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**FOREWORD**

It is with pride and honour that I submit the Public Service Commission’s (PSC’s) Annual Performance Plan for the 2016/17 financial year.

The Plan highlights the annual targets that the PSC hopes to achieve in order to realise its strategic objectives, and ultimately its strategic outcome oriented goals. An overview of the PSC’s budget for the 2016/17 financial year and Medium Term Expenditure Framework estimates is provided.

The PSC held its Strategic Planning Session in July 2015, wherein it revised its strategic outcome oriented goals and strategic objectives. This was to ensure that there is alignment with our Constitutional mandate. The revised strategic outcome oriented goals are as follows:

* Make a positive impact on the attainment of an efficient, economic, effective and development-oriented public service.
* Make a positive impact on the attainment of impartial and equitable service delivery that responds to the needs of the people and treat them with dignity.
* Strengthened institutional capacity.
* Make a positive impact on the attainment of sound labour relations and human resource management.

All the initiatives developed by the PSC will be focused towards achieving these goals. I will provide the necessary leadership and guidance to support the successful implementation of this Plan.
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* was developed by the management of the Office of the Public Service Commission under the guidance of Advocate Sizani, Chairperson of the Public Service Commission;
* was prepared in line with the 2015/16 – 2019/20 Strategic Plan of the Public Service Commission; and
* accurately reflects the performance targets which the Public Service Commission will endeavour to achieve given the resources made available in the budget for the 2016/17 financial year.
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# PART A: STRATEGIC OVERVIEW

## UPDATED SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS

The situational analysis reflected in the PSC’s revised Strategic Plan for the 2015/16 - 2019/20 financial years provided the strategic direction and the basis for the situational analysis. The continued research work conducted the PSC and the annual Strategic Planning Session also assisted in this regard.

### 1.1 PERFORMANCE DELIVERY ENVIRONMENT

1. *Impact of the global and local economy*

The global economic crisis affected economic growth in South Africa, promoting a deceleration in the rate of economic growth. The South African economy is still performing below market expectations due to a drop in the agriculture and manufacturing sector.

Government recognises that the country’s economic growth performance needs to be higher in order to address the country’s challenges. The implementation of the National Development Plan (NDP) remains a key priority of government as well as resolving the challenges regarding energy. In order to support South Africa’s economic competitiveness, government is implementing initiatives that will in enhance the county’s growth, targeting key sectors of the economy such as the energy sector.

In response to the low economic growth, government has had to reduce the budget allocations for government spending and setting a ceiling of about R25 billion over the next two years in the budget expenditure.

1. *Meritocratic and professional Public Service*

The PSC is mandated by the Constitution and the NDP to building a professional, career oriented, capable and value driven Public Service. It is critical that the PSC shows an appreciation that its “supervisory, advisory and watchdog role” over the Public Service requires that it cannot celebrate the failures of the Public Service. The PSC is in agreement with the NDP that the Public Service’s performance and character is uneven. There are pockets or centres of excellence such as the Departments of Home Affairs and Social Development as well as the South African Police Service. There are other areas where there is wide spread corruption, incompetence and failure to meet the set standards for service to the general public.

The PSC needs to be visible in helping government, Parliament and society to move from this uneven performance and character of the Public Service to a public service that is a centre of excellence in governance, service delivery and competence.

1. *Service delivery*

The expectations of the citizens of our country about the performance and conduct of the Public Service are very high. Our Bill of Rights holds a promise of a better quality of life for all.

Apart from widespread reporting about fraud, corruption, the abuse of power, South Africa has witnessed an increase in service delivery protests. Most of these emanate from a lack of access to basic services and they have become more violent. However, we have to acknowledge progress made in this area as recorded in the 20 years Review Report.

The PSC has the responsibility of proposing measures that will ensure that services to the people of this country are delivered in an effective, efficient and sustainable manner that will create a better life for all. It will therefore need to consider how its inspection methodology can be improved to better respond to the needs of the country and also expand, as this is an area where the PSC can make better impact.

1. *National Development Plan*

The NDP is the blueprint for eliminating poverty and reducing inequality in the country by 2030 through uniting South Africans, unleashing the energy of its citizens, growing an inclusive economy, building capabilities, enhancing the capacity of the state and leaders working together to solve complex problems. It is also the overarching government plan to progressively realise the socio-economic rights in our Constitution.

With regard to the PSC, Chapter 13 of the NDP provides that consideration should be given to the following:

* The PSC needs to be a robust champion of a meritocratic Public Service with a stronger oversight role. A strengthened role for the PSC is proposed in championing norms and standards, and monitoring recruitment processes.
* Strengthen the oversight role of the PSC by requiring departments to respond to PSC proposals and giving greater force to PSC recommendations.
* That the PSC should play a direct role in the recruitment of the most senior posts. The chair of the PSC, together with the proposed administrative head of the Public Service, should convene the selection panel for heads of department and their deputies. The Selection Panel would draw up a short-list of suitable candidates for senior posts, from which the political principal would select a preferred candidate. In order for the PSC to play a direct role, this would require amendments to the legislation.

