

National Treasury  
**TECHNICAL INDICATOR  
DESCRIPTORS**

2016/17



**national treasury**

Department:  
National Treasury  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA



# CONTENTS

<b>PROGRAMME 1: Administration.....</b>	<b>6</b>
Performance Indicator no 1.1.1.....	6
Performance Indicator no 1.1.2.....	7
Performance Indicator no 1.1.3.....	8
Performance Indicator no 1.1.4.....	9
Performance Indicator no 1.1.5.....	10
Performance Indicator no 1.1.6.....	11
Performance Indicator no 1.1.7.....	12
Performance Indicator no 1.1.8.....	13
Performance Indicator no 1.1.9.....	14
Performance Indicator no 1.2.1.....	15
Performance Indicator no 1.2.2.....	16
Performance Indicator no 1.2.3.....	17
Performance Indicator no 1.2.4.....	18
Performance Indicator no 1.2.5.....	19
Performance Indicator no 1.2.6.....	20
<b>PROGRAMME 2: Economic Policy, Tax and Financial Sector Policy.....</b>	<b>21</b>
Performance Indicator no 2.1.1.....	21
Performance Indicator no 2.2.1.....	22
Performance Indicator no 2.2.2.....	23
Performance Indicator no 2.3.1.....	24
Performance Indicator no 2.3.2.....	25
Performance Indicator no 2.4.1.....	26
Performance Indicator no 2.4.2.....	27
Performance Indicator no 2.4.3.....	28
Performance Indicator no 2.4.4.....	29
Performance Indicator no 2.4.5.....	30
Performance Indicator no 2.4.6.1.....	31
Performance Indicator no 2.4.6.2.....	32
Performance Indicator no 2.4.7.1.....	33
Performance Indicator no 2.4.7.2.....	34
<b>PROGRAMME 3: Public Finance and Budget Management .....</b>	<b>35</b>
Performance Indicator no 3.1.1.....	35
Performance Indicator no 3.1.2.....	36
Performance Indicator no 3.2.1.....	37
Performance Indicator no 3.2.2.....	38
Performance Indicator no 3.3.1.....	39
Performance Indicator no 3.3.2.....	40
Performance Indicator no 3.3.3.....	41
Performance Indicator no 3.4.1.....	42
Performance Indicator no 3.4.2.....	43
Performance Indicator no 3.4.3.....	44
Performance Indicator no 3.4.4.....	45
Performance Indicator no 3.4.5.....	46
Performance Indicator no 3.4.6.....	47
Performance Indicator no 3.5.1.....	48
Performance Indicator no 3.5.2.....	49
Performance Indicator no 3.6.1.....	50

Performance Indicator no 3.6.2.....	51
Performance Indicator no 3.6.3.....	52
Performance Indicator no 3.6.4.....	53
Performance Indicator no 3.6.5.....	54
Performance Indicator no 3.6.6.....	55
Performance Indicator no 3.6.7.....	56
Performance Indicator no 3.6.8.....	57
Performance Indicator no 3.6.9.....	58
Performance Indicator no 3.6.10.....	59
Performance Indicator no 3.6.11.....	60
<b>PROGRAMME 4: Assets and Liability Management .....</b>	<b>61</b>
Performance Indicator no 4.1.1.....	61
Performance Indicator no 4.1.2.....	62
Performance Indicator no 4.1.3.....	63
Performance Indicator no 4.1.4.....	64
Performance Indicator no 4.1.5.....	65
Performance Indicator no 4.1.6.....	66
Performance Indicator no 4.1.7.....	67
Performance Indicator no 4.1.8.....	68
Performance Indicator no 4.1.9.....	69
Performance Indicator no 4.1.10.....	70
Performance Indicator no 4.1.11.....	71
Performance Indicator no 4.1.12.....	72
Performance Indicator no 4.2.1.....	73
Performance Indicator no 4.2.2.....	74
Performance Indicator no 4.2.3.....	75
Performance Indicator no 4.3.1.....	76
Performance Indicator no 4.3.2.....	77
Performance Indicator no 4.4.1.....	78
Performance Indicator no 4.4.2.....	79
Performance Indicator no 4.4.3.....	80
<b>PROGRAMME 5 : Financial Accounting and Supply Chain Management Systems.....</b>	<b>81</b>
Performance Indicator no 5.1.1.....	81
Performance Indicator no 5.1.2.....	82
Performance Indicator no 5.1.3.....	83
Performance Indicator no 5.1.4.....	84
Performance Indicator no 5.1.5.....	85
Performance Indicator no 5.1.6.....	86
Performance Indicator no 5.1.7.....	87
Performance Indicator no 5.1.8.....	88
Performance Indicator no 5.1.9.....	89
Performance Indicator no 5.1.10.1.....	90
Performance Indicator no 5.1.10.2.....	91
Performance Indicator no 5.1.10.3.....	92
Performance Indicator no 5.1.11.....	93
Performance Indicator no 5.1.12.....	94
Performance Indicator no 5.1.13.1.....	95
Performance Indicator no 5.1.13.2.....	96
Performance Indicator no 5.1.14.....	97
Performance Indicator no 5.1.15.....	98
Performance Indicator no 5.2.1.....	99

Performance Indicator no 5.2.2.....	100
Performance Indicator no 5.2.3.....	101
Performance Indicator no 5.2.4.....	102
Performance Indicator no 5.2.5.....	103
Performance Indicator no 5.2.6.....	104
Performance Indicator no 5.2.7.....	105
Performance Indicator no 5.2.8.....	106
Performance Indicator no 5.3.1.....	107
Performance Indicator no 5.3.2.....	108
Performance Indicator no 5.3.3.....	109
Performance Indicator no 5.4.1.....	110
Performance Indicator no 5.4.2.....	111
Performance Indicator no 5.5.1.....	112
Performance Indicator no 5.5.2.....	113
Performance Indicator no 5.5.3.....	114
Performance Indicator no 5.5.4.....	115
Performance Indicator no 5.5.5.....	116
Performance Indicator no 5.5.6.....	117
Performance Indicator no 5.6.1.....	118
Performance Indicator no 5.6.2.....	119
Performance Indicator no 5.6.3.....	120
Performance Indicator no 5.6.4.....	121
Performance Indicator no 5.6.5.....	122
Performance Indicator no 5.6.6.....	123
Performance Indicator no 5.6.7.....	124
Performance Indicator no 5.6.8.....	125
Performance Indicator no 5.7.1.....	126
Performance Indicator no 5.7.1.....	127
Performance Indicator no 5.8.1.....	128
Performance Indicator no 5.8.2.....	129
<b>PROGRAMME 6 : International Financial Relations .....</b>	<b>130</b>
Performance Indicator no 6.1.1.....	130
Performance Indicator no 6.1.2.....	131
Performance Indicator no 6.2.1.....	132
Performance Indicator no 6.2.2.....	133
Performance Indicator no 6.3.1.....	134
Performance Indicator no 6.3.2.....	135
<b>PROGRAMME 7 : Civil Military Pensions, Contributions to Funds and Other Benefits.....</b>	<b>136</b>
Performance Indicator no 7.1.1.....	136
Performance Indicator no 7.1.2.....	137
Performance Indicator no 7.1.3.....	138
Performance Indicator no 7.2.1.....	139
<b>PROGRAMME 8: Technical Support and Development Finance Programme Management.....</b>	<b>140</b>
Performance Indicator no 8.1.1:.....	140
Performance Indicator no 8.1.2:.....	141
Performance Indicator no 8.1.3:.....	142
Performance Indicator no 8.1.4:.....	143
Performance Indicator no 8.1.5:.....	144
Performance Indicator no 8.2.1:.....	145
Performance Indicator no 8.2.2:.....	146
Performance Indicator no 8.3.1:.....	147

Performance Indicator no 8.3.2:.....	148
Performance Indicator no 8.3.3:.....	149
Performance Indicator no 8.3.4:.....	151
Performance Indicator no 8.3.5:.....	152
Performance Indicator no 8.4.1:.....	153
Performance Indicator no 8.4.2:.....	154
Performance Indicator no 8.4.3:.....	155
Performance Indicator no 8.4.4:.....	156
Performance Indicator no 8.4.5:.....	157
Performance Indicator no 8.4.6:.....	158
Performance Indicator no 8.4.7:.....	159
Performance Indicator no 8.4.8:.....	160
Performance Indicator no 8.4.9:.....	161
Performance Indicator no 8.5.1:.....	162
Performance Indicator no 8.5.2:.....	163
Performance Indicator no 8.5.3:.....	164

## PROGRAMME 1: Administration

### Performance Indicator no 1.1.1

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage completion of the business continuity plan
<b>Short definition</b>	Implement the business continuity plan to ensure minimal disruption to business operations in the event of a disaster
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To enable NT to increase its capability to respond to any existing, emerging or unknown risks in an effort to attain operational resilience
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Business continuity plan status or reports
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<p>The following formula should be used to compute percentage =</p> $\frac{\text{Plans completed (cumulative quarterly)}}{\text{Total plans planned (cumulative)}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Implement all the business continuity plan for phase two
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Risk Officer

**Performance Indicator no 1.1.2**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Management Performance Assessment Tool (MPAT) score achieved on Risk Management standard
<b>Short definition</b>	Improve the MPAT score relating to Risk Management standard
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Measures the Department's compliance with Risk Management prescripts and best practices in the public sector.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	MPAT moderated scores
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Risk Management score as per the MPAT moderated report
<b>Data limitation</b>	No specific limitation
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	To achieve a level 4 on Risk Management standard.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Risk Officer

### Performance Indicator no 1.1.3

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of Knowledge Management strategy rolled out
<b>Short definition</b>	Retain National Treasury's knowledge assets by harvesting intellectual and institutional memory of employees in the Treasury.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure that there is a platform where NT's knowledge assets can be deposited, shared and retained for research and for the development of a learning organisation
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Knowledge Management Strategy progress status or reports
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of Business Units in which the strategy is rolled out}}{\text{Number of Business Units in which the strategy is due to be rolled out}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	100% implementation of the Knowledge Management strategy
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Director: Knowledge Management



**Performance Indicator no 1.1.4**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage savings on goods and services expenditure
<b>Short definition</b>	Negotiate discounts on acquisition of goods and services
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To respond to cost containment measures and ensure maximum value received for funds spent; through strategic sourcing initiatives and other possible techniques.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	A schedule of savings achieved
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Savings achieved}}{\text{Cost incurred} + \text{savings achieved}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Savings on goods and services
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Financial Officer

## Performance Indicator no 1.1.5

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of funded positions filled
<b>Short definition</b>	Fill the funded vacant positions to ensure service delivery continuity
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure that the department is capacitated to achieve its objectives
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Data is sourced from PERSAL reports
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Total filled position}}{\text{Total funded positions}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Ensure that all funded positions are 100% filled
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Human Resource Management

## Performance Indicator no 1.1.6

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of staff retained
<b>Short definition</b>	The department should retain its employees to ensure that it delivers to its objectives
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure that the department is capacitated to achieve its objectives
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Data is sourced from PERSAL reports
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Total number of employees at the beginning of the year}}{\text{Number of employees at the end of the quarter}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Maintain a 90% retention of employees
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Human Resource Management

## Performance Indicator no 1.1.7

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of staff utilising development programmes
<b>Short definition</b>	Provide skills and management development to employees
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that employees are appropriately equipped with relevant appropriate skills to perform their duties
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Attendance registers or proof of enrolment or report of staff utilising development programmes
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of staff utilising the development programmes}}{\text{Total number of staff identified for development programmes}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	All employees identified for staff development enrol for the programmes
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Human Resource Management

**Performance Indicator no 1.1.8**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Services aligned to and delivered according to business requirements
<b>Short definition</b>	Alignment of ICT to business requirements is a dynamic state in which the department is able to use ICT effectively to achieve business objectives
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To integrate the information technology to the strategy, mission, and goals of the department
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	HEAT system
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Manual; Three categories - Open calls; Resolved calls and Breached calls. Total number of calls logged to calculate the % of each category.
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	Ensure 100% alignment of ICT to business needs
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Information and Communication Technology

## Performance Indicator no 1.1.9

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage availability of ICT systems achieved
<b>Short definition</b>	Ensure that the National Treasury is provided with ICT solutions and services
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To enable efficient and effective service delivery.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	ICT systems availability report
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Time system was available}}{\text{Time system should have been available}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	ICT systems to be available at all times (100%)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Information and Communication Technology

**Performance Indicator no 1.2.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage completion of the approved risk-based Internal Audit Plan.
<b>Short definition</b>	Conducting the planned assurance and consulting engagements on governance, risk management and control processes, and submit reports to relevant governance structures
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Assist NT to achieve its strategic goals by evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of the department's governance, risk management and control processes.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Status update of the implementation of the approved risk – based Internal Audit plan submitted to Audit Committee
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Completed audits}}{\text{Planned audits}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Risk-based internal audit plan implemented 100%
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Audit Executive

## Performance Indicator no 1.2.2

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage implementation of Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) annual plan
<b>Short definition</b>	Manage the Department's risks to an acceptable level through the implementation ERM plan.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Minimise the risks associated Department's strategic objectives and its operations to an acceptable level
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Implementation reports submitted to governance structures, such as the Risk Management Committee
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{ERM plans implemented}}{\text{Total ERM plans due}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Risk strategy implemented 100%
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Risk Officer



### Performance Indicator no 1.2.3

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of vetting files completed by priority group, submitted to State Security Agency (SSA) for investigation
<b>Short definition</b>	Vetting files completed and submitted to SSA for evaluation and further processing.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To perform background checks on government official in terms of the National Vetting strategy
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Completed vetting files submitted to SSA
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<u>Completed vetting files of identified employees submitted to SSA</u> X 100 Total number of identified employees to be vetted
<b>Data limitation</b>	No specific limitation
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Vetting of all identified employees
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Risk Officer

**Performance Indicator no 1.2.4**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of reviewed quarterly reports submitted for Minister's consideration
<b>Short definition</b>	Public entities' quarterly reports reviewed and submitted to the Minister for his consideration
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that public entities are delivering on their mandated objectives
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reviewed quarter reports
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Number of quarterly reports reviewed
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Review 40 quarterly reports submitted by 10 schedule 3A Public Entities
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Director: Public Entities Oversight Unit

## Performance Indicator no 1.2.5

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage adherence to prescribed timeframes on: i) Closure of Financial Records on BAS before the closure date. ii) Submission of the Procurement Plan before 31 March each year.
<b>Short definition</b>	Comply with the set financial closure dates and the submission date of the Procurement plan.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that the department adheres to cut-off dates as prescribed by the prescripts and internally.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reports presented in the management meetings
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<u>Components adhered</u> X100  Components due  Components refers to the below:  i) Closure of Financial Records on BAS before the closure date. ii) Submission of the Procurement Plan before 31 March each year.
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	100% compliance with the prescribed periods
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Financial Officer

**Performance Indicator no 1.2.6**

<b>Indicator title</b>	MPAT score achieved on Information Communication Technology (ICT) standard.
<b>Short definition</b>	Improve the MPAT score relating to ICT standard
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Measures the Department's compliance with ICT prescripts and best practices in the public sector.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	MPAT moderated scores
<b>Method of calculation</b>	ICT score as per the MPAT moderated report
<b>Data limitation</b>	No specific limitation
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	To achieve a level 4 on Risk Management standard
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	CD: Information and Communication Technology

