

Western Cape Government Environmental Affairs & Development Planning

ANNEXURE E

Technical Indicator Description Tables for Annual Performance Plan 2015/16 Annexure E provides a brief explanation of what the departmental non-sector indicators and national environmental sector indicators within the Annual Performance Plan 2015/16 are, with enough detail to give a general understanding and interpretation of what the programme would want to achieve during the 2015/16 financial year. The technical indicator description tables are presented per programme and sub-programme as reflected in the Annual Performance Plan 2015/16.

PROGRAMME 1: ADMINISTRATION

| 1.1 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Develop and implement Departmental Integrated Management Information System (DIMIS) |
| Short definition | To have a functioning DIMIS Application system in place. This will include the following: Implemented core DIMIS computer system Prioritised System Application functionality |
| Purpose/importance | Utilisation of the implementation plan in order to progress the DIMIS project to Phase 3, the integrating of the departmental data into a DIMIS central database. Also to further enable the business of the Department by integrating all the different systems in to one Departmental Integrated Management Information System. |
| Source/collection of data | Implementation BRS Project Plan and Implementation Progress Reports |
| Method of calculation | Progress Reports |
| Data limitations | Availability of Progress Reports |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annual |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | To ensure the initial implementation and basic functioning of DIMIS. |
| Indicator responsibility | Chief Directorate: Environmental Governance Policy Co- ordination and Planning and Compliance and Enforcement |
| Key Risks | The procurement process to conduct this activity is governed by the SITA Act. The Department therefore followed this process. |

| 1.2 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Develop and implement Departmental Communication Plan |
| Short definition | To approve the Departmental Communications Plan (drafted in the fourth quarter of the previous financial year) for implementation during the financial year. Quarterly reviews are completed in order to update the plan. |
| Purpose/importance | To ensure the effective roll-out of communication campaigns as prioritised in the Departmental Communications Plan |
| Source/collection of data | Current Communications plan, Legislative dates, Calendar dates and prioritised events. |
| Method of calculation | Simple count of approved Communications Plan (development) |

| | and quarterly reviews (implementation) |
|--------------------------|--|
| Data limitations | Not applicable |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annual |
| New indicator | New |
| Desired performance | Developed Communications Plan to be reviewed quarterly |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Strategic and Operational Support |
| Key Risks | Budget constraints |

| 1.3 | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Audit opinion obtained in respect of previous financial year |
| Short definition | This is an indication of audit opinion obtained from the Auditor- General in respect of the preceding financial year. It is recognised that the audit opinion is applicable to all potential audit areas; this sub-programme does not have direct control over the achievement of non-financial performance areas |
| Purpose/importance | It contributes to ensuring that the audit opinion obtained is unqualified. This indicates that the Department manages its finances effectively and has complied with all the necessary financial prescripts. It contributes to providing departmental financial management and support services |
| Source/collection of data | Management and audit report of the Auditor -General |
| Method of calculation | Signed Auditor-General report received in respect of the previous financial year. |
| Data limitations | No specific limitations |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Clean audit report |
| Indicator responsibility | All programme managers |
| Key Risks | Limited information on financial and non-financial performance provided could result in a negative audit outcome |

PROGRAMME 2: ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY, PLANNING AND CO-ORDINATION

SUB-PROGRAMME 2.1: Intergovernmental Co-ordination, Spatial and Development Planning

National environmental sector indicators

| 2.1.1 | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Number of intergovernmental sector tools reviewed |
| Short definition | Review of sector and municipal tools (e.g. IDPs, PGDS, SDF) to facilitate integration of environmental content into tools (demand driven). These reports are developed externally. |
| Purpose/importance | To facilitate environmental cooperative governance and promote sustainable development. |
| Source/collection of data | Review reports |
| Method of calculation | As and when signed off by delegated authority |
| Data limitations | Depend on external processes and the reliability of data depends on the accuracy of the analysis done and records kept. |

| Type of indicator | Output |
|--------------------------|--|
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Improved integration of environment issues (content) into sector |
| | and municipal tools. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Development Facilitation |
| Key Risks | Process coordinated by the Department of Local Government |
| | and Provincial Treasury. |

SUB-PROGRAMME 2.2: Legislative Development

| 2.2.1 | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of legislative tools to ensure the protection of species and ecosystems developed and implemented |
| Short definition | Amalgamation of the Western Cape Nature Conservation Board Amendment Bill, 2012 and the Draft Western Cape Environment Conservation Bill into a single bill (Western Cape Biodiversity Bill). |
| Purpose/importance | Both Bills regulate the same entity and the same subject matter and there is therefore no legal or rational basis to pass separate legislation on the same subject matter. |
| Source/collection of data | The Draft WC Biodiversity Bill |
| Method of calculation | Simple count of legislative tools developed. |
| Data limitations | Not applicable. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Draft WC Biodiversity Bill submitted to State Law Advisors |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Biodiversity and Coastal Management |
| Key Risks | Potential delays in reaching internal agreement on the content of the Draft WC Biodiversity Bill |

| 2.2.2 | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of waste policy instruments developed |
| Short definition | The development of a model bylaw on waste management for municipalities, |
| Purpose/importance | To ensure that bylaws are aligned with new national waste legislation and to address outdated regulatory barriers that hinder the growth in the waste economy |
| Source/collection of data | Concept document, attendance registers of public participation processes |
| Method of calculation | Simple count of waste policy instrument developed |
| Data limitations | Depends on accuracy of records kept |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non- cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Finalise the development of the model By-law |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Waste Management |
| Key Risks | Depends on comments from key stakeholders i.e municipalities |

| 2.2.3 | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Revised WC Biodiversity Offsets Guideline developed |
| Short definition | Development of a WC Biodiversity offset Guideline. |
| Purpose/importance | The guideline will enable consistent approaches to biodiversity |
| | offsets. |
| Source/collection of | 2011 draft biodiversity offset guideline, DEA & DP officials from |
| data | various directories and officials from CapeNature. |
| Method of calculation | A simple count of Draft Biodiversity Offset Guideline |
| Data limitations | Not applicable |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Final Draft of the Biodiversity Offset Guideline submitted to the HoD. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Biodiversity and Coastal Management |
| Key Risks | Potential delays for the appointment of approved service providers. |
| | Potential delays in reaching internal agreement on the content of the Draft Biodiversity Offset Guideline. |

National environmental sector indicators

| 2.2.4 | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of legislative tools developed |
| Short definition | Shows number of tools, legislation, guidelines, policies, procedures developed to guide environmental decision making (EMF,SOEOR/Outlook, SEA,EIP, AQMP, IWMP, legislated Biodiversity Plans). |
| Purpose/importance | To guide and inform environmental decision making at policy, programme and project level. |
| Source/collection of data | Approved Tools. |
| Method of calculation | Count: When approved by delegated authority |
| Data limitations | Accuracy depends on the quality of data received |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non- cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Improved environmental decision making |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorates: Biodiversity and Coastal management, and Waste Management |
| Key Risks | Staff Capacity Dependent on external stakeholders performing as expected. |

