

---

**Programme 1**
**Strategic Objective 1.1****Provide integrated business solutions****Performance Indicator no 1.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>% increase in Year on Year MPAT total score</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Calculating in percentage value the year on year difference in the total score achieved by NT for the annual DPME MPAT performance assessment
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To improve departmental management practices in order to advance an efficient, effective and development – orientated public service
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	NT MPAT results report
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{(\text{Previous year MPAT score} - \text{Current year MPAT score}) \times 100}{\text{Previous year MPAT score}}$
<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>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Year on year percentage increase in the NT MPAT total score
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	CD: SPM&E

<b>Performance Indicator no 1.1.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage completion of the business continuity strategy</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Percentage of completion of items, per phase of completion as reflected in the Business Continuity Strategy
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To enable NT to increase its capability to respond to any existing, emerging or unidentified risks in an effort to achieve operational resilience
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Business continuity report recording business continuity items completed and reported as a percentage of phase 3, Business continuity items to be completed per phase and as a percentage of the phase to be completed as reflected in the business continuity strategy
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<u>Number of business continuity plans completed x100</u> Total number of plans planned
<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>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	30% of Phase 3 of the Business Continuity strategy completed
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Risk Officer

<b>Performance Indicator no 1.1.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of Knowledge Management(KM)strategy implemented</b>
<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>	$\frac{\text{Number of Business Units in which the strategy is implemented}}{\text{Number of Business Units in which the strategy is due to be implemented}} \times 100$
<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>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	100% implementation of the Knowledge Management strategy
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Director: Knowledge Management

Performance Indicator no 1.1.3	
Indicator title	Percentage of funded positions filled
Short definition	Fill the funded vacant positions to ensure service delivery continuity
Purpose/importance	Ensure that the department is capacitated to achieve its objectives
Source/collection of data	Data is sourced from PERSAL reports
Method of calculation	$\frac{\text{Total filled position}}{\text{Total funded positions}} \times 100$
Data limitation	None
Type of indicator	Output
Calculation type	Non-cumulative
Reporting cycle	Quarterly
New indicator	Revised
Desired performance	Ensure that all funded positions are 100% filled
Indicator responsibility	Chief Director: Human Resource Management

Performance Indicator no 1.1.4	
Indicator title	Percentage availability of ICT systems achieved
Short definition	Ensure that the ICT solutions and services of the National Treasury are functional and available
Purpose/importance	To enable efficient and effective service delivery.
Source/collection of data	ICT systems availability report
Method of calculation	$\frac{\text{Time system was available}}{\text{Time system should have been available}} \times 100$
Data limitation	None
Type of indicator	Output
Calculation type	Non-Cumulative
Reporting cycle	Quarterly
New indicator	No
Desired performance	ICT systems to be available at all times (100%)
Indicator responsibility	Chief Director: Information and Communication Technology

Performance Indicator no 1.1.5	
Indicator title	Percentage saved on the rand value budgeted for paper usage, travel and Strategic Sourcing
Short definition	Implementation of cost containment measures relating to paper usage, travel and Strategic Sourcing.
Purpose/importance	To respond to cost containment measures and ensure maximum value received for funds spent; through strategic sourcing initiatives and other possible techniques.
Source/collection of data	A schedule of savings achieved
Method of calculation	$\frac{\text{Savings achieved}}{\text{Cost incurred} + \text{savings achieved}} \times 100$
Data limitation	None
Type of indicator	Output
Calculation type	Non-cumulative
Reporting cycle	Annually
New indicator	Yes
Desired performance	Savings on goods and services
Indicator responsibility	Chief Financial Officer

<b>Strategic Objective 1.2</b>	
<b>To ensure good governance and a sound control environment.</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 1.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Produce an Audited Annual Report</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	The annual report reflects the operations, the performance information, the human resources' information and the financial affairs of the department for the financial year
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To reflect the operations, the performance information, the human resources' information and the financial affairs of the department
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Audited Annual Report tabled in Parliament and published on the National Treasury's website
<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>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Accessible Annual Report
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	CD: SPM&E

<b>Performance Indicator 1.2.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage completion of the approved risk-based IA Plan</b>
<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>	$\frac{\text{Number of completed audits}}{\text{Planned audits}} \times 100$
<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>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Risk-based internal audit plan implemented 100%
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Audit Executive



<b>Performance Indicator 1.2.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Produce approved annual strategic risk mitigation plan and quarterly risk implementation assessment reports</b>
<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>	Simple count of a number of risk mitigation plans and reports.
<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>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Risk strategy implemented 100%
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Risk Officer

<b>Performance Indicator 1.2.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of entities reporting to MoF reviewed quarterly reports submitted for the Minister's consideration</b>
<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 quarterly reports
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of quarterly reports reviewed
<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>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Review 44 quarterly reports submitted by 11 schedule 3A Public Entities
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Director: Public Entities Oversight Unit

<b>Performance Indicator 1.2.4</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of vetting forms completed by staff group, submitted to State Security Agency (SSA)</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Vetting files completed by priority group, 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>	Simple count of completed vetting files submitted to SSA
<b>Data limitation</b>	No specific limitation
<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>	Vetting of all identified employees
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Risk Officer

<b>Strategic Objective 1.3</b>	
<b>Provide support for strategic and performance management across the organisation</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 1.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Produce an APP</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	The APP details the specific performance targets that the institution will aim to achieve in the financial year and the next 5 years in pursuit of strategic outcomes oriented goals and objectives set out in its Strategic Plan.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To detail the specific performance targets that the institution will aim to achieve in the financial year
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	APP tabled in Parliament and published on the National Treasury website
<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>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Accessible APP
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	CD: SPM&E

---

**Programme 2**
**Strategic Objective 2.1**

**Build economic research capacity in academic research institutions with the objective of promoting relevant research**

**Performance Indicator no 2.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of research institutions participating in building economic research capacity
<b>Short definition</b>	Promote the participation of research institutions in building economic research capacity
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Building economic research capacity in academic research institutions with the objective of promoting relevant research
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Relevant research papers as published by academic research institutions
<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>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Research institutions participating in building economic research capacity
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	DDG: Economic Policy and DDG: Tax and Financial Sector Policy

<b>Performance Indicator no 2.1.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of papers published in association with academic research institutions.</b>
<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>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<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

<b>Strategic Objective 2.2</b>	
<b>Provide policy advice on the financial sector</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator 2.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of policy advice on the financial sector provided
<b>Short definition</b>	Providing policy advice on the financial sector in relation to the regulatory framework and supporting legislation.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	The objective for policy is to make the financial sector safer and to treat customers more fairly and better, and to be more inclusive and have integrity
<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>	Simple count
<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>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Make the financial sector safer and to treat customers more fairly and better, and to be more inclusive and have integrity
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	DDG: Tax and Financial Sector Policy

<b>Performance Indicator no 2.2.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Enact Twin Peaks model legislation</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	“Implementation” here refers to implementing the provisions of the law. 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>	The implementation of the Twin Peaks model in South Africa has two fundamental objectives: <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>• Government Gazette and issued with a Gazette number on the government’s website.</li> <li>• Announcement, Tablings and Committees (ATC) document with the same Gazette number</li> <li>• Act published on the government website under Acts</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>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Enacted twin peaks model legislation
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	CD: Financial Stability



<b>Performance Indicator no 2.2.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Implement savings and retirement policies</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Implement regulatory reforms on savings and retirement policies that would lead to increased levels of national savings and enabling legislation. Consensus will either be an agreement to proceed with compulsory annuitisation for provident funds and, therefore, retain the current tax benefit for provident fund members OR consensus could also mean that the tax benefits to provident fund members will be clawed-back in the absence of an agreement to annuitise by provident fund members
<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>	Simple count (consensus achieved)
<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>	Increase in National Savings and percentage increase in retirement funds as reflected in macroeconomic data
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	CD: Financial Investments and Savings

<b>Strategic Objective 2.3</b>	
<b><i>Provide advice and input into tax policy, frameworks and legislation</i></b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 2.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of policy advice into tax policy, frameworks and legislation provided</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Provide advice and input into tax policy, frameworks and legislation
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To develop a tax administrative system that ensures sustainable growth of the economy and improved environmental sustainability
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Advice based on research, tax analysis and tax revenue forecasting published in the annual budget review
<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>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	To have a tax administrative system that ensures sustainable growth of the economy and improved environmental sustainability
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	CD: Tax Policy

<b>Performance Indicator no 2.3.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Publish tax proposals in annual budget review</b>
<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>	Check if 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>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Tax proposals published annually in the Budget Review
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	CD: Tax Policy

<b>Performance Indicator no 2.3.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Implement legislation to give effect to tax proposals from the Budget.</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Tax legislation in the 2017/18 financial year refers to Rates and Monetary Amounts Amendment Bill, Taxation Laws Amendment Bill and Carbon Tax Bill to enable 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>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Implement legislations
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	CD: Tax Policy

<b>Strategic Objective 2.4</b>	
<b>Provide input into economic policy and frameworks</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 2.4</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	Number of inputs into economic policy and framework
<b>Short definition</b>	Provide input into economic policy and frameworks
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Providing advice on macro and microeconomic policy, macroeconomic projections and modelling, monetary policy framework and economic sector strategies
<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>	Changes in economic environment not communicated timeously, resulting in delays to updating corresponding economic model, Quality of data
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Sound economic policy and frameworks
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	<b>DDG: Economic policy</b>

<b>Performance Indicator no 2.4.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of economic models maintained (Models reflect the most recent economic environment)</b>
<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>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	To update economic models with changes affecting their accuracy/relevance
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Economic Policy

<b>Performance Indicator no 2.4.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of economic forecasts produced</b>
<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>	Non-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

<b>Performance Indicator no 2.4.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Chapter 2 of the MTBPS and Budget Review published</b>
<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>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<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 2.4.4	
Indicator title	Percentage response to user requests to develop new economic models
Short definition	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.
Purpose/importance	Economic models are used to forecast economic activities, propose economic policy or politically justify economic policy.
Source/collection of data	Developed economic models
Method of calculation	$\frac{\text{Number of user requests responded to}}{\text{Total number of user of requests received}} \times 100$
Data limitation	None
Type of indicator	Output
Calculation type	Non-cumulative
Reporting cycle	Quarterly
New indicator	Yes
Desired performance	Develop economic models that will simplify economic reality or environment through economic policies
Indicator responsibility	Economic Policy

