



12 April 2018

2018/19 BUDGET AND ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLAN (APP) ANALYSIS OF THE INDEPENDENT POLICE INVESTIGATIVE DIRECTORATE (IPID): VOTE 20

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. OVERALL BUDGET ALLOCATION	2
2.1. Expenditure trends and estimates for significant spending items.....	3
2.2. Goods and services expenditure trends and estimates	3
2.3. Ring-fenced funds	4
2.4. Budget recommendations and Response from the Minister of Finance	4
3. PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND BUDGET ALLOCATION	6
3.1. Programme 1: Administration.....	6
3.2. Programme 2: Investigation and Information Management.....	8
3.3. Programme 3: Compliance Monitoring and Stakeholder Management	10
4. STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER (2018/19)	12
5. REFERENCES	12

1. INTRODUCTION

The Minister of Police, Hon Bheki Cele tabled the 2018/19 Annual Performance Plan (APP) of the Independent Police Investigative Directorate (IPID) in Parliament on 20 March 2018.¹ The Directorate also made the Technical Indicator Descriptions (TID) available, which provides significant insight into the purpose of performance indicators.

The APP contains several changes to the performance indicators of the Directorate, most notably a revision and reduction in targets for the core service delivery Programme (Investigation and Information Management). The Compliance Monitoring and Stakeholder Management Programme has four new indicators (the value of which should be questioned).

The Directorate relies solely on output indicators, meaning that performance relies only on a simple count of outputs, like number of campaigns, number of reports and number of investigations. The Directorate is mandated by its governing legislation and the National Development Plan (NDP) to impact on the conduct of police members, which cannot be measured by outputs alone.

The 23.38% nominal increase to the Directorate's budget is largely due to the reprioritisation of R59.7 million from the SAPS budget in 2018/19, of which almost half will be spent on contractual obligations/accruals.

The Minister of Police, Hon Bheki Cele reiterated his support for the functional and operational independence of the Directorate as the oversight mechanism to keep criminality within the ranks of the SAPS in check. The Minister further indicated that the IPID should continue putting strategies and plans in place to ensure better service delivery to communities.

¹ ATC No 32-2018



This paper provides a summary and analysis of the 2018/19 budget allocation and the performance indicators contained in the IPID APP for Parliamentary oversight by the Portfolio Committee on Police during deliberations scheduled for 20 April 2018. The paper further aims to highlight key concerns identified with the budget and performance indicators.

2. OVERALL BUDGET ALLOCATION

The IPID receives a main appropriation of R315 million in 2018/19 compared to R255.4 million in 2017/18, which is a nominal increase of 23.38%. This is due to the R158.5 million reprioritised from the SAPS budget to that of the IPID over the medium-term. Almost half of this reprioritised allocation (45%) will be spent on contractual obligations over the medium-term (R72.7 million from R158.5 million).

Although all programmes receive increased allocations in 2018/19, the allocation towards the Compliance Monitoring and Stakeholder Management Programme receives a nominal increase of 40.3% from R11.4 million in 2017/18 to R16 million in 2018/19. This increase is mainly for the review of the IPID Act, 2011. The increased allocation will continue over the medium term with an average growth rate of 17.4%. The programme receives only 5% of the total budget allocation of the Directorate.

Although the Compliance Monitoring and Stakeholder Management Programme receives the largest percentage increase, the Investigation and Information Management Programme receives the largest rand change. In 2018/19, this programme receives a nominal rand increase of R33.2 million. This programme performs the core service delivery function of the Directorate and as such receives 60.3% of the total budget allocation of the Directorate.

Table 1: IPID Expenditure over the medium term

Programmes								
1. Administration								
2. Investigation and Information Management								
3. Compliance Monitoring and Stakeholder Management								
Programme	Budget				Nominal Rand change	Real Rand change	Nominal % change	Real % change
	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21				
<i>R million</i>								
Programme 1	87.1	109.0	116.3	124.1	21.9	16.2	25.14%	18.62%
Programme 2	156.9	190.1	203.1	216.8	33.2	23.3	21.16%	14.84%
Programme 3	11.4	16.0	17.2	18.8	4.6	3.8	40.35%	33.03%
TOTAL	255.4	315.1	336.6	359.7	59.7	43.3	23.38%	16.94%

Source: National Treasury (2018)

The Directorate prioritised R1.2 million in 2018/19 towards finalising the review of the IPID Act, 2011. These funds would be spent on costs associated with stakeholder and public consultation such as travel and subsistence, stationary and printing. The Directorate further indicated that this review would consequently result in an average growth of 49.4% over the medium term in the Compliance and Stakeholder Management Programme. However, the



amendments to the IPID Act, 2011 as per the 2016 Constitutional Court judgement is currently contained in a Committee Bill and will be processed as such by Parliament.