## PROGRAMME 2: Economic Policy, Tax and Financial Sector Policy

### Performance Indicator no 2.1.1

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of papers published in association with academic research institutions.
<b>Short definition</b>	Research papers published in association with academic research institutions to promote macroeconomic stability, poverty alleviation, retirement reform and financial sector development, or as research need arise.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Promote the development of economic research institutions through the funding of economic research on behalf of the department
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Research papers as published by the department in association with research institutions
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Achieve at least 80 papers per annum
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	DDG: Economic Policy and DDG: Tax and Financial Sector Policy

## Performance Indicator no 2.2.1

<b>Indicator title</b>	Enact Twin Peaks model legislation
<b>Short definition</b>	The implementation of the Twin Peaks model of financial sector regulation will see the creation of a prudential regulator – the Prudential Authority – housed in the South African Reserve Bank (SARB), and a dedicated market conduct regulator – the Financial Sector Conduct Authority – housed in Financial Service Board (FSB).
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	<p>The implementation of the Twin Peaks model in South Africa has two fundamental objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To strengthen South Africa’s approach to consumer protection and market conduct in financial services, and</li> <li>• To create a more resilient and stable financial system.</li> </ul>
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of Enactment and implementation of the twin peaks</li> <li>• Evidence of other activity towards implementation , monitoring and evaluation of the legislation</li> <li>• Passed bill in National Council of Provinces (NCOP)</li> </ul>
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count (Passed Bill)
<b>Data limitation</b>	Non-availability of NCOP to pass the bill
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Outcome
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Enacted twin peaks model legislation
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	CD: Financial Stability

**Performance Indicator no 2.2.2**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Implement savings and retirement policies
<b>Short definition</b>	Implement regulatory reforms on savings and retirement policies that would lead to increased levels of national savings and enabling legislation
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To improve the national savings rate through reforms to the legislative framework governing the savings industry, including work being undertaken towards the implementation of retirement reform proposals and ultimately boost South African economy
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Evidence of activity related to the implementation of policy, in line with targets specified in the Annual Performance Plan
<b>Method of calculation</b>	None
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	None cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Increase in National Savings and percentage increase in retirement funds as reflected in macroeconomic data
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	CD: Financial Investments and Savings

**Performance Indicator no 2.3.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Publish tax proposals in annual budget review
<b>Short definition</b>	Tax proposals are proposals to amend, add, remove or effect changes sections to the income tax act or other tax related acts
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure an effective, equitable and efficient tax policy and tax administration system
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Tax proposals developed based on research, tax analysis and tax revenue forecasting published in the annual budget review
<b>Method of calculation</b>	None – Tax proposals are included in the annual budget review
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Tax proposals published annually in the Budget Review
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	CD: Tax Policy



**Performance Indicator no 2.3.2**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Implement legislation to give effect to tax proposals from Budget.
<b>Short definition</b>	Legislations to enable tax proposals from the budget review and speech to be implemented by the State.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that tax proposals from the budget are implemented in order to derive the benefits envisaged or close gaps identified.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	New legislations introduced
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Implement legislations
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	CD: Tax Policy

**Performance Indicator no 2.4.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of economic models developed in line with work agenda
<b>Short definition</b>	An economic model is a simplified description of reality, designed to yield hypotheses about economic behaviour that can be tested. Economic models are Developed to facilitate policy making as and when changes in policy occur.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Economic models are used to forecast economic activities, propose economic policy or politically justify economic policy.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Developed economic models
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	Develop economic models that will simplify economic reality or environment through economic policies
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Economic Policy

## Performance Indicator no 2.4.2

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of economic models maintained (Models reflect the most recent economic environment)
<b>Short definition</b>	Maintain and update all economic models that facilitate policy making as and when changes in policy occur
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure that economic models are up to date and reflect the current economic environment
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Updated economic models
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Changes in economic environment not communicated timeously, resulting in delays to updating corresponding economic model
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	To update economic models with changes affecting their accuracy/relevance
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Economic Policy

**Performance Indicator no 2.4.3**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of quarterly economic forecasts based on high-quality policy scenario modelling developed.
<b>Short definition</b>	Build high quality comprehensive macroeconomic analysis and forecasts based on scenario modelling tools
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Detailed and comprehensive economic models inform economic policy, and highlight areas where amendments or reforms to legislation are necessary
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Developed quarterly economic forecast
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Develop quarterly economic forecasts
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Economic Policy

**Performance Indicator no 2.4.4**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Chapter 2 of the MTBPS and Budget Review published
<b>Short definition</b>	Publish the global and South Africa's economic overview in the MTBPS and Budget Review
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To reflect on South Africa's past economic growth and to estimate the future growth in reference to Gross Domestic Product (GDP).
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Published economic overview/outlook chapter in the MTBPS and Budget Review
<b>Method of calculation</b>	None – The economic overview/outlook chapter will be reflected in the MTBPS and Budget Review
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	Publish economic overview/outlook chapter in the MTBPS and Budget Review
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Modelling and Forecasting

## Performance Indicator no 2.4.5

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of model to policy Scenario application conducted
<b>Short definition</b>	These are alternative forecasts which highlight the likely direction of the economy if some of the assumption do not materialise. 2 scenarios accompany each forecast
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	They highlight the risks to the domestic economy and thus inform the fiscal framework
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Quarterly Forecast Model
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Quality of data
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	Achieve target
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Modelling and Forecasting

**Performance Indicator no 2.4.6.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of economic policy analysis, research, assessment and advice on macroeconomics, including government policy proposals developed.
<b>Short definition</b>	Assess and provide advice on macroeconomic policy proposals and economic policy analysis to internal and external stakeholders
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To provide macroeconomic analysis on critical issues affecting monetary policy, economic growth, investment and job creation in order to inform the Ministry of Finance, NT and engagements with the Economic Cluster
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reports on exchange rate, monetary policy and macroeconomic framework
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity and output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Conduct economic analysis, research, assessment and advice on macroeconomics policy proposals
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Economic policy

**Performance Indicator no 2.4.6.2**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of economic policy analysis, research, assessment and advice on macroeconomics, including government policy proposals developed.
<b>Short definition</b>	Assess and provide advice on macroeconomic policy proposals and economic policy analysis to internal and external stakeholders
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To provide macroeconomic analysis on critical issues affecting monetary policy, economic growth, investment and job creation in order to inform the Ministry of Finance, NT and engagements with the Economic Cluster
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Daily, weekly and monthly reports on high frequency data
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity and output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Conduct economic analysis, research, assessment and advice on macroeconomics policy proposals
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Economic policy



**Performance Indicator no 2.4.7.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of economic policy analysis, research, assessment and advice on microeconomics, including government policy proposals developed
<b>Short definition</b>	Assess and provide advice on microeconomic policy proposals to internal and external stakeholders
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Provide microeconomic analysis on critical issues affecting competitiveness, economic growth, investment and job creation to inform the Ministry of Finance, NT and the economic-policy related departments in the Economic and Infrastructure clusters
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Regular reports on high frequency data
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Availability and provision of relevant data and information from SARS, other national departments and other external stakeholders
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Conduct economic analysis, research, assessment and advice on microeconomics policy proposals
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Economic policy

**Performance Indicator no 2.4.7.2**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of economic policy analysis, research, assessment and advice on microeconomics, including government policy proposals developed
<b>Short definition</b>	Assess and provide advice on microeconomic policy proposals to internal and external stakeholders
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Provide microeconomic analysis on critical issues affecting competitiveness, economic growth, investment and job creation to inform the Ministry of Finance, NT and the economic-policy related departments in the Economic and Infrastructure clusters
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Policy proposals reports, assessments and reviews
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Availability and provision of relevant data and information from SARS, other national departments and other external stakeholders
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Conduct economic analysis, research, assessment and advice on microeconomics policy proposals
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Economic policy

## PROGRAMME 3: Public Finance and Budget Management

### Performance Indicator no 3.1.1

<b>Indicator title</b>	Difference between the expenditure tabled for the MTEF years within the expenditure ceiling in medium term budget policy statement and the expenditure ceiling tabled for the MTEF years in the February budget
<b>Short definition</b>	This is the difference between the MTEF main budget expenditure ceiling target announced in the February budget and the revised expenditure ceiling announced in October, or influenced by any supplementary appropriation bill.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	This performance measure indicates whether government remains within the targeted expenditure ceiling announced
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	National Treasury databases managed by the Expenditure Planning and Fiscal Policy units
<b>Method of calculation</b>	= MTEF main budget expenditure ceiling tabled in February - MTEF main budget expenditure ceiling tabled in October, or as adjusted thereafter in an appropriation bill
<b>Data limitation</b>	No specific limitations
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	The revised MTEF main budget expenditure ceiling target announced in October or thereafter, should be equal to or less than the target announced in the February budget
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	National Treasury: Budget Office: Deputy Director General

**Performance Indicator no 3.1.2**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of sustainable fiscal frameworks provided
<b>Short definition</b>	The fiscal framework sets aggregate national spending and revenue
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Shows the sustainability of fiscal policy and underpins the budget process
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	National Treasury databases managed by Budget Office
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Fiscal framework set to ensure debt sustainability and published twice a year according to legal requirement
<b>Data limitation</b>	No specific limitations
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Bi-annual
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Tabling and publication must occur in line with predetermined timelines
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	National treasury: Budget Office: Deputy Director General

## Performance Indicator no 3.2.1

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of budget guidelines issued and budget decision making processes coordinated
<b>Short definition</b>	This is the budget submission guidance provided to institutions, and the process implemented by the National Treasury to analyse institutional submissions and obtain recommendations from decision makers. Guidance is also provided to institutions to enable them to compile their ENE and AENE publications inputs
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To inform institutions of the information requirements for decision makers to formulate recommendations and to schedule the Medium Term Expenditure Committee engagements required for the Committee to analyse information and form recommendations to the Ministers' Committee on the Budget and Cabinet. To inform institutions of the information requirements for compiling ENE and AENE chapter and database submissions
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Internet postings and administrative records
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Check if the Medium Term Expenditure Framework guidelines are published on the National Treasury's website by July Check if the Medium Term Expenditure Committee programme is drafted by July Check if the Adjusted Estimates of National Expenditure guidelines are published on the National Treasury's website by August Check if the Estimates of National Expenditure guidelines are published on the National Treasury's website by November
<b>Data limitation</b>	No specific limitations
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Guidelines must be issued to institutions and Medium Term Expenditure Committee programme must be drafted, by July
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	National Treasury: Budget Office: Chief Director: Expenditure Planning

**Performance Indicator no 3.2.2**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Adherence to timelines for budget allocation recommendations based on departmental budget submissions.
<b>Short definition</b>	This is the presentation of recommendations in respect of departmental budget submissions to MTEC, MinComBud, and Cabinet on the dates stipulated in Committee / Cabinet programmes
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	This indicator measures whether the National Treasury has provided MTEC, MinComBud, and Cabinet with reports / memoranda containing budget recommendations, on the dates contained in Committee / Cabinet programmes
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Recommendation reports / presentations and / or memoranda tabled at the MTEC / MinComBud and Cabinet
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Whether the dates of recommendation reports / presentations and / or memoranda tabled at the MTEC / MinComBud and Cabinet adhere to the budget programme calendar dates
<b>Data limitation</b>	No specific limitations
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Delivery of recommendations and reports in line with dates stipulated in Committee / Cabinet programmes
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	National Treasury: Budget Office and Public Finance: Deputy Director Generals

## Performance Indicator no 3.3.1

<b>Indicator title</b>	Budget legislation and accompanying documentation tabled in Parliament, and published
<b>Short definition</b>	This is the tabling of budget legislation and accompanying explanatory memoranda in Parliament, and availing them as publications
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To table budget legislation and accompanying documents containing detailed information, for Parliament and citizens to utilise to scrutinise and debate, in order for Parliament to adopt, amend or reject the legislation proposed
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Parliamentary administrative records and National Treasury internet postings
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<p>Check if the Appropriation Bill is tabled in Parliament and published on the National Treasury's website in February</p> <p>Check if the Budget Review document is tabled in Parliament and published on the National Treasury's website in February</p> <p>Check if the Estimates of National Expenditure document is tabled in Parliament and published on the National Treasury's website in February</p> <p>Check if the Adjustments Appropriation Bill is tabled in Parliament and published on the National Treasury's website in October</p> <p>Check if the Medium Term Budget Policy Statement document is tabled in Parliament and published on the National Treasury's website in October</p> <p>Check if the Adjusted Estimates of National Expenditure document is tabled in Parliament and published on the National Treasury's website in October</p>
<b>Data limitation</b>	No specific limitations
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Tabling and publication must occur in line with predetermined timelines
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	National Treasury: Budget Office: Deputy Director General

## Performance Indicator no 3.3.2

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of reports on public finance statistics according to function and economic classification.
<b>Short definition</b>	Measures the production of regular and on request data production and compliance with the data standard based on the Government Finance Statistics Manual (GFS) of 2014 and the Economic Reporting format used in the budget data. Regular data sets refer to data supporting the budget process and in-year reporting requirements of government. The economic classification specifies what is being bought and sold (such as user charges and compensation of employees) while the classification by function specifies the purpose of expenditure (such as research and development or housing).
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	The indicator is intended to show if the data is produced and compliance is maintained. Public finance data that meet these requirements can easily be understood nationally and internationally. Recognised data standards ensure that the country's reports on budgets and financial performance are reliable and trustworthy
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	The source of government finance statistics are the BAS/Vulindlela systems, annual financial statements, budget submissions and in-year reporting systems for national, provincial departments and public entities. The standard itself is laid out in the GFS manual of 2014. Supporting standards are the system of national accounts and accounting standards such as GRAP.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<p>Data submissions and requests can be enumerated. Other quantitative measurements can be derived from errors in the database: for example, if data from a unit that performs a health function has been classified as education and is not rectified before publication in the budget documents.</p> <p>Changes in the number of errors show if compliance is deteriorating or improving. Compliance to standards is reviewed manual for submissions and on the system by in-built consistency checks.</p>
<b>Data limitation</b>	Classification is mainly done by the government units; new employees in the units may not be familiar with the standards
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Input
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No



<b>Desired performance</b>	Extend coverage of consolidated accounts to include information on these accounts and on borrowing by general government
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Public Finance Statistics

### Performance Indicator no 3.3.3

<b>Indicator title</b>	Guidance to departments and entities on the classification of expenditure per quarter
<b>Short definition</b>	Guidance is provided by means of circulars, training of government officials in the finance departments and response to queries on the classification of expenditure in terms of government's Basic Accounting System (BAS) using the Standard Chart of Accounts (SCOA).
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Indicator intended to show that government units are being assisted to ensure that their transactions are carried out according to SCOA by checking that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Queries are attended to within a turn-around period of two weeks</li> <li>- Number of classification inconsistencies in the data do not increase</li> <li>- Circulars on classification issues are sent out timeously whenever the need arises</li> <li>- Training is given to public officials when required</li> </ul>
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Inconsistency reports come from the Vulindlela system</li> <li>- Queries turnaround sourced from the call centre run by the Public Finance Statistics unit</li> <li>- Circulars are stored on I-drive folder and logged on the NT website so they can easily be counted</li> <li>- SCOA training registers and reports from training partners such as National School of Government</li> </ul>
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Queries turnaround records time from when the call is logged to when it is finalised</li> <li>- Inconsistencies are counted automatically in the report</li> <li>- Circulars are physically counted</li> <li>- Number of officials trained can be counted</li> </ul>
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Input
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No

<b>Desired performance</b>	Issue classification circulars and guidelines used by departments for transactional classification guidance  Provide advice on the interpretation of the SCOA and the Reference Guide on Economic Classification when required.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Public Finance Statistics