<b>Performance Indicator no 2.4.5</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage response to users requests for economic research and policy analysis, and assessments of government policy proposals</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Assess and provide advice on 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>	$\frac{\text{Number of users' requests responded to}}{\text{Total number of users' requests received}} \times 100$
<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>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Conduct economic analysis, research, assessment and advice on macroeconomics policy proposals
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Economic policy

<b>Performance Indicator no 2.4.6</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage response to user requests for policy and scenario modelling</b>
<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>	$\frac{\text{Number of user requests responded to}}{\text{Total number of user requests received}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Quality of data
<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>	Achieve target
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Modelling and Forecasting

<b>Performance Indicator no 2.4.7</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage response to user requests for commentaries on economic data</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	These are requests received to analyse and provide insight into local and global economic data and could include the impact of this on South Africa.
<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 commentaries
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of user requests responded to}}{\text{Total number of user requests received}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Quality of data
<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>	Achieve target
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Modelling and Forecasting

---

**Programme 3**

<b>Strategic Objective 3.1</b>	
<b>Developing and Implementing South Africa's Fiscal Policy and related framework</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 3.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>South Africa's fiscal policy and related frameworks authorised</b>
<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. Fiscal framework set to ensure debt sustainability and published twice a year according to legal requirement.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	National Treasury databases managed by Budget Office
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	No specific limitations
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Tabling and publication must occur in line with predetermined timelines
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Budget Office: Deputy Director General

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.1.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Difference between the expenditure tabled for the MTEF years within the expenditure ceiling in MTBPS and the expenditure ceiling tabled for the MTEF years in the February budget</b>
<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 minus 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>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<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>	Budget Office: Deputy Director General

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.1.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of fiscal frameworks provided</b>
<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. Fiscal framework set to ensure debt sustainability and published twice a year according to legal requirement.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	National Treasury databases managed by Budget Office
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<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>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Tabling and publication must occur in line with predetermined timelines
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Budget Office: Deputy Director General

<b>Strategic Objective 3.2</b>	
<b>Preparation of the National Budget</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 3.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of budgets produced</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Preparation of the National Budget
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	National Budget that supports government's long-term policy and strategic priorities, within a fiscal framework that will ensure sound and sustainable financial policies and the effective, efficient and appropriate allocation of public funds
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Parliamentary administrative records and National Treasury internet postings
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	No specific limitations
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Tabled national budget that supports government's long-term policy and strategic priorities
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Budget Office and Public Finance: Deputy Directors General



<b>Performance Indicator no 3.2.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of budget guidelines issued</b>
<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>	<p>Check if the Medium Term Expenditure Framework guidelines are published on the National Treasury's website by July</p> <p>Check if the Medium Term Expenditure Committee programme is drafted by July</p> <p>Check if the Adjusted Estimates of National Expenditure guidelines are published on the National Treasury's website by August</p> <p>Check if the Estimates of National Expenditure guidelines are published on the National Treasury's website by November</p>
<b>Data limitation</b>	No specific limitations
<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>	Guidelines must be issued to institutions and MTEC programme must be drafted, by July; AENE guidelines published by August; ENE guidelines published by November.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	National Treasury: Budget Office: Chief Director: Expenditure Planning

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.2.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Budget decision making processes coordinated and adherence to timelines for budget allocation recommendations based on departmental budget submissions.</b>
<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>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<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

<b>Strategic Objective 3.3</b>	
<b>Publication of the National Budget</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 3.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of National Budgets published</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Publish the National Budget
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Publish the Budget Review, Estimates of National Expenditure and MTBPS and appropriation legislation, containing relevant, accurate and clear financial information and associated indicators of service delivery and performance
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Parliamentary administrative records and National Treasury internet postings
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	No specific limitations
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Published National Budget
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Budget Office and Public Finance: Deputy Directors General

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.3.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Budget legislation and accompanying documentation tabled in Parliament, and published</b>
<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>	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

<b>Performance Indicator 3.3.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of reports on public finance statistics according to function and economic classification</b>
<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>	Simple count - 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. 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.
<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

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.3.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of reports produced on guidance given to departments and entities on the classification of expenditure per quarter</b>
<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>	Simple count of number of reports produced
<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>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	<p>Issue classification circulars and guidelines used by departments for transactional classification guidance</p> <p>Provide advice on the interpretation of the SCOA and the Reference Guide on Economic Classification when required.</p>
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Public Finance Statistics

<b>Strategic Objective 3.4</b>	
<b>Monitoring and analysis of public expenditure and service delivery</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no. 3.4</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of annual expenditure reports submitted to the Standing Committee on Appropriations</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Provide the Standing Committee on Appropriation with high level summary of 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>	Simple count of number 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>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Informed SCOA on the significant preliminary expenditure patterns across government.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Budget Analysts: Public Finance

Performance Indicator no 3.4.1	
Indicator title	Percentage adherence to timelines for PFMA and TR approvals, sectoral analysis and policy advice
Short definition	The number of PFMA and TR requests approved within the deadlines as per NT requirements (see desired performance) and comments on Cabinet memoranda for the Minister of Finance (see desired performance)
Purpose/importance	To ensure that national departments and public entities get responses to their requests in the shortest time possible To ensure that the Minister has advice on Cabinet memoranda prior to Cabinet meetings
Source/collection of data	All requests for PFMA and TR approval from departments and public entities and Cab memo's and sent to the PF division for comment as well as the replies to those requests
Method of calculation	<u>(Number of responses to each request ( routine or more complex) sent by the deadline +Number of Cab memo comments sent by the deadline) X 100</u> Number requests received + Number of Cab memo received
Data limitation	None
Type of indicator	Output and efficiency
Calculation type	Non-cumulative
Reporting cycle	Quarterly
New indicator	Revised
Desired performance	Routine PFMA and TR approvals within 2 weeks of receipt More complex PFMA and TR approval within 4 weeks of receipt Routine sectoral analysis and policy advice within 2 weeks of request More complex sectoral analysis and policy advice within 4 weeks of receipt Comments on Cabinet memoranda to reach the Ministry at least one day before the relevant Cabinet meeting
Indicator responsibility	Chief Directors: Public Finance



<b>Performance Indicator no 3.4.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of monthly expenditure feedback reports to departments.</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Public Finance budget analysts to compile and provide month expenditure feedback to departments. 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>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>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Report to departments on early warning signs that could trigger unauthorised or irregular expenditure
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Budget Analysts: Public Finance

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.4.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of quarterly expenditure reports submitted to the Standing Committee on Appropriations</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Provide the Standing Committee on Appropriation with high level summary of quarterly expenditure reports for all departments. Quarterly expenditure reports submitted six weeks from the end of the quarter
<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>	Simple count of number 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>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Informed SCOA on the significant preliminary expenditure patterns across government.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Budget Analysts: Public Finance

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.4.4</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of reports produced on review and implementation of the COLA costing model</b>
<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>	Simple count of number of reports produced on the review and implementation of the model
<b>Data limitation</b>	Not applicable
<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>	A comprehensive report on the review of the model produced per quarter.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Public Sector Remuneration Analysis and Forecasting Unit

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.4.5</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage response to request for support on governance and financial management monitoring and compliance system in public entities provided.</b>
<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 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>	$\frac{\text{Total number of requests responded to in providing support to Public entities within 3 months}}{\text{Total number of the requests received from public entities to provide support}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Records of verbal requests, responses and discussions; and telephone discussions
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Implementation of the principles of improved governance in public entities
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Public Entities Governance Unit

<b>Strategic Objective 3.5</b>	
<b>Coordinating international development cooperation</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 3.5</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of ODA programmes coordinated</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Effectively manage and coordinate official development assistance (ODA), which includes grants, concessionary loans and technical assistance
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure alignment with government policies and priorities
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	ODA agreements/Project reports DCMIS
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of aligned agreements} \times 100}{\text{Total number of agreements signed}}$
<b>Data limitation</b>	None where agreements are processed by IDC
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Development cooperation fully coordinated with government policy and priorities
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: International Development Cooperation

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.5.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage alignment of development cooperation to government policy and priorities</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Alignment development cooperation relating to official development assistance (ODA), which includes grants, concessionary loans and technical assistance, with Government priorities
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure alignment with government policies and priorities
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	ODA agreements/Project reports Development Cooperation, Management and Information System (DCMIS)
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of aligned agreements} \times 100}{\text{Total number of agreements signed}}$
<b>Data limitation</b>	None where agreements are processed by IDC
<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>	Development cooperation fully aligned with government policy and priorities
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: International Development Cooperation

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.5.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage Management and coordination of development cooperation in South Africa</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Manage and coordinate the country's development cooperation at a macro level
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Manage and coordinate inbound South African technical and financial cooperation
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	RDP quarterly report PSC meetings Minutes Annual consultation Minutes Development Cooperation, Management and Information System (DCMIS)
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of ODA projects managed and coordinated}}{\text{Total number of ODA projects}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Departments do not consistently report on all ODA projects.
<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>	All ODA projects managed and co-ordinated and thus comprehensive information on all inbound ODA documented and accessible to all stakeholders
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: International Development Cooperation

<b>Strategic Objective 3.6 Coordination of intergovernmental relations</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 3.6</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of budget council meetings held</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Meetings held to ensure fiscal relations coordination between the three spheres of government
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Effectively coordinate fiscal relations between the three spheres of government and promote sound financial planning, reporting and management
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Attendance registers
<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>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Coordinated fiscal relations between the three spheres of government and promote sound financial planning, reporting and management
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Intergovernmental Relations



<b>Performance Indicator no 3.6.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of Division of Revenue and Division of Revenue Amendment Bills published annually</b>
<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>	Bi-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

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.6.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of reforms introduced to enhance provincial and local government fiscal frameworks</b>
<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>	Simple count of 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>	No
<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

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.6.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of plans assessed to support improvements in infrastructure planning in provinces</b>
<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>	Simple count of number of plans assessed
<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>	None
<b>Desired performance</b>	A total of 36 Infrastructure plans assessed (user asset management plans and infrastructure programme management plans) to ensure that there is an improvement in planning by provincial departments implementing infrastructure programmes and projects.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Provincial and Local Government Infrastructure