SUB-PROGRAMME 2.3: Research and Development Support

| 2.3.1 | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Environmental Implementation Plan (EIP) 2014-2019 Gazetted |
| Short definition | Section 11 of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 inter alia states that every provincial department responsible for environmental affairs must prepare an environmental implementation plan within five years of the coming into operation of the Act, and at intervals of not more than five years thereafter. |
| Purpose/importance | The purpose of an environmental implementation plan is to - coordinate and harmonise the environmental policies, plans, programmes and decisions of the various national departments that exercise functions that may affect the environment or are entrusted with powers and duties aimed at the achievement, promotion, and protection of a sustainable environment, and of provincial and local spheres of government. give effect to the principle of cooperative government in Chapter 3 of the Constitution; secure the protection of the environment across the country as a whole; prevent unreasonable actions by provinces in respect of the environment that are prejudicial to the economic or health interests of other provinces or the country as a whole; and enable the Minister to monitor the achievement, promotion, and protection of a sustainable environment. |
| Source/collection of data | Data is collected through Annual Performance Plans and Annual reports of relevant WCG Departments |
| Method of calculation | Simple count of EIPs gazetted. |
| Data limitations | Data is collected from documents such as annual performance plans and annual reports. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | One EIP gazetted. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Sustainability |
| Key Risks | Staff Capacity |

| 2.3.2 | |
|------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of sustainable Settlement Innovation Summits hosted |
| Short definition | A gathering of relevant government and non-governmental stakeholders to share strategic approaches, case studies, new theories and good practice examples of settlement practice which reduces the resource requirements whilst providing appropriate levels of services. |

| Purpose/importance | To raise awareness and stimulate good practice. Realising the limits of our eco-systems and at the same time having to provide energy, water, sanitation and transport services to an ever increasing population, the Western Cape Government and municipalities will have to think smarter about the type of service and infrastructure being provided to citizens of the Western Cape. |
|--------------------------|--|
| Source/collection of | Proceedings of the event, attendance register |
| data | |
| Method of calculation | Simple count of symposiums hosted. |
| Data limitations | None |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Increased awareness of in innovative good practice for sustainable urban development amongst participants. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Sustainability |
| Key Risks | Poor attendance of Summit |

| 2.3.3 | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of Western Cape Green Economy Indicator Reports compiled |
| Short definition | A measurement tool for the Green Economy framework strategy developed and implemented to monitor progress and measure the greening of the Western Cape economy |
| Purpose/importance | Clear messages need to be send to policy makers and the public at large to ensure that our decisions and actions are driving development and growth towards a more sustainable, resource efficient, low carbon and resilient system. |
| Source/collection of data | Literature reviews, desktop studies, interviews, workshops with public and government officials. (No primary research anticipated). |
| Method of calculation | Simple count of reports compiled |
| Data limitations | Data is not always readily available for all indicators. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Decisions and actions by policy makers and the public at large must drive development and growth towards a more sustainable, resource efficient, low carbon and resilient system. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Sustainability |
| Key Risks | Availability of data |

National environmental sector indicators

| 2.3.4 | |
|------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Number of environmental research projects undertaken |
| Short definition | The collective number of different types of research projects (reviews, scientific research, monitoring and collaborative research) being undertaken during the reporting period. This includes research projects, monitoring projects and collaborative projects. |

| Support environmental decision making, planning and policy |
|--|
| development through credible data and evidence generated |
| through research programmes. |
| |
| Completed surveys, project reports, report-backs, review reports |
| and published scientific and popular materials. |
| A research project is counted when a project has been finalised. |
| A project counted only once when finalised irrespective of the |
| number of surveys done or reports compiled on the project |
| |
| during the reporting period. |
| Inaccessibility and unavailability of data |
| Output |
| Non-cumulative |
| Annually |
| No |
| Credible research provided to inform decision making that |
| contributes to the sustainable utilisation of natural resources. |
| Directorate Sustainability |
| Delays in finalising the project due to: |
| Appointed service provider not producing acceptable end |
| |
| product; |
| SCM processes and procedures; |
| Financial reprioritisation. |
| |

SUB-PROGRAMME 2.4: Environmental Information Management

Departmental non-sector indicators

| 2.4.1 | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Geographic Information Services (GIS) departmental products developed/maintained/enhanced |
| Short definition | Spatial data is sourced and analysed in order to produce data products to assist with Departmental projects. |
| Purpose/importance | To be utilised with the environmental and developmental decision-making process. |
| Source/collection of data | Department of the Premier corporate data and external data stakeholders. |
| Method of calculation | Simple count of data products |
| Data limitations | Accuracy and credible/validated data. Lack of meta data. Availability of data. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Enhancement of data sets. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Strategic and Operational Support |
| Key Risks | Data sensitive to interpretation therefore only secure access to data allowed |

National environmental sector indicator

| 2.4.2 | |
|------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Number of functional environmental information management |
| | systems |
| Short definition | It shows the number of environmental information management systems (i.e. GIS, Air Quality, WIS) that are effectively maintained |
| | and efficiently utilised. |

| Purpose/importance | Information systems are utilised to improve decision making |
|--------------------------|---|
| | processes. |
| Source/collection of | Records of operational environmental information management |
| data | systems that are implemented. |
| Method of calculation | Count every environmental information management system that is maintained. |
| Data limitations | Data source limitations and regularity of updates. Lack of integration between databases. Lack of integration between national and provincial databases. Lack of stakeholder delivery of data (e.g. municipalities providing energy data). Reporting fatigue of stakeholders. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Accurate and reliable information available for informed |
| | decision making. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorates: Strategic and Operational Support and Waste Management |
| Key Risks | Service delivery is dependent on the server housed at DotP |

SUB-PROGRAMME 2.5: Climate Change Management

| 2.5.1 | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | M&E report on the WC Climate Change Response Strategy |
| Short definition | The compilation of an M&E report according to the Climate Change Response Strategy M&E Framework developed in 2014/15 |
| Purpose/importance | The Climate Change Response Strategy is the guiding document in terms of the climate change agenda for the Western Cape and the report will give an indication of the extent to which climate change projects and programmes are being implemented across the province. |
| Source/collection of data | Various databases pertaining to the indicators identified in the CCRS M&E Framework. |
| Method of calculation | Simple Count of Report. |
| Data limitations | Provision of climate change related data by such a wide range of stakeholders is not always forthcoming or available. This is a challenge for the monitoring report. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Biennial |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | The Climate Change Response Strategy M&E Report will report on the extent to which climate change projects and programmes are being implemented across the province as per the identified indicators in the M&E Framework. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Climate Change |
| Key Risks | Buy-in and implementation |

| 2.5.2 | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | District municipalities adequately incorporating climate change into IDPs (as defined in the WC Climate Change status Quo Assessment)* |
| Short definition | District and Local Municipalities are assessed according to the WC Climate Change IDP Assessment Framework. This assessment together with engagement with the District Municipalities will provide support to incorporate climate change into their IDP's |
| Purpose/importance | Mainstreaming of climate change across the Western Cape by assessing and supporting municipalities in responding to climate change. |
| Source/collection of data | CC IDP review assessment framework used to assess municipalities. Contact sessions such as Stakeholder Workshops will be held with the identified district to develop a status quo assessment and response framework. |
| Method of calculation | Simple Count of Draft Reports |
| Data limitations | Based on municipal Integrated Development Plans (IDP) reviews, climate change is currently not considered a priority in municipalities. Buy in from municipalities to be engaged in and take ownership of this process may, therefore, be a challenge. Without regular municipal engagement, this process is limited. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annual |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | The Climate Change Status Quo Report and Response Framework for Central Karoo District completed, singed off by Chief Director: Sustainability and submitted to the District Council. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Climate Change |
| Key Risks | Municipal capacity to participate in the programme |

| 2.5.3 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Number of WCG policies and strategies for WCCCRS alignment / misalignment completed |
| Short definition | Qualitative review of alignment between the WCCCRS and three key WCG policies and/or strategies according to an internal policy review template, with recommendations. |
| Purpose/importance | Establish cross sectoral alignment regarding WCG climate change response |
| Source/collection of data | WCG policy and strategy documents. |
| Method of calculation | Simple count of reviewed WCG policies and/or strategies |
| Data limitations | None |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Review with recommendations made on three (3) Cabinet approved WCG policies and/or strategies. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Climate Change |
| Key Risks | Consultant not delivering quality product |

National environmental sector indicator

| 2.5.4 | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Number of climate change response tools developed |
| Short definition | This refers to interventions developed and implemented to respond to challenges and potential impacts of climate change. These include provincial climate change policies and programmes, greenhouse gas mitigation responses, vulnerability and adaptation responses. |
| Purpose/importance | To mitigate against climate change and adapt to the impact of climate change in order to build climate change resilience |
| Source/collection of data | Approved tools |
| Method of calculation | Count: As and when developed and implemented |
| Data limitations | Accuracy of information captured depends on reliability and availability of data |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Development of one (1)tool, i.e. Monitoring and Evaluation Framework Document for WC Climate Change Response Strategy, to improve resilience to climate change. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Climate Change |
| Key Risks | Data availability and accuracy |