### Performance Indicator no 3.4.1

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage adherence to timelines for sectoral analysis and advice for policy framework development.
<b>Short definition</b>	Analysis of developments, challenges and trends in sectors and how these affects expenditure; identify policy frameworks that address these
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Analyses aims to identify shortcomings in the policy framework being implemented, as well as the means by which effectiveness and efficiency can be enhanced with new policies
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Sector reports, Statistics South Africa, research reports and various external sources
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Sector reports, compliance and monitoring reports analysed and submitted to stakeholders as required
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Comments on Cabinet memoranda to reach the Ministry one day before the relevant Cabinet meeting
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directors: Public Finance

**Performance Indicator no 3.4.2**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of monthly expenditure feedback to departments.
<b>Short definition</b>	Public Finance budget analysts to compile and provide month expenditure feedback to departments
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Report to departments on early warning signs that could trigger unauthorised or irregular expenditure
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Monthly In year monitoring (IYMs) submitted by departments
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Monthly feedback send to departments within 15 days after the official submission of IYMs by departments (departments submit IYMs on or before 15 of every month)
<b>Data limitation</b>	Information on Vulindlela is not always updated in line with departments' expenditure reports
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Feedback to departments is within 15 days after the official submission of IYMs by departments (departments submit IYMs on or before 15 of every month)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Budget Analysts: Public Finance

**Performance Indicator no 3.4.3**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of quarterly expenditure reports submitted to the Standing Committee on Appropriations
<b>Short definition</b>	Provide the Standing Committee on Appropriation with high level summary of quarterly expenditure reports for all departments
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Report on deviations against the monthly drawings schedule, expenditure on special/large projects in line with planning and on any deviations to policy and financial/accounting regulations
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Financial data extracted from Vulindlela to populate quarterly reports
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Evidence of reports compiled and submitted to the Standing Committee on Appropriations on a timely basis
<b>Data limitation</b>	Information on Vulindlela is not always updated in line with departments' expenditure reports.
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Quarterly expenditure reports submitted six weeks from the end of the quarter
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Budget Analysts: Public Finance

**Performance Indicator no 3.4.4**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of selected expenditure and performance reviews undertaken.
<b>Short definition</b>	: Public Expenditure and Policy Analysis reviews seek to investigate the resourcing and performance of government operations, in relation to the applicable policy.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Institutions which have participated in expenditure reviews and programme evaluation are expected to use the results of the reviews and evaluations
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	BAS expenditure data, engagements with departments, all documentation related to a given programme and/or institution that participates in a review
<b>Method of calculation</b>	A number of programmes and /or institutions are selected for expenditure reviews and the resulting number of completed reports are counted
<b>Data limitation</b>	Incomplete or limited access to the requisite data required for the reviews and constructing the data from scratch is time consuming; limited access to or engagements with affected departments' representatives
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Efficiency
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Six completed expenditure and performance review and/or programme evaluations per year
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Expenditure and Performance Reviews: GTAC and Chief Directors: Public Finance

**Performance Indicator no 3.4.5**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of reports produced on review and implementation of the cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) costing model
<b>Short definition</b>	Review and implement the personnel costing model to assess the costs of improvements in conditions of service and changes in personnel headcounts
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Assess the costs of improvements in conditions of service and changes in personnel headcounts to guide budget allocations and determine implications for the sustainability of the Compensation of Employees budget
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Internal NT databases
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Count number of reports produced on the review and implementation of the model
<b>Data limitation</b>	Not applicable
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output indicator
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	A comprehensive report on the review of the model produced per quarter.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Public Sector Remuneration Analysis and Forecasting Unit

**Performance Indicator no 3.4.6**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Provide support on governance and financial management monitoring and compliance system in public entities.
<b>Short definition</b>	The department (unit) provides support and guidance to public entities on issues relating to governance, financial management and compliance; this support can either be requested by the entities (demand driven) or the department can identify the need to provide support to the entities based on its observation or analysis.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To advise public entities on matters relating to financial management, governance and compliance with relevant financial and governance prescripts in order to ensure to ensure effective and efficient use of resources in public entities.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reports submitted, presentations presented, responses submitted to entities, Cabinet memorandum and minutes of the meetings
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Total number of requests responded to in providing support to Public entities}}{\text{Total number of the requests received from public entities to provide support}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Records of verbal requests, responses and discussions; and telephone discussions
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Outcomes
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Implementation of the principles of improved governance in public entities
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Public Entities Governance Unit

**Performance Indicator no 3.5.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage alignment of development cooperation to government policy and priorities
<b>Short definition</b>	Alignment of official development assistance (ODA), which includes grants, concessionary loans and technical assistance, with NDP, MTSF and the budget process
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure alignment with government processes, policies and priorities
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	ODA reports (annual) and ODA database during MTEF and ENE BAS expenditure reports DCMIS
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Evidence management of GBS allocation process in government i.e. ODA reports, work plans and other relevant documentation  Extent of alignment of development cooperation with sector budgets against pre agreed indicators as per financing agreements
<b>Data limitation</b>	In certain instances, coordination challenges with multiple development partners and line departments may limit the ability of the unit to coordinate the process according to plan (limited disclosure on TA)
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually and quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Incoming development cooperation fully aligned with government policy and priorities
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: International Development Cooperation



## Performance Indicator no 3.5.2

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage Management and coordination development cooperation in South Africa
<b>Short definition</b>	Manage and coordinate the country's development cooperation
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	<p>Manage and coordinate inbound South African technical and financial cooperation covering:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grants, via the RDP Fund</li> <li>• Technical assistance</li> <li>• Concessionary loans</li> </ul>
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Manage and coordinate development partner funds, concessionary loans and technical assistance (TA) to ensure optimal utilisation thereof in line with national policy and priorities
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly and annual reports (e.g. payment files) on existing programmes</li> </ul>
<b>Data limitation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For TA: Development partners are reluctant to provide detailed information on the number of technical experts, financial information and other allocations</li> <li>• Departments do not consistently report on all ODA programmes</li> </ul>
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Outcome
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually and quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Comprehensive information on all inbound ODA documented; and maintain value of technical and financial cooperation received from development partners
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: International Development Cooperation

**Performance Indicator no 3.6.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of Division of Revenue and Division of Revenue Amendment Bills published annually
<b>Short definition</b>	The Division of Revenue Bill and Division of Revenue Amendment Bill are bills tabled in Parliament by the Minister of Finance to determine and adjust budget allocations to provinces and municipalities
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	These Bills are required in terms of section 214 of the Constitution to allocate funds from revenue collected nationally to enable provinces and municipalities to fulfil their functions. These bills are also required to be tabled in terms of the Money Bills Amendment Procedure and Related Matters Act
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Parliament's Announcements Tablings Committees (ATC) document records all bills tabled
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Number of Division of Revenue Bills and Division of Revenue Amendment Bills reflected in the ATC as being tabled each financial year
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	One Division of Revenue Bill must be tabled per year (less is not acceptable), the number of Division of Revenue Amendment Bills may vary (up or down) depending on the need for amendments due to events that occur in-year
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Intergovernmental Policy and Planning

## Performance Indicator no 3.6.2

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of reforms introduced to enhance provincial and local government fiscal frameworks
<b>Short definition</b>	Changes to the structure of the financing of provinces and local government. This can include changes to the way equitable share allocations are calculated or changes to conditional grant allocation mechanisms or rules or the introduction of new grants or dissolution of grants. It can also include introduction of additional own revenue instruments/sources to provinces or local government
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	The provincial and local government fiscal frameworks ensure that provinces and municipalities are funded to be able to fulfil the functions assigned to them in terms of the Constitution
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Explanatory Memorandum to the Division of Revenue Bill (published on the National Treasury website as Annexure W1 to the Budget Review)
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Number of reforms approved for implementation each financial year
<b>Data limitation</b>	This indicator requires interpretation of changes to provincial or local government grants to be described in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Division of Revenue Bill and the introduction of additional municipal own revenue instruments to be legislated through the Municipal Fiscal Powers and Functions Act
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Additional changes could be needed if these will improve the performance of provinces and municipalities or protect the stability of the national fiscus. If changes cannot improve any of these factors then fewer changes should be made
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Intergovernmental Policy and Planning

**Performance Indicator no 3.6.3**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of plans assessed to support improvements in infrastructure planning in provinces
<b>Short definition</b>	The indicator measures the ability of provincial department to improve their infrastructure planning and the institutionalisation of the infrastructure delivery management system (IDMS)
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that there is an improvement in planning by provincial departments implementing infrastructure programmes and projects. Provide support when necessary, to assist in improving the plans.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Submission of user asset management plans, infrastructure programme management plans, pre-feasibility and feasibility reports, monthly IRM reports and human resource reports for infrastructure units.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Qualitative method : the quality of documents and data submitted is measured
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Inputs and outputs
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	None
<b>Desired performance</b>	A total of 36 Infrastructure plans assessed (user asset management plans and infrastructure programme management plans).
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Provincial and Local Government Infrastructure

## Performance Indicator no 3.6.4

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of built environment performance plans assessed to support improvement in the built environment
<b>Short definition</b>	Built environment Performance Plans are city-level plans formulated and approved by the metro, and it complements existing statutory plans and compliance with legal requirements. The Plan serves to better align the planning and budgets in the municipalities and is a brief, strategic overview of the built environment that will be used to enhance inter-governmental relations aimed at improving the performance of metropolitan built environments.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	BEPP is a requirement of the DORA in respect of infrastructure grants related to the  Built environment of metropolitan municipalities. It is one of the eligibility requirements for the Integrated City Development Grant (ICDG). The BEPP is thus also an instrument for compliance and submission purposes for the following infrastructure grants ICDG, USDG, HSDG, PTIG, NDPG, INEP
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Submitted by the metropolitan municipalities on a yearly basis and uploaded onto the NT, MFMA website
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of BEPPs submitted and reviewed as part of the Mid- year budget and BEPP process
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	That all the 8 metropolitan municipalities submit their BEPPs and that these BEPP's are reviewed as part of the intergovernmental mid-year budget process. The reviews undertaken each year reflect the incremental progress in the performance of the built environment especially with regard to spatial transformation, housing and transport.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Provincial and Local Government Infrastructure

## Performance Indicator no 3.6.5

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of training initiatives (workshops and courses) on conditional grants, infrastructure delivery management; budget formulation and analysis undertaken to facilitate improved budgeting and financial management
<b>Short definition</b>	Annual Division of Revenue Workshops with key national departments and provincial treasuries; Essentials of Budget Formulation, and Budget Analysis and Examination Training and an annual IYM workshop. Infrastructure Delivery Improvement System (IDMS) training to government officials that are involved in the infrastructure delivery process. The introduction to the IDMS is a two to three days' workshop where officials are introduced to concepts and principles of the IDMS
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To discuss key clauses and changes within the 2016 Division of Revenue Bill, Infrastructure, the Business Planning Process and Performance Evaluation for 2015/16 with regards to provincial Conditional Grants</li> <li>• To understand the essentials of budget preparation within the South African context. Included herein are the budget concepts, principles, MTEF budget process and key role players within national and provincial departments</li> <li>• To understand the core concepts and principles of budget examination and analysis, and demonstrate the application thereof through work based practical assessment activities</li> </ul>
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2016 Division of Revenue Bill and grant frameworks</li> <li>• Courses: Targeted audience are public service officials in national and provincial departments across South Africa who work in budgeting and finance environment, including officials who have an interest in understanding public sector budget preparation, examination and analysis thereof</li> <li>• Attendance registers</li> </ul>
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cumulative</li> <li>• Number of 2016 Division of Revenue Workshops (attendance registers)</li> <li>• Number of training interventions in provinces (attendance registers)</li> <li>• Numbers of participants attending the both the budget formulation and budget analysis (attendance registers)</li> </ul>
<b>Data limitation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshops: None</li> <li>• Courses: Due to operational requirements, not all intended or targeted beneficiaries are able to attend the courses. On the other hand, the pool of potential beneficiaries is gradually depleting as most have already attended these courses in the preceding years</li> <li>• Lack of or partial completion of attendance registers</li> </ul>
<b>Type of indicator</b>	The indicator measures output (i.e. Number of participants attending the courses/number of workshops)
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative (cumulating all provinces and national departments participants)

<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual reporting cycle
<b>New indicator</b>	Continues without change from the previous year
<b>Desired performance</b>	Actual performance must be higher than targeted performance is desirable
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Provincial Budget Analysis Chief Directorate: PLGI Chief Directorate: Local Government Budget Analysis

### Performance Indicator no 3.6.6

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of provincial budgeting benchmarking exercises held to improve provincial budget credibility, composition, and achievability
<b>Short definition</b>	Benchmark engagements – meet with each of the 9 provincial treasuries twice to evaluate and make recommendations on their Draft Budgets for the coming MTEF
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Monitoring of performance and to ensure that budgets are creditable
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Provincial documents, databases and tools
<b>Method of calculation</b>	There is no calculation needed – this is an annual occurrence for all 9 provincial treasuries
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Outcomes
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Continues from previous year
<b>Desired performance</b>	Delivery, credibility and achievability of provincial budgets
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Provincial Budget Analysis

**Performance Indicator no 3.6.7**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of reports published
<b>Short definition</b>	Publication of the adopted budget information for the new Medium Term Revenue and Expenditure Framework; section 71 quarterly reports including expenditure on conditional grants; routine publications, municipal payment schedule and the Local Government Budgets and expenditure review.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	In fulfilment of legal requirements in terms of the DoRA and MFMA regarding budget assessments and monitoring
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Through annual budget returns submitted by municipalities and reports submitted by Transferring Officers, NT initiative through the analysis of DoRA section 10 reports and MFMA section 71 monthly reports on municipalities' overall performance
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Number of reports published
<b>Data limitation</b>	Availability and accuracy of information in the monthly and quarterly reports submitted by municipalities and TNOs
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Inputs, activities and outputs
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Monthly, Quarterly, Annually and Bi-annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Consolidation of standing indicators from previous year
<b>Desired performance</b>	Timeous publication
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: LGBA



**Performance Indicator no 3.6.8**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of support initiatives implemented in provinces and non-delegated municipalities
<b>Short definition</b>	Support on revenue management, roll-over and offsetting of conditional grants process, budget compilation and assessment, mid-year performance monitoring, training on DoRA related matters and implementation of the province specific strategies to address municipal finance performance failures
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To monitor progress and provide support in the implementation of support initiatives to address municipal finance performance failures
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Progress reports received from Provinces and non-delegated municipalities, and own analyses
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Number of initiatives
<b>Data limitation</b>	Timeous submission of progress reports
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Inputs, activities and outputs
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Monthly, Quarterly, Annually and Bi-annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Consolidation of standing indicators from previous year
<b>Desired performance</b>	Visible decrease in the number of financial failures in municipalities
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: LGBA

**Performance Indicator no 3.6.9**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of reforms implemented
<b>Short definition</b>	Technical adjustments to the LGDRS and Municipal Budget and Reporting Regulations to accommodate mSCOA to ensure successful implementation
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that all 257 Municipalities provide Municipal financial data without mapping or extrapolating directly into LG database across the 6 regulatory segments.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Collection of documentation, questionnaires and data strings of municipal financial data, from all the 257 current Municipalities.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Assessment of quarterly risk evaluations, Monthly confirmation of data load and comparison with legacy reporting schedules.
<b>Data limitation</b>	Timeous submission of questionnaires and data uploads by Municipalities
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Inputs, activities and outputs
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Consolidation of standing indicators from previous year
<b>Desired performance</b>	mSCOA project governance improvement indicated by Red, Amber and Green status on the quarterly assessments (Not the financial distress indicators which are measured annually); Delivery and load of data without rejection and consistent with legacy reporting formats i.e. Section 71, 72 reports as well as A, B and C schedules..
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	mSCOA work stream leaders.