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.6.4</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of built environment performance plans assessed to support improvement in the built environment</b>
<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>	Non-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

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.6.5</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of capacity building initiatives (workshops and courses) to facilitate improved planning, budgeting and financial management</b>
<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 2017 Division of Revenue Bill, Infrastructure, the Business Planning Process and Performance Evaluation for 2016/17 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>• 2017 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>	Simple count of number of capacity building initiatives (workshops and courses)
<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>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<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

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.6.6</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of quarterly financial reports produced and published to comply with section 32 of the PFMA</b>
<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>	Simple count of 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>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Target is 4 per year. More will not be an improvement
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Provincial Budget Analysis

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.6.7</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of provincial and municipal budgeting benchmarking exercises held to improve provincial and municipal budget credibility, composition and achievability</b>
<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>	Simple count of number of benchmarking exercises conducted
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Outcomes
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Delivery, credibility and achievability of provincial budgets
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Provincial Budget Analysis

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.6.8</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of reports published in terms of MFMA and DoRA</b>
<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>	Simple count 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>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Consolidation of standing indicators from previous year
<b>Desired performance</b>	Timeous publication
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: LGBA



<b>Performance Indicator no 3.6.9</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of support initiatives implemented in provinces</b>
<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>	Simple count of number of initiatives
<b>Data limitation</b>	Timeous submission of progress reports
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activities
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<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

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.6.10</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of municipal budgeting and reporting reforms implemented</b>
<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>	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.

<b>Performance Indicator no 3.6.11</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of provincial and municipal mid-year budget and expenditure performance assessment reports published</b>
<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 for provincial and local municipalities respectively
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	In fulfilment of legal requirements in terms of the PFMA, DoRA and MFMA regarding budget assessments and monitoring
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Through annual budget returns submitted by provinces and municipalities as well as reports submitted by Transferring Officers, NT initiative through the analysis of MFMA Section 40 monthly reports on provinces, DoRA section 10 reports and MFMA section 71 monthly reports on municipalities' overall performance
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of assessment reports
<b>Data limitation</b>	Availability and accuracy of information in the monthly and quarterly reports submitted by provinces and municipalities and TNOs
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Consolidation of standing indicators from previous year
<b>Desired performance</b>	Timeous publication
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: LGBA

<b>Programme 4</b>
--------------------

**Strategic Objective 4.1****Minimise and mitigate risks emanating from Government's fiscal obligations****Performance Indicator no 4.4.1**

Indicator title	Percentage compliance with 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>	<p>All Risk Indicators should be below or within their limits or ranges as approved by Minister:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Share of short-term debt maturing in 12 months (Treasury bills) as a percentage of total domestic debt [15%]</li> <li>• Share of long-term maturing in 5-years as a percentage of fixed rate bonds and inflation linked bonds [25%]</li> <li>• Share of inflation-linked bonds as a percentage of total domestic debt [20-25%]</li> <li>• Share of foreign debt as a percentage of total government debt</li> <li>• Weighted term-to-maturity (fixed rate bonds and Treasury bills in years) [10-14]</li> <li>• Weighted term-to-maturity (inflation-linked bonds in years) [14-17]</li> </ul> <p><u>Number of risk indicators within their limits or ranges x100</u></p> <p>Total number of risk indicators</p>
<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>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Below percentage thresholds and within percentage ranges
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Strategy and Risk Management

<b>Performance Indicator no 4.1.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of corporate plans of Schedule 2 and 3B SOC's, development finance institutions (DFIs) and water boards (WBs) received and reviewed within four months of receipt</b>
<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>	$\frac{\text{Number of corporate plans of schedule 2 and 3 B SOC's, DFIs and water boards reviewed within 4 months}}{\text{Total number of corporate plans of Schedule 2 and 3B SOC's, DFIs and water boards received}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Late submission of 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> </ul>
<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>	Reviewed all corporate plans within the stipulated timeframes: 100% (the higher the better)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Governance and Financial Analysis

<b>Performance Indicator no 4.1.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of annual reports of Schedule 2 and 3B SOC's, DFI's and WB's received and reviewed within four months of receipt</b>
<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, DFI's 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, DFI's and water boards received
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of annual reports of schedule 2 and 3 B SOC's, DFI's and water boards reviewed within 4 months}}{\text{Total number of annual reports of Schedule 2 and 3B SOC's, DFI's and water boards received}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Late submission of annual reports SOC's, DFI &amp; WB's</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
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<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

<b>Performance Indicator no 4.1.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of annual reports and corporate plans received from Schedule 2 and 3B SOC's reporting to NT (SAA, PIC, DBSA, Land Bank, Sasria) tabled in Parliament within the required timescale(30 September each year)</b>
<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 30 September refers to both the tabling of Corporate Plans and Annual Reports whilst noting that the Corporate Plans are submitted at the end of February of the previous financial year.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<u>Number of annual reports and corporate plans of schedule 2 and 3 B SOC's, 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 SOC's</li> <li>• Executive Authority may require amendments to the Corporate Plans which may result in delays</li> </ul>
<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>	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

<b>Performance Indicator no 4.1.4</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of complete PFMA Section 54(2), 52, 55 and 92 applications received from Schedule 2 and 3B SOC's, DFIs and WBs reviewed within stipulated timeframes.</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Review all applications within the required timeframe, Section 54(2) must be reviewed within 30 days, and section 52, 55 and 92 must be reviewed with 4 months.
<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>	$\frac{\text{Number of complete applications reviewed within stipulated timeframes}}{\text{Total number of complete applications received}} \times 100$
<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>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<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



<b>Performance Indicator no 4.1.5</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of funding applications received from Schedule 2 and 3B SOC's, DFIs and WBs reviewed within stipulated timeframes.</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Review the funding applications – the applications must be reviewed within 30 days of receipt and presented to the next Fiscal Liability Committee (FLC). After the FLC the applications must be signed off by the DDG within three weeks.
<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>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<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>	<b>Percentage of complete guarantee applications received from Schedule 2 and 3B SOC's, DFIs and WBs reviewed within stipulated timeframes.</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Review the funding applications – the applications must be reviewed within 30 days of receipt and presented to the next Fiscal Liability Committee (FLC). After the FLC the applications must be signed off by the DDG within three weeks.
<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>	$\frac{\text{Number of applications for guarantees reviewed within stipulated timeframes}}{\text{Number of applications for guarantees received}} \times 100$
<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>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Reviewed all applications within the stipulated timeframes: 100% (the higher the better)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Sector Oversight

<b>Performance Indicator no 4.1.7</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of MFMA submissions relating to tariff adjustments received from Schedule 2 and 3B SOC's and WBs reviewed within stipulated timeframes.</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Submissions must be reviewed within 40 working days
<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>	$\frac{\text{Number of submissions reviewed within stipulated timeframes} \times 100}{\text{Number of submissions received}}$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Delayed on not received MFMA submissions relating to tariff adjustments received from Schedule 2 and 3B SOC's and WBs.
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output and activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Reviewed all submission within the stipulated timeframes: 100% (the higher the better)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Sector Oversight

<b>Performance Indicator no 4.1.8</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of reviews requested of legislation, policies and strategies impacting on Schedule 2 and 3B SOC's, DFIs and WBs conducted within stipulated timeframes</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Reviewing legislation, policies and strategies impacting on schedule 2 and 3B SOC's and provide feedback on the review within 2 months.
<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>	Output and activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<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

<b>Performance Indicator no 4.1.9</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of report on the review of schedule 2 and 3B SOCs, DFIs and WBs remuneration</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	<p>Review schedule 2 and 3B remuneration and provide a feedback on the outcome of the review</p> <p>Schedule 2 and 3B remuneration reviews must be done within 2 months (1 October - 31 December)</p> <p>WBs remuneration reviews must be done within 2 months (1 December - 31 January)</p>
<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>	$\frac{\text{Number of submissions reviewed}}{\text{Number of submissions received}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Late submission by entities
<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>	Complete the review
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director Governance and Financial Analysis

<b>Performance Indicator no 4.1.10</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of reports on the review of schedule 2 Board composition</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Assessing schedule 2 Board composition for compliance with corporate governance prescripts Assessment must be conducted within 3 months
<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>	$\frac{\text{Number of reviews of board composition}}{\text{Number of requests received}} \times 100$
<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>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Assessment of all schedule 2 board compositions for compliance with corporate governance prescripts
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director Governance and Financial Analysis

<b>Performance Indicator 4.1.11</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage completion of the NT Best Practice guidelines</b>
<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 The document has 3 sections
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Sections completed}}{\text{Total Sections}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Willingness of other organizations to share information
<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>	Review literature on best practice and updated the existing guidelines
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director Governance and Financial Analysis

<b>Performance Indicator no 4.1.12</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage completion of reviews of borrowing limit applications relating to schedule 2 and 3B SOC's, DFIs and WBs received with complete information and within stipulated timeframes</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Review schedule 2, 3B, SOC's, DFIs and WBs borrowing limit applications. Review the funding applications – the applications must be reviewed within 30 days of receipt and presented to the next Fiscal Liability Committee (FLC). After the FLC the applications must be signed off by the DDG within three weeks.
<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>	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>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<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



<b>Strategic Objective 4.2</b>	
<b>Optimal debt management and funding of government borrowing requirement</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 4.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Optimal debt management and funding of government borrowing requirement</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Fund government's annual borrowing requirements through various debt instruments
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Government's funding requirement to be met while ensuring that debt service costs remain sustainable
<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>	$\frac{\text{Government's annual gross borrowing requirement met (financed)}}{\text{Government's annual borrowing requirement targeted}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accurate revenue and expenditure forecasts</li> <li>• Market conditions</li> </ul>
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Oversight of all state-owned companies to enable them to achieve government's policy objectives
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	DDG: Asset and Liability Management