PROGRAMME 3: COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT

| 3.1.1 | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of investigations finalised |
| Short definition | The number of investigations finalised into the alleged transgression of environmental legislation. (Finalised means that an investigation outcome has been determined and executed). |
| Purpose/importance | To ensure compliance with environmental legislation. |
| Source/collection of data | Complaints are recorded in a register of complaints. Each complaint investigated has an associated case file. |
| Method of calculation | Numerical count of investigations finalised in the reporting period. |
| Data limitations | Inaccurate register |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | No (Refinement of previous indicator) |
| Desired performance | Demand driven indicator, dependent on the number complaints received and investigations concluded during the reporting period. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Environmental Compliance and Enforcement |
| Key Risks | The number of complaints investigated is dependent on the number of complaints received and staff capacity to conduct and conclude the investigation. |

| 3.1.2 | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of intergovernmental compliance and enforcement operations conducted |
| Short definition | The number of pro-active intergovernmental compliance and enforcement operations conducted by the Department with other organs of State. |
| Purpose/importance | To jointly ensure compliance with environmental and other legislation by conducting pro-active joint enforcement and compliance operations and promoting intergovernmental co- operations. |
| Source/collection of data | Register of operations and the associated case files. |
| Method of calculation | Numerical count of pro-active intergovernmental compliance and enforcement operations conducted within the reporting period |
| Data limitations | Inaccurate register |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | 6 |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Environmental Compliance and Enforcement |
| Key Risks | The availability of other organs of state to conduct intergovernmental operations with joint mandates. |

| 3.1.3 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Number of litigation cases managed |
| Short definition | The number of litigation matters managed. [Managed refers to the processing of a litigation matter that ensures that litigation process is complied with.] [Managed does not mean that the matter must have been acted on in the reporting period. The matter remains active as it is unresolved and requires action at any stage.] |
| Purpose/importance | To manage litigation matters that ensures that the requirements of the State Attorney, Legal Services and relevant court rules are adhered to. This includes the administration and financial management of the matter. |
| Source/collection of data | Register of litigation matters and associated case files. |
| Method of calculation | Numerical count of all litigation matters managed. |
| Data limitations | Inaccurate register |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Demand driven indicator, dependent on the number of litigation cases brought against the Department, and the pace of the resolution of these matters by courts and parties concerned. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Environmental Governance |
| Key Risks | The number and nature of court matters instituted against the Department. |

| 3.1.4 | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of appeals finalised |
| Short definition | The number of appeals finalised by the Chief Directorate to the Minister. [Finalised refers to the appeals submissions submitted to the Minister in terms of the relevant Appeals legislation from the Chief Directorate.] |
| Purpose/importance | To ensure that appeals and appeal-related applications are finalised in terms of the relevant appeals legislation. |
| Source/collection of data | Appeals Register and associated files. |
| Method of calculation | Appeals assessment, appeal review and appeal amendment submissions to the Minister. |
| Data limitations | Inaccurate register |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | No (Refinement of previous indicator) |
| Desired performance | Demand-driven indicator, dependent on the number of appeals lodged. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Environmental Governance |
| Key Risks | The Department has no control over the number of appeals and related applications received. Capacity of the Sub-directorate to process the appeals within the legislated timeframes. |

| 3.1.5 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Number of S24G applications finalised |
| Short definition | The number of S24G applications that have been finalised. |
| Purpose/importance | This indicator shows the number of section 24G applications that were processed to completion by the Department. |
| Source/collection of data | Register of Section 24G applications and associated files. |
| Method of calculation | Numerical count of applications finalised within the reporting period. |
| Data limitations | This count is cumulative as it includes applications received in previous financial years that have not been finalised. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Demand driven: Neither higher nor lower |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Environmental Governance |
| Key Risks | Dependent on the number of applications received. Non- payment or delays in the administrative fine by the applicant results in the decision not being issued or delayed. Changes in legislation affect the validity of applications. |

| 3.1.6 | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of completed criminal investigations handed to the NPA for prosecution |
| Short definition | The number of finalised criminal action undertaken in terms of environmental legislation [Finalised is when dockets had been handed over to the NPA for prosecution or it has been decided internally that the matter is concluded]. |
| Purpose/importance | To enforce compliance with environmental legislation by way of criminal action. |
| Source/collection of data | Register of cases and associated case files. |

| Method of calculation | Number of files referred to the NPA and number of files closed. |
|--------------------------|--|
| Data limitations | Inaccurate register |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Demand driven: Neither higher nor lower |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Environmental Governance |
| Key Risks | The number of criminal investigations finalized is dependent on the severity/nature of the contravention that warrants a criminal investigation resulting in either submission to the NPA or if not, closure of the criminal investigation by the Department, due to the matter not being of a serious nature. |

| 3.1.7 | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of administrative enforcement notices issued for non- compliance with environmental legislation |
| Short definition | The number of administrative notices issued for non-compliance with environmental legislation. The count of the following types of notices: • Warning letter • Pre-compliance Notice • Pre-Directive • Compliance Notice • Directive |
| Purpose/importance | To enforce compliance with environmental legislation by way of administrative enforcement action (This shows us the trend in non- compliance with environmental legislation.) |
| Source/collection of data | Register of cases and associated case files. |
| Method of calculation | Numerical count of notices as issued |
| Data limitations | Inaccurate register |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Demand driven: Neither higher nor lower |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Environmental Compliance and Enforcement |
| Key Risks | Is dependent on the number of complaints received and dependent on the nature of the non-compliance which warrants administrative enforcement action. |

National environmental sector indicators

| 3.1.8 | |
|------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of enforcement actions finalised for non-compliance with environmental management legislation |
| Short definition | The number of enforcement actions undertaken in response to non-compliances with pollution, waste, air quality, impact assessment, protected areas, biodiversity and integrated coastal management requirements, more specifically: 3.1.1 Number of criminal investigations handed to the NPA for prosecution(for EMI Institutions) [3.1.6]; 3.1.2 Number of administrative enforcement notices issued for non-compliance with environmental legislation (3.1.7) |

| Purpose/importance | Shows number of criminal cases being finalised for prosecution as well as the administrative enforcement tools used to mitigate environmental impact in blue, green and brown subsectors. This shows productivity of the Environmental Management Inspectorate in responding to non-compliance with environmental laws. (Expression of efficiency should be indicated as a percentage in the QPR narrative) |
|---------------------------|---|
| Source/collection of data | From all provinces and national |
| Method of calculation | From quarterly statistics submitted on an excel spreadsheet from the relevant institutions |
| Data limitations | Lack of a national compliance and enforcement information system to capture the statistics in a live and consolidated manner |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-Cumulative (per quarter) |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Demand driven: Neither higher nor lower |
| Indicator responsibility | Senior Managers Compliance and Enforcement |
| Key Risks | The number of criminal investigations is dependent on the severity/nature of the contravention that warrant criminal investigation and the amount of administrative enforcement notices issued is dependent on the number of complaints received which warrant's administrative enforcement action and the compliance thereof by transgressors. |

| 3.1.9 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Number of compliance inspections conducted |
| Short definition | Number of inspections conducted to assess compliance with the national and provincial environmental legislation and authorisations/permits issued in terms of pollution, waste, air quality, impact assessment, protected areas, biodiversity and integrated coastal management requirements |
| Purpose/importance | To indicate the comprehensiveness of the monitoring of compliance with environmental legislation in the blue, green and brown sub-sectors and authorisations and permits issued in terms thereof |
| Source/collection of data | From all provinces and national (also refer to the National Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Report for annual statistics) |
| Method of calculation | From quarterly statistics submitted on an excel spreadsheet from the relevant institutions (From quarterly compliance inspections completed) |
| Data limitations | Lack of a national compliance and enforcement information systems to capture the statistics in a live and consolidated manner |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non cumulative (per quarter) |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Neither higher not lower |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorates: Waste Management, Air Quality Management, and Environmental Compliance and Enforcement |
| Key Risks | Incomplete information if site inspections are incorrectly/not recorded into databases. Facilities not ensuring access to property will delay inspections |

