**12. REPORT OF THE PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE ON POLICE ON THE 2019/20 BUDGET, ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLAN OF THE CIVILIAN SECRETARIAT FOR POLICE SERVICES (CSPS), DATED 9 JULY 2019**

The Portfolio Committee on Police examined the Budget, Annual Performance Plan of the Civilian Secretariat for Police Services (CSPS) for the 2019/20 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. 108 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 2019/20 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 2018/19 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 2019/20 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 2019/20. 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 2019/20 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 2019/20 Budget on 4 July 2019. The Committee was dissatisfied with the presentation of the CSPS and asked the CSPS to correct their presentation to include performance targets as indicated in their APP and return on 9 July 2019.

**2. KEY CONCERNS RAISED BY THE COMMITTEE DURING THE 2018/19 FINANCIAL YEAR (HISTORIC CHALLENGES)**

**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.

**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 2019/20 financial year:

* Support the operations of the South African Police Service (SAPS) by effectively providing the necessary policy and legislation frameworks in line with the Constitution and the prescripts in the Civilian Secretariat for Police Service Act No. 2 of 2011. Continued monitoring and evaluation of police performance and conduct reports will be key in overseeing the journey to a police service that our people deserve.
* Updated research and policy development to track the ever-changing crime threats. The research focus for 2019/20 will be largely on SAPS training and skills development programmes to ensure an improved and better-skilled police service.
* Facilitate dialogue between communities and policing agencies.
* Analysis of feedback, complaints and compliments to identify areas where policing can be enhanced.
* Facilitation of key role-players to foster community orientated policing.

**STATE OF THE NATIONA JUNE 2019**

The reduction of violent crime was a key theme of both the February 2019 and June 2019 State of the Nation Addresses (SONA’s). As part of the five fundamental goals to realise the NDP’s Vision 2030, the President stated that violent crime must be halved over the next decade and importantly, that violent crime is a societal problem that requires a society-wide response.

The President noted that the reduction of violent crime (over the next decade) will be realised through the following efforts:

1. Increase police visibility by employing more police women and men. Currently, there are over 5,000 students registered for basic training in police training colleges and it is envisaged that this number will be increased to 7,000 per cycle over the next two intakes.
2. Create a more active role for citizens through effective community policing forums (CPFs).
3. Improve the success rates in investigating and prosecuting crimes.
4. Ensure better training and professionalisation throughout the criminal justice system.

In 2019/20, the Civilian Secretariat for Police Service (CSPS) will focus on piloting the implementation plan for the 2016 White Paper on Safety and Security. The White Paper replaced the 1998 White Paper on Safety and Security1 and provides a comprehensive policy approach to crime prevention. The White Paper is focussed on realising the vision of the NDP and calls for an integrated and holistic approach to safety and security across all government departments and civil society. However, the timeframes for implementation and responsible political authority are uncertain. Currently, the political authority and effective oversight of the White Paper is located within the Presidency with the CSPS providing a coordinating role to support implementation and facilitate engagements with civil society and Government on community safety.

The establishment of Community Policing Forums (CPFs) and Community Safety Forums (CSFs) has been a challenge since the adoption of a community policing approach post-1994. But it was only in October 2018, that an official Community Policing Strategy was launched by the SAPS. To date, there are CPFs attached to most police stations countrywide, but the functionality of these forums is questionable.

The eradication of gender based violence (GBV) and femicide was highlighted as a key focus area during both of the 2019 SONA’s. As part of an ongoing effort to address GBV, a Gender Based Violence and Femicide Council will be established and a National Strategic Plan developed to guide Government’s efforts. Another key aspect raised to reduce GBV is the capacitation and equipping the police and court system to support survivors of GBV.

The Civilian Secretariat for Police Service (CSPS) is mandated to produce bi-annual reports on the implementation of the Domestic Violence Act, 1998 (Act No 116 of 1998) (“DVA”). Although the CSPS produces these documents, the compliance levels of the SAPS remain very low.

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 2019/20**

The CSPS will focus on the following key priority projects for the 2019/20 financial years:

* Strengthening community participation in building a peaceful and crime free society;
* Supporting CPF and CSF formations in society;
* Developing policing policies and evidence based research for improved police service delivery to communities;
* Submitting policing legislative Bills for processing and approval; and
* Effective oversight in the conduct and performance of SAPS.