Performance Indicator no 4.2.1	
Indicator title	Percentage of government's annual gross borrowing requirement met
Short definition	Fund government's annual borrowing requirements through various debt instruments
Purpose/importance	Ensure that sufficient funds are available to meet government commitments
Source/collection of data	Annual gross borrowing requirement is sourced from the Budget tabled annually by the Minister of Finance
Method of calculation	Gross borrowing requirement is the sum of revenue, expenditure and debt due for repayment $\frac{\text{Government's annual gross borrowing requirement met (financed)}}{\text{Government's annual borrowing requirement targeted}} \times 100$
Data limitation	Accurate revenue and expenditure forecasts Market conditions
Type of indicator	Outcome
Calculation type	Non-Cumulative
Reporting cycle	Quarterly
New indicator	No
Desired performance	Meeting the annual borrowing requirement amount
Indicator responsibility	Chief Directorate: Liability Management

Performance Indicator no 4.2.2	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of interest and redemptions met</b>
<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>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non- Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<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

<b>Strategic Objective 4.3</b>	
<b>Ensure sound management of government's cash resources</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 4.3.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of government's liquidity requirements met</b>
<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> <p>Must maintain a positive actual closing balance</p>
<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>	Fully funded exchequer account (National Revenue account
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Financial Operations

<b>Strategic Objective 4.1</b>	
<b>Minimise and mitigate risks emanating from Government's fiscal obligations</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 4.4.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage compliance with market and refinancing risks benchmarks</b>
<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/Stats SA: 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>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Below percentage thresholds and within percentage ranges
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Strategy and Risk Management

## Programme 5

<b>Strategic Objective 5.1</b>	
<b>Improve financial management governance and Compliance across all spheres and entities in Government, giving effect to the PFMA and MFMA</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 5.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of financial management regulations, instructions, circulars, policies, guidelines and tools published</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Publish financial management regulations, instructions, circulars, policies, guidelines and tools
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Improve financial management governance and compliance across all spheres and entities in government, giving effect to the PFMA and MFMA
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	National Treasury website
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<u>Number of regulations, instructions, circulars, policies, guidelines and tools published X 100</u> Number of instructions, circulars, policies, guidelines and tools developed
<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>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Published Treasury Regulations, Instructions, Circulars, policies, guidelines and tools
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Governance Monitoring and Compliance

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.1.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of institutions work-shopped on IA and risk management guidelines</b>
<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 indicating the institutions they are representing
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of institutions work-shopped
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<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

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.1.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of assessments conducted of IA and state of readiness for quality assurance reviews and adoption of best practices to assess compliance with PFMA, MFMA and international professional practice standards</b>
<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 of assessment reports issued
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<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



<b>Performance Indicator no 5.1.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of institutions whose Audit Committees have been provided with support</b>
<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 presentations,
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of institutions supported
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Provide support to AC in institutions
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Internal Audit Support

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.1.4</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of knowledge sharing forums in internal audit and risk management facilitated through formal platforms</b>
<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 providing information on the logistics of the knowledge forum
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of knowledge forums
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<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

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.1.5</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of support plans developed for government entities struggling at lower levels of IA implementation as in the Financial Management Capability Maturity Model (FMCMM)</b>
<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 plans
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of support plans
<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>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	6 Institutions
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate Internal Audit Support

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.1.6</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of Public Sector Officials trained in risk management</b>
<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 of risk management training provided
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of trained officials
<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>	Trained officials gained knowledge and understanding of risk management
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Risk Management

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.1.7</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of institutions of higher learning work-shopped on the risk management curriculum</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Providing work-shops on Risks Management Curriculum
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that learning institutions reflect the guide on public sector risk management in their Risks Management Curriculum
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Attendance registers signed by officials attending the workshops indicating the institutions they are representing
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of higher learning institutions work-shopped.
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Learning Institutions are introduced to the guide on public sector risk management for adoption into their curriculum
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Risk Management

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.1.8</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of monitoring improvement of financial management in national and provincial institutions reports produced</b>
<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 of number national and provincial institutions reports produced
<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>	Quarterly
<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

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.1.9</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of guidelines to assist with the implementation of Treasury Regulations, policies and Treasury Instruction developed</b>
<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>	Simple count of number of guidelines developed
<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>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Published Treasury Regulations, Treasury Instruction and guidelines
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Governance Monitoring and Compliance

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.1.10</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of information sessions provided to support PFMA institutions on the implementation of Treasury Regulations, Treasury Instructions and guidelines</b>
<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 ad-hoc request from PFMA Compliant institutions
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of information sessions provided
<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>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Conducted all information sessions planned for the period
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Governance Monitoring and Compliance



<b>Performance Indicator no 5.1.11.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>FMCMM model revised</b>
<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/check if there is a web based model
<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>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Web-based FMCMM model
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : Governance Monitoring and Compliance

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.1.11.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>FMCMM Model revised</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Conduct an FMCMM model assessment
<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 an FMCMM model assessment conducted
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count/check if an assessment was conducted
<b>Data limitation</b>	Lack of funds to conduct a model assessment
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	FMCMM assessment conducted
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : Governance Monitoring and Compliance

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.1.12</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of forensic investigations conducted and special performance audit reports produced</b>
<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 of number of reports produced
<b>Data limitation</b>	Political interference. Distraction of documentation.
<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>	Completing the number of investigations as contemplated in the Annual Performance Plan
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Specialised Audit Services

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.1.13</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of cases referred and advisory services provided to Law Enforcement Agencies/ Anti-corruption Task Team for criminal investigation</b>
<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 of cases referred and advisory services offered
<b>Data limitation</b>	Law enforcement agencies documents. Top secret/ classified information Confidentiality of information. Leakage of documentation.
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<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

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.1.14</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of engagements held with public officials to address compliance and implementation of regulations, instructions and guidelines in a coordinated and consistent manner</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Enable financial management capacity building through engagements with public officials in a meeting on how to implement and be compliant with the regulations instructions and guidelines in order to ensure a coordinated and consistent application
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that there is a common understanding of and consistent application of regulations, instructions and guidelines
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Attendance registers signed by officials attending the meeting
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of engagements held
<b>Data limitation</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Consistent implementation and compliance to regulations, instructions and guideline
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Internal Audit Support Chief Directorate: Risk Management

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.1.15</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>No of financial management assessment tools modules for local government either developed, updated or maintained</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	The financial management assessment tools modules are designed to assess and improve the level of financial management maturity and capabilities within municipalities
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	The model undertakes baseline assessments to gauge progress by municipalities and municipal entities towards sound financial management practices since the MFMA was implemented and to provide information to guide possible improvements required by municipalities.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Database of FMCMM modules
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of modules developed / updated
<b>Data limitation</b>	Data dependent on feedback from municipalities reassessed
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	The upgrade and development of FMCMM modules
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : MFMA Implementation

<b>Performance Indicator no. 5.1.16</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of financial management grant support plans reviewed for alignment with grant framework for municipalities</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Review of the FMG support plans submitted by municipalities to ascertain how funds will be spent and to note alignment with the conditions of the grant as per the grant framework.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	The Division of Revenue Act requires the national transferring officer of a schedule 5 (b) conditional grant to monitor the grant to ensure compliance with the grant conditions and framework.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	List of FMG support plans received and reviewed
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number support plans reviewed}}{\text{Total number of support plans received from municipalities}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Late submission of the support plan will delay the review process
<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>	The review of FMG support plans for all municipalities
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : MFMA Implementation

<b>Performance Indicator no. 5.1.17</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of days taken to respond to requests to draft financial recovery plans from receiving the request</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Assist with the preparation of a financial recovery plan when a request is received
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	A financial recovery plan may assist in the resolution of financial problems at a municipality as per the MFMA.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Tracking register of municipalities assisted with the preparation of the financial recovery plans
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of days taken to respond to requests
<b>Data limitation</b>	Late submission of relevant information by municipalities to commence with the preparation of the financial recovery plans
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Preparation of a financial recovery plan for the affected municipalities
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : MFMA Implementation



<b>Performance Indicator no. 5.1.18</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of requests to the MFMA helpdesk responded to within 30 days of receipt of request</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Manage the MFMA helpdesk, which assists municipalities, municipal entities and all other stakeholders to interpret and implement the MFMA, Regulations, MFMA Circulars and Guidelines within 30 days
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	The MFMA helpdesk assists with the interpretation of the MFMA, the regulations, Circulars and Guidelines. This helps to ensure consistent countrywide application of the Act and its regulations. The helpdesk also assists NT to identify gaps in the implementation of the legal framework and to address these through MFMA Circulars, Regulations or Guidelines, as may be appropriate.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Tracking register for all queries received on the helpdesk
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of requests responded to within 30 days} \times 100}{\text{Total number of requests received}}$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Delays in receiving inputs from relevant units within NT
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Respond to all queries raised on the helpdesk within 30 days
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : MFMA Implementation

<b>Performance Indicator no. 5.1.19</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of municipalities assisted in addressing gaps as identified by FMCMM and financial indicator assessments</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	The FMCMM and financial indicator assessments undertaken at municipalities identified shortcomings in the processes, procedures and systems to effectively implement the MFMA and supporting regulations. NT to strategise and assist municipalities in addressing the identified areas of concern.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Improve the level of financial management maturity and capabilities within municipalities
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	List of municipalities assisted
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of municipalities assisted
<b>Data limitation</b>	Delays in receiving action plans from municipalities on interventions to be taken in addressing shortcomings from the assessment
<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>	Assisted the targeted number of municipalities in addressing shortcomings identified in the FMCMM and financial indicator assessments
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : MFMA Implementation

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.1.20</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of municipalities with the highest UIFW incurred annually monitored to rectify such expenditure in terms of the MFMA</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Provide guidance to municipalities on how to address UIFW expenditure
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To reduce UIFW expenditure incurred by municipalities
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Progress reports by highest municipal contributors of UIFW expenditure
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of municipalities assisted
<b>Data limitation</b>	Late submission of relevant information by municipalities to monitor processes and progress made in addressing UIFW expenditure
<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>	Monitored highest municipal contributors of UIFW expenditure
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : MFMA Implementation