In addition, the NDP indicates the following in respect of the OPSC:

*“The Office of the Public Service Commission, which is the administrative arm of the PSC, is partially dependent on the executive for the appointment of its director-general and the allocation of its budget. This provides some important benefits including the scope to participate in the Governance and Administration Cluster, but there is also the potential for these links to compromise the PSC’s independence. These are issues that may need to be reflected on going forward.”*

The PSC will therefore need to finalise its review of the most appropriate model to support the PSC to enhance its operational functioning as well as adopt a position on the recommendations of the NDP as they relate to the PSC.

1. *Public Administration Management Act*

The Public Administration Management Act (PAMA) was in December 2014 signed into law by the President. The Act will take effect on a date still to be determined by the President, as most of the provisions will require regulations before bringing it into force and effect.

There is a potential of duplication and overlap of functions, such as the –

* promotion of the basic values and principles governing public administration by each institution.
* the establishment of the Public Administration Ethics, Integrity and Disciplinary Technical Assistance Unit to provide, among others, technical assistance and support to all spheres of government.
* the establishment of the Office of Standards and Compliance.

The PSC is pleased that the Act has incorporated its proposals with regard to the prohibition of public servants from doing business with government.

1. *Kader Asmal Report*

A review of Chapter 9 Institutions and the association institutions in 1997, conducted by the late Kader Asmal and reported to the National Assembly was complementary towards the PSC, and recognised its “excellent work”, the fact that it has “performed its functions more than adequately” and the need to retain its “character and function”.

Recommendations were made in the report in relation to:

* the process of selecting and appointing Commissioners,
* the reduction of the number of Commissioners;
* the advocacy role played by provincially based commissioners;
* the relevance of reports to the provincial legislatures;
* the location of the budget of the PSC; and
* public awareness of the role and activities of the PSC.

Recommendation of a general nature, applicable to all reviewed institutions were also made, which pertained to stardardisation, the protection of the independence of these institutions, the fast tracking of the appointment process of Commissioners and the establishment of “unit on constitutional institutions” by the National Assembly.

Recommendations around the greater advocacy role required in the provincial legislatures and awareness raising on its role and activities have been addressed in recent years, more especially in the Strategic Plan. The report calls upon institutions to explore “innovative” public outreach and awareness mechanisms.

The Speaker of the National Assembly expects that the PSC should respond to the Kader Asmal report.

1. *Support to Parliament*

The PSC has improved its relations with the National Parliament especially the Portfolio Committee on Public Service and Administration/ Performance Monitoring and Evaluation. The Committee regards the PSC as its strategic partner in advancing its oversight role. It has also played an important role in speeding up the filling of vacancies once they occur in the PSC. However, the PSC recognises the uneven relationship with our provincial legislatures.

The PSC has witnessed an increase in demand for its work by various Portfolio Committees in Parliament. During its recent interactions include issues that they need advice or assistance on. These areas include the resolution taken by the National Assembly in 2011 regarding the PSC’s mandate over the local government sphere and public entities and the reports of the PSC being included in annual reports of departments.

Other issues raised include:

* the holding of a workshop with the Portfolio Committee in order for them to understand the PSC’s constitutional mandate on powers;
* conducting an independent survey on the perceived and felt change as well as commitment by public servants after the adoption of the Public Service Charter;
* the production of a schedule on the status of the implementation of PSC recommendations;
* a need to increase the visibility of the PSC through inspections.

The PSC will therefore need to develop a clear action plan on how the resolutions of Parliament as well as other recommendations from the Portfolio Committee will be taken forward.

The resolution that the National Assembly seeks to locate the budget of the PSC with Parliament’s budget vote, which emanates from a recommendation in the Kader Asmal report discussed earlier, will also be pursued by the Portfolio Committee in order to preserve the PSC’s independence from the Executive, and allow for the PSC’s reporting and budget process to be aligned.

### 1.2 ORGANISATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

The organisational environment is discussed under four headings: the PSC and its governance structures, resources, financial matters and stakeholders.

1. *The PSC and its Governance Structures*

The PSC is an independent entity that was established in 1999 in terms of Section 196 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996. The Constitution stipulates that there is a single PSC for the Republic of South Africa, consisting of 14 members, five of which are appointed by the President on the recommendation of the National Assembly. One member is appointed from each of the nine provinces, after nomination by the Premier of the province on the recommendation of the Provincial Legislature. The PSC is accountable to the National Assembly and must report to it annually. It must also report to the Legislature of a province on its activities in each province.

The diagram below illustrates the single PSC for the Republic:

5

Commissioners recommended by the National Assembly

9

Commissioners nominated by the Premier of each province on the recommendation by the Provincial Legislatures

Public Service Commission

The PSC Act provides for the President to designate one Commissioner as Chairperson and another as Deputy Chairperson of the PSC. The PSC has, in terms of Section 11 of the PSC Act, 1997, issued Governance Rules of the PSC. The reviewed Governance Rules were gazetted and took effect in April 2015. The Rules will ensure the effective functioning of the PSC. The Delegations to Provincial Commissioners was gazetted in June 2015. The delegated powers include amongst others the following:

* Management and investigations of grievances and complaints timeously in the provinces
* Conducting announced and unannounced inspections
* Management of the financial disclosure framework within the province
* Interface with all relevant stakeholders of commission in the provinces.

Cluster Commissioners were also identified and will be the focal point for the departments in the relevant Clusters. Cluster Commissioners will therefore be the hands and feet on the ground to communicate and oversee departments in the cluster on behalf of the Commission.