2.1. Expenditure trends and estimates for significant spending items

The table below shows expenditure for significant spending items in 2018/19 compared to the previous financial year. The budget allocation for compensation of employees increases from R176.8 million in 2017/18 to R212.2 million in 2018/19, which is a nominal increase of 20.02%. This is mainly due to the increase in the personnel establishment of the Directorate. At the end of 2016/17, the Directorate had a vacancy rate of 11.48%, or 48 vacant posts, of which 29 posts were in the Investigation and Information Management Programme. The vacancy rate was reduced to 7% at the end of the second quarter of 2017/18.

The expected expenditure on travel and subsistence increases from R10.4 million in 2017/18 to R14.2 million in 2018/19, which is a nominal increase of 36.54%. Spending on operating leases is expected to increase from R23.1 million to R28.2 million in 2018/19, which is a nominal increase of 22.08%. Similarly, spending on property payments is expected to increase by 61.47% in 2018/19 compared to the previous financial year.

Table 2: Expenditure for significant spending items

Programme	Budget		Nominal	Real Rand	Nominal	Real %
	2017/18	2018/19	Rand change	change	% change	change
<i>R million</i>						
	2017/18	2018/19	2017/18-2018/19	2017/18-2018/19	2017/18-2018/19	2017/18-2018/19
Compensation of employees	176.8	212.2	35.4	24.3	20.02%	13.77%
Travel and subsistence	10.4	14.2	3.8	3.1	36.54%	29.42%
Operating leases	23.1	28.2	5.1	3.6	22.08%	15.71%
Property payments	10.9	17.6	6.7	5.8	61.47%	53.05%
TOTAL	221.4	272.2	50.8	36.6	22.94%	16.54%

Source: National Treasury (2018)

The Directorate's funded personnel establishment is set to increase by 27 posts, from 388 in 2016/17 to 415 in 2018/19, and remains constant over the medium term. Between 2018/19 and 2020/21, the Directorate will spend 68.2% (R687.6 million) of its total budget on compensation of employees, mostly investigators.

2.2. Goods and services expenditure trends and estimates

The overall allocation for *Goods and service* increases from R77.4 million in 2017/18 to R97.7 million in 2018/19, which is an increase of 26.1%. Over the medium term, the allocation has an average growth rate of 11.4%. The following changes to line-item allocations should be noted:

- Allocation for *Minor assets* increases from R43 thousand in 2017/18 to R2.09 million in 2018/19 (increase of 4 769.7%), which will have an average growth rate of 276.7% over the medium term.
- Allocation for *Bursaries: Employees* increases from R214 thousand in 2017/18 to R454 thousand in 2018/19 (increase of 112.1%). The allocation has an average growth rate of 32.7% over the medium-term.



- Allocation for *Catering: Departmental activities* increases from R90 thousand in 2017/18 to R131 thousand in 2018/19, which is an increase of 45.5%. Over the medium-term, the average growth rate is 15.9%.
- Allocation for *Agency and support/Outsourced service* increases significantly from R27 thousand in 2017/18 to R100 thousand in 2018/19, which is an increase of 270.3%. Over the medium-term, the average growth rate of the allocation will be 60.2%.
- Allocation for *Consumable supplies* decreases from R509 thousand in 2017/18 to R264 thousand in 2018/19, which is a decrease of 48.1%. The allocation has an average growth rate of -17.1% over the medium term.
- Allocation for *Property payment* increases from R10.9 million in 2017/18 to R17.59 million in 2018/19. This is an increase of 60.3%. On average, the allocation increases with 21% over the medium term.
- Allocation for *Training and development* increases from R931 thousand in 2017/18 to R2 million in 2018/19, which is an increase of 115.68%. Over the medium term, the allocation has an average growth rate of 33.8%.

