430 | 21 754 | 23 280 |
| Community Outreach | 4 006 | 4 138 | 4 428 | 4 746 |
| **TOTAL**  | 23 771 | 24 478 | 26 182 | 28 020 |

 Source: 2018/19 CSPS APP

The table below summarises the programme performance indicators and targets of the Intersect oral and Strategic Partnerships Programme:

**Table 6: Programme Performance Indicators and Targets: Intersect oral and Strategic Partnerships Programme**

|  |
| --- |
| **Sub programme: Intergovernmental, Civil Society and Public-Private Partnerships** The purpose of the sub programme is to manage and facilitate intergovernmental, civil society and public partnerships |
| **Performance Indicator**  | **2018/19 Target** |
| Number of memoranda of understanding (MoUs) signed with stakeholders in order to build safer communities  | 2 |
| Number of workshops facilitatedwith Provincial Secretariats andmunicipalities on the establishment ofCommunity Safety Forums (CSFs) peryear | 9 Workshops |
| Number of anti-crime campaigns conducted per year  | 3 |
| Number of CPF training programmes approved by the Secretary for Police Service  | 2 |
| Number of izimbizo/public participation programmes held with communities to promote community safety  | 8 |
| Total number of provinces implementing Community Police Forums Guidelines  | 9 |
| Number of provincial capacity-building sessions held on crime prevention programmes  | 9 |
| Number of promotional events for the Office of the Directorate for priority Crimes Investigation (DPCI)  | 6 |

 Source: CSPS 2018/19 APP

**4.2.3 Programme 3: Legislation and Policy Development 2018/19 Budget allocations**

The purpose of the Legislation and Policy Development Programme is to develop policy and legislation for the police sector and to conduct research on policing and crime.

The overall allocation of the Legislation and Policy Development Programme has increased nominally by 15.1% in 2017/18 compared to the previous financial year. In 2016/17, the Programme received R24.4 million, which increased to R28.1 million in 2017/18. The Policy Development and Research sub programme received a slightly higher proportional budget increase compared to the Legislation sub-programme in 2017/18.

**Table 7: Budget Allocation – Legislation and Policy Development Programme**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Programme**  | **Adjusted Appropriation** | **Medium –Term Expenditure Estimate** |
| *R thousand*  | **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/2021** |
| Policy development and Research | 14 056  | 14 510  | 15 524  | 16 620 |
| Legislation | 5 527  | 6 882  | 7 355  | 7 861 |
| **TOTAL**  | 19 583  | 21 392  | 22 879  | 24 481 |

 Source: 2018/19 CSPS APP

The table below summarises the programme performance indicators and targets of the Legislation and Policy Development Programme:

**Table 8: Programme Performance Indicators and Targets: Legislation and Policy Development Programme**

|  |
| --- |
| **Sub programme: Policy Development and Research** The purpose of the sub programme is to develop policies and undertakes research in areas of policing and crime |
| **Performance Indicator**  | **2018/19 Target**  |
| Number of policies on policing submitted to the Minister of Police for approval per year  | 3 |
| Number of research reports on policing approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year  | 2 |
| **Sub programme: Legislation** The purpose of the sub programme is to provide legislative support services to the Minister |
| **Performance Indicator**  | **2018/19 Target**  |
| Number of Bills submitted to the Minister for approval per year  | 3 |

 Source: 2018/19 CSPS APP

**4.2.4** **Programme 4: Civilian Oversight, Monitoring and Evaluation**

The purpose of the Civilian Oversight, Monitoring and Evaluation Programme is to oversee, monitor and report on the performance of the SAPS.

The overall budget allocation of the Civilian Oversight, Monitoring and Evaluation Programme increases from R23.59 million in 2017/18 to R28.31 million in 2018/19. The Police Performance, Conduct and Compliance sub-programme receives R12.96 million in 2018/19 compared to R12. 46 in 2017/18.

**Table 9: Budget Allocation – Civilian Oversight, Monitoring and Evaluation Programme**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Programme**  | **Adjusted Appropriation** | **Medium –Term Expenditure Estimate** |
| *R thousand*  | **2017/18** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2020/2021** |
| Police Performance, Conduct andCompliance | 12 462  | 12 960  | 13 870  | 14 851 |
| Policy and Programme Evaluations | 4 957  | 5 157  | 5 525  | 5 922 |
| Information Management | 3 373  | 3 532  | 3 799  | 4 089 |
| Office of the Directorate for PriorityCrime Investigation Judge | 3981 | 5148 | 5513 | 5907 |
| National Forensic Oversight and EthicsBoard | 3 540 | 3 881 | 4 157 | 4 457 |
| **TOTAL**  | 28 313  | 30 678  | 32 864  | 35 226 |

 Source: 2018/19 CSPS APP

The table below summarises the programme performance indicators and targets of the Civilian Oversight, Monitoring and Evaluation Programme:

**Table 10: Programme Performance Indicators and Targets: Civilian Oversight, Monitoring and Evaluation Programme**

|  |
| --- |
| **Sub programme: Police Performance, Conduct and Compliance Monitoring** The purpose of the sub programme is to Monitor the performance, conduct, compliance and transformation of the South African Police Service. |
| **Performance Indicator**  | **2018/19 Target** |
| Number of oversight visits to police stations conducted per year  | 22 |
| Number of Police Station Service Delivery Trends Analyses Reports approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year  | 1 |
| Number of SAPS Budget and Programme Performance Assessment Reports approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year  | 1 |
| Number of Assessments Reports on Complaints Management approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year  | 2 |
| Number of reports on SAPS Implementation of IPID Recommendations approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year  | 2 |
| Number of Compliance Monitoring Reports on the implementation of the Domestic Violence Act (98) by SAPS approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year  | 2 |
| Number of reports on the implementation and compliance to legislation approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year  | 1 |
| Number of Customer Satisfaction Survey Reports approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year  | 1 |
| Number of monitoring reports on police stations implementation of the school safety protocol approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year  | 2 |
| **Sub programme: Policy and Programme Evaluations** The purpose of the sub programme is to Evaluate the effectiveness of programmes implemented by the South African Police Service. |
| **Performance Indicator**  | **2018/19 Target** |
| Number of evaluation reports on the relevance and effectiveness of oversight initiatives approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year  | 1 |
| Number of assessment reports on establishment and functionality of CSFs approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year **(Revised indicator)**  | 1 |
| Number of assessment reports on establishment and functionality of CPFs approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year **(Revised indicator)**  | 1 |
| Number of evaluation reports on Domestic Violence Act non-compliance, exploring causes and possible remedies approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year **(New indicator)**  | 1 |

 Source: 2018/19 CSPS APP

**5. COMMITTEE OBSERVATIONS**

The Committee made the following observations on the strategic priorities of the Civilian Secretariat during the 2018/19 budget hearings:

**5.1 General**

**Leadership and accountability:**

The Chairperson of the Committee indicated that he was informed by the Secretary of Police that he would not attend and he apologised as he had to attend a MINMEC meeting. The Committee raised concerns as it was the Department’s Budget vote hearing and the accounting officer should have been there to account. The CSPS should ensure that there is compliance with prescripts and it has to lead by example. For this reason, there needs to be better compliance from the leadership of the Secretariat. If the CSPS monitors the police and IPID, then it should lead by example and be accountable itself.

**Advertising costs:** Members questioned the large increases in advertising costs and wanted an explanation of the reasons for the cost escalation. The Secretariat reported that it has spent almost R2 million rand on advertising costs which was mainly to advertise staff in the Office of the DPCI Judge.

**Budget Vote of the Secretariat:** The Committee questioned why the Secretariat does not have its own Vote and still functions as a cost centre of the SAPS. The Secretariat has been a designated department since 2014 and it appears that it is not making a concerted effort to break the financial cord with the SAPS. The Committee urged the Secretariat to move to its own budget vote as soon as possible. The Secretariat responded by stating that the changes in the leadership of the SAPS has not helped it as every year they prepare a management letter with which they hope to engage the SAPS leadership. When the leadership changes, they have to start the negotiations all over again.

**Budget spend of 95%:** The Committee welcomed the fact that the Secretariat spent 95% of its budget, but questioned if it was value for money spent. The reason was the fact that the SAPS was not taking the Secretariat seriously. In addition, the Provincial Secretariats were not taken seriously by their Heads of Department with respect to the National Secretariat. The Committee raised questions over the fact that the staff bursaries were doubled, consultants were employed and the advertising budget increased by 450%. Members wanted to know how the Secretariat was going to remedy the problem of the SAPS ignoring the recommendations of the Secretariat.

**DNA Board Annual Report:** The Committee expressed its dissatisfaction with the fact that there was no Annual Report for the DNA Forensic Oversight and Accountability Ethics Board. The Chairperson raised his concerns with the non-tabling of the report. He urged the Secretariat to ensure compliance of any entity that it overseas.

**Inspecting DPCI Judge**

The Committee raised concerns about the manner in which the Civilian Secretariat spent its budget on the DPCI Judge. It was reported that a vehicle was purchased for the Judge. According to the Secretariat, the Judge also wanted his PA to be upgraded in her post, which was not in keeping with the Public Service Regulations. The Committee expressed its unhappiness about the situation and asked the Secretariat to provide a full report and which policy they were following when purchasing a vehicle for the Judge.