| 3.1.10 | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of S24G applications received |
| Short definition | The number of \$24G applications that have been received. |
| Purpose/importance | Indicates the trend in the volume of S24G applications received (including the number of applications in respect of unlawfully commencing with EIA and waste listed activities) in respect of illegal activities |
| Source/collection of data | From all provinces. (also refer to National Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Report for annual statistics). Also potentially source the information from the NEAS. |
| Method of calculation | From quarterly statistics submitted on an excel spreadsheet from the relevant institutions and/or NEAS |
| Data limitations | Lack of a national compliance and enforcement information systems to capture the statistics in a live and consolidated manner. NEAS not gathering the required information in a comprehensive manner. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-Cumulative (per quarter) |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | No (has changed somewhat) |
| Desired performance | Demand driven: Neither higher nor lower |
| Indicator responsibility | Senior Managers Compliance and Enforcement |
| Key Risks | This is dependent on the number of applications received and cannot be estimated. |

| 3.1.11 | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of S24G fines paid |
| Short definition | The number of S24G fines that have been paid in relation to the S24G applications received |
| Purpose/importance | Indicates the efficiency in dealing with the payment of fines in relation to the S24G applications that are submitted (as an indicator of efficiency in obtaining payment in relation to the applications received). |
| Source/collection of data | From all provinces. (also refer to National Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Report for annual statistics). Also potentially source the information from the NEAS. |
| Method of calculation | From quarterly statistics submitted on an excel spreadsheet from the relevant institutions; and/or NEAS |
| Data limitations | Lack of a national compliance and enforcement information systems to capture the statistics in a live and consolidated manner. NEAS not gathering the required information in a comprehensive manner. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-Cumulative (per quarter) |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | New |
| Desired performance | Demand driven: Neither higher nor lower |
| Indicator responsibility | Senior Managers Compliance and Enforcement |
| Key Risks | This is dependent on the number of applications received and cannot be estimated. |

PROGRAMME 4: ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT

SUB-PROGRAMME 4.1: Impact Management

| 4.1.1 | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of Provincial Environmental Impact Assessment System |
| | evaluation reports |
| Short definition | The evaluation of the Provincial Environmental Impact |
| | Assessment System. |
| Purpose/importance | This evaluation report will facilitate continual improvement in |
| | implementation of the One Environmental System in the |
| | province, thus ensuring the continued efficiency, effectiveness |
| | and responsiveness of the system. |
| | The evaluation report will review environmental decision making, |
| | as well as advice and support given to stakeholders. This review |
| | will include, amongst others, measuring compliance with |
| | statutory EIA timeframes, and evaluating the efficacy of |
| | standard operating procedures externally and internally, |
| | Departmental delegations, internal templates and guidelines, |
| | and internal and external capacity building programmes. |
| Source/collection of | NEAS reports, EMCOM minutes, Minister's monthly reports, |
| data | Departmental circulars. |
| Method of calculation | Simple count of completed review report annually in Q4. |
| Data limitations | Accuracy depends on the quality of the data received. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually (Q4) |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Completion of evaluation report annually in Q4, which will ensure |
| | the continued efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness of the |
| | system. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Development Planning Region 1, 2, 3 |
| Key Risks | Lack of co-operation of and coordination between the different |
| | organs of State who all participate in the new "One |
| | Environmental System". |

National environmental sector indicators

| 4.1.2 | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Percentage of EIA applications finalized within legislated time- frames |
| Short definition | It shows the percentage of environmental authorisation applications where final decisions are made to either issue environmental authorisation or refuse authorisation in the reporting period within legislated timeframes. |
| Purpose/importance | This indicator shows the efficiency of the consideration of EIA applications. It also indicates the level of capacity made available by the department in pursuit of sustainable development in the province |
| Source/collection of data | National Environmental Authorisation System (NEAS) |
| Method of calculation | Count every EIA authorisation issued or refused, in the reporting period, within the legislated timeframe set for processing of an EIA application. In addition, for efficiency, express this as a percentage of the applications not finalised within the timeframe. |

| Data limitations | The reliability of the register depends on the accuracy of the |
|--------------------------|---|
| | data captured |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | It is desired that 95% of all EIA applications received are finalised |
| | within legislated timeframes pending the quality of submissions |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Development Planning Region 1, 2, 3 |
| Key Risks | Inaccurate statistical information which could result from |
| | applications being recorded incorrectly in the database, or not |
| | recorded at all. |

SUB-PROGRAMME 4.2: Air Quality Management

| 4.2.1 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Report on the Annual State of Air Quality Management |
| Short definition | The Annual State of Air Quality Management Report provides an account of air quality management interventions in the Province over a 12 month period. |
| Purpose/importance | To provide information on the state of air quality management in the Province that can be used by the Department, key stakeholders and the public in for example, town and regional planning, research, policy formulation and decision making purposes. |
| Source/collection of data | Air quality management information is compiled by the Department from air quality monitoring data, information obtained from the Air Quality Officer's Forum, and the District Municipalities. |
| Method of calculation | Simple count of Annual State of Air Quality Management Report |
| Data limitations | Data collected from the ambient air quality monitoring network may not be available for periods due to power outages in the locations where ambient air quality is measured. |
| Type of indicator | Output Report |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Report on the Annual State of Air Quality Management |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Air Quality Management |
| Key Risks | Incomplete air quality monitoring data sets due to power outages in the locations where ambient air quality is measured. |

| 4.2.2 | |
|--------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Number of stations continuously monitoring ambient air quality |
| Short definition | Number of ambient air quality monitoring stations that measure criteria air pollutants such as particulate matter (PM ₁₀ & PM _{2.5}), sulphur dioxide (SO ₂), ozone (O ₃) and oxides of nitrogen (NO _x), carbon monoxide (CO), carbon dioxide (CO ₂) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in air. Note: not all air quality monitoring stations measure all criteria pollutants. |
| Purpose/importance | To monitor and report on ambient air quality so as to inform air |
| | quality management in the Province. |

| Source/collection of data | Data is obtained through direct measurement from the analysers |
|---------------------------|--|
| | at the ambient air quality monitoring stations and compiled into |
| | air quality monitoring reports. |
| Method of calculation | Simple count of air quality monitoring stations generating data, |
| | which is recorded. |
| Data limitations | All instrumentation is electronic and is sensitive to power failures |
| | and surges, and is also subjected to normal "wear and tear". This |
| | may result in incomplete air quality monitoring data sets, where |
| | ambient air quality is measured. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | 11 Provincial owned ambient air quality monitoring stations |
| | measuring criteria air pollutants. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Air Quality Management |
| Key Risks | Monitoring stations malfunctioning due power outages. |
| | No spare equipment when repairs are required. |

| 4.2.3 | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Progress Report of Air Quality Health Risk Assessment |
| Short definition | This report provides progress on the study areas and investigations where human health risk is assessed in terms of air pollution. |
| Purpose/importance | Gives an indication of the progress the health risk assessment undertaken in the prioritised study areas, over a period of three years. |
| Source/collection of data | A progress report on the health risk assessment undertaken |
| Method of calculation | Simple count of a progress report on the health risk assessment study |
| Data limitations | Accuracy and availability of data as collected by the appointed service provider. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Annual progress reports produced |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Air Quality Management |
| Key Risks | Limited air quality and health data and the cooperation from the communities in the study areas. |