The new Governance Rules also provides for reporting on the PSC’s activities and the performance of its functions, as contemplated in section 196 (4)(e) of the Constitution.

The PSC is a separate and independent institution which functions independently of government departments, Ministers or institutions. The PSC is recognised as a constitutional body, however it is not listed in Schedule 1 of the Public Finance Management Act, that provides a list of the constitutional institutions. The PSC is supported by the OPSC.

The OPSC is established as a national government department in terms of Schedule 1 of the Public Service Act, 1994, as amended, and is an organ of state. The OPSC is headed by a Director-General, who is also the Accounting Officer. In terms of Section 14 of the PSC Act, the Director-General shall, subject to the control and directions of the PSC, be responsible for the administration of the relevant Office. The principal responsibility of the Director-General is to provide support and render advice to the PSC. The NDP specifies that there is potential for the OPSC’s status as a Public Service department to compromise the PSC’s independence. This view is reinforced by the outcome of a workshop of the Office on Institutions Supporting Democracy held in September 2011 to discuss the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Review of Chapter 9 and Associated Institutions. In respect of governance matters, it was recommended that there is a need to fast-track legislative amendments that will provide clear demarcation of functions in respect of Chairpersons and Chief Executive Officers, and clearly define accountability lines.

At its Strategic Planning Session held in July 2014, the PSC identified the need to re-position the PSC as a key priority. In re-positioning the PSC, it should be decided whether the Office, as a department, has any negative impact on its functioning and independence, and if so whether the concern should be addressed through legislative changes. In the latter regard, the OPSC, established in terms of the Public Service Act, 1994, as amended, would have to be removed from Schedule 1 of the Act and the Department abolished.

The Chairperson of the PSC is the Executive Authority of the OPSC and as such has all the powers vested with executive authorities in terms of Section 3 of the Public Service Act, 1994 and the Public Service Regulations, 2001.

The PSC’s national office is in Pretoria and has 9 provincial offices located in each province and a parliamentary office. The organisational structure of the OPSC is currently comprised of the following four branches:

Corporate Services

Leadership and

Management Practices

Monitoring and Evaluation

Integrity and Anti-Corruption

In the current model, the PSC is supported by a government department. This model has a potential to create a conflict of role and responsibilities as the Commissioners are appointed according to provisions derived from Chapter 10 of the Constitution and the PSC Act while the OPSC is provided for in the PSC Act and regulations.

1. *Resourcing*

The organisational structure has 312 posts, including the 14 Commissioners. As at 29 February 2016, all posts of Commissioner were filled and 31 posts within the OPSC were vacant. Over a period of 10 years, there has been a minor increase of 74 posts on the establishment, (from 225 posts in the 2005/06 financial year to 299 posts in the 2015/16 financial year, excluding Commissioners). However, the work of the PSC increased substantially. For example, in order for the PSC to fully implement the resolution of Parliament, there will be a need for a substantial increase on its budget allocation.

The PSC’s budget is located within the budget appropriation of the Department of Public Service and Administration (DPSA). However, DPSA does not have any authority to adjust the allocation to the PSC, and merely acts as a conduit for the transfer of monies to the PSC. Although the PSC has an Executive Authority in the form the Chairperson, it is unable to defend its budgetary requirements before Parliament and is dependent on the Minister for Public Service and Administration to lobby for its needs.

The location of budgets of institutions supporting democracy and other constitutional bodies has been raised as a concern within the Forum for Institutions Supporting Democracy (FISD) as well as by the Portfolio Committee on Public Service and Administration. The Report of the ad hoc Committee on the Review of Chapter 9 and Associated Institutions recommends that budget allocations of institutions supporting democracy should be relocated from national departments to the Budget Vote of Parliament and that a revised funding model for all these institutions must be formulated.

The PSC’s budget is limited to cover its wide mandate and most of the resources are allocated to the OPSC. The current budget structure is according to a department and not a constitutional institution. The PSC is in the process of re-organising the organisational structure in order to ensure that it supports the effective delivery of its mandate.

1. *Financial matters*

The PSC’s budget for the 2015/16 financial year was reduced to R222 million, resulting in a R15 million shortfall which will severely affect the PSC’s operations. The Office is in continuous discussions with National Treasury in order to address the shortfall. Due to the limited resources, the PSC has put further cost-saving measures in place, however, the PSC’s limited budget and human resources impact negatively on its ability to discharge its oversight function to Parliament and has resulted in the PSC not being able to meet the increasing requests for assistance from its stakeholders. Given the PSC’s limited resources, it will need to prioritise and focus on specific areas that have a potential for maximum impact.

1. *Stakeholders*

The PSC has a wide spectrum of stakeholders and partners who jointly contribute to its vision of being a champion of public administration excellence in democratic governance in South Africa. These stakeholders include the Parliament of South Africa, the provincial legislatures, members of the executive, the donor community, international stakeholders (the African Union and Association of African Public Services Commissions), Institutions Supporting Democracy, citizens and the media.

A longer term strategy of the PSC is to reposition itself so that it maintains its relevance and is able to play a more meaningful role in the consolidation of democracy and the creation of a professional Public Service. At the heart of the approach is for the PSC to become the driver of Public Service discourse through, for instance, Citizens’ Forums, outreach programmes, roundtable discussions and public hearings.