**Performance Indicator no 3.6.10**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of provincial visits undertaken to assess financial performance for effective service delivery
<b>Short definition</b>	Provincial visits – meet with each of the 9 provincial treasuries 4- months into the financial year to evaluate their financial and service delivery
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Monitoring of performance and to ensure that budgets are creditable
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Provincial documents, databases and tools
<b>Method of calculation</b>	There is no calculation needed – this is an annual occurrence for all 9 provincial treasuries
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Outcomes
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Continues from previous year
<b>Desired performance</b>	Delivery, credibility and achievability of provincial budgets
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Provincial Budget Analysis

**Performance Indicator no 3.6.11**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of quarterly financial reports produced and published to comply with section 32 of the PFMA
<b>Short definition</b>	Summary of financial and conditional grant performance for all provinces
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Early warning system to detect problems in provincial performance
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Nine electronic submissions in Excel format (IYM Model) from provincial treasuries to CD: PBA. Currently submitted via email, validated and stored on network drive (K drive) at NT
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Count the number of publications per year – there should be 4
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Inputs, activities and outputs
<b>Calculation type</b>	Both cumulative and non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Continues without change from the previous year
<b>Desired performance</b>	Target is 4 per year. More will not be an improvement
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Provincial Budget Analysis

## PROGRAMME 4: Assets and Liability Management

### Performance Indicator no 4.1.1

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of corporate plans of Schedule 2 and 3B SOC's, DFIs and water boards received and reviewed within 4 months of receipt
<b>Short definition</b>	Review the plans to ensure alignment with government policy
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensures that the corporate plans of the SOC's, DFIs and water boards are reviewed to assess their potential impact on the fiscus and alignment with government policy so that mitigating action can be taken
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reports or memos on review of corporate plans of Schedule 2 and 3B SOC's, DFIs and water boards received
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<p><u>Number of corporate plans of schedule 2 and 3 B SOC's, DFIs and water boards reviewed within 4 months X 100</u></p> <p>Total number of corporate plans of Schedule 2 and 3B SOC's, DFIs and water boards received</p>
<b>Data limitation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Late submission of Corporate Plans from SOC's</li> <li>• Executive Authorities may request amendments to Corporate Plans which may result in delays</li> <li>• Entities are not required to submit final shareholder compacts to NT for review</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output and activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Reviewed all corporate plans within the stipulated timeframes:100% (the higher the better)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Governance and Financial Analysis

**Performance Indicator no 4.1.2**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of annual reports of Schedule 2 and 3B SOC's, DFIs and water boards received and reviewed within 4 months of receipt
<b>Short definition</b>	Review the reports to assess their potential impact on the fiscus
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensures that the annual reports of the SOC's, DFIs and water boards are reviewed to assess their potential impact on the fiscus so that mitigating action can be taken
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reports or memos on review of annual reports of Schedule 2 and 3B SOC's, DFIs and water boards received
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of annual reports of schedule 2 and 3 B SOC's, DFIs and water boards reviewed within 4 months}}{\text{Total number of annual reports of Schedule 2 and 3B SOC's, DFIs and water boards received}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Late submission of annual reports SOC's, DFI &amp; WBs</li> <li>• Executive Authorities may request amendments or extension to annual reports which may result in delays</li> <li>• Entities are not required to submit final shareholder compacts to NT for review</li> </ul>
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output and activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Reviewed all annual reports within the stipulated timeframes:100% (the higher the better)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Governance and Financial Analysis

## Performance Indicator no 4.1.3

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of annual reports and corporate plans received from Schedule 2 and 3B SOCs reporting to NT (SAA, PIC, DBSA, Land Bank, Sasria) tabled in Parliament within the required timelines i.e. 30 September each year
<b>Short definition</b>	Tabling of reports and plans to Parliament to ensure adherence with timeframes
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure that the annual reports and corporate plans are tabled in Parliament within the required timelines
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Record of tabling in Parliament
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<u>Number of annual reports and corporate plans of schedule 2 and 3 B SOCs, DFIs and water boards tabled within required timelines X 100</u> 10
<b>Data limitation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Late submission of Corporate Plans or annual reports from SOCs</li> <li>• Executive Authority may require amendments to the Corporate Plans which may result in delays</li> </ul>
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output and activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Submitted all corporate plans and annual reports within the stipulated timeframes: 100% (the higher the better)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Governance and Financial Analysis and Chief Directorate: Sector Oversight

#### Performance Indicator no 4.1.4

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of complete PFMA Section 54(2), 52, 55 and 92 applications received from Schedule 2 and 3B SOCs, DFIs and water boards reviewed within stipulated timeframes.
<b>Short definition</b>	Review all applications within the required timeframe
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure that SOC all applications in terms of the PFMA and MFMA are reviewed within stipulated timeframes to identify risks or other issues so that mitigating action can be taken
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Submissions prepared in response to applications for PFMA applications
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of complete applications reviewed within stipulated timeframes}}{\text{Number of complete applications received}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Inter-temporal differences between the submissions received during the course of the year and those responded to, due to additional information being required to finalise the review of submissions and applications received
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output and activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Reviewed all applications within the stipulated timeframes:100% (the higher the better)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Sector Oversight and Chief Directorate: Governance and Financial Analysis



**Performance Indicator no 4.1.5**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of funding applications received from Schedule 2 and 3B SOCs, DFIs and water boards reviewed within stipulated timeframes.
<b>Short definition</b>	Review the funding applications
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure that all funding applications are reviewed within stipulated timeframes to identify risks or other issues to provide input into the Budget process to inform decisions on whether funding should be allocated
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Presentations/submissions prepared in response to applications for funding
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of applications for funding reviewed within stipulated timeframes}}{\text{Number of applications for funding received}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Not all of the applications may be forwarded to ALM for review  Inadequate information may be submitted  Reviews are usually undertaken in a presentation format rather than as a submission
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output and activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Reviewed all applications within the stipulated timeframes:100% (the higher the better)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Sector Oversight

**Performance Indicator no 4.1.6**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of complete guarantee applications received from Schedule 2 and 3B SOCs, DFIs and WBs reviewed within stipulated timeframes.
<b>Short definition</b>	Once considered by the FLC, submissions have to be compiled for submission to the Minister taking into account the recommendations of the FLC
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure that all guarantee applications are reviewed within stipulated timeframes for consideration by the FLC
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Submissions prepared in response to applications for guarantees that are submitted to the FLC
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<u>Number of applications for guarantees reviewed within stipulated timeframes</u> X 100  Number of applications for guarantees received
<b>Data limitation</b>	Once considered by the FLC, submissions have to be compiled for submission to the Minister taking into account the recommendations of the FLC
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output and activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Reviewed all applications within the stipulated timeframes:100% (the higher the better)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Sector Oversight

**Performance Indicator no 4.1.7**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of MFMA submissions relating to tariff adjustments received from Schedule 2 and 3B SOCs and WBs reviewed within stipulated timeframes.
<b>Short definition</b>	Review of MFMA submissions relating to tariff adjustments
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure that all MFMA submissions are reviewed within stipulated timeframes to identify any risks and issues so that mitigating action can be taken
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Submissions prepared in response to MFMA submissions
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of submissions reviewed within stipulated timeframes}}{\text{Number of submissions received}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Applications submitted with incomplete information
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output and activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Reviewed all submission within the stipulated timeframes: 100% (the higher the better)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Sector Oversight

**Performance Indicator no 4.1.8**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of reviews requested of legislation, policies and strategies impacting on Schedule 2 and 3B SOCs, DFIs and WBs conducted within stipulated timeframes
<b>Short definition</b>	Reviewing legislation, policies and strategies impacting on schedule 2 and 3B SOCs and provide feedback on the review.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Reviews ensure that any potential negative impact of new/amended legislation, policies, sector reforms and strategies are identified and mitigated
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Feedback or comments provided on legislation, policy etc.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of reviews of legislation, policies and strategies conducted}}{\text{Number of requests received to review legislation, policies and strategies}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Requests for comments are not always made in a formal way
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity and output indicator
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Completion of all planned reviews and related activity within the stipulated timeframes: 100% (the higher the better)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Sector Oversight

**Performance Indicator no 4.1.9**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Report on the review of schedule 2 and 3B SOCs, DFIs and water boards remuneration
<b>Short definition</b>	Review schedule 2 and 3B remuneration and provide a feedback on the outcome of the review
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Monitor compliance with applicable policies , guidelines and standards
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Annual financial statements
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Late submission by entities
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Old
<b>Desired performance</b>	Complete the review
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director Governance and Financial Analysis

**Performance Indicator no 4.1.10**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Report on the review of schedule 2 Board composition
<b>Short definition</b>	Assessing schedule 2 Board composition for compliance with corporate governance prescripts
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure that the schedule board compositions complies with companies act, corporate governance principles and other relevant prescripts
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Report on schedule 2 Board composition
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Late submission by entities
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Old
<b>Desired performance</b>	Assessment of schedule 2 board compositions
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director Governance and Financial Analysis

**Performance Indicator no 4.1.11**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Update the Guidelines for Best Practice in Treasury Management
<b>Short definition</b>	Update the Guidelines for Best Practice in Treasury Management for the State-owned Companies and Development Finance Institutions
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure that the treasury divisions of State-owned Companies and Development Finance Institutions have a best practice guideline for the purpose of benchmarking treasury management
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Publications from domestic and international sources on best practice in treasury management
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Percentage completion of the updating process
<b>Data limitation</b>	Willingness of other organizations to share information
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Percentage completion of the project
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual, the guidelines however only need to be updated every 5 years
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	Review literature on best practice and updated the existing guidelines
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director Governance and Financial Analysis

**Performance Indicator no 4.1.12**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage completion of reviews of borrowing limit applications relating to schedule 2 and 3B SOCs, DFIs and water boards received with complete information and within stipulated timeframes
<b>Short definition</b>	completion of reviews of borrowing limit applications relating to schedule 2 and 3B SOCs, DFIs and water boards
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure that all borrowing limit applications are reviewed within stipulated timeframes for consideration by the FLC
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Submissions prepared in response to applications for borrowing limits that are submitted to the FLC
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of applications for borrowing limits reviewed within stipulated timeframes}}{\text{Number of applications for borrowing limits received}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Data and additional information from the applicant
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output is the memo to the Minister
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Reviewed all applications within the stipulated timeframes:100% (the higher the better)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Governance and Financial Analysis



## Performance Indicator no 4.2.1

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of government's annual gross borrowing requirement met
<b>Short definition</b>	Fund government's annual borrowing requirements through various debt instruments
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure that sufficient funds are available to meet government commitments
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Annual gross borrowing requirement is sourced from the Budget tabled annually by the Minister of Finance
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<p>Gross borrowing requirement is the sum of revenue, expenditure and debt due for repayment</p> $\frac{\text{Government's annual gross borrowing requirement achieved}}{\text{Government's annual borrowing requirement targeted}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	<p>Accurate revenue and expenditure forecasts</p> <p>Market conditions</p>
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Outcome
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Meeting the annual borrowing requirement amount
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Liability Management

## Performance Indicator no 4.2.2

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of interest and redemptions met accurately and timely
<b>Short definition</b>	Payment of government debt obligations in a timely and accurate manner to avoid any credit defaults or additional costs due to inaccurate/delayed payment
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Servicing of debt is a requirement as per loan agreements; failure to do so will result in credit defaults which could lead to credit rating downgrades and loss of investors
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Government debt-service costs are contained in the annual Budget as tabled by the Minister of Finance
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Amount of interest and redemptions paid}}{\text{Amount of interest and redemptions due}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Inability to access debt recording and payment systems due to internal and/or external factors
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Outcome
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	To accurately meet all government debt obligations on time
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Liability Management

**Performance Indicator no 4.2.3**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of roadshows to retain current, and attract new investors
<b>Short definition</b>	Developing initiatives to attract new investors whilst maintaining sound relations with current investors
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Positioning South Africa as a safe and credible borrower
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reports or feedback from the road-shows
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activities and outcomes indicator
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Promote SA economy through retaining current, and attracting new investors
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Liability Management

**Performance Indicator no 4.3.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of reporting requirements met on national government debt in terms of the PFMA and international reporting requirements
<b>Short definition</b>	To report on national government debt operations in terms of the PFMA, and the reporting standards of the IMF and the OECD, to investors and the financial markets
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Dissemination of information on government debt operations relating to the progress on government's borrowing plan, outstanding government debt and guarantees improves transparency, accountability and investor confidence
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Internal NT operational system, Excel databases and inputs from departments and SOCs
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Monthly reports on the progress on government's borrowing requirement; monthly and quarterly reporting on guarantees; annual financial information of the ALM division; Budget documents
<b>Data limitation</b>	The accuracy of the numbers is dependent on the accuracy of source information
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Outputs and activities
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative – for the year
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Varies from monthly, quarterly and annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Accurate and timely reporting on national government debt and investment operations to stakeholders
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Financial Operations

## Performance Indicator no 4.3.2

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of government's liquidity requirements met
<b>Short definition</b>	Forecasting and management of government's short and medium term cash flows
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure provision for government's short and medium term commitments at the right time, in the right amounts and in the right currency
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Cash flow data on receipts and payments is received from SARS, Reserve Bank and various units within NT and then consolidated
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<p>Government's net cash position is calculated, taking into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gross borrowing requirement, which is the sum of revenue, expenditure and debt due (interest and redemptions)</li> <li>- Proceeds from short- and long-term loans issued in the domestic and international markets</li> <li>- Change in cash balances</li> </ul> <p>A monthly net cash position is calculated for the MTEF period and thereafter maintained</p> <p>Daily net cash positions are forecast for three months ahead</p>
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Inputs and outputs
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative – for the year
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly and annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Fully funded exchequer account (National Revenue account)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Financial Operations

**Performance Indicator no 4.4.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage compliance to market and refinancing risks benchmarks
<b>Short definition</b>	Management of debt portfolio within approved risk benchmarks so that it minimises the impact of interest rate, inflation and exchange rate risks on annual funding requirements and government's debt portfolio while balancing liquidity (cash) and cost objectives
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To recommend annual risk allocations using appropriate techniques in order to ensure compliance to market and refinancing risks benchmarks
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Fiscal Policy: revenue, expenditure, budget deficit; Economic Policy/StatsSA: GDP, exchange rates, CPI; ALM: borrowing requirements, bond redemptions, real and nominal yields
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Ratio-based on portfolio indicators and quantitative on underlying risk factors
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative – quarterly
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised (implemented in 2014/15, to remain in place for 5 years - 2018/19)
<b>Desired performance</b>	Below percentage thresholds and within percentage ranges
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Strategy and Risk Management