1. **CSPS BUDGET ANALYSIS AND PERFORMANCE TARGETS FOR 2019/20**

**BUDGET ANALYSIS**

**4.1. Overall expenditure estimates and trends**

The CSPS received a budget allocation of R146.7 million in 2019/20, which is a nominal increase of R15.5 million when compared to the previous financial year in which the Secretariat had an Adjusted allocation of R131.2 million. The Administration Programme received the largest percentage increase in 2019/20 (18.6%) when compared to the previous financial year and is expected to increase by 118% over the medium-term.

The Administration Programme received the largest proportional allocation of the total budget at 44.3%. It is important to note that the average proportional allocation was 41.5% over the previous medium-term, indicating an increased focus on the Administration Programme. Although this is attributed to the allocation of the Office Accommodation sub-programme, the Departmental Management, Corporate Services and Finance Administration sub-programmes accounts for the majority of expenditure against the total Programme allocation at 18.7%, 36.7% and 28.5% of the Programme’s allocation, respectively.

A concern in the large proportional allocation of the Administration Programme is that administration is not the core service delivery mandate of the Department and should not receive the highest proportional allocation. For instance, in the IPID, the Investigation and Information Management Programme receives more than half (61.18%) of the total budget. Similarly, the Visible Policing Programme of the SAPS receives more than half of the total budget (51.1%). For both departments, the largest proportional allocation is made to the core service delivery programmes.

A key driver for the increased allocation of the **Administration Programme** is attributed to the fact that funds for office space were transferred from the SAPS budget to that of the CSPS. Previously, the CSPS operated as a cost centre of the SAPS, but when it became a separate Department in 2013/14, funds for office space remained in the SAPS budget that gave accommodation to CSPS staff members. However, this arrangement caused two significant challenges, one being that the SAPS did not have sufficient office space available, which resulted in staff working in crammed spaces and secondly, the independence of the CSPS as an oversight body over the SAPS, was compromised. In 2017/18, the Portfolio Committee intervened and made a recommendation to National Treasury to ensure that the funds are transferred to the CSPS to procure its own office space. This was effected by National Treasury through a mediation process with SAPS and is thus reflected in the 2019/20 budget of the Secretariat.

**The Legislation and Policy Development Programme** received the second highest budget increase between 2018/19 and 2019/20. In 2018/19, the Programme had an allocation of R21.2 million, which increased by 7.08 in 2019/20 to a Main allocation of R22.7 million. The increase in allocation is attributed to a focus on the revision of legislation. For 2019/20, a total of seven laws are identified for review, including the SAPS Act and another three over the medium-term. However, the Programme has underperformed over the past years, as the majority of laws have been identified since 2012/13.

**Table 1: Comparative changes in expenditure estimates by programme: 2018/19 to 2019/20**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Programmes** | | | | | | |
| 1. Administration  2. Intersectoral Coordination and Strategic Partnerships  3. Legislation and Policy Development  4. Civilian Oversight, Monitoring and Evaluation | | | | | | |
| **Programme** | **Adjusted appropriation** | **Main Appropriation** | **Nominal Increase / Decrease in 2019/20** | **Real Increase / Decrease in 2019/20** | **Nominal Percent change in 2019/20** | **Real Percent change in 2019/20** |
| **R million** | **2018/19** | **2019/20** |  |  |  |  |
| Programme 1 | 54.8 | 65.0 | 10.2 | 7.0 | 18.61 % | 12.75 % |
| Programme 2 | 23.4 | 25.0 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 6.84 % | 1.56 % |
| Programme 3 | 21.2 | 22.7 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 7.08 % | 1.78 % |
| Programme 4 | 31.8 | 34.0 | 2.2 | 0.5 | 6.92 % | 1.63 % |
| **TOTAL** | 131.2 | 146.7 | 15.5 | 8.2 | **11.8 %** | **6.29 %** |

**Source: Treasury (2019)**

In terms of comparative average growth between the previous medium-term (2015/16 to 2018/19) and the current medium-term (2018/19 to 2021/22), the table below shows the following:

* The total average growth rate accelerates over the latter period, from 5.1% to 8.4%.
* The average growth rate of the Administration Programme accelerates from 9.4% to 10.7% in the latter period. Furthermore, it is the only programme with an indicative increase in the rate of average expenditure (percentage) against the total budget allocation.
* The average growth rate of the Civilian Oversight, Monitoring and Evaluation Programme decelerates over the latter period from an average growth rate of 12% between 2015/16 and 2018/19, to 6.9% during 2018/19 and 2021/22.
* The average growth rates of the Intersectoral Coordination and Strategic Partnerships and the Legislation and Policy Development Programmes accelerates significantly during the latter part (2018/19 to 2021/22).
* Despite the accelerated average growth of the Intersectoral Coordination and Strategic Partnerships Programme, its average expenditure against the total budget (percentage of the budget) decelerates from 19.9% to 17.2% between 2018/19 and 2021/22. This is indicative of a lesser focus on this Programme.

**Table 2: Average expenditure per programme: 2015/16 to 2018/19 and 2018/19 to 2021/22**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Programmes** | | | | | | |
| 1. Administration  2. Intersectoral Coordination and Strategic Partnerships  3. Legislation and Policy Development  4. Civilian Oversight, Monitoring and Evaluation | | | | | | |
| **Programme** | **Revised estimate** | **Average growth rate (%)** | **Average expenditure/**  **Total (%)** | **Main allocation** | **Average growth rate (%)** | **Average expenditure/**  **Total (%)** |
| R million | **2018/19** | **2015/16 – 2018/19** | | **2019/20** | **2018/19 – 2021/22** | |
| Programme 1 | 54.8 | 9.4% | 41.6% | 65.0 | 10.7% ↑ | 43.8% ↑ |
| Programme 2 | 23.4 | -0.7% | 19.9% | 25.0 | 6.8% ↑ | 17.2% ↓ |
| Programme 3 | 21.2 | -0.5% | 15.5% | 22.7 | 6.1% ↑ | 15.5% ↑↓ |
| Programme 4 | 31.8 | 12.0% | 23.1% | 34.0 | 6.9% ↓ | 23.4% ↑ |
| **TOTAL** | **131.2** | **5.1%** | **100.0%** | **146.7** | **8.4%** ↑ | **100.0%** |

Source: Treasury (2019)

**Expenditure by economic classification**

The total Vote allocation to be appropriated by Parliament is categorised into the main budget programmes and economic classification. The economic classification is divided into current payments, transfers and subsidies, payments for capital assets and payments for financial assets.

* Current payments are payments made by the Secretariat for its operational requirements.
* Transfers and subsidies are payments made by the Secretariat for which it does not directly receive anything in return.
* Payments for capital assets are payments made by the Secretariat for an asset that can be used for more than one year, and from which future economic benefits or service potential are expected to flow.

The main allocation for Current payments increased from R129.4 million in 2018/19 to R144.8 million in 2019/20, which is an increase of 11.9% in comparison. Over the medium-term, the average annual growth rate is 8.4%, which is an increases from the previous medium-term growth rate of 5.1%. The increase is due to a significant increase in the allocation for Goods and services from R31.9 million in 2018/19 to R39.9 million in 2019/20 (increase of 25.08%). The average annual growth rate of Goods and services had an average annual decrease of -9.4% over the previous medium-term, which improves to an average annual growth rate of 12% over the current medium-term. In 2021/22, the allocation is expected to increase to R120 million. The drivers of the increase in average growth are: external audit costs, computer services, fleet services and operating leases.

In 2019/20, the main allocation for CoE increased from R97.5 million in 2018/19 to R104.9 million, which is an increase of 7.59% in comparison. Over the medium-term, expenditure on CoE is expected to increase by an average annual growth rate of 7.2%. Between 2015/16 and 2018/19, CoE had an average expenditure against the total budget of 66.3%, which increases to 72.3% over the medium-term (between 2018/19 and 2021/22).

The allocation for Transfers and subsidies, specifically Departmental agencies and accounts, remains unchanged in 2019/20, but shows an average annual growth rate of 4.9% over the medium-term. This growth is attributed to payments made to the Safety and Security Sector Education and Training Authority (SASSETA). In 2018/19, the allocation was R176 thousand and will increase to R185 thousand in 2019/20 and R204 thousand in 2021/22.

The total allocation for Payments for capital assets remains unchanged in 2019/20, but within the item, allocations to Machinery and equipment and Software and other intangible assets do change. The allocation for Machinery and equipment decreased from R1.6 million in 2018/19 to R1.4 million in 2019/20, which is a decrease of 12.5%. Over the medium-term, the allocation is expected to show a slight average annual decrease of 0.2%.