The PSC is accountable to Parliament and regularly provides Parliament and the Provincial Legislatures with feedback on the implementation of its mandate. Over the years, the PSC has witnessed an increase in the demand for engagement with the various Portfolio Committees and Legislatures and also requests to conduct research on public administration matters. Some of the requests involve the PSC undertaking research in areas that have not been previously researched. The PSC cannot predict the number and nature of requests it will receive and therefore has to take such requests into consideration when planning for the forthcoming financial years. Although offering assistance is part of the PSC’s constitutional mandate, the PSC will need to develop methods to respond effectively to greater demands from its stakeholders and create sufficient space for meeting these demands.

In executing its mandate, the PSC recognises the importance of the cooperation of its stakeholders. The main challenge faced by the PSC is the responsiveness of stakeholders to its recommendations. This impacts on the PSC’s ability to effectively deliver on its mandate. There has also been unevenness in its interaction with Parliament as there is greater demand for its interaction with selected Portfolio Committees. Another challenge is that the PSC lacks the authority to enforce its recommendations and thus the PSC is severely constrained in accounting to Parliament on the actual impact that it makes in other aspects of its mandate. In order to address these challenges, the PSC will therefore need to robustly engage with its stakeholders in the period ahead.

Through a resolution of Parliament in 2011, a need for the PSC to annually evaluate the performance of all departments against the nine values in Section 195 of the Constitution was identified. The evaluation would be done in such a manner that trends in performance over time could be shown and key weaknesses in public administration could be identified so that government could have a clear indication of what needs to be done to ensure excellence in public administration. Parliament expressed the expectation that the PSC’s report on the governance and performance of departments could complement the Auditor-General’s financial, regularity and performance information audits, and should be inserted in the annual report of a department in the same manner as the Auditor-General’s report. The PSC has considered the resolution of Parliament but due to resource constraints, it will only be able to implement the resolution in an incremental manner.

The PSC is a member of the FISD. The aim of the Forum is to provide a platform for the institutions supporting democracy to pursue cooperation, collaboration and an alliance while maintaining their independence and autonomy. Through the FISD, the PSC will continue to forge better working relations with members of these institutions. The FISD has also established working groups that will look into issues such as complaints management in order to avoid duplication of work, the funding of these institutions and how these institutions account to Parliament.

1. *Programme evaluations*

The PSC introduced a change management programme, which entails the review of the PSC’s business processes. Two major business processes (grievance and complaints management) were identified as a priority to be re-engineered. The main objectives of the re-engineering process was to enhance the internal processes of dealing with grievances and complaints as well as addresses some of the challenges identified.

Through the implementation of the re-engineered business processes, periodic reviews were conducted. Based on the achievements, challenges, stakeholder expectations and concerns, and lessons from other institutions, review reports were produced, which contains recommendations for further strengthening these business processes.

## REVISIONS TO LEGISLATIVE AND OTHER MANDATES

The PSC embarked on a process of amending the following legislation:

*PSC Amendment Bill and the Conditions of Service Bill*

On 24 June 2015, Cabinet approved the introduction of the PSC Amendment Bill to Parliament. The Bill deals with the renewal of the term of office of a Commissioner as both the Constitution and PSC Act focus on the appointment process and no provision is made to deal with the instance of a renewal; and makes provision to appoint a Commissioner to act in the absence of the Chair and the Deputy.

The Department of Justice and Constitutional Development is assisting the PSC by drafting the Determination of Remuneration of Office-Bearers of the PSC Amendment Bill. The Bill, amongst others, addresses the further regulation of the appointment of Commissioners of the PSC and the determination of the salary, allowances and benefits of Commissioners.

Other areas requiring legislative change, such as the local government mandate, is dependent on amendments to the PAMA and will be addressed when the relevant Act is amended.

## OVERVIEW OF THE 2016/17 BUDGET AND MTEF ESTIMATES

### EXPENDITURE ESTIMATES

Due to the limited financial resources, the PSC has had to prioritise which initiatives it will embark upon within the appropriated budget. The table below provides the detailed expenditure estimates per budget programme.

| **Programme** | **Audited outcomes** | **Adjusted appropriation** | **Medium-term expenditure estimates** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R million | **2012/13** | **2013/14** | **2014/15** | **2015/16** | **2016/17** | **2017/18** | **2018/19** |
| Administration | 85.2 | 102.8 | 107.1 | 98.8 | 105.8 | 113.9 | 121.0 |
| Leadership and Management Practices | 24.8 | 29.4 | 35.7 | 40.9 | 40.4 | 42.4 | 45.6 |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | 22.2 | 29.2 | 37.3 | 36.4 | 38.7 | 40.7 | 43.7 |
| Integrity and Anti-Corruption | 29.9 | 39.5 | 45.7 | 49.8 | 49.3 | 51.5 | 55.3 |
| **Total** | **162.1** | **200.9** | **225.8** | **226.0** | **234.2** | **248.4** | **265.7** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Economic classification** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Current payments** | **159.1** | **195.1** | **218.8** | **225.6** | **234.2** | **248.3** | **265.6** |
| Compensation of employees | 111.9 | 128.4 | 155.4 | 186.4 | 190.8 | 195.3 | 209.6 |
| *Goods and services* | *47.2* | *66.6* | *63.4* | *39.2* | *43.4* | *53.0* | *56.0* |
| *Of which:* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Minor assets* | *0.7* | *1.6* | *0.4* | *3.6* | *0* | *0.2* | *0.1* |
| *Communication* | *2.3* | *3.0* | *3.4* | *2.5* | *0* | *2.7* | *2.7* |
| *Computer services* | *3.5* | *4.6* | *5.7* | *1.9* | *4.4* | *4.7* | *4.9* |
| *Operating leases* | *8.2* | *9.6* | *11.1* | *18.4* | *23.5* | *25.0* | *26.4* |
| *Travel and subsistence* | 10.7 | 11.0 | 15.2 | 6.8 | 0 | 3.0 | 3.1 |
| *Training and development* | **0.9** | **1.6** | **1.2** | **1.8** | **2.0** | **2.0** | **2.1** |
| **Transfer and subsidies** | **1.4** | **1.0** | **1.2** | **1** | **0** | **0** | **0** |
| *Foreign governments and international organisations* | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Non-profit institutions* | - | - | 0.5 | - |   |   |   |
| *Household* | 1.4 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Payments for capital assets** | **1.6** | **4.9** | **5.7** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** |
| *Machinery and equipment* | 1.5 | 3.2 | 4.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| *Software and other intangible assets* | 0.1 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Payments for financial assets** | **0.0** | **0.0** | **0.2** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** |