**Disjuncture between National and Provincial Secretariats:** TheCommittee noted that there was a disjuncture between the National and Provincial Secretariats. It was clear that there was no proper alignment between the national and Provincial Secretariats as the Provincial Secretariats developed their own programme and priorities if they did not agree with the national policy. Members pointed to a legislative amendment that was required to bring the provincial secretariats into line with the National Secretariat. The provincial Heads of Departments were not taking the Provincial Secretariats seriously. It has consequences for the full implementation of the mandate of the CSPS.

**Indicators for the CSFs:** The Committee questioned why theCommunity Safety Forums had no proper indicators of a public private partnership. The members wanted the Secretariat to explain what they meant by a public private partnership. In addition, the members of community police forums are also requesting money and stipends for the work they do in the communities.

**State of Policing report:** The Committee questioned why the Secretariat has not delivered on the State of Policing Report after promising the Committee that it would be completed. The Secretariat was asked to make sure that the report is finalised so that the country can have an idea as to what the state of policing in South Africa looks like.

**Community Policing Forums (CPFs)**: The Committee has noted that the provision to deal with the community police forums are enshrined in the White Paper on Policing and the function of the CSPS is to support the CPF’s. However, this can only be effected if the SAPS Act is amended.

**6. RECOMMENDATIONS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

This section provides a summary of the recommendations made by the Committee and also a summary of the additional information requested during the 2018/19 budget hearings.

**6.1 Additional information**

The Committee requested additional information (to be submitted within six months) through written responses to supplement the information gathered during hearings on the 2018/19 budget hearings of the CSPS:

* The CSPS must submit a written copy of its revised legislative schedule.
* The CSPS must provide the Committee with a plan for the capacitation and support to CPFs and include which other departments are supporting the payment of CPFs programmes.
* The CSPS must provide the Committee with the revised School Safety Protocol evaluation report.

**6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee made several recommendations to the CSPS during the 2018/19 budget hearings. These included the following:

**6.2.1 Budget recommendations:**

1. The Committee recommends that the CSPS should provide a budget plan for all the legislative structures functioning under its aegis and make submissions to National Treasury on the adequate funding of these structures such as the DNA Board and the DPCI Judge for the 2019/20 financial year.
2. The Committee recommends that the Secretariat reviews its advertising costs.
3. The Committee recommends that the Civilian Secretariat develops its own Budget Vote with urgency to lessen its dependence on the SAPS financial infrastructure.
4. The Committee commends the 95% budget spend, but cautions the Secretariat against spending on items such as bursaries, vehicles and consultants.

**6.2.2 Performance recommendations:**

1. The Committee recommends that the Strategic Plan (2015-2020) and APP (2018/19) of the CSPS performance targets should be relevant and well formulated.

1. The Committee recommends that the Civilian Secretariat displays leadership in the departments that it oversees and it leads by example by ensuring compliance in its own department before monitoring other departments.
2. The Committee recommends that the Civilian Secretariat delivers on the NDP with respect to demilitarisation, professionalisation and the institution of the National Police Board.
3. The Committee recommends that the Executive Authority ensures that the DNA Board tables its Annual Report in Parliament without delay.
4. The Committee recommends that the Secretariat finalises its report on the State of Policing Report and provide the Committee with the Report.
5. The Committee recommends that the CSPS should provide the Committee with an updated legislative schedule submitted to the office of the Leader of Government Business in the National Assembly. The Committee expects to be updated with any legislative programme changes.
6. The Committee recommends that the Department provides it with a quarterly progress report on re-positioning the Secretariat to become the Department of Police.
7. The Committee recommends that the Civilian Secretariat reports on the activities of the Consultative Forum.
8. The Department should prioritise the SAPS Amendment Bill for delivery at the end of the 2018/19 financial year, failing which the Committee will table a Committee Bill.

1. The Committee recommends that the Secretariat develops proper indicators and criteria for the development of Community Safety Forums.
2. The Committee recommends that the vetting process of all the staff of the Secretariat is completed, especially of the junior staff members.
3. The Committee recommends that the Secretariat improves co-operation with the Provincial Secretariats.
4. The Committee recommends that the Secretariat prioritises the development of indicators and targets for the community police forums in fighting crime.
5. The Committee recommends that the Secretariat signs an MOU with the DNA Board and provides it with the necessary support.

**7. CONCLUSION**

The Committee notes the fact that the new Minister of Police, Mr Bheki Cele, has developed a new list of priorities for the Secretariat to enhance the fight against crime. The Committee supports the efforts of the Minister to reprioritise the Secretariat as the Department of Police. Leadership stability must be prioritised within the SAPS and the Secretariat must be empowered to support the Minister in this regard. The Committee urges the Secretariat to complete the State of Policing Report and the Committee eagerly awaits the outcome of the research process.

The Portfolio Committee on Police supports the budget of the Civilian Secretariat for Police Services for 2018/19 as a Department within Vote 23 (Police) and recommends that the budget be adopted. The Democratic Alliance reserved its rights with respect to supporting or not supporting the budget vote.

**Report to be considered.**