National environmental sector indicator National environmental sector indicator

| 4.2.4 | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of designated organs of state with approved and implemented AQMP's |
| Short definition | It shows the total number of designated organs of state that have approved and implemented Air Quality Management Plans and reviewed in line with the Air Quality Act requirements. |
| Purpose/importance | It indicates the level of management effectiveness towards improved air quality. |
| Source/collection of data | Record of the approved AQMP's that are implemented by designated organs of state. |

| Method of calculation | Count the number of approved AQMP's that are implemented by |
|--------------------------|--|
| | designated organs of state (Count of Approved AQMP'S. |
| | Approval of an AQMP implies implementation thereof) |
| Data limitations | The accuracy of record-keeping |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | If target is exceeded, it may be indicative of increased resources |
| | and improved institutional linkages and capacity. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Air Quality Management |
| Key Risks | Municipalities have not budgeted for the development of |
| | AQMPs, resulting in AQMPs not being developed and approved. |

| 4.2.5 | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Percentage of Atmospheric Emission Licenses with complete |
| | applications issued within legislated time frames. |
| Short definition | It shows the percentage of air emission licence applications where final decisions are made to either issue the authorisation or refuse authorisation or withdraw the application or close the lapsed application in the reporting period within legislated timeframe (It shows the percentage of atmospheric emission licenses that were issued within legislated timeframes after complete applications were received in terms of S21 of NEM:AQA. Incomplete or withdrawn AELs are excluded.) |
| Purpose/importance | This indicator shows the efficiency of the consideration of air emission licence applications. It also indicates the level of capacity made available by the department in pursuit of sustainable development in the province |
| Source/collection of data | Air emission licences' register (Record of air emission licences' fines) |
| Method of calculation | Count every air emission licence issued, every air emission licence refused, every withdrawn air emission licence application which lapsed and closed in the reporting period within the legislated timeframe. In addition, for efficiency, express this as a percentage of the applications received and a percentage of the applications not finalised within the timeframe. (This is a demand-driven target. Performance will be recorded as "Not Applicable" where no applications or incomplete applications are received, or where applications have been withdrawn by the applicant.) |
| Data limitations | The reliability of the register depends on the accuracy of the data captured |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | It is desired that 80% of all air emission licence applications received are finalised within legislated timeframes pending the quality of submissions. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Air Quality Management |

| Key Risks | AEL applications not completed in full, thus delaying the process |
|-----------|---|
| | of issuing an AEL license to the facility. The timeframes for |
| | handling an AEL in such instances are therefore extended, as the |
| | process starts over again. |

| 4.2.6 | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Percentage of facilities with Atmospheric Emission Licences reporting to the National Atmospheric Emissions Inventory System (NAEIS) |
| Short definition | To facilitate the reporting of emissions from listed activities, relevant data holders and government departments with a platform to report online both air pollutants and greenhouse gases emissions, towards the compilation of a national emissions inventory profile (The NAEIS is a platform where facilities that have been issued an atmospheric emission license reports to.) |
| Purpose/importance | The NAEIS will provide a platform for the reporting of air pollutants and greenhouse gases nationally in a sustainable manner. |
| Source/collection of data | Facilities and Local Authorities |
| Method of calculation | Count every facility with Atmospheric Emission Licence reporting to the NAEIS (This is demand-driven target. Performance will be recorded as "Not Applicable", where no facilities are required to report to the NAEIS.) |
| Data limitations | Reporting of facilities into NAEIS is largely depended on the finalisation of the reporting regulations |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative, self-regulatory reporting to DEA |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | Yes, 50% of facilities with AELs reporting to the NAEIS |
| Desired performance | 100% of facilities with AELs reporting to the NAEIS |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Air Quality Management |
| Key Risks | Facilities not reporting on time and adequately. Access to NAEIS system dependant on internet uptime, DEA delays in implementing database system. |

SUB-PROGRAMME 4.3: Pollution and Waste Management

| 4.3.1 | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of river and estuarine sites monitored in respect of pollution control |
| Short definition | Number of sites monitored for water quality in order to monitor pollution impacts in targeted river and estuarine sites. The water quality parameters measured are: chemical, bacteriological, pesticides and metals. |
| Purpose/importance | To identify potential pollution sources in rivers and estuaries. |
| Source/collection of data | Samples are collected and analysed by an appointed service provider conducting the monitoring at set frequencies. Certificates of Analysis for each water quality parameter measured at each site. |
| Method of calculation | Count of river and estuarine sites monitored in respect of pollution control |

| Data limitations | Seasonal influences, particularly during winter or summer, may result in sampling frequency being affected. |
|--------------------------|---|
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | 30 sites monitored |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Pollution and Chemicals Management |
| Key Risks | High water levels in winter could impact monitoring; Dry rivers during extreme summer conditions could impact monitoring. |

| 4.3.2 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Annual Report on Sustainable Water Management Plan |
| Short definition | An annual report is developed on the implementation of the |
| | Western Cape Sustainable Water Management Plan (WC SWMP). |
| Purpose/importance | The Annual Report provides progress on the implementation of |
| | the SWMP, as it relates to 12 priorities. |
| Source/collection of data | An information template is submitted to authorities for completion |
| | on progress made, as it relates to the 12 priorities of the SWMP. |
| Method of calculation | A simple count of an annual report on the Implementation of the |
| | SWMP. |
| Data limitations | Timely reporting by all authorities and accuracy of data provided |
| | by all authorities. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Annual report on implementation of the Western Cape |
| | Sustainable Water Management Plan (SWMP). |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Pollution and Chemicals Management |
| Key Risks | Authorities not providing information for the report by the required |
| | due dates, resulting in a delay in the completion of the report. |

| 4.3.3 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Number of riverine sites targeted for rehabilitation |
| Short definition | The number of sites targeted in rivers where indigenous |
| | vegetation is planted or maintained for river rehabilitation. |
| Purpose/importance | To rehabilitate the river by planting and maintaining indigenous |
| | vegetation along the river bank at targeted riverine sites. |
| Source/collection of data | Riverine sites targeted for rehabilitation by an appointed Service |
| | Provider; Monthly progress reports are provided by the Service |
| | Provider. |
| Method of calculation | A count of riverine sites in rehabilitation. |
| Data limitations | Not Applicable |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | 4 riverine sites targeted for rehabilitation |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Pollution and Chemicals Management |
| Key Risks | Loss of indigenous vegetation due to disease, flooding or extreme |
| | temperatures after planting at the targeted riverine sites; irrigation |
| | infrastructure failure at targeted riverine sites. |

| 4.3.4 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Number of inspections in respect of pollution control |
| Short definition | The number of inspections undertaken to control pollution to the environment. |
| Purpose/importance | Inspections are undertaken to ensure the control of pollution from potential sources of pollution. |
| Source/collection of data | Inspection Logs |
| Method of calculation | Simple count of number of inspections undertaken. |
| Data limitations | Non-cooperation from land owners / facilities to provide information on their processes. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | 5 inspections in respect of pollution control |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Pollution and Chemicals Management |
| Key Risks | Lack of co-operation from land owners or facilities. |

| 4.3.5 | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of \$30 cases responded to |
| Short definition | Number of Section 30 emergency incident cases on which |
| | responses are provided. |
| Purpose/importance | To ensure that actions are taken to mitigate the risk to humans |
| | and the environment, in respect of Section 30 Emergency |
| | Incidents. |
| Source/collection of | Section 30 Emergency Incident Log |
| data | |
| Method of calculation | A simple count of the number of Section 30 Emergency Incident |
| | cases responded to. |
| Data limitations | This is a demand-driven indicator; therefore, Section 30 |
| | Emergency Incident cases may not be received. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | 24 x Section 30 Emergency Incident cases responded to |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Pollution and Chemicals Management |
| Key Risks | Section 30 Emergency Incident cases may not be received, |
| | resulting in no responses provided |

| 4.3.6 | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of remediation cases responded to |
| Short definition | Number of remediation cases for which responses is provided. |
| Purpose/importance | To ensure that actions are taken to mitigate the risk to humans |
| | and the environment, in respect of contaminated land. |
| Source/collection of data | Remediation Logs |
| Method of calculation | Simple count of the number of remediation cases responded to |
| Data limitations | This is a demand-driven indicator; therefore, remediation cases |
| | may not be received. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | 48 x remediation cases responded to |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Pollution and Chemicals Management |

| Key Risks | Remediation cases may not be received, resulting in no responses |
|-----------|--|
| | provided. |