The allocation for Software and other intangible assets increased by 200% in 2019/20 (R3000.00) when compared to the previous financial year (R1000.00), and this drives the increased average growth for Payments for capital assets. Despite the small monetary value of this item, increases in growth rates should be taken into account.

The main allocation for Current Payments increased from R129.4 million in 2018/19 to R144.8 million in 2019/20, which is an increase of 11.9% in comparison. Over the medium-term, the average annual growth rate is 8.4%, which is an increases from the previous medium-term growth rate of 5.1%. The increase is due to a significant increase in the allocation for Goods and Services from R31.9 million in 2018/19 to R39.9 million in 2019/20 (increase of 25.08%). The average annual growth rate of Goods and Services had an average annual decrease of -9.4% over the previous medium-term, which improves to an average annual growth rate of 12% over the current medium-term. In 2021/22, the allocation is expected to increase to R120 million. The drivers of the increase in average growth are: external audit costs, computer services, fleet services and operating leases.

In 2019/20, the main allocation for CoE increased from R97.5 million in 2018/19 to R104.9 million, which is an increase of 7.59% in comparison. Over the medium-term, expenditure on CoE is expected to increase by an average annual growth rate of 7.2%. Between 2015/16 and 2018/19, CoE had an average expenditure against the total budget of 66.3%, which increases to 72.3% over the medium-term (between 2018/19 and 2021/22).

The allocation for Transfers and Subsidies, specifically Departmental agencies and accounts, remains unchanged in 2019/20, but shows an average annual growth rate of 4.9% over the medium-term. This growth is attributed to payments made to the Safety and Security Sector Education and Training Authority (SASSETA). In 2018/19, the allocation was R176 000 and will increase to R185 000 in 2019/20 and R204 000 in 2021/22.

The total allocation for Payments for capital assets remains unchanged in 2019/20, but within the item, allocations to Machinery and equipment and Software and other intangible assets do change. The allocation for Machinery and equipment decreased from R1.6 million in 2018/19 to R1.4 million in 2019/20, which is a decrease of 12.5%. Over the medium-term, the allocation is expected to show a slight average annual decrease of 0.2%.

The allocation for Software and other intangible assets increased by 200% in 2019/20 (R3000.00) when compared to the previous financial year (R1000.00), and this drives the increased average growth for Payments for capital assets. Despite the small monetary value of this item, increases in growth rates should be taken into account.

**Table 3: Departmental expenditure estimates by economic classification**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Economic classification** | **Revised estimate** | **Main allocation** | **% Increase/ (Decrease)** | **Average growth rate (%)** |
| *R million* | **2018/19** | **2019/20** | **2018/19 – 2019/20** | **2018/19 – 2021/22**  **compared to 205/16-2018/19** |
| **Current payments** | **129.4** | **144.8** | **11.9%** | **8.4%** ↑ |
| Compensation of employees | 97.5 | 104.9 | 7.59% | 7.2% ↓ |
| Goods and services | 31.9 | 39.9 | 25.08% | 12.0% ↑ |
| **Transfers and subsidies** | **0.2** | **0.2** | **0%** | **4.9%** ↑ |
| Departmental agencies and accounts | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0% | 5.0% ↑ |
| **Payments for capital assets** | **1.7** | **1.7** | **0%** | **5.2%** ↑ |
| Machinery and equipment | 1.6 | 1.4 | (12.5%) | -0.2% ↑ |
| Software and other intangible assets | 0.1 | 0.3 | 200% | 78.4% ↑ |
| **TOTAL** | **131.2** | **146.7** | **11.8%** | **8.4%** ↑ |

Source: Treasury (2019)

The Secretariat’s significant spending items include CoE, Computer services and travel and subsistence. The table below shows that these items represent 85.5% of the total budget allocation over the medium-term.

The Secretariat’s spending on CoE is expected to increase at an average annual rate of 7.2% from R97.5 million in 2019/20 to R120 million in 2021/22, to remain within Government’s expenditure ceiling for CoE. Due to the labour-intensive nature of the Department, CoE accounts for 72.3% of the total budget. The number of personnel in the Department is expected to increase from 158 in 2018/19 to 160 in 2021/22.