**Performance Indicator no 4.4.2**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of interactions to manage and ensure effective relations with the credit rating agencies
<b>Short definition</b>	Continuous and proactive engagements with and information sharing between the credit rating agencies and NT
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Strengthen relations between government and the rating agencies to improve the context of the discussions regarding credit ratings and to ensure that the most accurate information on the country is shared with the rating agencies on a timely basis; and to address information asymmetries and ensure that government is the first point of contact for key policy messages to be shared with the rating agencies
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Email correspondence and engagement reports forms the bulk of the communication. International and domestic meetings and conference calls are scheduled to discuss ratings matters more in depth.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple calculation- assigning of risk ratings on qualitative and quantitative indicators
<b>Data limitation</b>	Regional, contagion and political risks are outside of the control of this NT programme
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity (i.e. presentations, meetings / round table discussions, conference calls) and output (i.e. presentation reports, strategy documents of government (NDP progress reports, 9 Point Plan, SOCs turnaround strategies, etc.)).
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly, semi – annual and annually.
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Consistently improving relationships with the rating agencies.  Consistency across public and private sector when communicating key policy messages  Greater collaboration in addressing ratings constraints
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Strategy and Risk Management

**Performance Indicator no 4.4.3**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of reports on the management of government's contingent liabilities and counterparty risk
<b>Short definition</b>	Management of contingent liability and counterparty risk exposure to limit the impact on the fiscus
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Management of contingent liabilities is critical to prevent government from being in a position where contingent liabilities, should they materialise, compromise the sustainability of funding strategies
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Annual Reports and interim reports of SOCs and banks - Quarterly reports outlining government contingent liabilities and counterparty risk- , BA 900 reports from the SARB
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly, Semi-annual and Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Consistently ensuring that government's exposure to contingent liabilities and counterparty risk remains within acceptable parameters
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Strategy and Risk Management



## PROGRAMME 5: Financial Accounting and Supply Chain Management Systems

### Performance Indicator no 5.1.1

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of institutions work-shopped on internal audit and risk management guidelines - National
<b>Short definition</b>	Providing awareness and knowledge sharing on internal audit and risk management guidelines to national institutions
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that institutions have common understanding of and comply with the internal audit and risk management guidelines
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Attendance registers signed by officials attending the workshops
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	Work shop National institutions to ensure knowledge sharing on internal audit and risk management
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Internal Audit Support Chief Directorate: Risk Management

## Performance Indicator no 5.1.2

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of institutions work-shopped on internal audit and risk management guidelines - Provincial
<b>Short definition</b>	Providing awareness and knowledge sharing on internal audit and risk management guidelines to provincial institutions
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that institutions have common understanding of and comply with the internal audit and risk management guidelines
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Attendance registers signed by officials attending the workshops
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	Work shop provincial institutions to ensure knowledge sharing on internal audit and risk management
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Internal Audit Support Chief Directorate: Risk Management

**Performance Indicator no 5.1.3**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of assessments on Internal audit and State of Readiness for quality assurance reviews and adoption of best practice to assess compliance with PFMA,MFMA and international professional practice standards conducted
<b>Short definition</b>	Assess internal audit compliance with PFMA, MFMA and international professional practice standards of internal audit, and its state of readiness for quality assurance reviews
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Review internal audit functions to determine their level of compliance with the PFMA, MFMA, Treasury Regulations and international internal audit standards
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Signed reports issued to the department, municipality or entity concerned
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Compliance of internal audit with relevant prescripts and its ability to do quality assurance reviews
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Internal Audit Support

## Performance Indicator no 5.1.4

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of institutions for which Audit Committees (AC) were provided with support.
<b>Short definition</b>	Provide Audit Committees with support e.g. attendance of meetings, interviewing and selection of potential members, induction of new members etc.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that Audit Committees delivers the duties effectively and efficiently through our support
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Attendance registers, minutes, reports or invitation and acknowledgement to invitations
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	Provide support to support to AC in institutions
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Internal Audit Support

## Performance Indicator no 5.1.5

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of knowledge sharing forums in internal audit and risk management facilitated through formal platforms
<b>Short definition</b>	Provide a platform for deliberations and thoughts on internal audit and risk management to institutions
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that institutions are informed and updated with new or revised prescripts related to internal audit and risk management
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Attendance registers or reports on knowledge sharing forums
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	Share information with institutions to keep them abreast.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Internal Audit Support Chief Directorate: Risk Management

## Performance Indicator no 5.1.6

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of strategic support plans with government entities struggling at lower levels of IA and risk management implementation as per Financial Management Capability Maturity Model
<b>Short definition</b>	Support plan detailing support activities to be conducted
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To strengthen effectiveness of internal audit
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Approved support plan, progress reports, etc.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	New
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	6 Institutions
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate Internal Audit Support Chief Directorate Risk Management

## Performance Indicator no 5.1.7

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of Public Sector Officials supported or trained on risk management
<b>Short definition</b>	Provide training or support to Public Sector Officials on risk management
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To equip and enhance Public Sector Officials with risk management tools that will allow them to execute their responsibilities efficiently and effectively.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Attendance registers and or reports on support provided
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	Trained and supported officials
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Risk Management

## Performance Indicator no 5.1.8

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of Universities work shopped on the Risk Management Curriculum
<b>Short definition</b>	Providing work-shops on Risks Management Curriculum
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that Risks Management Curriculum is up to date and new content is introduced in time
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Attendance registers signed by officials attending the workshops
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Input
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	Workshop universities on Risk Management Curriculum
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Risk Management



**Performance Indicator no 5.1.9**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Review and updating of e-learning module
<b>Short definition</b>	The e-learning module is a web based e-Learning programme that is designed to enable users to test their understanding of the Public Sector Risk Management Framework
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that the modules are up to date and updated with new developments
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reviewed and Updated e-learning modules
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	Updated e-learning modules
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Risk Management

**Performance Indicator no 5.1.10.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Monitor improvement of financial management in national and provincial institutions  i. Progress report on the improvement of financial management submitted to Parliament by 30 November
<b>Short definition</b>	Draft report to inform and update Parliament on the status of financial management maturity in national and provincial institutions
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To report to Parliament on improvements of financial management maturity across national and provincial spheres of government
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Results on FMCMM assessments completed by national and provincial institutions
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Non submission and/or late submission of FMCMM completed assessments by national and provincial institutions
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Report on identified gaps through the analysis of information submitted by national and provincial institutions and report to Parliament
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : Governance Monitoring and Compliance

**Performance Indicator no 5.1.10.2**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Monitor improvement of financial management in national and provincial institutions  ii. Cabinet memorandum on audit outcomes submitted by 31 October
<b>Short definition</b>	Draft Cabinet memorandum to inform and update Cabinet on the status of compliance with the PFMA and financial management improvement results in national and provincial institutions
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To report to Cabinet on improvements of financial management in national and provincial institutions
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Annual reports and reports on tabling information of annual reports to Parliament
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Non finalization of audit within the prescribed period in institutions
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Report on the status of compliance with the PFMA and improvements of financial management in national and provincial institutions
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : Governance Monitoring and Compliance

**Performance Indicator no 5.1.10.3**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Monitor improvement of financial management in national and provincial institutions  iii. Bi-Monthly reports to FOSAD on payments to suppliers within 30 days
<b>Short definition</b>	Draft bi-monthly reports to inform and update FOSAD on the status of compliance with the PFMA on the requirements to pay suppliers within 30 days by national and provincial departments
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To update FOSAD on progress made by national and provincial departments and their status of compliance with the requirement to pay suppliers within 30 days
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Monthly exception reports submitted by national and provincial departments
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Non submission and/or late submission of exception reports by national and provincial departments
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Bi-Monthly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	To update FOSAD on the status of compliance with the PFMA requirements to pay suppliers within 30 days
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : Governance Monitoring and Compliance

**Performance Indicator no 5.1.11**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of guidelines to assist with the implementation of new or revised Treasury Regulations, policies and Treasury Instruction developed
<b>Short definition</b>	Simplify the provisions of the PFMA, Treasury Regulations and Treasury Instructions for PFMA compliant institutions.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To assist PFMA compliant institutions with the interpretation and application of the legislative framework related to financial management in-order to ensure compliance with the provisions of the PFMA, Treasury Regulations and Treasury Instructions
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Existing legislative framework, transversal matters raised by PFMA Compliant institutions matter arising from Provincial Accountant-General forums and Chief Financial Officers Forums and any other information related to financial management received from internal divisions within National Treasury
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Number of Treasury Instructions and guidelines per quarter
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Published Treasury Regulations, Treasury Instruction and guidelines
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Governance Monitoring and Compliance

**Performance Indicator no 5.1.12**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of information sessions provided to support PFMA compliant institutions on the implementations of new or revised Treasury Regulations, Treasury Instructions and guidelines
<b>Short definition</b>	Workshops, training sessions, advocacy sessions and other information sharing platforms to provide clarity on how to implement and apply the revised Treasury Regulations, Treasury Instructions and guidelines
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Increase the understanding of the legislative frameworks
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	These sessions are based on the number of Treasury Instructions and guidelines developed and also based on the adhoc request from PFMA Compliant institutions
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Two sessions per quarter
<b>Data limitation</b>	Failure to honour the request of the PFMA compliant institutions or failure to honour the request of National Treasury by PFMA compliant institutions.
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Conducted all information sessions planned for the period
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Governance Monitoring and Compliance

**Performance Indicator no 5.1.13.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Improved Financial Management Capability Maturity Model (FMCMM) iv. Develop a web-based FMCMM model
<b>Short definition</b>	Development of a web-based FMCMM model for online submission of assessments
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Online assessment of the financial health of departments, constitutional institutions and selected public entities listed in schedule 3A and 3C to the PFMA
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Evidence of a developed FMCMM web based
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Lack of funds to develop a web-based model
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Input
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Web-based FMCMM model
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : Governance Monitoring and Compliance

**Performance Indicator no 5.1.13.2**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Improved FMCMM Conduct one FMCMM assessment
<b>Short definition</b>	Conduct FMCMM assessment in national and provincial institutions and analyse the results
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Conduct assessment on the financial health of departments, constitutional institutions and selected public entities listed in schedule 3A and 3C to the PFMA
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	FMCMM assessment results
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Non completion or late submission of assessment by national and provincial institutions
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Successful conduct of the FMCMM assessment in national and provincial institutions
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : Governance Monitoring and Compliance



**Performance Indicator no 5.1.14**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of forensic investigation and Special performance audit reports
<b>Short definition</b>	Conduct investigations and special performance audit in all spheres of government on a broad range of financial management and internal control systems in public procurement processes.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that the public procurement system is fair, equitable, transparent, competitive and cost effective.  To ensure compliance with public sector legislation in each sphere of government.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Forensic investigation reports and Audit reports or list of the forensic investigations and special performance audit reports
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Political interference.  Distraction of documentation.
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Completing the number of investigations as contemplated in the Annual Performance Plan
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Specialised Audit Services

**Performance Indicator no 5.1.15**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of cases referred and supported to Law Enforcement Agencies/ Anti-corruption Task Team for criminal investigation
<b>Short definition</b>	Refer all irregularity reportable cases to Law Enforcement Agencies/Anti-corruption Task Team for criminal investigation and recovery were possible
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that the public procurement system is fair, equitable, transparent, competitive and cost effective.  To ensure compliance with public sector legislation in each sphere of government.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	List of cases referred
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Completing the number of referral of cases as contemplated in the Annual Performance Plan
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Specialised Audit Services

**Performance Indicator no 5.2.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of Officials from provincial treasuries supported through training on the preparation of provincial consolidated financial statements, provincial revenue fund statements and implementation of GRAP standards
<b>Short definition</b>	Provision of support and training initiatives on provincial revenue funds and provincial consolidated financial statements, as well as to municipalities and public entities on GRAP standards
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Enable financial management capacity building. The indicator measures the number of government personnel trained in these financial areas.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Number of trainees as indicated by training event attendance registers
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activities
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Trained Officials
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Accounting Support and Reporting

## Performance Indicator no 5.2.2

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of timely and accurate monthly statements reports of actual revenue and actual expenditure for the National Revenue Fund (NRF) published.
<b>Short definition</b>	In terms of Section 32 of the PFMA , these statements must be published within 30 days of month end
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A requirement of the PFMA, used by the IMF and other interested parties to analyse monthly financial performance</li> <li>• Used as an early warning system by departments and NT</li> </ul>
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Monthly reports published on time in the Government Gazette
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Outputs
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Reports published every month in the Government Gazette
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Accounting Support and Reporting

## Performance Indicator no 5.2.3

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage compliance with the Banking services for national government: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Daily bank reconciliation of NRF.</li> <li>• Electronic verification of supplier banking details within four working days</li> </ul>
<b>Short definition</b>	Assist departments with electronic verification of banking details and payments, and provide a daily bank statement reflecting all payments and receipts
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Need to provide a bank statement daily to interface with ledger. Departments can then follow up on exceptions and perform bank reconciliations.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of number of transactions verified daily</li> <li>• Evidence of completion of the daily bank reconciliation</li> </ul>
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{(\text{Number of daily bank reconciliations of NRF conducted} + \text{number of of supplier banking details verified})}{(\text{Number of daily bank reconciliation of NRF to be conducted} + \text{number of of supplier banking details to be verified})} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Daily bank reconciliation of NRF</li> <li>• Electronic verification of supplier banking details within four working days</li> </ul>
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Accounting Support and Reporting

**Performance Indicator no 5.2.4**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of consolidated annual financial statements for national departments, public entities and Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) Fund tabled on 31 October
<b>Short definition</b>	Section 8 of the PFMA requires consolidated annual financial statements to be prepared and tabled. The RDP Act requires annual financial statements (AFS) for the RDP fund.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Audited financial statements for stakeholders on the results, and consolidated results for the year
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Tabled RDP financial Statements
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	The consolidated AFS depends on receiving audited financial statements from all entities and departments. Delay in submissions from significant entities delays the submission of consolidated AFS.
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Tabling the appropriate quality of financial statement annually, on 31 October
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Accounting Support and Reporting

## Performance Indicator no 5.2.5

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of officials trained in the national and provincial spheres of government in building public financial management competencies.
<b>Short definition</b>	Provide training that enables national and provincial spheres officials to comply with the financial management competency requirements of their positions.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Promote compliance with required financial management competency levels
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Attendance registers or list of officials trained
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	Provide training to at least 250 officials
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Capacity Building

## Performance Indicator no 5.2.6

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of municipal officials trained on financial management competencies.
<b>Short definition</b>	Provide training that enables municipal officials to comply with the financial management competency requirements of their positions, in alignment with municipal regulations
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Promote compliance with required financial management competency levels
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Data collated from various sources – Local Government Sector Education and Training Authority (LGSETA), listed training providers and municipalities – and maintained on a spread-sheet
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Data is captured in basic Excel which is onerous and needs automation for better disaggregation and analysis.
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Provide training for at least 700 learners a year
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Capacity Building



## Performance Indicator no 5.2.7

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage implementation of financial management capacity development strategy (CDS).
<b>Short definition</b>	Implement the CDS outlining the NT's vision for public financial management capacity development, including the strategic objectives, enablers and separate implementation plans for the PFMA and MFMA aligned with the NT's strategic plans cascaded down to the level of Chief Directorates
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Provide an agreed upon process to address identified capacity constraints and strengthen the implementation of public financial management reforms across the three spheres of the government
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity Development Strategy Implementation plan (Approved Integrated Strategic Support Plans)</li> <li>Reports on progress made on the implementation plans</li> </ul>
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{CDS implementation plans implemented}}{\text{CDS plans due for implementation}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Strategy implemented in line with the Annual Performance Plan
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Capacity Building

## Performance Indicator no 5.2.8

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of participants on the academic support programme for prospective chartered accountants.
<b>Short definition</b>	The programme is intended to provide academic support to public sector officials pursuing the chartered accountants profession
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To contribute to addressing the shortage of financial management skills countrywide, especially in the public sector
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	A List of participants in the CA academic support programme
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Inputs
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support provided to the target number of candidates, as specified in the Annual Performance Plan</li> <li>• Inclusion of other government institutions in the CAA in order to increase the number of chartered accountants qualifying each year</li> </ul>
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Capacity Building