| 4.3.7 | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Waste minimisation intervention(s) undertaken for priority waste streams |
| Short definition | Development of waste minimisation interventions(s) for priority waste streams |
| Purpose/importance | To develop intervention(s) that will guide and promote the minimisation of priority waste streams |
| Source/collection of data | Waste minimisation intervention with respect to food waste |
| Method of calculation | A simple count of the waste minimisation intervention(s) |
| Data limitations | None |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | A Status Quo Report that will guide and promote the |
| | minimisation(s) o food waste |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Waste Management |
| Key Risks | Buy-in and support from key stakeholders |

| 4.3.8 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Municipal integrated waste management infrastructure assessment report |
| Short definition | Conduct a study to assess the municipal integrated waste management infrastructure needs |
| Purpose/importance | To assess municipal integrated waste management infrastructure needed to facilitate waste diversion/recovery, treatment and disposal |
| Source/collection of data | Assessment report on municipal integrated waste management infrastructure |
| Method of calculation | A simple count of the assessment report on municipal integrated waste management infrastructure |
| Data limitations | None |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | An assessment report on municipal integrated waste management infrastructure (phase 1) |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Waste Management |
| Key Risks | Buy-in and support from municipalities |

| 4.3.9 | |
|------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Review of Western Cape 1st Generation IWMP (Integrated Waste |
| | Management Plan) |
| Short definition | The review of the Western Cape 1st Generation IWMP to develop |
| | a 2 nd generation IWMP. |

| During a set (include a relieve a s | To not interesting the late Concentration WAYAR in a part line of which the superto |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Purpose/importance | To review the 1st Generation IWMP in compliance with the waste |
| | act to ensure that the Plan is current and reflects the new |
| | policies, practices and strategic direction in order to develop the |
| | second generation Western Cape IWMP |
| Source/collection of data | The reviewed Western Cape 1st Generation IWMP |
| Method of calculation | A simple count of reviewed 1st Generation IWMP |
| Data limitations | None |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | A revised status quo report informing the review of the 1st |
| | generation IWMP |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Waste Management |
| Key Risks | Availability of waste-related data |
| | |

| 4.3.10 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Hazardous waste intervention(s) undertaken |
| Short definition | Development of hazardous waste intervention(s) for a priority |
| | hazardous waste stream |
| Purpose/importance | To develop an intervention(s) that will guide and promote |
| | hazardous waste interventions to ensure the safe management of |
| | a hazardous waste stream |
| Source/collection of data | The developed intervention(s) based on a hazardous waste |
| | stream information |
| Method of calculation | Simple count of the intervention(s) |
| Data limitations | None |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Interventions developed to ensure the safe management of a |
| | hazardous waste stream |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Waste Management |
| Key Risks | Limited information |
| | |

| 4.3.11 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Waste management planning interventions undertaken |
| Short definition | Development of waste management planning tool(s) |
| Purpose/importance | To develop tools which will assist with integrated waste |
| | management planning to improve waste management/ |
| Source/collection of data | The planning tool(s) developed |
| Method of calculation | Simple count of the tool(s) developed |
| Data limitations | None |
| Type of indicator | Non- cumulative |
| Calculation type | Output |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Development of a waste management planning tool |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Waste Management |
| Key Risks | Buy-in from stakeholders |
| | |

| 4.3.12 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Annual state of waste management report developed |
| Short definition | TA report on the state of waste management provides an |
| | account of the waste management interventions in the province |
| Purpose/importance | To provide information on the state of waste management in the province for the Department and key stakeholders for policy formulation, waste planning and decision- making |
| Source/collection of data | The annual state of waste management report waste information compiled by the department from waste reporting, information obtained for the Greenest Municipality Competition (waste theme), waste licenses, compliance audits. |
| Method of calculation | Simple count of annual state of waste management report |
| Data limitations | None |
| Type of indicator | Non- cumulative |
| Calculation type | Output |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | An annual state of waste management report |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Waste Management |
| Key Risks | Quality of information received from stakeholders |

National environmental sector indicator

| 4.3.13 | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Percentage of Waste Licence applications finalised within legislated timeframes |
| Short definition | It shows the percentage of waste licence applications where final decisions are made to either issue the authorisation or refuse authorisation or withdraw the application or close the lapsed application in the reporting period within legislated timeframe |
| Purpose/importance | This indicator shows the efficiency and effectiveness of the consideration of waste licence applications. It also indicates the level of capacity made available by the department in pursuit of sustainable development in the province |
| Source/collection of data | Waste licences' register (Record of waste licences' fines) |
| Method of calculation | Count every waste licence issued, every waste licence refused every withdrawn waste licence application which lapsed and closed in the reporting period within the legislated timeframe. In addition, for efficiency, express this as a percentage of the applications received and a percentage of the applications not finalised within the timeframe. |
| Data limitations | The reliability of the register depends on the accuracy of the data captured |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | It is desired that 80% of all waste licence applications received are finalised within legislated timeframes pending the quality of submissions. (The Department's desired performance is 95%) |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Waste Management |
| Key Risks | Staff absenteeism, staff resignations, competing priorities Dependent of licence applications received Loss of electronic data eg. Hard Drive crashing |

PROGRAMME 5: BIODIVERSITY MANAGEMENT

SUB-PROGRAMME 5.1: Biodiversity and Protected Area Planning and Management

| 5.1.1 | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Western Cape Provincial Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (PBSAP) |
| Short definition | To define the mandate, functions, priorities and associated responsibilities of the Department and its implementing agent CapeNature in biodiversity management. |
| Purpose/importance | To develop a unique PBSAP for the Western Cape. |
| Source/collection of data | Existing policy and legal documents from local to global perspectives. |
| Method of calculation | Count of completed draft PBSAP |
| Data limitations | The accuracy of the data depends on records available. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulatively |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Development of a Final Draft Provincial Biodiversity Strategy & Action Plan (PBSAP) for Western Cape signed off by the HoD. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Biodiversity and Coastal Management |
| Key Risks | Potential delays in reaching internal agreement on the content of the Final Draft PBSAP. Limited internal personnel capacity within the Directorate to conclude the Strategy and Action Plan and associated consultation process. |

| 5.1.2 | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Eco-Invest Programme developed and implemented |
| Short definition | To contribute to the development of the provincial biodiversity economy strategy through the mobilisation of private sector investment in natural capital and ecosystems infrastructure through the Western Cape Eco-Invest Project. Phase 3 will focus on the unlocking opportunities in prioritised biodiversity economy value chains. |
| Purpose/importance | To create opportunities and align with the Green Economy Strategy Framework and the developing PBSAP in order to drive a biodiversity-based economy and address green job creation. |
| Source/collection of data | Existing National Biodiversity Economy Development Strategy (NBEDS) and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) |
| Method of calculation | Count of completed Western Cape Eco-Invest project Phase 3 Report. |
| Data limitations | The accuracy of the data depends on records available. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulatively |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Completion of the Western Cape Eco-Invest project Phase 3. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Biodiversity and Coastal Management |

| Key Risks | Potential delays for the appointment of approved service |
|-----------|---|
| | providers. |
| | Insufficient private sector uptake of investment opportunities. |
| | Limited internal personnel capacity to broker investments. |

National environmental sector indicator

| 5.1.3 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Number of hectares in the conservation estate |
| Short definition | It shows the total surface area of land mass under formal conservation at the time of reporting (critical priority areas, and not merely the total number of hectares). [The CapeNature conservation estate comprises the total hectares of land surface area of the Western Cape managed by CapeNature and includes land secured through Stewardship or acquired by any other means.] |
| Purpose/importance | It indicates the level of progress towards the Millennium Development Goals and Convention on Biodiversity on conservation. Indicates progress towards the national and provincial protected areas expansion strategy. [The indicator responds to national imperatives and deliverables around the expansion of the conservation estate.] |
| Source/collection of data | Record of government gazettes of proclaimed protected areas and record of contractual agreements. |
| Method of calculation | Total surface area of land under conservation/Total number of hectares of Province x 100%. [Within CapeNature it is calculated as sum of total hectares of land managed by CapeNature.] |
| Data limitations | The accuracy of the data in terms of specific boundaries and hectares and access to information and clarity on ownership of protected land. |
| Type of indicator | Outcome |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Effective protection of sufficient land to ensure the long term survival of all vegetation types and species. |
| Indicator responsibility | Public Entity: CapeNature (Executive Director: Biodiversity Support) |
| Key Risks | International and National targets may not be met. |