###

### 3.2 RELATING EXPENDITURE TRENDS TO STRATEGIC OUTCOME ORIENTED GOALS

Over the medium term, the PSC will continue focusing on human resource practices and management, creating a stable political-administrative interface, strengthening the implementation of Financial Disclosure Framework and improving confidence in the integrity of the public service. These activities are largely funded from the Leadership and Management Practices and the Integrity and anti-Corruption programmes which account for 38.1 per cent of the department’s budget over the medium term. These programmes also account for 51.3 per cent of the total personnel complement of 312 in the Commission over the medium term.

## Compensation of Employees accounts for 81% of the total budget, and 19% is for goods and services. It should be noted that the PSC is a knowledge based institution and conducts research internally instead of outsourcing its projects/work. This results in the bulk of the budget being allocated to Compensation of Employees. The PSC has identified a need to realign the budget to a reasonable ratio between Compensation of Employees and Goods and services. There are 312 posts in the structure including 14 Commissioners and the average cost per head is R626 000.

#

# PART B: PROGRAMME AND SUB-PROGRAMME PLANS

## PROGRAMME 1: ADMINISTRATION

**Purpose of the Programme:** The programme provides overall management of the PSC and centralised support services.

There were no changes in the budget programme structure during the 2015/16 financial year. The figure below provides an overview of the three sub-programmes

Planning and Reporting

Legal Services

Special Operations

Office of the DG

PSC Support

**The Programme consists of the following three Sub-programmes**

**Key categories of personnel**

* Members of the PSC
* SMS members
* Administrative staff

***Sub-programme 1.3:***

***Corporate Services***

Information Technology

Communication and

Information Services

Supply Chain Management and Security Services

***Sub-programme 1.1:***

***PSC***

Human Resources Management and Development

***Sub-programme 1.2:***

***Management***

Financial Management

## 4.1 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE ANNUAL TARGETS

| Strategic Objective | 5 Year Strategic Plan Target | Audited/Actual Performance | Estimated Performance | Medium-Term Targets |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 |
| To execute the PSC’s mandate by providing sound direction and leadership through the implementation of the five year strategic and annual performance plans | Annual review of the Strategic Plan and Annual Performance Plan | - | - | Strategic Plan for 2015/16- 2019/2020 and Annual Performance Plan for 2015/16 approved | Revised Strategic Plan for 2015/16- 2019/2020 and Annual Performance Plan for 2016/17 approved | Strategic Plan for 2015/16 – 2019/2020 reviewed and Annual Performance Plan for 2017/18 financial year approved | Strategic Plan for 2015/16 – 2019/2020 reviewed and Annual Performance Plan for 2018/19 financial year approved | Strategic Plan for 2015/16 – 2019/2020 reviewed and Annual Performance Plan for 2019/20 financial year approved |
| Provide corporate support services to the PSC and Office to enable the PSC to achieve its strategic objectives through the continuous improvement of governance and financial management, the appropriate use of resources and maintaining an unqualified audit | Unqualified audit report | Unqualified audit report | Unqualified audit report | Unqualified audit report | Unqualified audit report | Unqualified audit report | Unqualified audit report | Unqualified audit report |

##

## 4.2 SELECTED PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND ANNUAL TARGETS

| Programme Performance Indicator | Audited/Actual Performance | Estimated Performance | Medium-Term Targets |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 |
| Implementation of the Workplan monitored on a quarterly basis | - | Implementation of the Workplan was monitored on a quarterly basis through discussions at Plenary, Executive Management meetings and Management Committee meetings | 88% (of which 9% partially achieved) of performance targets achieved | 80% of outputs on Workplan achieved | 80% of outputs on Workplan achieved | 80% of outputs on Workplan achieved | 80% of outputs on Workplan achieved |
| Approved Strategic Plan | - | - | Strategic Plan for 2015/16 – 2019/2020 approved | Revised Strategic Plan for 2015/16 – 2019/2020 approved | - | - | - |
| Approved Annual Performance Plan | - | - | Annual Performance Plan for 2015/16 approved | Annual Performance Plan for 2016/17 approved | Annual Performance Plan for 2017/18 financial year approved | Annual Performance Plan for 2018/19 financial year approved | Annual Performance Plan for 2019/20 financial year approved |
| Clean audit report | Clean audit report | Clean audit report | Clean audit report | Clean audit report | Clean audit report | Clean audit report | Clean audit report |
| Vacancy rate of below 10% maintained | 9% | 21% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% |
| 100% compliance with all SCM related prescripts | - | - | 100% compliance | 100% compliance | 100% compliance | 100% compliance | 100% compliance |
| Information technology infrastructure, systems and services maintained | - | 96% | 96% | 98% | 98% | 98% | 98% |