**Performance Indicator no 5.3.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage Availability of current transversal systems
<b>Short definition</b>	Maintenance of current transversal systems: Basic Accounting System (BAS), Financial Management System (FMS), Logis, Persal and Vulindlela  Ensure that these systems are available to government users during working hours in line with SLA agreements
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure that transversal financial management systems continue to operate within agreed parameters
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Call centre logs, mainframe audit trails and other formal user requests
<b>Method of calculation</b>	The % is extracted from SITA Report
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output and efficiency
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly/annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Maintain 98 percent availability of systems during working hours or in line with SLA with service provider
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : Financial Systems

## Performance Indicator no 5.3.2

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of generic solution configuration templates completed
<b>Short definition</b>	The generic solution template is the standard processes, customisations and configurations to be applied by departments falling under the Public Services Act.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Standardisation of government policies and procedures which will also result in a reduction of implementation costs as well as the longer-term hosting and maintenance costs.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Solution within a testing / development environment
<b>Method of calculation</b>	100%
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output and efficiency
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Single Global Template for PSA departments
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : IFMS

**Performance Indicator no 5.3.3**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of IFMS comprehensive implementation strategies published
<b>Short definition</b>	Strategic document setting out the implementation approach and timelines for the rollout of the generic template at lead sites and for the national rollout
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To guide and monitor the performance of the programme
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	MS Project
<b>Method of calculation</b>	% progress
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output and efficiency
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Approved document ready for Envisioning for finalisation during this stage of the programme.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : IFMS

**Performance Indicator no 5.4.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of Instructions issued in line with policy interventions and proposed designated products or categories to enhance SCM Policy
<b>Short definition</b>	Issue instructions designating certain sectors or products with a stipulated minimum threshold for local production and content
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that local industrial development imperatives are achieved
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Research reports from the dti and input from Economic Policy
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Inputs from key stakeholders affecting the quality of information and/or responses received (where required)
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly and annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Instructions issued after taking into account relevant economic factors
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	National Treasury OCPO: Chief Directorate SCM Policy and Legal

**Performance Indicator no 5.4.2**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of Procurement Bills drafted and published for comment
<b>Short definition</b>	Develop a uniform Public Procurement Bill to regulate procurement in all spheres of government
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To, amongst others, streamline disparate procurement laws and strengthen local development imperatives
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Stakeholder engagement, desktop research
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Inputs from key stakeholders affecting the quality of information and/or responses received (where required)
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>REPORTING cycle</b>	Quarterly and annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Public Procurement Bill is drafted and published for comment
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	National Treasury OCPO: Chief Directorate SCM Policy and Legal

**Performance Indicator no 5.5.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of departments / Entities quarterly performance information reports reviewed in terms of variations and deviations
<b>Short definition</b>	Deviations and Variations published to create openness and transparency on awards outside of the competitive bidding process
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Enhance transparency and openness in the procurement process
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Data is obtained from the departments/ entities
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<u>Number of deviation/expansion reviewed</u> x100 Number of deviation/ expansion received
<b>Data limitation</b>	Data received can be published
<b>Type of indicator</b>	It measures the extend that institutions procure goods/services outside the normal bidding process
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	None
<b>Desired performance</b>	That the procurement through deviations/ variations be reduced
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Process owner : Chief Director: SCM – GMC Managing and reporting : SCM Governance



## Performance Indicator no 5.5.2

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of procurement plans published on the e-tender portal.
<b>Short definition</b>	Procurement plans published to ensure transparent and highlight business possible opportunities.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To notify public on business opportunities available from various state institutions.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Procurement plans
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of procurement plans reviewed}}{\text{Number of procurement plans received}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Only the information received from the departments and public entities is published
<b>Type of indicator</b>	It measures procurement plans reviewed and published.
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Business to take advantage of the business opportunities
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Process owner : Chief Director: SCM – GMC Managing and reporting : SCM Governance

## Performance Indicator no 5.5.3

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of bids specifications reviewed for alignment with policy and other applicable procurement instructions
<b>Short definition</b>	Review bid specifications to ensure compliance with policy, norms and standards and any SCM prescripts
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure that bid specifications are unbiased and transparent
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of reviews conducted</li> <li>• Number of reports issued to bid specification owners</li> </ul>
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Bid specifications reviewed}}{\text{Bid specifications received}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Long turnaround times if clients do not respond on time on queries raised
<b>Type of indicator</b>	It measures inputs used in compiling a specification (SCM prescripts) and resulting output in terms of advertised specification.
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Review all bid specifications received
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	<p>Process owner: Chief Director: SCM – GMC</p> <p>Managing and reporting Directorate: Monitoring and Compliance</p>

## Performance Indicator no 5.5.4

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of bid evaluation and adjudication reviewed to ensure compliance with the criteria/ scoring specified in bidding documents.
<b>Short definition</b>	Review minutes of bid evaluation and adjudication to assess objectivity of bid award process and ensure that evaluation and adjudication are aligned with the bid specification and the general and specific bid conditions
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure and assess the fairness of the tender award process
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Bid evaluation and adjudication minutes received from state institutions
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<u>Reviewed bid evaluation and adjudication (Minutes)</u> X 100 Bid evaluation and adjudication received
<b>Data limitation</b>	Long turnaround times if clients do not respond on time on queries raised.
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Review all bid evaluation and adjudication minutes
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Process owner: Chief Director : SCM - GMC Managing and reporting Directorate: Monitoring and Compliance

## Performance Indicator no 5.5.5

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of contracts awarded reviewed to verify if contract delivery is in line with the specifications.
<b>Short definition</b>	Review of contracts and provide guidance (and advice to departments) to ensure compliance with ToR, SLA and specification.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure that goods and service are delivered in-line with specification.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Contracts from state institutions
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Contracts reviewed}}{\text{Contracts received}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Long turnaround times if clients do not respond on time on queries raised
<b>Type of indicator</b>	It measure contracts reviewed and guidance provided to clients related to contracts
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	No
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Process Owner: Chief Director: SCM - GMC Managing and reporting Directorate: Monitoring and Compliance

## Performance Indicator no 5.5.6

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of projects visited to verify if the awarded contracts delivery is aligned with the condition of contract.
<b>Short definition</b>	The verification of projects including the goods , services and works delivered.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure that goods, services and works delivered are compliant to the specification.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Identified projects from various sources
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Projects identified}}{\text{Projects confirmed}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Delay in confirmation from institutions.
<b>Type of indicator</b>	It measure compliance to specification and value for money
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	No
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Process Owner: Chief Director: SCM - GMC Managing and reporting Directorate: Monitoring and Compliance

**Performance Indicator no 5.6.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of Strategic Procurement Framework (SPF), tailored for different forms of procurement revised
<b>Short definition</b>	A Strategic Procurement Framework which will serve as a guide for procurement officials who want to embark on strategic sourcing initiatives.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that government has a well-documented strategic procurement framework that gives guidance to the process to be followed for developing sourcing strategies for all types of goods and services
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	From government departments and research
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	This indicator will measure the impact on expenditure.
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative over the period of project implementation
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Increased number of government departments who implement the SPF.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	OCPO: CD-Strategic Procurement

## Performance Indicator no 5.6.2

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of systems for publishing procurement spend data developed
<b>Short definition</b>	An information system to gather expenditure data from various sources, clean the data, map the data, analyse and report the expenditure data
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To provide transparency in government spending categories, in order to determine opportunities for strategic sourcing
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Various ERP systems across government (BAS, LOGIS, Payment systems, Order systems)
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Fragmented systems; no standard item classification and codification system
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Measures input, activity and output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	Quality and accurate data and reporting
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	OCPO: CD-Strategic Procurement

## Performance Indicator no 5.6.3

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of proposals for Strategic Sourcing opportunities
<b>Short definition</b>	The identification of new opportunities (Transversal, departmental, sectoral) to apply strategic sourcing on commodities/ services in order to improve efficiency and realise savings for government
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure a continuous stream of projects to realise government's savings objectives
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Various ERP systems across government (BAS, LOGIS, Payment systems, Order systems)
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Fragmented systems; no standard item classification and codification system
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	Higher than targeted performance
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	OCPO: CD-Strategic Procurement



## Performance Indicator no 5.6.4

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of sourcing strategies for identified commodities/ Procurement categories developed
<b>Short definition</b>	Development of sourcing strategies for identified commodities/procurement categories on a project basis, using the SPF
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure a collaborative, structured and systematic approach to analysing commodity spend, establishing demand and understanding market dynamics; using this information to acquire goods and services effectively; and supporting government's service delivery objectives.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Financial systems, Order systems, Payment Systems
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Fragmented data sources Lack of standardised procurement reporting
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Reduced expenditure; improved service delivery; improved supplier performance
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	OCPO: CD-Strategic Procurement

## Performance Indicator no 5.6.5

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of sourcing strategies for identified commodities/ Procurement categories implemented
<b>Short definition</b>	Implementation of sourcing strategies for commodities/procurement categories that were developed in the previous cycle
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure a collaborative, structured and systematic approach to implementing sourcing strategies and ensuring proper stakeholder management for a smooth transition.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	From stakeholders
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Fragmented data sources Lack of standardised procurement reporting
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Reduced expenditure; improved service delivery; improved supplier performance
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	OCPO: CD-Strategic Procurement

## Performance Indicator no 5.6.6

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of on-boarding, monitoring and benefits tracking on sourcing strategies
<b>Short definition</b>	Monitoring and evaluating the progress of implemented sourcing strategies, in terms of benefits achieved.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To determine the success of implemented sourcing strategies
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Defined KPI's and standard templates
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Fragmented data sources Lack of standardised procurement reporting Lack of response by Department of reporting requirements
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Inputs and Outputs
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	New
<b>Desired performance</b>	Reduced expenditure; improved service delivery; improved supplier performance
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	OCPO: CD-Strategic Procurement

## Performance Indicator no 5.6.7

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of Reviews on current price referencing system (PRS) model conducted
<b>Short definition</b>	A Price reference system that can be accessed by SCM Officials and used as a guide to benchmark low value products during the procurement process
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To provide SCM Officials a schedule of standard fair-value prices for certain low value products procured by government
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	STATS SA and other reputable sources
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	N/A
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Input, Activity and Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Improved system
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	OCPO: CD-Strategic Procurement

**Performance Indicator no 5.6.8**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of transversal term contracts renewed per annum for National Procurement
<b>Short definition</b>	<p>A transversal contract refers to a contract for common goods or services or ad hoc goods and services in which more than one government institution participates.</p> <p>A national procurement system refers to expansion of the present portfolio of transversal contracts to include various commodities purchased routinely by departments.</p>
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Contracts are maintained and sourced primarily to achieve economies of scale through bulk purchasing
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	An annual transversal term contract register is maintained by the Chief Directorate: Transversal Contracting
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly reporting
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Maintain and establish transversal term contracts that achieve value for money and improved service delivery
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Transversal Contracts

## Programme 5 OAG Technical Indicator Descriptions

### Performance Indicator no 5.7.1

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of external stakeholder engagements held
<b>Short definition</b>	<p>The Stakeholders &amp; Clients management is responsible for providing a platform for both the OCPO and stakeholders to engage on issues that affect both parties emanating from both sides.</p> <p>It also provides support to inter-governmental structures on the SCM related issues.</p>
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Stakeholders will be provided with information necessary to engage with government and inter-governmental structures will be support through approaches fitting for each client to ensure their mandates are carried out with the correct understanding and interpretation of expectations.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Where minutes are available these will be provided. Where none exist like workshops, calendars will be provided
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly reporting
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Ensure that the role-players within the SCM environment understand their role in each part of the chain and carries out these as outlined.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Stakeholders & Clients Management

## Performance Indicator no 5.7.1

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of external stakeholder engagements held
<b>Short definition</b>	<p>The Stakeholders &amp; Clients management is responsible for providing a platform for both the OCPO and stakeholders to engage on issues that affect both parties emanating from both sides.</p> <p>It also provides support to inter-governmental structures on the SCM related issues.</p>
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Stakeholders will be provided with information necessary to engage with government and inter-governmental structures will be support through approaches fitting for each client to ensure their mandates are carried out with the correct understanding and interpretation of expectations.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Where minutes are available these will be provided. Where none exist like workshops, calendars will be provided
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly reporting
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Ensure that the role-players within the SCM environment understand their role in each part of the chain and carries out these as outlined.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Stakeholders & Clients Management

**Performance Indicator no 5.8.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Develop e-Commerce Centre
<b>Short definition</b>	Develop an efficient way of conducting commercial transactions online on the world wide web, to reduce time of processing orders, reporting on performance and collecting data on procurement trends
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	It offers government the opportunity to increase its efficiency in conducting business whilst reducing costs.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	3 eCommerce website are maintained by the OCPO's SCM ICT namely; <a href="https://www.gcommerce.gov.za">https://www.gcommerce.gov.za</a> ; <a href="https://etendersgov.za">https://etendersgov.za</a> ; <a href="http://www.csd.gov.za">www.csd.gov.za</a>
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Enable better SCM performance
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	National Treasury OCPO: Chief Directorate SCM ICT



**Performance Indicator no 5.8.2**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of e-SCM performance management module established
<b>Short definition</b>	Develop an electronic solution for managing the performance of government's SCM function
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	The SCM function is presently being overhauled. The dynamic nature of such a change needs constant monitoring so that progress can be measured and performance improves consistently over time.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Electronic reports tracking KPIs of SCM system
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Accurate knowledge on performance of SCM system
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	National Treasury OCPO: Chief Directorate SCM ICT

## PROGRAMME 6: International Financial Relations

### Performance Indicator no 6.1.1

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of analyses and briefs on current issues and recommendations compiled
<b>Short definition</b>	Analyses refer to the synthesis of data in a manner that draws indications, inferences or bases for recommendations. A briefing note contains the facts, detailed information and/or a country position that should be used as a guide for a particular meeting.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To lead or support participation of the National Treasury and Ministry of Finance in various forums, including but not limited to those organised by WEF, G20, BRICS, SADC, SACU, WB, IMF, AU, UNECA, G24 and Commonwealth.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Analysis, briefs and recommendations compiled on current issues.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity and output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Provide analysis, briefs and recommendations on current issues
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Global and Emerging Markets Chief Directorates: Multilateral Development Banks and Concessional Finance Chief Directorate: Country and Thematic Analysis Chief Directorate: African Economic Integration

## Performance Indicator no 6.1.2

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of obligations towards international agreements met
<b>Short definition</b>	Ensuring monitoring of and support for the implementation of applicable international agreements, to which South Africa is a party. Furthermore to identify the potential benefits and risks which South Africa could incur as a result of signing specific agreements.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that South Africa maintains a streamlined and prudent approach to subscribing to international agreements and; to ensure that South Africa complies with, and is able to demonstrate such compliance, to international agreements.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reports or minutes on obligations met towards international agreements
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Total number of obligations achieved towards international agreements}}{\text{Total number of obligations to be achieved towards international agreements}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Outputs and activities
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Discharge all the international agreements obligations
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Multilateral Development Banks and Concessional Finance Chief Directorate: African Economic Integration Chief Directorate: Global and Emerging Markets Country and Thematic Analysis