The allocation for Computer Services shows an increase of 46.8% in 2019/20 when compared to the previous financial year. The 2019/20 allocation of R7.93 million is expected to increase to R10.47 million in 2021/22, which is an average annual growth of 24.7% over the medium-term.

**Table 4: Expenditure trends and expenditure for significant spending items**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Economic Classification** | **Adjusted Appropriation** | **Average growth rate (%)** | **Average: Expenditure/ Total Vote (%)** | **Main Appropriation** | **Average growth rate (%)** | **Average: Expenditure/ Total Vote (%)** |
| **R thousand** | **2018/19** | **2015/16 – 2018/19** | | **2019/20** | **2018/19 – 2021/22** | |
| Compensation of employees | 97 452 | 14.3% | 66.8% | 104 859 | 7.2% | 72.3% |
| Computer Services | 5 407 | -15.7% | 6.2% | 7 938 | 24.7% | 5.5% |
| Travel and Subsistence | 12 604 | -7.0% | 10.3% | 10 658 | -2.0% | 7.7% |
| **Total** | **115 462** | **8.7%** | **83.3%** | **123 455** | **7.2%** | **85.5%** |

Source: Treasury (2019)

In terms of comparative average growth between the previous medium-term (2015/16 to 2018/19) and the current medium-term (2018/19 to 2021/22), the table below shows the following:

* The total average growth rate accelerates over the latter period, from 5.1% to 8.4%.
* The average growth rate of the Administration Programme accelerates from 9.4% to 10.7% in the latter period. Furthermore, it is the only programme with an indicative increase in the rate of average expenditure (percentage) against the total budget allocation.
* The average growth rate of the Civilian Oversight, Monitoring and Evaluation Programme decelerates over the latter period from an average growth rate of 12% between 2015/16 and 2018/19, to 6.9% during 2018/19 and 2021/22.
* The average growth rates of the Intersectoral Coordination and Strategic Partnerships and the Legislation and Policy Development Programmes accelerates significantly during the latter part (2018/19 to 2021/22).
* Despite the accelerated average growth of the Intersectoral Coordination and Strategic Partnerships Programme, its average expenditure against the total budget (percentage of the budget) decelerates from 19.9% to 17.2% between 2018/19 and 2021/22. This is indicative of a lesser focus on this Programme.

**PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS**

This section provides a summary of the performance indicators and targets of the four budget programmes of the Department. The section further highlights key concerns for consideration of Parliament during the 2019/20 budget hearings of the Department.

The 2019/20 APP shows little change when compared to the previous year. Several performance indicators were removed and only one indicator to measure the functionality of the DNA Database was introduced.

**PROGRAMME 1: ADMINISTRATION**

The purpose of the Administration Programme is to provide strategic leadership, management and support services to the Department. 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 Service Act, 2011.

**Sub-programme: Corporate Services**

1. Maintain vacancy rate to 7% of the total post establishment. This target has improved from a vacancy rate of 10% in 2018/19 to 7% in 2019/20.

**Sub-programme: Finance Administration**

1. 100% of payments made to creditors within 30 days;
2. 100% of Internal Audit recommendations implemented;
3. 100% of external audit recommendations implemented; and
4. 98% of expenditure in relation to the allocated budget. This target was increased from 95% in 2018/19 to 98% in 2019/20. Expenditure against the allocated budget has been a challenge for the Departments as continuous underspending has occurred in past years.

In 2019/20, two performance indicators were removed from the APP, including:

* Produce four quarterly performance reports against predetermined objectives submitted within 30 days after end of the quarter; and
* Produce one Workplace Skills Plans approved by the Secretary for Police Service was removed.

**PROGRAMME 2: INTERSECTORAL COORDINATION AND STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS**

The purpose of the Intersectoral Coordination and Strategic Partnerships Programme is to manage and encourage national dialogue on community safety and crime prevention. For the 2018/19 financial year, the following performance targets were identified:

**Sub programme: Intergovernmental, Civil Society and Public-Private Partnerships**

1. Two memoranda of understanding (MoUs) signed with stakeholders in order to build safer communities.
2. 20 workshops facilitated with Provincial Secretariats and municipalities on the establishment of Community Safety Forums (CSFs).
3. Nine provincial capacity-building sessions held on crime prevention policies per year.
4. Three of anti-crime campaigns conducted per year.
5. Three partnership strategies approved by the Secretary. This target was increased from one partnership in 2018/19 to three in 2019/20.
6. Two monitoring reports on implementing Community Policing Forum (CPF) regulations/standards approved by the Secretary.