<b>Strategic Objective 5.2</b>	
<b>Support and facilitate capacity development across all Spheres of government in order to improve financial Management execution</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator 5.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of planned capacity development initiatives implemented</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	To support and facilitate capacity development across all spheres of government in order to improve financial management execution
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To research, develop and implement interventions that contribute to improved public finance management (PFM) capacity, capability and performance in all three spheres of government, through institutional, organisational, individual and stakeholder development.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Attendance registers
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of planned capacity development initiatives implemented}}{\text{Total number of capacity development initiatives planned for implementation}} \times 100$
<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>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Trained Officials
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Accounting Support and Reporting Chief Director: Capacity Building Chief Directorate: Specialised Audit Services

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.2.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of officials trained in the preparation of provincial consolidated financial statements, provincial revenue fund statements and implementation of generally recognised accounting practices (GRAP) standards</b>
<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 of attendees
<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>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Trained Officials
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Accounting Support and Reporting

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.2.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of timely and accurate monthly statements reports of actual revenue and actual expenditure published for the National Revenue Fund (NRF)</b>
<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 of monthly statements
<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>	Reports published every month in the Government Gazette
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Accounting Support and Reporting

Performance Indicator no 5.2.3	
Indicator title	<p>Percentage compliance with the banking services for national government:</p> <p><b>Daily bank reconciliation of NRF.</b></p> <p><b>Electronic verification of supplier banking details within four working days</b></p>
Short definition	Assist departments with electronic verification of banking details and payments, and provide a daily bank statement reflecting all payments and receipts
Purpose/importance	Need to provide a bank statement daily to interface with ledger. Departments can then follow up on exceptions and perform bank reconciliations.
Source/collection of data	<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>
Method of calculation	<p><u>(Number of daily bank reconciliations of NRF conducted + number of of supplier banking details verified) X 100</u></p> <p>(Number of daily bank reconciliation of NRF to be conducted + number of of supplier banking details to be verified)</p>
Data limitation	None
Type of indicator	Output
Calculation type	Non-cumulative
Reporting cycle	Quarterly
New indicator	No
Desired performance	<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>
Indicator responsibility	Chief Director: Accounting Support and Reporting

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.2.4</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of consolidated annual financial statements for national departments, public entities and Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) Fund tabled on 31 October</b>
<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 of number of consolidated annual financial statements
<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



<b>Performance Indicator no 5.2.5</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of the public financial management education, training and development implementation plan achieved.</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Research, develop and pilot the delivery of the public financial management education, training and development solutions.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	The development of PFM ETD solutions that have specific relevance to the public sector in order to support the development of a cadre of high performance officials
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	ETD solutions and project reports
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of PFM ETD solutions implemented}}{\text{Number of PFM ETD solutions planned}} \times 100$
<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>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	PFM ETD solutions developed and piloted as per the PFM ETD implementation plan
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Capacity Building

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.2.6</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of municipal officials trained in financial management competencies.</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Provide training that enables municipal officials to comply with the financial management competency requirements of their positions, in alignment with the municipal regulations
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Promote compliance with required financial management minimum 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 central learner management database
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of municipal officials trained
<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>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Provide training for at least 1000 learners per year
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Capacity Building

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.2.7</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of the public financial management capacity development strategy (CDS) implementation plan achieved.</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Perform activities that support the achievement of the objectives of the CDS as defined in the annual CDS implementation plan
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	The CDS provides a holistic, systemic and integrated approach to addressing the capacity constraints across government in order to achieve excellence in the management of public funds
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity Development Strategy implementation plan</li> <li>• Reports on progress made on the implementation plan</li> </ul>
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{CDS implementation plan activities implemented}}{\text{CDS implementation plan activities due for implementation}} \times 100$
<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>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Capacity Development Strategy implementation plan activities implemented according to the implementation plan
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Capacity Building

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.2.8</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of qualifying trainees that participate in the academic support programme for prospective chartered accountants</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	The programme is intended to provide academic support to CA Trainees pursuing the chartered accountants profession
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To contribute to addressing the shortage of financial management skills within the public sector
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	A list of participants in the CA academic support programme
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<u>Number of qualifying candidates participating in the academic support programme X 100</u> Total number of qualifying candidates
<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>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Support provided to the target number of CA Trainees
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Capacity Building

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.2.9</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of municipalities monitored to comply with minimum competencies regulations for financial management</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	As part of ensuring good financial management is practiced by municipalities, municipalities will be monitored to ensure that they comply with the minimum competencies regulations for financial management
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Good financial management is a challenge at local government hence interventions to address compliance with good financial management is a priority for local government
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Compliance Reports
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of municipalities monitored
<b>Data limitation</b>	Late submission of relevant information by municipalities to monitor processes and progress made
<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>	Municipalities comply with minimum competencies regulations for financial management
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: Internal Audit Support Chief Directorate: Risk Management

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.2.10</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of municipalities that received disclaimers and adverse opinions prioritized by NT and PT for support</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Strengthening of governance
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Efficient, effective and economic use of resources
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Auditor-General's reports
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	none
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Reduction in the number of findings
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	CD Internal Audit Support

<b>Strategic Objective 5.3</b>	
<b>Manage existing financial systems and renew these as required to exercise comprehensive financial management</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 5.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage alignment of financial management systems to regulations, policies and instructions</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Manage existing financial systems and renew these as required to exercise comprehensive financial management
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Maintain existing financial systems including the provision of reliable, efficient and effective support and user training over the medium term
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Call centre logs, mainframe audit trails and other formal user requests
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<u>Number of financial management systems aligned to regulations, policies and instructions x 100</u> Total number of financial management systems
<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>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Maintain 98 percent availability of systems during working hours
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : Financial Systems

Performance Indicator no 5.3.1	
Indicator title	Percentage Availability of current transversal systems
Short definition	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
Purpose/importance	Ensure that transversal financial management systems continue to operate within agreed parameters
Source/collection of data	Call centre logs, mainframe audit trails and other formal user requests
Method of calculation	$\frac{\text{Number of normal working days} - \text{number of normal working days mainframe was unavailable}}{\text{Number of normal working days}} \times 100$
Data limitation	None
Type of indicator	Output and efficiency
Calculation type	Non-cumulative
Reporting cycle	Quarterly
New indicator	No
Desired performance	Maintain 98 percent availability of systems during working hours or in line with SLA with service provider
Indicator responsibility	Chief Directorate : Financial Systems



<b>Performance Indicator no 5.3.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of generic solution configuration templates completed</b>
<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>	Simple count of number of generic solution configuration templates completed
<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>	Single Global Template for PSA departments
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : IFMS

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.3.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of IFMS comprehensive implementation strategies published</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	To facilitate full implementation, IFMS implementation strategies will be published
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To support the complete implementation of IFMS
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Published IFMS implementation strategies
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of IFMS comprehensive implementation strategies published
<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>	IFMS implementation
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate : IFMS

<b>Strategic Objective 5.4</b>	
<b>Modernise SCM policies and procedures</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 5.4</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of revise SCM Process and Procedures published</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Modernise SCM policies and procedures
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Comprehensive review of SCM policies to ensure a simplified and modernised SCM environment in government, including the amendment of processes and procedures in line with the revised policies
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Research reports from the dti and input from Economic Policy
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of revise SCM Process and Procedures published} \times 100}{\text{Total number of SCM Process and Procedures revised}}$
<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>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Instructions issued after taking into account relevant economic factors
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: SCM Policy and Legal

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.4.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of Instructions issued in line with policy interventions and proposed designated products or categories to enhance SCM Policy</b>
<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 of number of Instructions issued
<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
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Instructions issued after taking into account relevant economic factors
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: SCM Policy and Legal

<b>Strategic Objective 5.5</b>	
<b>Monitor and evaluate SCM performance</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 5.5</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of SCM performance monitoring reports published on the website</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Monitor and evaluate SCM performance
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Exercise oversight over SCM policies, procedures, norms and standards. This will entail oversight of: Published procurement plans Published deviations and contract expansions Bid specifications and procurement plans against SCM policies and procedures Bid evaluation and adjudication to ensure compliance with evaluation criteria/scoring Implementation of projects against contract specifications and conditions of tender
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data is obtained from the departments/ entities</li> </ul>
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of SCM performance monitoring reports published on the website}}{\text{Total number of SCM performance monitoring reports concluded}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Only the information received from the departments and public entities is published
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Oversight over SCM policies, procedures, norms and standards to ensure compliance with evaluation criteria/scoring Implementation of projects against contract specifications and conditions of tender
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Process owner: Chief Director: SCM – GMC Managing and reporting Directorate: Monitoring and Compliance

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.5.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of Departments' / Entities' quarterly performance information reports reviewed in terms of variations and deviations</b>
<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>	$\frac{\text{Number of deviation/expansion reviewed}}{\text{Number of deviation/ expansion received}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Data received can be published
<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>	That the procurement through deviations/ variations be reduced
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: SCM – Governance Monitoring Compliance

Performance Indicator no 5.5.2	
Indicator title	Percentage of procurement plans published on the e-tender portal
Short definition	Procurement plans published to ensure transparent and highlight business possible opportunities.
Purpose/importance	To notify public on business opportunities available from various state institutions.
Source/collection of data	Procurement plans
Method of calculation	$\frac{\text{Number of procurement plans published on the e-tender portal}}{\text{Number of procurement plans received}} \times 100$
Data limitation	Only the information received from the departments and public entities is published
Type of indicator	Output
Calculation type	Non-cumulative
Reporting cycle	Quarterly
New indicator	No
Desired performance	Business to take advantage of the business opportunities
Indicator responsibility	Process owner : Chief Director: SCM – GMC Managing and reporting : SCM Governance

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.5.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of bid specifications reviewed for alignment with policy and other applicable procurement instructions</b>
<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>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Review all bid specifications received
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Process owner: Chief Director: SCM – GMC Managing and reporting Directorate: Monitoring and Compliance



<b>Performance Indicator no 5.5.4</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of bid evaluation and adjudications reviewed to ensure compliance with the criteria/ scoring specified in bidding documents.</b>
<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>	$\frac{\text{Number of reviewed bid evaluation and adjudication (Minutes)}}{100} \times \text{Total number of bid evaluation and adjudication received}$
<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>	Non-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

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.5.5</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of contracts awarded reviewed to verify if contract delivery is in line with the specifications.</b>
<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>	$\frac{\text{Number of contracts reviewed}}{\text{Total number of contracts received}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Long turnaround times if clients do not respond on time on queries raised
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Compliance with ToR, SLA and specifications
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Process Owner: Chief Director: SCM - GMC Managing and reporting Directorate: Monitoring and Compliance