2.3. Ring-fenced funds

The following items received specifically and exclusive appropriations (ring-fenced) in the Appropriations Bill, 2018:²

- Compensation of employees: R212.2 million

2.4. Budget recommendations and Response from the Minister of Finance

The Committee recommended in its 2016/17 Budgetary Review and Recommendations Report (BRRR) that the Department enhance engagements with National Treasury, Executive Authority and JCPS Cluster (especially SAPS) to secure additional funding over the MTEF.

In response, the Minister of Finance stated the following:³

Over the 2018 MTEF, IPID will be allocated an additional R50 million in 2018/19, R52.8 million in 2019/20 and R55.7 million in 2020/21 from funds reprioritised from the SAPS as part of the 2018 Budget. These funds will provide for, among other things, finalising the review of the IPID Act, 2011 in line with the 2016 Constitutional Court judgement, human resource capacity strengthening across all of the Directorate's programmes to address compliance-related audit queries raised by the AG and enhancement of the Directorate's security measures to ensure compliance with minimum information security standards. In addition, a portion of the reprioritised funds will be utilised to settle the Directorate's accruals from previous years in relation to contractual obligations.

² Appropriations Bill, 2018 [B3-2018]

³ Section 7(4) of the Money Bills Amendment Procedure and Related Matters Act, 2009, prescribes that the Minister of Finance submit a report to Parliament explaining how the budget gives effect to the recommendation contained in the BRRRs when tabling the main budget. The responses are submitted as part of Annexure A of the Budget Review 2018.



The Committee could consider the following key concerns:

- 1) The Directorate should explain the significant expenditure (R500 thousand) on the review of the IPID Act, 2011 during 2017/18 and the further reprioritisation of R1.2 million in 2018/19 to finalise the review, especially in light of the fact that the Civilian Secretariat for Police is legally mandate to draft all legislation for the policing environment.
- 2) The Directorate should explain the lack of funds allocated to employee social benefits (Households) in 2018/19. This trend continues throughout the medium term. Members should keep in mind that the allocation to this item in the SAPS budget for 2018/19 increased significantly.
- 3) The Directorate should explain the significant increase to the allocation of the *Information Management* subprogramme in 2018/19 compared to the previous financial year. The allocation grew from R3.7 million to R7.8 million, which is an increase of 110.8%. Over the medium term, the allocation has an average growth rate of 37.5% (2020/21: R9.7 million).
- 4) The Directorate should explain the decreased allocation towards the *Stakeholder Management* subprogramme in 2018/19 compared to the previous financial year. In 2017/18, the subprogramme received an allocation of R5.9 million that decreases to R5 million in 2018/19 (15.2% decrease). Over the medium term, the allocation has a negative growth rate of 0.5%.
- 5) While the allocation of the *Stakeholder Management* subprogramme decreases over the medium term (0.5%), the allocation of the other subprogramme within the *Compliance Monitoring and Stakeholder Management Programme*, namely the *Compliance Monitoring* subprogramme, increases significantly from R5.5 million in 2017/18 to R11 million in 2018/19. This is an increase of exactly 100%, which continues over the medium term with an average growth rate of 31.9% (2020/21: R12.7 million).
- 6) The Directorate should explain the significant growth in the travel and subsistence allocation of the *Compliance Monitoring and Stakeholder Management Programme*. The allocation increased from R500 thousand in 2017/18 to R1.4 million in 2018/19, which is an increase of 180%. This trend continues over the medium term with an average growth rate of 49.4%.
- 7) The Directorate should explain why no allocation was made for *claims against the state* as a contingent liability. The monetary amount of claims against the Department increased from R24.5 million in 2014/15 to R41.4 million in 2015/16 and R57.2 million in 2016/17. This is a significant escalation and was raised by the Audit Committee as an area of concern.
- 8) The Directorate should explain the significant nominal increases in the allocations of compensation of employees (20%), travel and subsistence (36.54%), operating leases (22.08%) and property payments (61.47%).
- 9) The increase in the allocation for property payments is especially high (61.7% nominal increase). The allocation increased from R10.9 million in 2017/18 to R17.6 million in 2018/19.
- 10) The Committee should ask whether the Directorate's accruals account is under control. The accruals account was understated by R9.2 million at the end of the 2016/17 financial year, which led to a qualified audit opinion from the AGSA.
- 11) Is management performing adequate reviews on the accruals schedules to ensure that all goods and service received at year-end but not paid were completely disclosed as accruals?