**Sub-programme: Community Outreach**

1. Eight izimbizo/public participation programmes held with communities to promote community safety. This target was increased with two public participation programmes.

In 2019/20, two performance indicators were removed from the APP in comparison to the previous year, including:

* Promotional events for the Office of the Directorate for Priority Crime Investigation (DPCI) Judge. This indicator was only introduced in 2018/19 and the reason for the removal should be questioned.
* CPF training programmes.

**PROGRAMME 3: LEGISLATION AND POLICY DEVELOPMENT**

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

**Sub programme: Policy Development and Research**

1. Three policies on policing submitted to the Minister of Police for approval per year;
2. Two research reports on policing approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year; and
3. One newsletter (gazettes) published on Safer Spaces per year.

**Sub programme: Legislation**

1. Two Bills submitted to the Minister for approval. This target was reduced from three bills in the previous financial year.

The performance indicator to submit one regulation to the Minister for Promulgation was removed in the 2019/20 APP.

**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 Directorate for Priority Crime Investigation (DPCI) Judge and National Forensic Oversight and Ethics Board sub-programmes were added in 2018/19.

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

**Sub programme: Police Performance, Conduct and Compliance Monitoring**

1. Two Police Station Oversight Report approved by the Secretary. The target increased from one such report in 2018/19.
2. One Police Station Service Delivery Trends Analysis Report approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year.
3. One SAPS Budget and Programme Performance Assessment Report approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year.
4. Two Assessments Reports on Complaints Management approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year.
5. Two reports on SAPS Implementation of IPID Recommendations approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year
6. Two Compliance Monitoring Reports on the implementation of the Domestic Violence Act, 1998 by SAPS approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year
7. One report on the implementation and compliance to legislation and policies approved by the Secretary.
8. One assessment report on Litigation Management approved by the Secretary.
9. Four reports on the functioning of the National Forensic DNA Database assessed per year (New indicator).

The performance indicator to measure the police stations’ implementation of the school safety protocol approved by the Secretary was removed.

The inclusion of the new performance indicator to monitor the functioning of the DNA Database is due to the incorporation of the National Forensic Oversight and Ethics Board as a sub-programme of the Civilian Oversight, Monitoring and Evaluation Programme at the start of the 2019/20 financial year.

A key concern is that the Office of the Directorate for Priority Crime Investigation (DPCI) Judge was also incorporated as a sub-programme, but has no measurable performance indicator despite a budget allocation of R6.8 million in 2019/20. It is vital that there is accountability on how state funds are spent.

**Sub programme: Policy and Programme Evaluations**

1. One assessment report on establishment and functionality of CSFs approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year.
2. One Customer Satisfaction Survey Reports approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year.

**5. COMMITTEE OBSERVATIONS**

The Committee made the following observations on the strategic priorities of the Civilian Secretariat during the 2019/20 budget hearings:

**5.1 General**

**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, despite being asked to do so in 2018. 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.

**Budget allocation - Compensation of Employees:** The Committee did not accept that the allocation for Compensation of Employees was 85% of the budget allocation. This was concerning for Members who questioned what value for money was received by the Minister in terms of the advice he receives from the Civilian Secretariat. Members wanted to know what the advice to the Minister was on the training of the 5000 trainees with respect to transformation on policing.

**Legislative Schedule**

The Committee raised serious concerns about the legislative schedule of the Department, especially the review of the South African Police Services Act. The SAPS review of the SAPS Act is more than ten years overdue and the White Papers on Police and Safety and Security has been finalised. The Committee noted that seven other pieces of legislation was to be tabled in the current financial year and urged the Civilian Secretariat to prioritise the legislation.

**Office Accommodation:** The Committee noted the intended relocation of office accommodation and questioned the state of relationship between the CSPS and the Department of Public Works. Members wanted to know how serious the condition of the current building was in view of the staff establishment and was alarmed at the allocation showing an increase of 670%.

**Community Police Forums and Community Safety Forums (CSFs)**

The Committee noted that the question of support to Community Police Forums (CPFs) and Community Safety Forums (CSFs) has not been finalised and urged the Secretariat to finalise the question of stipends to the CPFs. The Committee noted that the CPFs were critical to the vision of the President to achieve a 50% reduction of violent crime in 10 years.