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.5.6</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of projects visited to verify if the delivery of awarded contracts is aligned with the contract conditions</b>
<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>	$\frac{\text{Projects verified}}{\text{Projects identified}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Delay in confirmation from 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>	Ensure that goods, services and works delivered are compliant to the specifications
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Process Owner: Chief Director: SCM - GMC Managing and reporting Directorate: Monitoring and Compliance

<b>Strategic Objective 5.6</b>	
<b><i>Develop and implement strategic procurement</i></b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 5.6</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Strategy for strategic procurement implemented</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Develop and implement strategic procurement
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Implementation of a strategic procurement framework, guidelines and tools in order to contribute to efficient and effective procurement by expanding centre-led contracting for common goods and service
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	From stakeholders
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count – Strategy for strategic procurement developed
<b>Data limitation</b>	Fragmented data sources
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Optimise performance, minimise costs, improve access to business opportunities in line with B-BEEE policy and increase value per rand spent
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	OCPO: CD-Strategic Procurement

<b>Indicator 5.6.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of proposals for strategic sourcing opportunities</b>
<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 of number of proposals
<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>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Higher than targeted performance
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	OCPO: CD-Strategic Procurement

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.6.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of sourcing strategies for identified commodities/ Procurement categories developed</b>
<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 of number of sourcing strategies developed
<b>Data limitation</b>	Fragmented data sources Lack of standardised procurement reporting
<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>	Reduced expenditure; improved service delivery; improved supplier performance
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	OCPO: CD-Strategic Procurement

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.6.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of sourcing strategies for identified commodities/ Procurement categories implemented</b>
<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 of number of sourcing strategies implemented
<b>Data limitation</b>	Fragmented data sources Lack of standardised procurement reporting
<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>	Reduced expenditure; improved service delivery; improved supplier performance
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	OCPO: CD-Strategic Procurement

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.6.4</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of on-boarding, monitoring and benefits tracking on sourcing strategies</b>
<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 of number of on-boarding, monitoring and benefits tracking on sourcing strategies
<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>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Reduced expenditure; improved service delivery; improved supplier performance
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	OCPO: CD-Strategic Procurement



<b>Performance Indicator no 5.6.5</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of transversal term contracts renewed per annum for National Procurement</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	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. A national procurement system refers to expansion of the present portfolio of transversal contracts to include various commodities purchased routinely by departments.
<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 of number of transversal term contracts
<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>	Maintain and establish transversal term contracts that achieve value for money and improved service delivery
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Transversal Contracts

Performance Indicator no 5.6.6	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of procurement spend reports published</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Procurement spend information gathered from various sources, cleaned up, mapped, analysed, visualised and reported.
<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 of number of procurement spend reports published
<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>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Quality and accurate data and reporting
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	OCPO: CD-Strategic Procurement

<b>Strategic Objective 5.7</b>	
<b>Build and strengthen stakeholder relations</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 5.7</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Build and strengthen stakeholder relations</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Provide an environment for SCM engagements and for support to stakeholders/clients
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To provide stakeholders with information necessary to engage with government and inter-governmental structures will be supported 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 – Develop stakeholder engagement model
<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>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Developed stakeholder engagement model
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Stakeholders & Clients Management

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.7.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of external stakeholder engagements held</b>
<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>	To provide stakeholders with information necessary to engage with government and inter-governmental structures will be supported 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>	$\frac{\text{Number of engagements held} \times 100}{\text{Number of planned engagements}}$
<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>	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 5.7.2	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of departments and entities supported on supply chain</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	<p>The Stakeholders &amp; Clients management is responsible for setting up an email facility and a walk in centre to facilitate the payment of suppliers by Departments, Constitutional Institutions, and Public Entities listed in Schedule 2 and 3, within 30 days from receipt of an invoice.</p> <p>It also provides support to inter-governmental structures on the SCM related issues.</p>
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure payment of suppliers through facilitation and implementation of Instruction Note 5 of 2016/17.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Queries lodge by affected service providers
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of departments and entities supported
<b>Data limitation</b>	Contracts entered into without following prescribed procurement processes
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Ensure that department comply and adhere to the 30 day payment instruction note
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Stakeholders & Clients Management

<b>Strategic Objective 5.8</b>	
<b>Modernise and automate SCM processes</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 5.8</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>e-Procurement implemented</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Modernise and automate SCM processes
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Modernise ICT to improve SCM performance and reduce the amount of paper used in processing transactions
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Solution maintained by the OCPO's SCM ICT and policy guidelines will be used for the implementation of the solution.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count – Develop e-procurement
<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>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Modernise and automate SCM processes
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	National Treasury OCPO: Chief Directorate SCM ICT

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.8.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of departments enabled on an centralised electronic quotation system</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Develop an efficient way of allowing request for quotations and submission of quotations to be facilitated electronically thus improving efficiency.
<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>	Solution maintained by the OCPO's SCM ICT and policy guidelines will be used for the implementation of the solution.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of departments
<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>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Enable better SCM performance and efficiency
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	National Treasury OCPO: Chief Directorate SCM ICT

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.8.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of tenders submitted on an electronic tendering platform for transversal contracts</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Develop an efficient way of conducting commercial transactions online on the world wide web, to reduce time of processing tenders.
<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>	Solution maintained by the OCPO's SCM ICT and policy guidelines will be used for the implementation of the solution.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of tenders
<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>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Enable better SCM performance
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	National Treasury OCPO: Chief Directorate SCM ICT



Performance Indicator no 5.8.3	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of contract management solution developed and implemented</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Develop an efficient way of managing supply chain management contracts through an easily accessible means over the internet
<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>	The solution will be maintained by the OCPO's SCM ICT
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of contract management solution developed and implemented
<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>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Enable better SCM performance
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	National Treasury OCPO: Chief Directorate SCM ICT

<b>Performance Indicator no 5.8.4</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of business processes defined for SCM stream of IFMS</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Compiled business processes to be implemented on the IFMS SCM module
<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>	The solution will be maintained by the OCPO's SCM ICT
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of business processes
<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>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Enable better SCM performance
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	National Treasury OCPO: Chief Directorate SCM ICT

---

**Programme 6**
**Strategic Objective 6.1**

**Advance South Africa's interests specifically, and those of Africa more generally, through regular strategic analysis, engagements and negotiations at regional and global financial and economic forums**

**Performance Indicator no 6.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of initiatives conducted to advance South Africa's interests specifically, and those of Africa more generally</b>
<b>Short Definition</b>	Assessing the content and context of current policy debates and expanding awareness of them and managing the relationship between South Africa and selected public finance and development institutions, with particular focus on implementation of agreements
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Advance South Africa's interests specifically, and those of Africa more generally, through regular strategic analysis, engagements and negotiations at regional and global financial and economic forums
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reports or minutes on intervention, linked directly to the increased presence at the particular institutions
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of initiatives
<b>Data limitation</b>	Evidence that refers to documents that are confidential or secret and not for public consumption
<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>	Actual decisions / votes / policy positions / changes in processes that benefit SA
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: African Economic Integration Chief Directorate: Multilateral Development Banks and Concessional Finance Chief Directorate: Global and Emerging Markets

<b>Indicator 6.1.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of obligations towards international agreements met monitored</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Ensuring monitoring of the meeting of obligations arising from the international agreements that National Treasury is party to. 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 complies with, and is able to demonstrate such compliance, to international agreements that the National Treasury is party to.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Relevant international agreements. Through an obligation monitoring register that will include the following: Name of agreement; List of obligations; Status of obligations; Remedial action taken if appropriate, Document evidence reference
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of obligations towards international agreements met monitored}}{\text{Number of obligations towards international agreements}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Evidence that refers to documents that are confidential or secret and not for public consumption. International Agreements only refers to those international agreements that the National Treasury is party to.
<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>	Contributed and supported the implementation of all relevant 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

Performance Indicator no 6.1.2	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage response to customer requests on mandatory briefing notes and analysis</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	<p>A briefing note contains the facts, detailed information and/or a country position that should be used as a guide for a particular meeting.</p> <p>Analyses refer to the synthesis of data in a manner that draws indications, inferences or bases for recommendations.</p> <p>Mandatory refers to customer requests either received in respect of meetings or as determined by the agenda of the designated meetings, including but not limited to the following organisations: SADC, SACU, AU, ARF, G20; BRICS, WB&amp;IMF, AfDB, OECD, WEF, WEF AFRICA, IDA, ADF, PARIS CLUB, Financing for Climate Change, Financing for Development and Sustainable Developed Goals, UNECA, G24, Commonwealth</p> <p>Customers includes but is not limited to the Minister of Finance, Director-General of National Treasury, Presidency</p>
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To further the interests of South Africa by influencing the agenda, proceedings and outcomes of meetings.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Analysis and briefs on current issues are compiled by the relevant Chief Directorates within IREP. Requests and responses are recorded in registers within the relevant Chief Directorates.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of customer requests responded to}}{\text{Total number of customer requestss}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Evidence that refers to documents that are confidential or secret and not for public consumption
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Responded to all requests by customers
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	<p>Chief Directorate: Global and Emerging Markets</p> <p>Chief Directorates: Multilateral Development Banks and Concessional Finance</p> <p>Chief Directorate: Country and Thematic Analysis</p> <p>Chief Directorate: African Economic Integration</p>

Performance Indicator no 6.1.3	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage response to customer requests on ad-hoc briefing notes and analysis</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	<p>A briefing note contains the facts, detailed information and/or a country position that should be used as a guide for a particular meeting.</p> <p>Analyses refer to the synthesis of data in a manner that draws indications, inferences or bases for recommendations.</p> <p>Ad-hoc refers to customer requests arising from non-agenda meetings, including but not limited to the following organisations: SADC, SACU, AU, ARF, G20; BRICS, WB&amp;IMF, AfDB, OECD, WEF, WEF AFRICA, IDA, ADF, PARIS CLUB, Financing for Climate Change, Financing for Development and Sustainable Developed Goals, UNECA, G24, Commonwealth</p> <p>Customers includes but is not limited to the Minister of Finance, Director-General of National Treasury, Presidency</p>
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To further the interests of South Africa by influencing the agenda, proceedings and outcomes of meetings.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	<p>Analysis and briefs on current issues are compiled by the relevant Chief Directorates within IREP.</p> <p>Requests and responses are recorded in registers within the relevant Chief Directorates.</p>
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of responses to customer requests on ad-hoc briefing notes and analyse}}{\text{Total number of customer requests on ad-hoc briefing notes and analyses}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Evidence that refer to documents that are confidential or secret and not for public consumption
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Responded to all requests by customers
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	<p>Chief Directorate: Global and Emerging Markets</p> <p>Chief Directorates: Multilateral Development Banks and Concessional Finance</p> <p>Chief Directorate: Country and Thematic Analysis</p> <p>Chief Directorate: African Economic Integration</p>