## 4.3 QUARTERLY TARGETS

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Performance Indicators | Reporting Period | Annual Target2016/17 | Quarterly Targets |
| **1st** | **2nd** | **3rd** | **4th** |
| Approved Annual Performance Plan | Quarterly | Annual Performance Plan for 2017/18 financial year approved | - | 1st draft Annual Performance Plan produced | 2nd draft Annual Performance Plan produced | Approved Annual Performance Plan |
| Clean audit report | Annually | Clean audit report | - | Clean audit report | - | - |
| Vacancy rate of below 10% maintained | Monthly | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% |
| 100% compliance with all SCM related prescripts | Monthly | 100% compliance | 100% compliance | 100% compliance | 100% compliance | 100% compliance |
| Information technology infrastructure, systems and services maintained | Monthly | 98% | 98% | 98% | 98% | 98% |

## 5. PROGRAMME 2: LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

**Purpose of the Programme:** The programme promotes sound Public Service leadership, human resource management, labour relations and labour practices.

There were no changes in the budget programme structure during the 2015/16 financial year. The figure below provides an overview of the two sub-programmes.

Human Resources Best Practice (2)

Senior Management Service Labour Relations

**The Programme consists of the following two Sub-programmes**

Key categories of personnel

* SMS members
* Labour Relations experts
* Administrative staff

***Sub-programme 2.2:***

***Leadership and Human***

***Resource Reviews***

Labour Relations Dispute and Litigation

Human Resources Best Practices (1)

***Sub-programme 2.1:***

***Labour Relations Improvement***

Complaints Investigative Research and Advisory Service

Leadership Evaluations

## 5.1 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE ANNUAL TARGETS

| Strategic Objective | 5 Year Strategic Plan Target | Audited/Actual Performance | Estimated Performance | Medium-Term Targets |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 |
| Public Service labour relations and practices enhanced through timely investigation of all properly referred grievances and provision of best practices | 80% of all properly referred grievances concluded | 377 grievances concluded | 63% of grievances concluded | 90% of grievances concluded | 68%\* of all grievances received concluded  | 70%\* of all grievances received concluded  | 75%\* of all grievances received concluded  | 80%\* of all grievances received concluded  |
| To identify and promote sound Human Resource Management and Leadership Practices in public administration | 80% of annual targets achieved | 4 research reports produced | 4 research reports produced | 4 research reports produced | 80% of planned targets achieved | 80% of planned targets achieved | 80% of planned targets achieved | 80% of planned targets achieved |

*\* Absolute numbers cannot be provided as the PSC cannot determine the number of grievances that will be properly referred to the PSC within a financial year. Due to a reduction of the time period (from 3 months to 45 days) to conclude a grievances, the target has been revised.*

## 5.2 SELECTED PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND ANNUAL TARGETS

| Programme Performance Indicator | Audited/Actual Performance | Estimated Performance | Medium-Term Targets |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 |
| Percentage of grievances received concluded  | 377 grievances concluded | 63% of grievances concluded | 90% of grievances concluded | 68% of all grievances received concluded  | 70% of all grievances received concluded  | 75% of all grievances received concluded  | 80% of all grievances received concluded  |
| Number of reports on the management of grievances in the Public Service produced | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Number of reports on labour relations produced | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Number of reports on strategic human resources and leadership produced | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |

## 5.3 QUARTERLY TARGETS

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Performance Indicators | Reporting Period | Annual Target2016/17 | Quarterly Targets |
| **1st** | **2nd** | **3rd** | **4th** |
| Percentage of grievances received concluded | Quarterly  | 70% of all grievances received concluded  | 35%\* | 45%\* | 60%\* | 70%\* |
| Number of reports on the management of grievances in the Public Service produced | Annually  | 1 | - | - | - | 1 |
| Number of reports on labour relations produced | Annually | 1 | - | - | - | 1 |
| Number of reports in strategic human resources and leadership produced | Annually  | 5  | - | - | 2 | 3 |

\*Cumulative target as the number of grievances increase each quarter

## **PROGRAMME 3: MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

**Purpose of the Programme:** To establish a high standard of service delivery, monitoring and good governance in the Public Service.

There were no changes in the budget programme structure during the 2015/16 financial year. The figure below provides an overview of the two sub-programmes.