## Performance Indicator no 6.2.1

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of interventions implemented in Pursuit of Institutional reform
<b>Short definition</b>	A campaign or measure aimed at achieving change, to improve specific institutional performance.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Institutions such as SADC and the AU have the potential to add immense value to South Africa and the continent, if they were able to operate more efficiently and effectively. This pursuit of institutional reform is intended to be achieved over the medium-term by offering support and analysing the root causes of challenges faced
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reports or minutes on interventions implemented
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Improve institutional performance through the implementation of intervention in pursuit of institutional reform
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: African Economic Integration Chief Directorate: Multilateral Development Banks and Concessional Finance Chief Directorate: Global and Emerging Markets Chief Directorate: Country and Thematic Analysis

## Performance Indicator no 6.2.2

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of interventions to increase presence within institutions of particular strategic value
<b>Short definition</b>	Increasing South Africa's presence in strategically valuable institutions, such as the AfDB, World Bank, IMF and OECD; through appropriate means and measures. Assess the prospects of increasing South Africa's influence in these institutions.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Increasing influence in these institutions is one of the means which SA can use to increase its voice and influence in Africa and work towards a more developed and self-sustainable continent.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reports or minutes on interventions implemented to increase presence in institution
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output and impact
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Engagement with external stakeholders Appropriate participation in domestic working groups
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: African Economic Integration Chief Directorate: Multilateral Development Banks and Concessional Finance Chief Directorate: Global and Emerging Markets Chief Directorate: Country and Thematic Analysis

## Performance Indicator no 6.3.1

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of initiatives to expand relations with key strategic partners
<b>Short definition</b>	In order to exploit opportunities with key strategic partners, an alignment of interests and mutual awareness of available opportunities is necessary
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	This will help SA achieve its strategic objectives and contribute to increased economic activity in the region
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reports or minutes on initiatives undertaken to expand relations with key strategic partners
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple calculation
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Identification of strategic partners;  Increased exchange of views and improved alignment of interests; and  Increased outreach and stronger information exchange on current policy debates and issues, particularly with EMDCs, especially in SSA
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: African Economic Integration  Chief Directorate: Multilateral Development Banks and Concessional Finance  Chief Directorate: Global and Emerging Markets  Chief Directorate: Country and Thematic Analysis

## Performance Indicator no 6.3.2

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage implementation of assessments of initial conditions and projects and plans to accelerate regional integration
<b>Short definition</b>	To empower decision-makers with an understanding of the status quo and constraints to increasing trade amongst countries in SSA
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	In order to develop a coherent strategy and refine implementation of the strategy of the medium-term, it is important to understand the status-quo and identify present constraints and opportunities available to increase trade in the region.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reports or minutes on implementation of the assessments of initial conditions and projects and plans to accelerate regional integration
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Assessment of initial conditions and projects and plans implemented}}{\text{Assessment of initial conditions and projects and plans to be implemented}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activities and outputs
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Development of An Africa strategy. Targeted support to increase investment in infrastructure in SSA; through analysis of the opportunities and constraints.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: African Economic Integration Chief Directorate: : Multilateral Development Banks and Concessional Finance Chief Directorate: : Global and Emerging Markets Chief Directorate: Country and Thematic Analysis

## PROGRAMME 7: Civil Military Pensions, Contributions to Funds and Other Benefits

### Performance Indicator no 7.1.1

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage of benefits paid within liable dates
<b>Short definition</b>	Payments of benefits on time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post-retirement medical benefits paid within 30 days</li> <li>• Injury on duty paid within 45 days</li> <li>• Special pension paid within 60 days</li> <li>• Military pensions within 45 days</li> </ul>
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To measure the level of the time it takes in administering and processing of benefits
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reports on payment of benefits
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Benefits paid within the specified timeframe as a percentage of benefits paid during the reporting period
<b>Data limitation</b>	Delays by Employer in submitting original awards from Compensation Fund for IOD, delays by applicants in submission of banking details for SP and MP, employers submitting of Post-retirement medical benefit forms to GPAA with errors.
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Pay all benefits within the liable dates
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	General Manager: Programme 7 (GPAA)



## Performance Indicator no 7.1.2

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage Compliance with National Treasury SLA
<b>Short definition</b>	Compliance to Service Level Agreement with National Treasury
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To track compliance with all predetermined service levels
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Systems reports : Excel spread sheets, MIS and CIVPEN
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Total achieved SLA indicators}}{\text{Total number SLA indicators}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Delays by employer departments in submitting outstanding information to enable GPAA to process and finalize benefits in time
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	To comply with customer service level agreement
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	General Manager: Programme 7 (GPAA)

## Performance Indicator no 7.1.3

<b>Indicator title</b>	Improvement of data integrity of client data
<b>Short definition</b>	To consistently improve client data integrity, to the extent that the quality of client information is consistently accurate and difficult to compromise
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	In order to ensure that the right person (i.e. the lawful member or beneficiary) is paid every time, client data of high integrity is critical. For this purpose the GPAA has resolved to ensure that client data integrity is increased substantially over the medium-term.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reports on integrity of data. Evidence of progress against work-plans
<b>Method of calculation</b>	50% reduction of baseline data with issues
<b>Data limitation</b>	Delays by IT in implementing proposed system changes to address data issues
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Aim is to improve data quality by 50% from baseline
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	GENERAL MANAGER: PROGRAMME 7 (GPAA)

## Performance Indicator no 7.2.1

<b>Indicator title</b>	Percentage customer service complaints resolved within seven days
<b>Short definition</b>	Acknowledgement and resolution of customer complaints with predetermined time frame.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To improve customer experience
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Schedule of customer service complaints resolved within seven days
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of complaints resolved within seven days}}{\text{Number of complaints received}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Delays by Employer in submitting necessary information, delays by Appeal Board in finalization of appeal cases
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Maintain 100% complaint resolution within defined timeframes
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	General Manager: Programme 7 (GPAA)

## PROGRAMME 8: Technical Support and Development Finance Programme Management

### Performance Indicator no 8.1.1:

<b>Indicator title</b>	Progress reported in GTAC quarterly monitoring reports
<b>Short definition</b>	Reporting on operations of the Government Technical Advisory Centre.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	<p>Progress of GTAC operations monitored through reports to the DG and Minister. Managing the institutional relationship to ensure that GTAC efforts are aligned with the priorities of government and the Ministry of Finance</p> <p>Ensuring compliance with governance and reporting requirements</p> <p>Establishing the oversight and engagement relationship with GTAC</p> <p>Establishing report formats and frequency for submission to the DG and Minister</p> <p>Ensuring continued monitoring and evaluation of programme implementation</p>
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	APP Quarterly Reports to Minister of Finance
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Counting number of report submitted
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative for the year
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	100% compliance on reporting requirements which illustrates expected progress
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Programme Manager

**Performance Indicator no 8.1.2:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of technical advisory projects supported.
<b>Short definition</b>	<p>The number of projects supported during a defined period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A project is considered supported once it has been registered as a project on the Business Management Information System.</li> <li>• Projects are categorised as New, Ongoing, Completed.</li> <li>• New means it has been selected by the Project Selection Committee and is in the definition phase.</li> <li>• Ongoing means that a project is being implemented</li> <li>• Completed means that the project is closed and all related documentation has been uploaded in the Business Management Information System.</li> </ul>
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To give an indication of the number of technical advisory projects supported by the GTAC.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Business Management Information System (BMIS and verified project list verified against the Business Management Information System.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<p>Count the number of projects in the project list on the BMIS that display the following status - pipeline, current, or completed.</p> <p>The projects are counted on the last day of each quarter (i.e. 30 June, 30 September, 31 December, and 31 March).</p>
<b>Data limitations</b>	<p>The number of projects per status (pipeline, current and completed) is, by nature, variable. Therefore, the numbers reported reflect the system register at that particular date.</p> <p>A spreadsheet is issued, dated and signed by the two officials responsible for the data and for the management of professional services.</p>
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative for the year
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Amended to remove transaction advisory projects
<b>Desired performance</b>	Support to targeted number of projects afforded, as intended and within acceptable service parameters
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Director: Technical Consulting Services

**Performance Indicator no 8.1.3:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of transaction advisory projects registered.
<b>Short definition</b>	The number of projects registered in a defined period.  A transaction advisory project is considered registered if it is registered at national treasury and a letter has been sent through to PPP to initiate the project
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To give an indication of the number of transaction advisory projects registered.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Transaction register of projects
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Count the number of projects in the project list.
<b>Data limitations</b>	A spreadsheet is issued, dated and signed by the persons responsible for the data and for the management of the projects.
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative for the year
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Support to targeted number of projects afforded, as intended and within acceptable service parameters
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Transaction Advisory Services

**Performance Indicator no 8.1.4:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of capital project advice projects
<b>Short definition</b>	<p>Provide advice on capital projects as agreed with relevant stakeholders in the National Treasury and line departments.</p> <p>Capital projects relate to large multi-year projects relating to key government infrastructure, such as infrastructure required for provision of water and energy to all citizens.</p>
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Large capital projects require a focused and concerted approach to resolve challenges proactively and appropriately, where necessary. Key decisions on these matters have strategic impact which could involve several billions of Rands and influence service delivery for several years in the future.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Per programme project list; programme 8 and GTAC quarterly report
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Number of projects undertaken, as expressed in the Annual Performance Plan
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative for the year
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Number of projects supported, in relation to the intended number (specified in the APP)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Capital Projects respectively

**Performance Indicator no 8.1.5:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of performance and expenditure reviews
<b>Short definition</b>	<p>Conduct expenditure reviews, as agreed with relevant stakeholders in the National Treasury and line departments.</p> <p>Public Expenditure and Policy Analysis reviews seek to investigate the resourcing and performance of government operations, in relation to the applicable policy.</p>
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	The Public Expenditure and Policy Analysis offers government the ability to re-calibrate, where necessary, the extent of resources to deliver on selected policies of government. The policy custodian is engaged in the review and involved in the development of scenarios to achieve objectives most efficiently.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Per programme project list; programme 8 and GTAC quarterly report
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Number of projects undertaken, as expressed in the Annual Performance Plan
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative for the year
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Number of projects supported, in relation to the intended number (specified in the APP)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Public Expenditure and Policy Analysis



**Performance Indicator no 8.2.1:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Transfer of the Financial Management Grant (FMG) funds to all municipalities
<b>Short definition</b>	The disbursement of the FMG allocations to all municipalities in the country as gazetted in the Division of Revenue Act (DoRA)
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To promote and support reforms in financial management by building capacity in municipalities to implement the Municipal Finance Management Act (MFMA)
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	FMG Payment Schedule
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Count the number of municipalities that the grant was transferred to
<b>Data limitations</b>	Verification of data lies with municipalities
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative for the year
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	The transfer of the FMG allocation to all municipalities
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: MFMA Implementation Unit

**Performance Indicator no 8.2.2:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of municipalities and provincial treasuries assisted through Municipal Finance Improvement Project II (MFIP II).
<b>Short definition</b>	The MFIP II programme is meant to support municipalities through placement of advisors to build institutional capacity to deliver on the MFMA reforms.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To assist municipalities build their capacity to deliver under the MFMA reforms.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Consolidated Quarterly MFIP II Progress Reports
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Count the number of municipalities assisted
<b>Data limitations</b>	Minimal data limitation as this is compiled using adopted and agreed upon provincial and municipal support plans which contains targets of achievement against identified outcome.
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity indicator
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative starting from the inception of the project (1 July 2014)
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Actual performance that is higher than the target is more desirable
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Capacity Building, MFIP II Programme Management Unit

**Performance Indicator no 8.3.1:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of precinct plans completed
<b>Short definition</b>	Detailed planning and design of precincts within the urban networks as identified by municipalities using a Transit Oriented Development approach, as outlined in the NDP Unit's Urban Hub Design Toolkit.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	<p>The purpose of precinct plans are to: Identify land uses and reflect the long-term strategic spatial transformation plans at precinct level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lead to the identification and prioritisation of the Intergovernmental Project Pipeline</li> <li>• Lead to the identification of non-capital interventions to unlock investment in precincts</li> <li>• Identify and unlock both public and private sector leverage</li> </ul>
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	<p>Precinct Plans are developed and submitted by Municipalities to the Neighbourhood Development Partnership Programme (NDPP) with the support of Professional Service Providers through funding from the NDPG Technical Assistance allocation.</p> <p>The Plans are collected, reviewed by the NDPP and the status reflected via an Acceptance letter.</p> <p>Deliverables are stored as records within NDPP Unit file plan structure.</p>
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Count of Precinct Plans with NDP Unit Letters of Acceptance / No Objection approved and issued
<b>Data limitations</b>	No real data limitations, as the NDP Unit assists municipalities in drafting the precinct plans via the Urban Hub Toolkit and a series of workshops and studio sessions until the plans meet pre-defined criteria.
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative (since the inception of the Urban Networks Strategy)
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Actual performance that is higher than targeted in the corresponding Annual Performance Plan is desirable
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Neighbourhood Development Partnership Programme

**Performance Indicator no 8.3.2:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of catalytic projects approved
<b>Short definition</b>	Catalytic project components are identified within strategic nodes, urban hubs, and secondary linkages as part of the precinct planning phase and also in rural areas. A list of prioritised catalytic projects (name, scope, completion dates and costs estimates) is developed in each identified Urban Hub precinct. Projects from the list are given “permission to proceed with implementation planning” as a result are regarded as approved.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	<p>The purpose of approving catalytic projects are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link a municipality’s development objectives and strategic planning processes to physical projects on the ground</li> <li>• Target investment and development within strategically well-located areas to ensure value for money and to optimise impact</li> <li>• Sequence the delivery and budgeting of identified and prioritised projects at the precinct level</li> <li>• Ensure that the projects contribute as a catalytic investment to achieve a return of investment at third party leverage at the precinct level</li> <li>• Improve the quality of life and the levels of access to opportunity for residents in South Africa’s under-served neighbourhoods</li> </ul>
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	<p>Completed project templates are identified, listed and prioritised as per the Unit’s Programme Cycle, and then submitted to the NDP by Municipalities (with the support of Professional Service Providers through funding from the NDPG Technical Assistance allocation)</p> <p>Project templates are collected, reviewed by the NDP unit and the statuses of projects are reflected on the Management Information System.</p> <p>Project related plans and lists are stored as records within NDP Unit file plan structure.</p>
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Count of qualified municipal project components with NDP Unit’s “permission to proceed with implementation planning” instructions approved and issued
<b>Data limitations</b>	<p>The identification of catalytic projects is dependent on a sequence of milestones / stage gates through the Unit’s Programme Cycle i.e. Urban network plans with identified Urban Hubs, precinct plans, precinct management plans and then projects. Some risks related to the data include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The duration/effort taken to identify, scope and provide costs estimates per project</li> <li>• Any subjectivity in determining prioritisation</li> <li>• The availability and scheduling of municipal NDP Grant TA or CG funding to take project through to construction</li> <li>• The human resources capacity for the successful coordination and</li> </ul>

	<p>implementation of NDPG at the municipal level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The level of effort/quality the municipality provides in coordinating the development of NDPG related municipal plans or deliverables, i.e. submission of monthly and quarterly expenditure and progress reports.</li> </ul>
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative (since the start of the programme)
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Actual performance that is higher than targeted in the corresponding Annual Performance Plan is desirable
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Neighbourhood Development Partnership Programme