**Filling of vacant posts**

The Committee questioned the Department on the filling of vacant posts. Members indicated that the Secretariat was important with respect to supporting the Minister with providing strategic and policy advice. In this respect, the Committee called on the Department to urgently fill the outstanding vacancies in its staff establishment. The Department was commended for having a strong showing in the non-senior management service echelon.

**Performance Indicators**

Members questioned the fact that some of the performance indicators have been removed from the APP of the Civilian Secretariat. In particular, the Department did not have an indicator for the appointment of people with disabilities where the government norm is 2% of the staff establishment. Outcome-orientated performance indicators and targets are vital in the Civilian Oversight, Monitoring and Evaluation Programme, as opposed to output-orientated performance indicators and targets. The strategic objective of the programme is to contribute to an accountable and transformed police service. The impact of the programme should be measured in terms of the outcome/impact made/achieved through its activities/outputs.

**Domestic Violence**

The Committee expressed its concerns about the removal of the Domestic Violence Act compliance indicator. The indicator and target for the evaluation reports on Domestic Violence Act non-compliance, exploring causes and possible remedies approved by the Secretary for Police Service per year has been removed from the 2018/19 APP, after it was included only in the previous financial year.

**Policy and Research**

The Committee noted that the Civilian Secretariat should indicate the areas in which the three policies on policing will be completed and whether this target will be achieved. The Secretariat should indicate the areas in which the two research reports on policing will be completed and whether this target will be achieved.

**National Monitoring Tool**

The Committee wanted to know what the challenges experienced with the implementation and use of the National Monitoring Tool (NMT) was. The station oversight reports are measured though census data collected from police stations through the NMT. The APP lists the data limiter to measure performance as “data more quantitative than qualitative”. This statement should be explained, as the source data (use of NMT) is a system developed and used by the Department.

**The DPCI Judge**

The Committee understood noticed that the Department did not have an indicator for measuring the performance of the DPCI Judge whose budget is R6.8 million. The Committee viewed this as urgent for the smooth functioning of the Office of the DPCI Judge.

**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 2019/20 budget hearings. These included the following:

**6.2.1 Budget recommendations:**

1. The Committee recommends that the CSPS finalise the necessary arrangements for the Secretariat to be an independent Budget Vote with urgency to lessen its dependence on the SAPS financial infrastructure.
2. The Committee recommends that the Secretariat should develop a performance indicator to measure the achievements and budget of the Office of the DPCI Judge.
3. The Committee recommends that the Civilian Secretariat reviews its allocation for Compensation of Employees.
4. The Committee recommends that the Secretariat endeavours to repeat its performance of a clean audit for the current financial year.

**6.2.2 Performance recommendations:**

1. The Committee that the Civilian Secretariat reviews the performance indicators and re-inserts those targets and indicators which it took out of the APP, especially those targets which has a serious impact on reducing violent crime.
2. 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 the Department to prioritise the SAPS Amendment Bill.

1. The Committee recommends that the Secretariat develops proper indicators and criteria for the development of Community Police Forums and Community Safety Forums.
2. The Committee recommends that the Secretariat improves co-operation with the Provincial Secretariats.
3. The Committee recommends that the Secretariat signs an MOU with the DNA Board and provides it with the necessary support.
4. The Committee recommends that the Secretariat makes available policies developed for the Minister of Police by the Policy and Research Unit.
5. The Committee recommends that the Secretariat makes copies of its State of Police Report.

**7. CONCLUSION**

The Portfolio Committee on Police has appreciation for the fact that the Civilian Secretariat for Police has achieved a clean audit from the AGSA. The Committee hopes the Department will continue to build on this audit outcome and produce similar results in the 2019/20 Annual Report. The Committee is of the firm opinion that the Civilian Secretariat must become much more proactive with regards to making sure that the SAPS implements the policy on CSFs and CPFs. In conclusion, the Secretariat should be at the forefront of making sure that the SAPS implements action plans to reduce violent crime radically. The Committee thanks the Department and the Minister in its willingness to change its programme in co-operating during the 2019 Budget hearings

The Portfolio Committee on Police supports the budget of the Civilian Secretariat for Police Services for 2019/20 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.**