***Sub-programme 3.2:***

***Service Delivery and***

***Compliance Evaluations***

Programme Evaluations

Public Service Monitoring and Evaluation System

Compliance Evaluation and Organisational Reviews

Consultative Evaluations

***Sub-programme 3.1:***

***Governance Monitoring***

**The Programme consists of the following two Sub-programmes:**

Key categories of personnel:

* SMS members
* Monitoring and evaluation professionals

## 6.1 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE ANNUAL TARGETS

| Strategic Objective | 5 Year Strategic Plan Target | Audited/Actual Performance | Estimated Performance | Medium-Term Targets |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 |
| To provide institutional assessments and programme evaluations that support policy and management decisions | 80% of annual targets achieved | 19 research reports produced | 2 research reports produced | 14 research reports produced | 80% of annual targets achieved | 80% of annual targets achieved | 80% of annual targets achieved | 80% of annual targets achieved |
| To provide participative evaluations as well as evaluations of service delivery models and processes to support policy and management decisions | 80% of annual targets achieved | 17 research reports produced | 7 research reports produced | 6 research reports produced | 80% of annual targets achieved | 80% of annual targets achieved | 80% of annual targets achieved | 80% of annual targets achieved |

## 6.2 SELECTED PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND ANNUAL TARGETS

| Programme Performance Indicator | Audited/Actual Performance | Estimated Performance | Medium-Term Targets |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 |
| Number of reports on governance monitoring produced | 19 | 2 | 14 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 12 |
| Number of inspections conducted | 17 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |

## 6.3 QUARTERLY TARGETS

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Performance Indicators | Reporting Period | Annual Target2016/17 | Quarterly Targets |
| **1st** | **2nd** | **3rd** | **4th** |
| Number of reports on governance monitoring produced | Annually | 4 | - | - | - | 4 |
| Number of inspections conducted | Annually | 7 | - | - | - | 7 |

## PROGRAMME 4: INTEGRITY AND ANTI-CORRUPTION

**Purpose of the Programme:** The programme is responsible for undertaking public administration investigations, promoting a high standard of professional ethical conduct amongst public servants and contributing to the prevention and combating of corruption.

There were no changes in the budget programme structure during the 2015/16 financial year. The figure below provides an overview of the two sub-programmes.

***Sub-programme 4.2:***

***Professional Ethics***

Forensic Specialist

Public Administration Investigations (1), (2) and (3)

***Sub-programme 4.1:***

***Public Administration Investigations***

National Anti-Corruption Hotline

Professional Ethics Research and Promotion

Management of Conflicts of Interest

Early Resolution

**The Programme consists of the following two Sub-programmes:**

Key categories of personnel:

* SMS members
* Investigators
* Administrative staff

## 7.1 STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE ANNUAL TARGETS

| Strategic Objective | 5 Year Strategic Plan Target | Audited/Actual Performance | Estimated Performance | Medium-Term Targets |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 |
| To investigate and finalise an average of 60% of complaints lodged and improve public administration practices | 60% of complaints concluded | 215 complaints concluded | Number of public administration investigations successfully concluded:* 50 investiga-tions
* 64 early resolution cases finalised
* 151 early resolution cases closed
 | Number of public administration investigations successfully concluded:* 107 investiga-tions
* 90 early resolution cases finalised
* 147 early resolution cases closed
 | 60% of complaints concluded | 60% of complaints concluded | 60% of complaints concluded | 60% of complaints concluded |
| To promote ethical conduct amongst public servants through the scrutiny of financial disclosure forms submitted to the PSC, the referral of 90% of NACH cases and provide advice on professional and ethical conduct in the Public Service | 100% of financial disclosure forms scrunitised | 89% (8 342)of financial disclosure forms scrunitised | 73% (9 433)of financial disclosure forms scrunitised | 100% (9 692) of financial disclosure forms scrutinised | 100% (10 000) of financial disclosure forms scrutinised | 100% (10 000) of financial disclosure forms scrutinised | 100% (10 000) of financial disclosure forms scrutinised | 100%(10 000) of financial disclosure forms scrutinised |
| 90% referral of NACH cases | 11 850 | 14 149 | 15 455 | 90%\* | 90%\* | 90%\* | 90%\* |

*\* Absolute numbers cannot be provided as the PSC cannot determine the number of cases it will receive within a financial year. This is dependent on the cases reported to the PSC by the whistleblowers within a financial year.*

## 7.2 SELECTED PROGRAMME PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND ANNUAL TARGETS

| Programme Performance Indicator | Audited/Actual Performance | Estimated Performance | Medium-Term Targets |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 |
| Number of complaints concluded | 215  | 265 | 344 | 60%\* | 60%\* | 60%\* | 60%\* |
| Factsheet on financial misconduct produced | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Percentage of NACH cases referred within 21 days of receipt of case report | 1 963 | 2 600 | 1 612 | 90%\* | 90%\* | 90%\* | 90%\* |
| Percentage of financial disclosure forms received and scrutinised | 89%(8 342) | 73%(9 433) | 100%(8 699) | 100%(10 000) | 100%(10 100) | 100%(10 100) | 100%(10 100) |
| Number of investigations through early resolution finalised | - | - | 224 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

*\* Absolute numbers cannot be provided as the PSC cannot determine the number of cases it will receive within a financial year. This is dependent on the cases reported to the PSC by the whistleblowers within a financial year.*