- 12) The Committee should interrogate the significant increase in the allocation for Minor Assets. Capital assets are split into major capital assets and minor capital assets for administrative convenience. Currently, minor capital assets include those items costing less than R5000 as determined by the Office of the Accountant-General (OAG). Any asset costing R5000 or above should be recorded as a major capital asset. This provision can be abused in practises like splitting a quotation into amounts less than R5000.00 to avoid processes associated with capital assets or going out on tender.
- 13) Is the minor capital assets register made available to the external auditors at year-end? The controls over safekeeping (amongst others) of minor assets are the same for major capital assets.
- 14) What is the nature of services rendered under *Agency and support/Outsourced service*? Although the monetary allocation is not significantly high (R100 thousand), the allocation increased by 270.3% from the previous financial year. Members should keep in mind that costs incurred for research purposes are also classified as “current expenses” under *goods and services* without considering the threshold.
- 15) The Directorate should provide a copy of its Training Plan for 2018/19 to the Committee. The Committee should be assured that the significant increase in the allocation for *Training and development* from R931 thousand in 2017/18 to R2 million in 2018/19 (115.7%) will be well spent and that value for money is ensured.
- 16) The allocation for *Compensation of employees* is ring-fenced for all government departments, which means that funds can only be shifted (during the adjustments period) after approval from Treasury or Parliament.⁴ In 2017/18, the Directorate shifted R9.3 million away from the allocation of *compensation of employees* due to vacancies to defray expenditure on other items. In light thereof, the Committee should question the creation of 27 new posts in 2018/19 to increase the staff establishment from 388 to 415.

3. PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND BUDGET ALLOCATION

3.1. Programme 1: Administration

The purpose of the Administration Programme is to provide for the overall management of the Independent Police Investigative Directorate and support services, including strategic support to the Department. The table below provides a summary of the programme performance indicators and targets of the *Administration* Programme for the 2018/19 financial year:

Table 3: Programme Performance Indicators and Targets: Administration Programme

Strategic objectives and Annual Targets	2018/19
Strategic objective: Capable workforce	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of strategic training areas undertaken as per IPIDs Training Plan 	7
Performance Indicator	
1) Percentage vacancy rate per year	<10%
2) Percentage implementation of Annual Internal Audit Plan	80%
3) Percentage implementation of risk mitigating strategies (<i>New</i>)	40%

⁴ Shifting funds from Compensation of employees to Goods and services requires Parliamentary approval.



Strategic objectives and Annual Targets	2018/19
Strategic objective: Capable workforce	
4) Number of evaluations conducted per year (<i>New</i>)	Approved evaluation Plan
5) Number of written legal opinions provided to the Department within 30 working days.	70% (4)
6) Percentage of contracts/service level agreements finalised within 30 working days	70% (10)

Source: 2018/19 IPID APP

The Committee could consider the following concerns during deliberations:

- 1) A data limiter of the reporting on the percentage of vacancies is the availability of the Personnel and Salary Administration System (PERSAL). The Directorate should indicate whether any challenges have been experienced with the availability of PERSAL and expand thereon. Is the system stable?
- 2) The Directorate should indicate why the target for the percentage implementation of the Annual Internal Audit Plan is set at 80%. The purpose of this indicator is to ensure that the Directorate improves on its compliance and performance through a strong internal control environment and as such, the target should be increased.
- 3) The Committee should question whether the Directorate developed an audit charter, which clearly defines the purpose, authority and responsibility of the internal audit function. If so, the Committee should request a copy of the charter.
- 4) If the charter was developed, the Committee should question whether this was done in consultation with the Audit Committee.
- 5) The Committee should ask whether the Internal Audit Function reports at all Audit Committee meetings as prescribed by the Treasury Regulations (once a quarter).
- 6) The Committee should ask whether the Internal Audit function has unhindered access to all information needed in the performance of its audits.
- 7) The Committee should request the Directorate to elaborate on the current capacity status of the Internal Audit Sub-programme in terms of funding and personnel. Is the capacity sufficient to address deficiencies in internal control?
- 8) The Directorate should indicate the personnel strength of the Internal Audit Sub-programme. The functions of all personnel should be clearly delineated in the response given to the Committee.
- 9) The Committee should request an explanation for the high level of under-spending within the Internal Audit Sub-programme. Expenditure of less than 75 per cent at the end of the financial year should be a cause for great concern to the Committee.
- 10) In light of the under-spending on this sub-programme, the Committee should closely monitor the performance of this sub-programme when the Annual Report of the Directorate is published later this year.
- 11) The performance indicator that measures the *number of reports on risk maturity level* was introduced in 2017/18, but removed in 2018/19. The Directorate indicated that, based on management deliberations and performance dialogue with the Department Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME), it was agreed that the strategic objective was more operational. The purpose of this indicator was to ensure that the Directorate matures in addressing identified risks by instituting mitigation plans that will lead to the achievement of strategic objectives and targets. However, this indicator was presumably replaced by the new indicator on the percentage of risk mitigation strategies implemented, which



purpose is to reduce residual risk levels of risks facing the Department. The Directorate should explain the difference between the two indicators and how the new indicator is not operational in nature.

- 12) The Directorate included a new performance indicator on the *number of evaluations conducted* annually. The Directorate's TID states, "These are evaluations that will be conducted in line with the approved departmental 3 year Evaluation Plan." The target for 2018/19 is the development and approval of said Evaluation Plan. The purpose of the indicator is to "provide management with information on critical matters that directly or indirectly affect performance of the Department and service delivery". The Directorate should explain the nature of this indicator, specifically on the areas that will be evaluated and on what basis the evaluations are conducted. The Directorate plans to produce one such report annually over the medium-term.
- 13) The Committee should ask the Directorate what is the status of the Evaluation Plan.

3.2. Programme 2: Investigation and Information Management

The purpose of the Investigation and Information Management Programme is to strengthen the Department's oversight role over the police service by conducting investigations, in line with the powers granted by the Independent Police Investigative Directorate Act No. 1 of 2011. This includes making appropriate recommendations on investigations in the various investigation categories and submitting feedback to complainants. The Programme will also enhance efficiency in case management and maintain relationships with other state security agencies, such as the SAPS, the National Prosecuting Authority (NPA), Civilian Secretariat for Police (CSP) and community stakeholders, through on-going national and provincial engagement forums.

The table below summarises the programme performance indicators and targets of the *Investigation and Information Management Programme*:

Table 4: Programme Performance Indicators and Targets: Investigation and Information Management Programme

Strategic objectives and Annual Targets	2018/19
Strategic Objective: Specialised investigative capacity established	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of investigators trained on specialised services 	75
Strategic Objective: Decision-ready cases finalised	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of decision ready cases completed from total cases received 	45% (5 347)
Strategic Objective: Provide Investigation advisory service to investigators	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of legal advice provided to investigators from the total requests received 	90% (6)
Performance Indicator	
1) Percentage of cases registered and allocated within 72 hours of written notification	79% (5 332)
2) Number of statistical reports on investigations generated (<i>Revised</i>)	2
3) Number of investigations of deaths in police custody that are decision ready (<i>Revised</i>)	150



Strategic objectives and Annual Targets	2018/19
4) Number of investigations of death as a result of police action that are decision ready (<i>Revised</i>)	130
5) Number of cases for investigation of the discharge of an official firearm by a police officer that are decision ready (<i>Revised</i>)	500
6) Number of investigations of rape by a police officer that are decision ready (<i>Revised</i>)	65
7) Number of investigations of rape while in police custody that are decision ready (<i>Revised</i>)	10
8) Number of investigations of torture that are decision ready (<i>Revised</i>)	60
9) Number of investigations of assault that are decision ready (<i>Revised</i>)	2 000
10) Number of investigations of corruption that are decision ready	60
11) Number of investigations of other criminal and misconduct matters referred to the directorate in terms of s28(1)(h) and s35(1)(c) of the IPID Act that are decision ready (<i>Revised</i>)	80
12) Number of approved systemic corruption cases that are decision ready	2
13) Number of backlog decision ready cases completed (excluding cases of systemic corruption)	1 250
14) Percentage of criminal recommendation reports referred to the NPA within 30 days of recommendation report being signed off	90% (1 300)
15) Percentage of disciplinary recommendation reports referred to the SAPS or MPS within 30 days of recommendation report being signed	90% (1 400)
16) Percentage of oral legal advice provided to investigators within 24 hours of request	90% (3)
17) Percentage of written legal advice provided to investigators within 2 working days of request	90% (3)
18) Percentage of PAIA requests finalised within 30 days	100% (65)