SUB-PROGRAMME 5.2: Western Cape Nature Conservation Board

| 5.2.1 | |
|--------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Oversight report on the performance of CapeNature |
| Short definition | An annual oversight report based on the cumulative assessment of Cape Nature's performance in terms of their Strategic Plan and Annual Performance Plan. |
| Purpose/importance | To provide oversight to the Public Entity through the assessment of performance and to provide for recommendations for improvement. |

| Source/collection of | CapeNature APP and QPRs,, Annual Reports, DEADP Quarterly |
|--------------------------|---|
| data | Assessments |
| Method of calculation | Count of the oversight reports completed. |
| Data limitations | Formalised monitoring & evaluation system to oversee the delivery of services by CapeNature to the Department is in development. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Annual oversight report based on the cumulative assessment of CapeNature's performance in terms of their Strategic Plan and Annual Performance Plan, singed off by HoD. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Biodiversity and Coastal Management |
| Key Risks | Time, different opinions, mandate (organisations) CN & DEA &DP Delay of delivery of input reports for oversight. |

National environmental sector indicator

| 5.2.2 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Percentage of area of state managed protected areas assess with a METT score above 67% |
| Short definition | It shows the total number of state managed protected areas (inclusive of Marine Protected Areas) that are managed efficiently within set criteria of measure (METT score). (To assess the management of effectiveness of South African protected areas). [This indicator refers to protected areas managed by CapeNature]. |
| | Area is defined as the hectares as listed (and as calculated) per protected area in the GIS layers entitled CNC_Reserves and ca_mar which are stored on the Scientific Services GIS in Jonkershoek. Management complexes are groups of land parcels that are clustered due to similarity in purpose, objectives, connectivity and proximity. |
| Purpose/importance | To measure the efficiency and effectiveness of national government, provinces and their conservation agencies in managing protected areas within their jurisdiction in a way to ensure ecosystem sustainability and biodiversity persistence in line with their management objectives. |
| Source/collection of data | METT assessment template and reports as well as any other supporting documentation available. |

| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
|--------------------------|---|
| Method of calculation | Four (4) scoring focus areas are assessed for scoring within the scale of 0-4. Legal compliance, resource input, achievable output and the management process are measured. |
| | [The METT-SA percentage score is calculated by totalling the sum of the scores achieved in the METT-SA divided by the Adjusted Total Maximum score where the Not Applicable scores have been subtracted. |
| | Percentage of area of state managed protected areas assessed with a METT score above 67%: |
| | The total area (hectares) of management complexes with a |
| | METT-SA percentage score above 67% divided by the total area (hectares) of management complexes multiplied by 100.] |
| Data limitations | The reliability of own scoring with no peer review, as well as limited understanding of the system. [The accuracy and completeness of the data in the METT-SA audits.] |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No for CapeNature |
| Desired performance | Higher – To have by 2019, 90% of the area of state managed |
| | protected areas assessed with a METT score above 67%. |
| Indicator responsibility | Public entity: Cape Nature (Executive Director: Conservation |
| | Management) |
| Key Risks | Moderate |

| 5.2.3 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Number of permits issued within legislated timeframes |
| Short definition | The issuing of natural resource permits to stakeholders done efficiently. |
| Purpose/importance | To ensure that legislative natural resource permits are issued within the stipulated timeframes. It measures the efficiency and effectiveness in service delivery showing the number of permits issued or refused and communicated within legislative timeframes. [CapeNature is governed by Nature Conservation Ordinance no. 19 of 1974 which does not prescribe legislative timeframes. A standard operating procedure will guide the timeframes attached to issuing permits according to the Ordinance.] |
| Source/collection of data | Provincial Permits database. [Electronic Permit System at CapeNature.] |
| Method of calculation | Report drawn from auditable permits management system. [Total sum of permits issued within timeframes as per the standard operating procedure.] |
| Data limitations | Provincial permits management system (manual). [No specific limitations.] |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | No [Yes, as CapeNature is measuring this for the first time] |
| Desired performance | Higher - to have permits issued within the stipulated timeframes. [Performance that is higher than targeted is desirable; a 10% variation above the target will be deemed as target met] |
| Indicator responsibility | Public entity: Cape Nature (Executive Director: Biodiversity Support Services) |
| Key Risks | Moderate |

SUB-PROGRAMME 5.3: Coastal Management

| 5.3.1 | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Finalisation and implementation of the Provincial Coastal Management Programme |
| Short definition | The development and finalisation of the Western Cape Coastal Management Programme. |
| Purpose/importance | In terms of the National Environmental management: Integrated Coastal management Act (Act no. 24 of 2008) Provincial Government is required to develop a Coastal Management Programme which supports the implementation of the National Coastal Management Programme, recently published in November 2014. |
| Source/collection of data | PCC Minutes, District Municipality CMPs, the National CMP, comments received on published Draft WC CMP, Estuarine Management Programme documents, consultant reports. |
| Method of calculation | Simple count the Western Cape Provincial Coastal Management Programme completed and signed off by Provincial Minister. |
| Data limitations | Lack of State of the Coast Reporting system and the M&E Framework. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Provincial Coastal Management Programme approved by the Provincial Minister |
| Indicator responsibility | Director: Biodiversity and Coastal Management |
| Key Risks | Procurement timeframes and late conclusion of the CMP implementation plan as the critical informant to its implementation. |

| 5.3.2 | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Finalise the estuarine management plan for the Breede River estuary |
| Short definition | The revision and finalisation of the Breede River Estuarine Management Plan |
| Purpose/importance | In terms of the National Estuarine Management Protocol, the development of the Breede River Estuarine Management Plan is a WC Provincial Government responsibility. |
| Source/collection of data | Draft Breede River Estuary Management Plan and Local authority Plans |
| Method of calculation | Simple count of the Breede River Estuary Management Plan completed. |
| Data limitations | Availability of hydrological and sediment data to inform the plan. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annual |
| New indicator | Yes |

| Desired performance | Finalised Breede River Estuarine Management Plan submitted to the Provincial Minister |
|--------------------------|--|
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Biodiversity and Coastal Management |
| Key Risks | Procurement process delays, local level stakeholder conflicts which prevent the finalisation of the EMP. |

| 5.3.3 | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Completion of technical determination of the Eden coastal Setback line |
| Short definition | Delineated a draft coastal management line for the Eden District Municipal area by means of the refined methodology adopted by the Department. |
| Purpose/importance | To protect vulnerable coastal ecosystems, private properties and public safety. Provide legal certainty and reduce the number of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) in the coastal zone in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA): Integrated Coastal Management Act (ICMA). |
| Source/collection of data | Project Reports |
| Method of calculation | Count of the evaluation of the project progress reports |
| Data limitations | Availability of data |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Delineation of draft coastal overlay zone with accompanying development parameters, including: draft coastal management line; coastal protection zone; littoral active zone; risk zones along the Eden District coastline. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Spatial Planning and Coastal Planning and Impact Management |
| Key Risks | Dependent on external stakeholders, funding available and appropriate legal tool to implement the coastal overlay zone with development parameters |