## 7.3 QUARTERLY TARGETS

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Performance Indicators | Reporting Period | Annual Target2016/17 | Quarterly Targets |
| **1st** | **2nd** | **3rd** | **4th** |
| Number of complaints concluded | Quarterly | 60% | 20%\* | 35%\* | 45%\* | 60%\* |
| Percentage of NACH cases referred within 21 days of receipt of case report | Quarterly | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% |
| Percentage of financial disclosure forms scrutinised | Annually | 100%(10 100) | - | - | - | 100%(10 100) |
| Number of investigations through early resolution finalised | Quarterly | 100 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |

\*Cumulative target as the number of complaints increase each quarter

## RECONCILING PERFORMANCE TARGETS WITH THE BUDGET AND MTEF

## 8.1 PROGRAMME 1: ADMINISTRATION

**8.1.1 Expenditure Estimates**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Programme 1 | Expenditure Outcomes | AdjustedAppropriation | Medium-Term Expenditure Estimates |
| **Rand million** | **2012/13** | **2013/14** | **2014/15** | **2015/16** | **2016/17** | **2017/18** | **2018/19** |
| Public Service Commission | 18.4 | 22.4 | 19.6 | 19.8 | 19.5 | 22.2 | 23.7 |
| Management | 8.3 | 13.1 | 8.3 | 6.3 | 5.5 | 6.5 | 7.0 |
| Corporate Services | 43.2 | 52.5 | 62.5 | 53.5 | 54.3 | 57.1 | 60.6 |
| Property Management | 12 | 11.8 | 12.8 | 19.0 | 26.5 | 28.2 | 29.7 |
| **Total** | **82.1** | **99.8** | **103.2** | **98.6** | **105.8** | **114.0** | **121.0** |

**8.1.2 Performance and Expenditure Trends**

Expenditure trends increases from R82.1 million in 2012/13 to R121 million in the 2018/19 financial year and the baseline growth increases from R105.8 million in 2016/17 to R121 million in the 2018/19 financial year.

## **PROGRAMME 2: LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES**

**8.2.1 Expenditure Estimates**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Programme 2 | Expenditure Outcomes | AdjustedAppropriation | Medium-Term Expenditure Estimates |
| **Rand million** | **2012/13** | **2013/14** | **2014/15** | **2015/16** | **2016/17** | **2017/18** | **2018/19** |
| Labour Relations Improvement | 14.2 | 18.2 | 22.4 | 23.2 | 23.7 | 24.8 | 26.7 |
| Leadership and Human Resource Reviews | 10.6 | 11.2 | 13.3 | 14.6 | 15 | 15.7 | 16.9 |
| Programme Management: LMP | 0.3 | 0.7 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 2.0 |
| **Total** | **25.1** | **30.1** | **37.3** | **39.5** | **40.4** | **42.4** | **45.6** |

**8.2.2 Performance and Expenditure Trends**

Expenditure increases from R25.1 million in 2012/13 to R47.1 million in the 2018/19 financial year and the baseline growth increases from R39.5 million in 2015/16 to to R45.6 million in the 2018/19 financial year.

## **8.3 PROGRAMME 3: MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

8.3.1 Expenditure Estimates

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Programme 3 | Expenditure Outcomes | AdjustedAppropriation | Medium-Term Expenditure Estimates |
| **Rand million** | **2012/13** | **2013/14** | **2014/15** | **2015/16** | **2016/17** | **2017/18** | **2018/19** |
| Governance Monitoring | 10.4 | 14.3 | 20.8 | 18.1 | 18.7 | 19.6 | 21.0 |
| Service Delivery and Compliance Evaluations | 11.9 | 14.9 | 16.5 | 18.5 | 18.3 | 19.2 | 20.7 |
| Programme Management: M&E | 1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.0 |
| **Total** | **23.3** | **29.6** | **37.7** | **37.7** | **38.7** | **40.7** | **43.7** |

**8.3.2 Performance and Expenditure Trends**

Expenditure increases from R23.3 million in 2012/13 to R45.1 million in the 2018/19 financial year and the baseline growth increases from R37.7 million in 2015/16 to R43.7 million in the 2018/19 financial year.

**8.4 PROGRAMME 4: INTEGRITY AND ANTI-CORRUPTION**

**8.4.1 Expenditure Estimates**

| Programme 4 | Expenditure Outcomes | AdjustedAppropriation | Medium-Term Expenditure Estimates |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rand million | 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 |
| Public Administration Investigations | 13.5 | 16.1 | 19.0 | 21.9 | 21.2 | 22.0 | 23.7 |
| Professional Ethics | 16.4 | 23.4 | 26.6 | 26.8 | 26.4 | 27.6 | 29.6 |
| Programme Management: IAC | 1.7 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.0 |
| **Total** | **31.6** | **41.4** | **47.5** | **50.5** | **49.3** | **51.5** | **55.3** |

**8.4.2 Performance and Expenditure Trends**

Expenditure trends increases from R31.6 million in 2012/13 to R55.3 million in the 2018/19 financial year and the baseline growth increases from R50.5 million in 2015/16 to R55.3 million in the 2018/19 financial year.

# **PART C: LINKS TO OTHER PLANS**

## **LINKS TO THE LONG-TERM INFRASTRUCTURE AND OTHER CAPITAL PLANS**

The PSC does not have long-term infrastructure and other capital plans.

## **CONDITIONAL GRANTS**

The PSC does not pay conditional grants.

## **PUBLIC ENTITIES**

The PSC does not have public entities reporting to it.

## **PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS**

The PSC has no plan over the medium term to enter into Public-Private Partnerships.