Source: IPID 2018/19 APP

The Committee could consider the following concerns during deliberations:

- 1) The Directorate should explain why almost all the expression of targets for the Programme is changed from percentages to numbers. Additionally, the Directorate should indicate why these changes are not stated in the APP.
- 2) The original rationale for expressing the targets as percentages and not actual numbers was that the nature of investigations is incident based and thus difficult to express the target as an actual number. The Directorate should state what changed to enable the Directorate to express these targets as actual numbers alone.
- 3) The targets, now expressed as numbers as opposed to percentages, have decreased significantly. For example, the 2017/18 target for investigations completed of deaths as a result of police custody was 48% (or 459 cases), which means that total caseload would have to be 955 cases. The 2018/19 target is the completion of 130 investigations. This is a significant decrease, which stretches across the mandatory investigation areas of the IPID, as per the IPID Act, 2011. This is seriously problematic as it breaks consistency for comparative purposes across years.



- 4) The Directorate should indicate what steps are taken to address possible inaccurate data on files, reports, case flow management system and databases, which can affect the accuracy of performance data.
- 5) The Committee should request the Directorate to elaborate on the status of the National Specialised Investigation Team (NSIT) and how the performance of this team is measured.
- 6) The IPID appeared before the Portfolio Committee on Police on the investigation of high profile cases (29 March 2018). During the meeting, Executive Director, Robert McBride stated, “The biggest threat to national security is corruption in the SAPS”. Yet, for 2018/19, the IPID aims to have only two cases of systemic corruption decision ready to go to court.

3.3. Programme 3: Compliance Monitoring and Stakeholder Management

The purpose of the Compliance Monitoring and Stakeholder Management Programme is to safeguard the principles of cooperative governance and stakeholder management through on-going monitoring and evaluation of the quality of recommendations made to the SAPS and MPSs. In addition, also report on the police service’s compliance with reporting obligations in terms of the Independent Police Investigative Directorate Act No. 1 of 2011.

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

Table 5: Programme Performance Indicators and Targets: Programme

Strategic objectives and Annual Targets	2018/19
Strategic Objective: Ensure an Integrated Communication and Stakeholder Engagement Strategy	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage implementation of the Integrated Communication and Stakeholder Engagement Strategy 	90%
Performance Indicator	
1) Number of community outreach events conducted per year	80
2) Number of formal engagements held with key stakeholders	128
3) Number of disciplinary recommendations referred to the SAPS and MPS that are analysed (<i>New</i>)	1 000
4) Number of criminal referrals forwarded to the NPA that are analysed (<i>New</i>)	748
5) Percentage of responses from SAPS and MPS that are analysed (<i>New</i>)	50% (900)
6) Percentage of responses from NPA that are analysed (<i>New</i>)	50% (600)

Source: IPID 2018/19 APP

The Committee could consider the following concerns during deliberations:

- 1) The Directorate to elaborate on the nature of communication and stakeholder engagement action plans identified for the 2018/19 financial year.
- 2) The target for the number of community outreach events was reduced significantly in 2018/19 compared to the previous year. The indicator serves to inform the public about IPID’s mandate to build the image of the Directorate with the aim of creating a demand for IPID services. Due to the importance of the indicator, the Directorate should explain the reduction in number of outreach events.