<b>Strategic Objective 6.2</b>	
<b>Increase Africa's voice and South Africa's influence in international institutions and forums</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 6.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Secure the 3rd Chair for Sub-Sahara Africa in the IMF Board implemented</b>
<b>Short Definition</b>	Increase Africa's voice and South Africa's influence in international institutions and forums
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Strengthen and expand South Africa's engagement in key institutions and with partners at selected policy for an Increase capital participation (as appropriate) to more firmly anchor South Africa's role in advancing governance reform and pressing for improved effectiveness in the delivery of institutional / organisational mandates
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reports / motivations
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Evidence that refers to documents that are confidential or secret and not for public consumption
<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>	Increase Africa's voice and South Africa's influence in international institutions and forums
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: African Economic Integration Chief Directorate: Multilateral Development Banks and Concessional Finance Chief Directorate: Global and Emerging Markets

<b>Performance Indicator no 6.2.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of interventions to increase South Africa's presence within institutions of particular strategic value</b>
<b>Short Definition</b>	Increasing influence in these institutions in line with SA's interests specifically and Africa's interests generally. This can be done through, but is not limited to, placing individuals at institutions such as the SADC Secretariat, influencing and achieving the appointment of a SA Executive Director at the AfDB and an alternate Executive Director at the WB and IMF
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Increasing South Africa's presence in strategically valuable institutions, such as the AfDB, World Bank, IMF and OECD; through appropriate means and measures.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reports or minutes on intervention, linked directly to the increased presence at the particular institutions
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of interventions
<b>Data limitation</b>	Evidence that refers to documents that are confidential or secret and not for public consumption
<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>	Actual decisions / votes / policy positions / changes in processes that benefit SA
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: African Economic Integration Chief Directorate: Multilateral Development Banks and Concessional Finance Chief Directorate: Global and Emerging Markets



<b>Performance Indicator no 6.2.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of interventions in pursuit of institutional reform implemented</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	The implementation of a plan to effect interventions in pursuit of institutional reform. This includes, but is not limited to, institutional reform and budget reform within AU structures, the establishment of a 3 <sup>rd</sup> chair for SSA in the IMF Board.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	This pursuit of institutional reform is intended to advance South Africa's interests specifically, and those of Africa more generally.
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	The implementation plan; Monitoring reports; Evidence of plan implemented
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of interventions implemented}}{\text{Total number of interventions planned to be implemented}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Evidence that refers to documents that are confidential or secret and not for public consumption
<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 contribute towards the improvement of institutional reforms / effect change in institutions
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: African Economic Integration Chief Directorate: Multilateral Development Banks and Concessional Finance Chief Directorate: Global and Emerging Markets

<b>Strategic Objective 6.3</b> <b>Support an enabling environment for increased economic activity within Africa</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 6.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>African strategy implemented</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	To support an enabling environment for increased economic activity within Africa
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Promote regional economic integration and strengthen economic links within Africa by: Encouraging increased cooperation and investment that support improved interconnectedness in the region Expanding bilateral engagements on issues of mutual interest
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reports / minutes / consultation records
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitation</b>	Evidence that refers to documents that are confidential or secret and not for public consumption
<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>	African strategy implemented
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: African Economic Integration

<b>Performance Indicator no 6.3.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of initiatives to expand relations with key strategic partners</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	To develop a coherent engagement strategy for Africa and to refine the implementation of the strategy over the medium-term.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To expand relations with key strategic partners
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Reports / minutes / consultation records
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of initiatives
<b>Data limitation</b>	Evidence that refers to documents that are confidential or secret and not for public consumption
<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>	Re-scope the development of an Africa strategy.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: African Economic Integration

<b>Performance Indicator no 6.3.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage implementation of identified projects and plans to accelerate regional integration</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	To help SA achieve its strategic objectives and contribute to increased economic activity in the region. This will be done, but is not limited by, the contribution towards the establishment of a North South Corridor Management Institute, facilitating Cabinet approval and implementation of the draft policy on One Stop Border Posts for South Africa, promotion of foreign domestic investment and regional integration through the hosting of the World Economic Forum for Africa.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	In order to exploit opportunities with key strategic partners, an alignment of interests and mutual awareness of available opportunities is necessary with the ultimate goal to accelerate regional integration
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	The implementation plan; Monitoring reports; Evidence of plan implemented
<b>Method of calculation</b>	$\frac{\text{Number of achieved initiatives}}{\text{Total number of initiatives planned}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Evidence that refer to documents that are confidential or secret and not for public consumption
<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>	Establishment structures, development of policies, hosting of events that promote regional integration. Increased exchange of views and improved alignment of interests using various platforms.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Directorate: African Economic Integration Chief Directorate: Multilateral Development Banks and Concessional Finance

---

**Programme 7**
**Strategic Objective 7.1*****Ensure good governance and robust control environment for fund administration*****Performance Indicator no 7.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Improved audit outcome</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Ensure good governance and a robust control environment for fund administration
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure effective administration of funds where funds paid to eligible applicants and recipients are accurate, punctual and cost effective as required by the applicable legislation
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Auditor-General's report
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count – No repeat findings
<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>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Good governance and a robust control environment for fund administration
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	General Manager: Programme 7 (GPAA)

<b>Performance Indicator no 7.1.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of benefits validated for payments paid within liable dates</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	<p>Payments of validated benefits on time:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post-retirement medical benefits validated and paid within 45 days</li> <li>• Injury on duty benefits validated and paid within 45 days</li> <li>• Special pension benefits validated and paid within 45 days</li> <li>• Military pensions benefits validated and paid within 45 days</li> <li>• Other benefits validated and paid within 45 days</li> </ul>
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To measure the level of time it takes from receiving complete documents, processed, validated and payments of benefits within liability date
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Applications, Awards, Schedules of Members from medical schemes. Reports of all benefits applications received and paid in a particular period.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<p><u>Number of benefits validated for payment paid within liability date during the reporting period X 100</u></p> <p>Total number of benefits applications received</p>
<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 validated benefits within the liable dates
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	General Manager: Programme 7 (GPAA)

<b>Performance Indicator no 7.1.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage Compliance with SLA between NT and GPAA specifically Programme 7 related indicators</b>
<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>	<b>Percentage integrity of client data</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	To consistently improve client data integrity, to the extent that the quality of client information is consistently accurate, difficult to compromise and reliable
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	To ensure that the integrity and reliability of data meet high standard and free from the risks of incorrect payment of benefits
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Data script up against CIVPEN system and exceptions reports provided to management.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<u>Total exceptions resolved x 100</u> Total number of data with issues at the beginning of the financial year
<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>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<b>Desired performance</b>	Aim is to improve data quality by 80% from baseline
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	General Manager: Programme 7 (GPAA)



<b>Strategic Objective 7.2</b> <b><i>Provide an improved and integrated customer service Experience</i></b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 7.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage of customer service complaints responded to</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Receipt, acknowledgement and resolution of customer complaints within 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>	$\frac{\text{Number of complaints resolved within seven days}}{\text{Total number of complaints received}} \times 100$
<b>Data limitation</b>	Delays by Employer in submitting necessary information, delays by Appeal Board in finalization of appeal cases, Delays by Compensation Fund in addressing errors
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Maintain 100% complaint responded to within defined timeframes
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	General Manager: Programme 7 (GPAA)

Indicator no 7.2.1	
Indicator title	Percentage of customer service complaints responded to within seven days
Short definition	Receipt, acknowledgement and resolution of customer complaints within predetermined time frame.
Purpose/importance	To improve customer experience
Source/collection of data	Schedule of customer service complaints resolved within seven days
Method of calculation	$\frac{\text{Number of complaints resolved within seven days}}{\text{Total number of complaints received}} \times 100$
Data limitation	Delays by Employer in submitting necessary information, delays by Appeal Board in finalization of appeal cases, Delays by Compensation Fund in addressing errors
Type of indicator	Output
Calculation type	Non-Cumulative
Reporting cycle	Quarterly
New indicator	Revised
Desired performance	Maintain 100% complaint responded to within defined timeframes
Indicator responsibility	General Manager: Programme 7 (GPAA)

---

**Programme 8**
**Strategic Objective 8.1**

**Establishment of GTAC as a centre of excellence in public sector advisory services, project management and public finance management**

**Performance Indicator no 8.1**

<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Improved audit outcome</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Ensure good governance and internal controls
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Ensure effective administration of funds where funds paid to eligible applicants and recipients are accurate, punctual and cost effective as required by the applicable legislation
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Auditor-General's report
<b>Method of calculation</b>	None – Improved audit outcome
<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>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Good governance and internal controls
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Financial Manager: Financial Management

Performance Indicator no 8.1.1	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of GTAC quarterly monitoring reports reporting on progress produced</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Reporting on operations of the Government Technical Advisory Centre. Progress of GTAC operations monitored through reports to DG and Minister.
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managing the institutional relationship to ensure that GTAC efforts are aligned with the priorities of government and the Ministry of Finance by:</li> <li>• Ensuring compliance with governance, reporting requirements and continued monitoring and evaluation of programme implementation</li> </ul>
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	APP Quarterly Reports to Minister of Finance
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<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>	Monthly, quarterly progress reports available as well as an annual report
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Senior Manager: Strategy, Management and Communication