**Performance Indicator no 8.3.3:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Estimated third-party investment leveraged
<b>Short definition</b>	<p>The NDP Unit's strategy is aimed at leveraging third-party investment in order to transform strategic identified nodes, which in townships are referred to as urban hubs. The NDPP aims to attract third-party investment into township developments by catalytic project funding, optimising a package of public infrastructure investment and ensuring greater coordinated urban management. The outcome of this strategy is measured by the increase of the reported amount of third-party investment leveraged into targeted locations.</p>
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	<p>The purpose of leveraging third-party investment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wise government investments will save substantial costs by effectively leveraging private funds and by producing improved economic circumstances that reduce other costs and expand public revenues</li> <li>• To maximize and exploit the opportunities of targeted locations</li> <li>• Motivate for greater alignment of fiscal and regulatory incentives &amp; instruments across spheres/sectors (such as infrastructure grants) that foster growth in strategically targeted urban spaces (urban hubs)</li> <li>• To unlock further developmental and economic opportunities through private sector investment</li> <li>• To promote long term sustainability and reduce risk</li> <li>• To increase returns on investment (both public and private)</li> </ul>
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	<p>There are various sources that qualify as third-party investment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• other Government grants,</li> <li>• municipal co-investment</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• non-governmental support/resources</li> <li>• private sector business</li> <li>• investors (developers, project financiers, equity funds, community funds, tribal authorities)</li> <li>• in-kind/sweat equity</li> <li>• direct fund (contributing hard cash)</li> <li>• land (e.g. municipality offering land without any cost)</li> <li>• conditional loans at preferential rates.</li> </ul> <p>Estimated leverage is reflected on the Management Information System. Leverage information/reports are stored as records within NDPP file plan structure.</p>
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Estimated leverage is reflected on the Management Information System. The outcome of the NDP's strategy is measured by the estimated amount of total third-party investment leveraged into all targeted locations.
<b>Data limitations</b>	<p>There are various challenges in securing, reporting and attributing leverage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The regulatory constraint sometimes inhibit development, land release hindering the market to invest into strategic locations</li> <li>• The scale of the development may be limited by the nature of infrastructure available e.g. bulk infrastructure provision</li> <li>• Effectiveness of investments, i.e. sustainable development (public) vs returns and profitability (private)</li> <li>• Dependency on the nature of macro investment climate</li> <li>• The level / capacity and effort in mobilising private/public capital</li> <li>• Difficulty in attributing investment solely to catalytic NDPP funding</li> <li>• Factoring in long term operation cost or contributions e.g. urban management</li> <li>• Investment may come in several forms (not all may be integrated or constructive)</li> <li>• Investment may only materialise after the NDP unit has completed the projects</li> </ul>
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Outcome
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative (since the start of the programme)
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Actual performance that is higher than targeted in the corresponding Annual Performance Plan is desirable
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Neighbourhood Development Partnership Programme

**Performance Indicator no 8.3.4:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of projects confirmed within the identified integration / spatial transformation zones (per year).
<b>Short definition</b>	Within the integration zones cities need to identify, plan and implement catalytic projects. These projects must be integrated (mixed land use, mixed income, leverage investment from the private sector (households/business)).
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Many projects are generally planned sectorally and the synergies and efficiencies (with regarding financing and outcomes) that can be generated through integration are not realised. Planning is a critical part of the project cycle. By undertaking the planning, a pipeline of projects is being developed and provides an indication of the potential number of projects that could be implemented
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Built Environment Performance Plans submitted by municipalities
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of the number of integration zones as reflected in the BEPP submitted to NT for 2015/16
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Increased number of projects that are planned in the integration/spatial transformation zones by the public and private sector which contributes to the spatial transformation and inclusive growth in the cities.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Cities Support Programme Chief Directorate : Provincial and Local Government Infrastructure

**Performance Indicator no 8.3.5:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of integrated city development projects under implementation (per year).
<b>Short definition</b>	The integration zones are spatially targeted areas for infrastructure investment by the cities sometimes in partnership with the private sector. The implementation phase of the projects include detailed design, construction and close out/ completion.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Many projects are generally financed and implemented sectorally and the synergies and efficiencies (with regard to financing and sustainability etc) that can be generated through integration are not realised. It is important to measure the number of projects being implemented as this relates to the expenditure of the grant finance.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	They are reflected in the Built Environment Performance Plans (BEPP) of the municipalities and submitted to National Treasury on a yearly basis
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of the number of projects under implementation in integration zones reflected in the BEPP submitted to NT for 2014/15
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Increased number of projects that are implemented in the integration/ spatial transformation zones by the public and private sector which contributes to the spatial transformation and inclusive growth in the cities
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Cities Support Programme Chief Directorate : Provincial and Local Government Infrastructure



**Performance Indicator no 8.4.1:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of Jobs Fund projects approved (cumulative).
<b>Short definition</b>	Denotes the number of project applications approved by the Investment Committee per funding round from inception of the Fund to date.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To track the number of applications that have successfully met the Jobs Fund's competitive requirements and the extent to which the Jobs Fund is progressively meeting its strategic imperatives.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Investment Committee Minutes and decision records
<b>Method of calculation</b>	A count of all the applications that have been approved at a sitting of the Investment Committee meeting.
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative (from project inception to date)
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	A higher number of projects spread across the various funding windows are desirable.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Social Security and Jobs Fund Project Management Unit

**Performance Indicator no 8.4.2:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Grant funding approved (cumulative).
<b>Short definition</b>	Denotes the quantum (in Rand value terms) of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grant funds that has been allocated (Committed) for the implementation of approved portfolio projects and</li> </ul>
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Represents the amount of grant funds committed to approved projects relative to the total MTEF allocations for grant awarding by the Jobs Fund and the amount of matched funding committed by project applicants.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Data is collected from Investment Committee Decision Records and meeting Minutes
<b>Method of calculation</b>	A count of the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>total approved grant amount to be used for the implementation of approved projects</li> </ul>
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative (project inception to date)
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Separated from matched funding committed
<b>Desired performance</b>	Matched funding ratio as per approved project portfolio
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Social Security and Jobs Fund Project Management Unit

**Performance Indicator no 8.4.3:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Matched funding committed (cumulative)
<b>Short definition</b>	Denotes the quantum (in Rand value terms) of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matched funding committed</li> </ul>
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Represents the amount of grant funds committed to approved projects relative to the total MTEF allocations for grant awarding by the Jobs Fund and the amount of matched funding committed by project applicants.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Data is collected from Investment Committee Decision Records and meeting Minutes
<b>Method of calculation</b>	A count of the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• total committed matched funding as reflected in Investment Committee meeting Minutes and decision record</li> </ul>
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative (project inception to date)
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Amended to include matched funding committed
<b>Desired performance</b>	Matched funding ratio as per approved project portfolio
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Social Security and Jobs Fund Project Management Unit

**Performance Indicator no 8.4.4:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	New jobs contracted (cumulative).
<b>Short definition</b>	Denotes the number of projected new permanent jobs (or Full Time Equivalent) that is expected to be created as a result of Jobs Fund projects over the projects' contracted project life cycle.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	The Jobs Fund intends to catalyse innovative and new approaches to the creation of sustainable jobs. This indicator demonstrates the progressive realisation of this Jobs Fund's objective through the measurement of projected permanent jobs anticipated by the contracted portfolio of projects.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Jobs Fund Investment Committee Minutes and decision records
<b>Method of calculation</b>	A count of approved projected permanent jobs to be created by projects by the end of their implementation cycle.
<b>Data limitations</b>	The data are accurate to the extent that projects have adequately projected the quantum of anticipated jobs to be created. These numbers can change (through IC approval) post approval and in the course of implementation on account of several factors, which may include: Economic growth, sector challenges that hinder performance; availability of sufficient matched funding which may impact of the project size; exchange rate; project terminations; project withdrawals; lapsed approval offers; etc.
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Outcome
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative (project inception to date)
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	A higher performance against the targeted value is desirable.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Social Security and Jobs Fund Project Management Unit

**Performance Indicator no 8.4.5:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of placements contracted (cumulative).
<b>Short definition</b>	Denotes the number of projected job placements (with and beyond project partners) facilitated by Jobs Fund projects over their contracted project life cycle.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	The Jobs Fund intends to catalyse innovative and new approaches to the creation of sustainable jobs. This indicator demonstrates the progressive realisation of this Jobs Fund's objective through the measurement of permanent placements expected to be unlocked by contracted projects.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Jobs Fund Investment Committee meeting minutes and decision records.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	A count of total approved projected job placements to be unlocked by projects by the end of their implementation cycle.
<b>Data limitations</b>	The data will be accurate to the extent that projects have adequately projected the quantum of anticipated job placements to be facilitated. These numbers can change (through IC approval) post approval and in the course of implementation on account of several factors, which may include: Economic growth,, sector challenges that hinder performance, availability of demand, project terminations, withdrawals, lapsed approval offers, etc.
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Outcome
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	A higher performance against the targeted value is desirable.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Social Security and Jobs Fund Project Management Unit

**Performance Indicator no 8.4.6:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of training opportunities contracted (cumulative).
<b>Short definition</b>	Denotes the projected number of beneficiaries to successfully complete training programmes provided by the Jobs Fund approved projects, over their contracted life cycle.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	As part of its holistic value proposition, the Jobs Fund seeks to, amongst other things; improve the employability of the beneficiaries that participate in Jobs Fund supported projects. This indicator measures the projected number of beneficiaries that would successfully meet the requirements of such training programmes with a view to acquiring more tradable skills.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Jobs Fund Investment Committee meeting minutes and resolutions.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	A count of the projected number of approved beneficiaries expected to successfully complete training interventions provided by Jobs Fund projects by the end of their implementation cycle.
<b>Data limitations</b>	The data will be accurate to the extent that projects have adequately projected the quantum of anticipated beneficiaries that will successfully complete training interventions. These numbers can change (through IC approval) post approval and in the course of implementation on account of several factors, which may include: sector challenges that hinder performance, demand from employers, project terminations, withdrawals, lapsed approval offers, etc.
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Outcome
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative (project inception to date)
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	A higher performance against the targeted value is desirable.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Social Security and Jobs Fund Project Management Unit

**Performance Indicator no 8.4.7:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Value of grant funding disbursed (cumulative).
<b>Short definition</b>	Denotes the Rand-value of grant funding disbursed to contracted Jobs Fund projects.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	The Jobs Fund operates on an advance disbursement principle in its dealings with its Partners on a quarterly basis. Disbursements enable the projects to undertake their implementation plan activities, which are converted to outputs and these in turn are converted to the desired outcomes. Tracking the flow of disbursement is important in ensuring that the Jobs Fund projects are on course to meet their quarterly and ultimately overall contracted results.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Jobs Fund Reporting Framework
<b>Method of calculation</b>	A calculation of the sum of all payments made to eligible Jobs Fund projects against their approved grant allocations.
<b>Data limitations</b>	The data will be accurate to the extent that the projects request disbursements as per their disbursement schedule however this may be impacted on by projects that have not accurately projected expenditure, external (environment and internal project challenges); change in project implementation model.
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output indicator
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative (inception to date)
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Performance that is as close as possible to the targeted disbursement amount is desirable.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Social Security and Jobs Fund Project Management Unit

**Performance Indicator no 8.4.8:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of Jobs Fund evaluation reports published
<b>Short definition</b>	Denotes the design, set up and management of monitoring and evaluation systems and processes that systematically collect, analyse and disseminate key information on the performance of portfolio projects during and post implementation.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	One of the key Jobs Fund mandate objectives is the piloting of innovative and inclusive approaches to job creation. This indicator enables the Jobs Fund to systematically collect and decipher critical information on the effectiveness of different project models of change, and to better understand their delivery challenges and successes. This knowledge will assist future Jobs Fund decision making and could inform future government policy on job creation.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Project Implementation and Monitoring Plans (PIMPs), Site Visit Reports, Comparative Studies, Evaluation Reports.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Quarterly project performance reports. Evaluation reports completed post project implementation.
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Performance that is higher than the targeted number is desirable
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Social Security and Jobs Fund Project Management Unit



**Performance Indicator no 8.4.9:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of employment, income distribution and inclusive growth research papers completed
<b>Short definition</b>	REDI3x3 seeks to advance an integrated response to unemployment, inequality and poverty, building on a research framework developed through a partnership between the Department of Economics at the University of the Free State and the Southern Africa Labour and Development Research Unit at the University of Cape Town.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	During 2012, the Minister of Finance called for evidence, analysis and advice on public policy and public finance reforms in support of accelerated employment creation, a more equitable distribution of income and inclusive growth, and approved the National Treasury supporting a multi-year collaborative research project on Employment, Income Distribution and Inclusive Growth (as part of its Employment Creation Facilitation sub-programme).
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	For each of the three focus areas (i. Employment; ii. Income Distribution; and iii. Inclusive Growth), the project has identified a number of research gaps. Members of the research community have been (and continue to be) invited to submit proposals which address these gaps.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Number of completed research papers and workshops
<b>Data limitations</b>	The number of research papers completed is dependent on the response from the research community, the number of proposals approved.
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative (project inception to date)
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Performance that is higher than the targeted number is desirable
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Social Security and Jobs Fund Project Management Unit

**Performance Indicator no 8.5.1:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of technical assistants deployed to support capacity in infrastructure delivery
<b>Short definition</b>	Supporting the improvement of infrastructure planning, procurement, delivery, and maintenance capacity for purposes of efficient and effective infrastructure delivery and maintenance.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Improved planning of infrastructure delivery and maintenance capacity is envisaged to contribute to improving the value for money on infrastructure spending as well as to optimize the allocation of financial resources directed to infrastructure delivery and maintenance.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Technical Assistants' signed contracts
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Count of number of technical assistants deployed to participating departments
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	The intended number of technical assistants are deployed to participating departments and improvements in capability are being made over the duration of the programme
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Provincial and Local Government Infrastructure

**Performance Indicator no 8.5.2:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of officials trained on the infrastructure delivery management (IDM) toolkit
<b>Short definition</b>	IDM Toolkit training is facilitated through needs driven engagements on the IDMS in order to formally train and build a knowledge base of officials within the infrastructure delivery chain.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To improve provincial government capacity to plan, procure, deliver, maintain, manage and report on infrastructure. Ultimately this will contribute to improving the government's capability to deliver on infrastructure mandate.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Attendance registers
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Count of number of delegates that attended
<b>Data limitations</b>	Incomplete attendance registers
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative (since inception of project and every financial year)
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Capacitated infrastructure units that can effectively and efficiently plan, procure, deliver, maintain, manage and report on infrastructure
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Provincial and Local Government Infrastructure

**Performance Indicator no 8.5.3:**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of graduates in training for professional registration
<b>Short definition</b>	The number of graduates in training as per the requirements of the respective statutory councils.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	The indicator is meant to show gradual progression of graduates from registration (as candidates) right through to becoming registered professionals in their respective fields.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monthly and quarterly reports submitted by municipalities</li> <li>• Empirical information from reports and municipal visits</li> </ul>
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<p>Business plans submitted by municipalities with numbers of required graduates,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graduates names are submitted to the relevant statutory institutions for registration,</li> <li>• Appropriate programme or work plans are issued in alignment to the requirements of the statutory councils for training under the supervision of the municipality's supervisors</li> <li>• After graduates have covered all the elements as required by the statutory councils - graduates are assessed and registration granted or required to train further to cover elements that they are found not competent (by the relevant statutory council).</li> </ul>
<b>Data limitations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistencies in the information reported by municipalities (which could be attributed to the high staff turnover)</li> <li>• Some municipalities are not complying to the grant framework</li> </ul>
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Trained graduates that are able to qualify for professional registration and support improvements in the built environment
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Provincial and Local Government Infrastructure