- 3) The achievement of 80 community outreach events are measured by means of counting signed feedback reports. The Directorate should explain what a signed feedback report entails – how are the reports developed and what is the nature thereof.
- 4) The indicator for the number of formal engagements held with key stakeholders was collapsed into one indicator (national and provincial stakeholders were measured separately in 2017/18). The target was reduced from 156 engagements to 128 engagements. The Directorate should explain the collapse of the previously separate indicators and the reduction of the target. The Directorate should elaborate on the nature of the meetings held with stakeholders that have an interest in the work of IPID. Additionally, the Directorate should indicate the names of the key stakeholders.
- 5) The IPID introduced four new performance indicators to analyse the quality of recommendation reports to the SAPS/MPS and the NPA and to analyse the subsequent responses received back from the three departments. However, the targets for these indicators should be explained, as they are seemingly not aligned to each other.
- 6) The target for the *number of disciplinary recommendations referred to the SAPS/MPS that are analysed* is set at 1000 analyses for 2018/19, but the target for the accompanying indicator to analyse the responses from the SAPS/MPS is set at 50% (900). The response analysis indicator serves to assess the consistency/appropriateness of the responses/feedback received from the SAPS and MPS. Thus, if 1000 recommendations were to be referred, one would expect that 50% thereof would be 500 and not 900 analyses, as per the IPID target.
- 7) The Directorate should explain the nature of the Quality Assurance Tool used to analyse the disciplinary recommendation reports forwarded to SAPS/MPS and the criminal recommendations forwarded to the NPA. How is the Quality Assurance Tool applied to identify gaps to improve the quality of these reports?
- 8) The indicators for the analyses of responses received back from the SAPS, MPS and NPA aim to assess the consistency or appropriateness of the responses/feedback received from the SAPS and MPS. However, the source/collection data used to measure performance on this target is merely the number of responses received back and the calculation method for the 50% target is the following calculation: (Number of response reports analysed / total number of response reports received from the SAPS and MPS) * 100. This begs the question as to how this indicator assesses the consistency or appropriateness of responses received when the type of indicator is a simple output or count.
- 9) The question around the new targets is what is the use of the analyses or how is the information derived from the analyses used to IMPACT police conduct through better quality reports to SAPS/MPS and NPA and in turn, improved responses, if the performance indicator is merely to count the number of analyses.
- 10) The IPID should be encouraged to start developing impact and outcome indicators instead of focussing merely on output indicators.



4. STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER (2018/19)

The Department has identified the following key strategic risk that may affect realisation of the strategic objectives of the Department.

Extreme Risk

- **Counter investigations by the SAPS:** The mandate of IPID is to investigate cases and finalise them efficiently and on time. Cases might not be finalised as per the set objectives due to the counter investigations that sets to interfere with the investigations by IPID.
- **Political interferences:** In delivering the constitutional mandate, the IPID may be affected by external political environment to achieve proper implementation of its objectives.

High risk

- **Constrained resources:** Adequate resources and their proper allocation is fundamental to the IPID to achieve its overall objectives. Due to the continuous baseline budget reduction experienced, there is a high possibility of resources being constrained which will affect negatively on operations.
- **Inadequate information systems:** Proper information technology serves as a critical part of the origination's ability to perform its duties and achieve its mandate. The risk on the information systems impact on the Department's performance as it will hinder in terms of conducting certain functions to finalise the work that needs to be done.
- **Inability to investigate and finalise cases timeously:** The mandate of IPID is to investigate cases and finalise them effectively and on time. Cases might not be finalised as per the set objectives.

The Committee could consider the following concerns during deliberations:

The risks stated as extreme are of a very serious nature and must be addressed as a matter of priority. The Directorate should present the risk mitigation strategy for each of the identified risk areas. For instance, the Directorate states, to mitigate against counter investigations: (1) they will engage with Ministry of Police and Senior Management of SAPS to manage counter investigations; (2) launch court interdicts to stop the counter investigations; (3) ensure adequate resourcing of human capacity and litigation budget to address the legal implications; and (4) develop Standard Operating procedures to expeditiously address the legal impact. From this, it is not clear how these strategies will be implemented to address counter investigations in reality.

5. REFERENCES

Appropriations Bill, 2018.

National Treasury (2018). Budget Review 2018: Annexure A. Response of the National Treasury to the Portfolio Committees.

National Treasury. (2018) Estimates of National Expenditure 2018.

National Treasury. (2018a) Vote 20: Independent Police Investigative Directorate (IPID).

IPID (2017). Annual Performance Plan 2017/18.

IPID (2018). Annual Performance Plan 2018/19.

IPID (2018). Technical Indicator Description Annual Performance Plan 2018/19.