Performance Indicator no 8.1.2	
Indicator title	Number of technical advisory projects supported
Short definition	<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 and 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>
Purpose/importance	To give an indication of the number of technical advisory projects supported by the GTAC.
Source/collection of data	Business Management Information System (BMIS and verified project list verified against the Business Management Information System.
Method of calculation	Simple count
Data limitations	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
Type of indicator	Activity
Calculation type	Cumulative
Reporting cycle	Quarterly
New indicator	No
Desired performance	Increase the number of projects supported within acceptable service parameters
Indicator responsibility	Senior Manager: Professional Management Services

<b>Performance Indicator no 8.1.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of transaction advisory projects registered</b>
<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 as required by Regulation 16
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Transaction register of projects
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Activity
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	No
<b>Desired performance</b>	Increase number of transaction advisory projects registered
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Transaction Advisory Services

<b>Performance Indicator no 8.1.4</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of capital project appraisal reports completed</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Provide advice on capital projects as agreed with relevant stakeholders in the National Treasury and line departments. 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.
<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>	Simple count
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<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>	Number of projects supported, in relation to the intended number (specified in the APP)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Capital Projects respectively

<b>Performance Indicator no 8.1.5</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of performance and expenditure reviews completed</b>
<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>	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>	Simple count
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<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>	Number of Performance and Expenditure reviews completed according to the planned target in the annual performance plan
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Public Expenditure and Policy Analysis



<b>Strategic Objective 8.2</b>	
<b>Local government financial management improvement</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 8.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of municipalities supported through Local Government Financial Management</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	The MFIP II and the next version MFIP III programme is meant to support municipalities and provincial treasuries 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 III Progress Reports
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<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>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Improved local government financial management
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Capacity Building, MFIP III Programme Management Unit

<b>Performance Indicator no 8.2.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Transfer of the Financial Management Grant (FMG) funds to all municipalities</b>
<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>	Simple count of number of municipalities to which funds were transferred
<b>Data limitations</b>	Verification of receipt of funds lies with municipalities
<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>	The transfer of the FMG allocation to all municipalities
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: MFMA Implementation Unit

<b>Performance Indicator no 8.2.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of municipalities and provincial treasuries assisted through MFIP II</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	The MFIP II and the next version MFIP III programme is meant to support municipalities and provincial treasuries 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 III Progress Reports
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<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>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Quarterly
<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 III Programme Management Unit

<b>Strategic Objective 8.3</b>	
<b>Promotion of urban integration and neighbourhood Development</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 8.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of urban integration and neighbourhood development initiatives supported</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	Promotion of urban integration and neighbourhood development
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Promote public and private investment in city development, integrated urban networks and neighbourhood development initiatives
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Plans are collected, reviewed by the NDPP and the status reflected via an Acceptance Letter. Deliverables are stored as records within the NDPP Unit File plan structure Built Environment Performance Plans (BEPP) submitted by the municipalities
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Promotion of urban integration and neighbourhood Development
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Neighbourhood Development Partnership Programme Cities Support Programme Chief Directorate : Provincial and Local Government Infrastructure

Performance Indicator no 8.3.1	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of precinct plans completed</b>
<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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify land uses and reflect the long-term strategic spatial transformation plans at precinct level</li> <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>	The plans are collected, reviewed by the NDPP and the status reflected via an Acceptance Letter. Deliverables are stored as records within the NDPP Unit File plan structure.
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count
<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>	Non-Cumulative
<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 8.3.2:	
Indicator title	Number of catalytic projects approved
Short definition	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.
Purpose/importance	<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>
Source/collection of data	Municipal submissions of “Permission to Proceed with Planning” and “Permission to proceed with Construction” templates that are considered for approval by the NDPP
Method of calculation	Simple count of the approved catalytic projects
Data limitations	None
Type of indicator	Output
Calculation type	Non-Cumulative
Reporting cycle	Quarterly
New indicator	No
Desired performance	Actual performance that is higher than targeted in the corresponding Annual Performance Plan is desirable
Indicator responsibility	Head: Neighbourhood Development Partnership Programme

<b>Performance Indicator no 8.3.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of integrated projects in Integration Zones identified for planning</b>
<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 integrated projects in Integration zones as reflected in the BEPP submitted to NT
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<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>	Increased number of integrated 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

<b>Performance Indicator no 8.3.4</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of integrated projects in Integration Zones under implementation</b>
<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 the year
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<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>	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 CD : Provincial and Local Government Infrastructure



<b>Strategic Objective 8.4</b>	
<b>Facilitation of employment creation and inclusive growth</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 8.4</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of permanent jobs created (cumulative across the term of project)</b>
<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>	Facilitation of employment creation and inclusive growth
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Jobs Fund Investment Committee Minutes and decision records
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple 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>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Employment creation and inclusive growth
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Head: Social Security and Jobs Fund Project Management Unit

<b>Performance Indicator no 8.4.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of Jobs Fund projects approved (cumulative across the term of project).</b>
<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>	A list of the approved jobs fund projects or Investment Committee Minutes and decision records
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple 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>	Annually
<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>	<b>Grant funding approved (cumulative across the term of project).</b>
<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>	Simple 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>	No
<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

<b>Performance Indicator no 8.4.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Matched funding committed (cumulative across the term of project)</b>
<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>	Simple 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>	<b>New jobs contracted (cumulative across the term of project).</b>
<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>	Simple 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>	<b>Number of placements contracted (cumulative across the term of project).</b>
<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>	Simple 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(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 8.4.6	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of training opportunities contracted (cumulative across the term of project).</b>
<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>	Output
<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

<b>Performance Indicator no 8.4.7</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Value of grant funding disbursed (cumulative across the term of project)</b>
<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>	Simple count 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
<b>Calculation type</b>	Cumulative (project 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



<b>Performance Indicator no 8.4.8</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of Jobs Fund evaluation reports and dissemination of learning conducted</b>
<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>	Simple count of number of Jobs Fund evaluation reports and dissemination of learning conducted
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<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>	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>	<b>Number of employment, income distribution and inclusive growth research papers completed</b>
<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>	Simple count of the 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>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-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

<b>Strategic Objective 8.5</b>	
<b>Improved infrastructure planning, management and skills development</b>	
<b>Performance Indicator no 8.5</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of capacity improvement initiatives in infrastructure planning, management and skills development done</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	<p>Initiatives to support the improvement of capability to efficiently plan, procure, deliver, and maintain infrastructure.</p> <p>Initiatives to support the improvement of capability to efficiently plan, procure, deliver, and maintain infrastructure.</p> <p>Initiatives offered by IDIP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Assistants support to provincial departments and to institutionalise the Infrastructure Delivery Management System (IDMS) ;</li> <li>• Formal training and workshops conducted on IDMS to government officials;</li> <li>• Workshops conducted on Standards for Infrastructure Procurement and Delivery Management (SIPDM) to government officials;</li> <li>• Training on Infrastructure Delivery Management Toolkit (IDMT); and</li> <li>• Review and update of a Model (Infrastructure Progression Model) to assist provincial departments to improve capability and performance through the Improvement Plans.</li> </ul>
<b>Purpose/importance</b>	Improved infrastructure planning, management and skills development
<b>Source/collection of data</b>	Improvement initiative's project charter or signed Technical Assistance Agreements. (where applicable)
<b>Method of calculation</b>	Simple count of number of project charters or Agreements (where applicable), delegates that attended
<b>Data limitations</b>	None
<b>Type of indicator</b>	Output
<b>Calculation type</b>	Non-Cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annually
<b>New indicator</b>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Improved performance and value for money on infrastructure spending.
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Provincial and Local Government Infrastructure

<b>Performance Indicator 8.5.1</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Percentage response to provincial and national requests to procure Professional Service Providers to assist with institutionalizing the IDMS</b>
<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>	Professional Service Providers' signed contracts
<b>Method of calculation</b>	<u>Number of requests from provincial and national departments responded to x100</u> Total number of requests received
<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>	Yes
<b>Desired performance</b>	Ensure that all requests from provincial and national departments are responded to (100%)
<b>Indicator responsibility</b>	Chief Director: Provincial and Local Government Infrastructure

<b>Performance Indicator 8.5.2</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of officials trained on the infrastructure delivery management system initiatives (including IDMP, IDM toolkit, IPM)</b>
<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>	Simple count of number of delegates that attended
<b>Data limitations</b>	Incomplete attendance registers
<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>	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

<b>Performance Indicator 8.5.3</b>	
<b>Indicator title</b>	<b>Number of graduates in training for professional registration</b>
<b>Short definition</b>	The number of graduates in training as per the requirements of the respective statutory councils. In training defined as already enrolled for professionalization but not yet obtained professional registration.
<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>	Simple count of graduates in training
<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>	Non-cumulative
<b>Reporting cycle</b>	Annual
<b>New indicator</b>	Revised
<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

Performance Indicator 8.5.4	
Indicator title	Number of capacity improvement initiatives undertaken to support infrastructure delivery
Short definition	<p>Initiatives to support the improvement of capability to efficiently plan, procure, deliver, and maintain infrastructure.</p> <p>Initiatives to support the improvement of capability to efficiently plan, procure, deliver, and maintain infrastructure.</p> <p>Initiatives offered by IDIP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Assistants support to provincial departments and to institutionalise the Infrastructure Delivery Management System (IDMS) ;</li> <li>• Formal training and workshops conducted on IDMS to government officials;</li> <li>• Workshops conducted on Standards for Infrastructure Procurement and Delivery Management (SIPDM) to government officials;</li> <li>• Training on Infrastructure Delivery Management Toolkit (IDMT); and</li> <li>• Review and update of a Model (Infrastructure Progression Model) to assist provincial departments to improve capability and performance through the Improvement Plans.</li> </ul>
Purpose/importance	Improve the capability to plan, procure, deliver, and maintain infrastructure to contribute to improved performance and value for money on infrastructure spending as well as to optimize the allocation of financial resources directed to infrastructure delivery and maintenance.
Source/collection of data	Improvement initiative's project charter or signed Technical Assistance Agreements. (where applicable)
Method of calculation	Simple count of number of project charters or Agreements (where applicable)
Data limitations	None
Type of indicator	Output
Calculation type	Non-Cumulative
Reporting cycle	Annually
New indicator	Yes
Desired performance	Improved performance and value for money on infrastructure spending.
Indicator responsibility	Chief Director: Provincial and Local Government Infrastructure