PROGRAMME 6: ENVIRONMENTAL EMPOWERMENT SERVICES

SUB-PROGRAMME 6.1: Environmental Capacity Development and Support

| 6.1.1. | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Review Departmental Environmental Capacity Building Strategy |
| Short definition | The review of the Departmental Environmental Capacity Building Strategy. |
| Purpose/importance | To ensure the continued efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness of the strategy. |
| Source/collection of data | Review report and performance information. |
| Method of calculation | Completion of review report Annually in Q4 |

| Data limitations | With respect to the annual review report there is no specific data limitations. |
|--------------------------|--|
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually (Q4) |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Completion of review report Annually in Q4 to ensure the continued efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness of the strategy. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Development Facilitation |
| Key Risks | Lack of coordination within the Department as well as lack of cooperation and coordination between the different organs of State and SALGA that work with the Department to implement the Strategy. |

| 6.1.2. | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Percentage implementation of the Local Government Support |
| | Strategy |
| Short definition | Provide environmental management support to municipalities. |
| Purpose/importance | Promote sustainable development by integrating environmental |
| | sustainable considerations in local development agenda |
| Source/collection of | DEA branches, Partners (COGTA, SALGA and SANBI), Provinces, |
| data | local authorities DEA&DP components |
| Method of calculation | Calculation of percentage of implementation against the |
| | quarterly or annual performance target. |
| Data limitations | Baseline data not available at a local scale for relevant |
| | thematic areas |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Environmentally sustainable municipalities |
| Indicator responsibility | Environmental Affairs (National & Provinces), Partners (COGTA, |
| | SALGA and SANBI), Provinces, local authorities (Monitoring & |
| | Reporting Responsibility: Working Group 3) Director: |
| | Development Facilitation |
| Key Risks | Sector Strategy coordinated by COGTA and DEA, and also |
| | dependent on the responsiveness of the Municipalities. |

National environmental sector indicator

| 6.1.3 | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of work opportunities created through environmental programmes |
| Short definition | This refers to formal and informal employment opportunities created through environmental programmes and may include internship, volunteer programmes, EPWP, CBNRM, recycling and buy-back centres, nurseries, etc). |
| Purpose/importance | To track job creation opportunities in the environment sector. |
| Source/collection of data | Count of number of opportunities created from Contracts, payslips, timesheets, programme beneficiary registers, EPWP quarterly reporting (Environment component of Environment and Culture Sector reports). |

| Method of calculation | Payroll, contract files, beneficiary data, EPWP quarterly reporting |
|--------------------------|---|
| | (Environment component of Environment and Culture Sector |
| | · · |
| | reports). |
| Data limitations | Possibility of providing a skewed picture when comparing figures |
| | to those required in terms of other reporting obligations eg EPWP, |
| | CBNRM, recycling and buy-back centres, nurseries, etc |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | No (with refined definition) |
| Desired performance | Increase job opportunities in the environmental sector through |
| | environmental programmes. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Sustainability |
| Key Risks | Availability of relevant candidates for appointment. |

| 6.1.4 | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of environmental capacity building activities conducted |
| Short definition | Refers to the number of activities conducted in order to build stakeholder capacity to implement environmental regulatory framework |
| Purpose/importance | To build capacity of stakeholders on the environmental regulatory framework to improve service delivery. |
| Source/collection of data | Activity plans and attendance registers |
| Method of calculation | Activity count |
| Data limitations | Verification of data |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | Increase the knowledge of stakeholders on governmental environmental regulatory procedures to improve service delivery. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorates: Development Facilitation, Sustainability, Biodiversity and Coastal Management, Climate Change, Waste Management, Air Quality Management and Pollution Management |
| Key Risks | Expected number of delegates not attending the event |

SUB-PROGRAMME 6.2: Environmental Communications and Awareness

National environmental sector indicator

| 6.2.1 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Number of environmental calendar days celebrated |
| Short definition | The scope entails raising awareness of various groups in the Western Cape, building capacity thereof, on environmental issues. |
| Purpose/importance | To promote environmental awareness, youth and community development to enhance progressive realization of environmental rights |
| Source/collection of data | Communication material distributed, attendance registers, evaluation forms and reports. |
| Method of calculation | According to the national and UN dates for environmental calendar days |
| Data limitations | None |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |

| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
|--------------------------|---|
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | To ensure that environmental calendar days are celebrated through educational interventions and awareness campaigns, networking with other relevant stakeholders. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Sustainability |
| Key Risks | Expected number of delegates not attending the event |

| 6.2.2 | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of environmental awareness activities conducted |
| Short definition | Refers to the number of activities conducted refers to the number of activities (workshop, session, presentation in a community meeting) organized towards promoting awareness about the environment. For example, awareness workshops conducted in schools, communities, visits by students to environmental centre, distribution of pamphlets, celebration of environment commemorative days, exhibitions, clean-up campaigns, media campaigns, resources developed, greening or trees planted, etc. |
| Purpose/importance | To track environmental awareness efforts. |
| Source/collection of data | Copies of resources developed and communication material distributed, attendance registers, evaluation forms and reports. |
| Method of calculation | Manual Count |
| Data limitations | Inaccurate records and access to reliable data. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | No |
| Desired performance | The more awareness activities are undertaken, the more the general public will be knowledgeable about environmental issues. |
| Indicator responsibility | Chief Directorate: Environmental Governance Policy Co- ordination and Planning and Compliance and Enforcement and Directorates: Sustainability, Biodiversity and Coastal Management, Waste Management, |
| Key Risks | Expected number of delegates not attending the event |

| 6.2.3 | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Number of quality environmental education resources materials developed |
| Short definition | Number of quality environmental education resources materials developed refers to the number of educational resource materials developed to support awareness, empowerment, education and capacity building efforts for transformative learning and practice in environment and sustainability education. |
| Purpose/importance | To record and keep track of available environmental education resource materials developed and monitor their impact on transformative environmental learning and practice. |
| Source/collection of data | Types of environmental education resource materials developed and distributed |
| Method of calculation | Manual count |
| Data limitations | Inaccurate records and access to reliable data. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Quarterly |
| New indicator | New |

| Desired performance | The more available environmental education resource materials developed, published, and distributed, the more the general public will be informed, acquire skills, become knowledgeable about environmental practices and advance their learning experience. |
|--------------------------|--|
| Indicator responsibility | Directorates: Sustainability and Waste Management |
| Key Risks | Development of educational material is subject to current/existing programmes. Not all information available on websites supports the intended educational programmes. |

PROGRAMME 7: DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

SUB-PROGRAMME 7.1: Development Facilitation

| 7.1.1 | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of catalytic Initiative Programme evaluation reports |
| | |
| Short definition | The evaluation of the Development Facilitation Catalytic |
| | Initiative Programme. |
| Purpose/importance | To ensure the continued efficiency, effectiveness and |
| | responsiveness of the programme. |
| Source/collection of | Evaluation report and performance information. |
| data | |
| Method of calculation | Completion of evaluation report Annually in Q4 |
| Data limitations | With respect to the annual evaluation report there is no specific |
| | data limitations. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually (Q4) |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Completion of evaluation report Annually in Q4 to ensure the |
| | continued efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness of the |
| | programme. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Development Facilitation |
| Key Risks | Lack of cooperation and coordination of the other organs of |
| | State who needs to support the programme. |

| 7.1.2 | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of Land Assembly Strategy review reports |
| Short definition | The review of the Development Facilitation Land Assembly Strategy. |
| Purpose/importance | To ensure the continued efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness of the strategy. |
| Source/collection of | Review report and performance information. |
| data | |
| Method of calculation | Completion of review report Annually in Q4 |
| Data limitations | With respect to the annual review report there is no specific data limitations. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually (Q4) |
| New indicator | Yes |

| Desired performance | Completion of review report Annually in Q4 to ensure the continued efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness of the strategy. |
|--------------------------|--|
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Development Facilitation |
| Key Risks | Lack of cooperation and coordination of the other organs of State who needs to support the strategy. |

| 7.1.3 | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Indicator title | Number of Department Municipal Support and Capacity Building Strategy evaluation reports. |
| Short definition | The evaluation of Departmental Municipal Support and Capacity Building Strategy. |
| Purpose/importance | To ensure the continued efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness of the strategy. |
| Source/collection of data | Review report and performance information. |
| Method of calculation | Completion of review report Annually in Q1 |
| Data limitations | With respect to the annual review report there is no specific data limitations. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually (Q4) |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Completion of review report Annually in Q1 to ensure the continued efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness of the strategy. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Development Facilitation |
| Key Risks | Lack of coordination within the Department as well as lack of cooperation and coordination between the different organs of State and SALGA that work with the Department to implement the Strategy. |

| 7.1.4 | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of Provincial Development Planning Intelligence |
| | Management Strategy evaluation reports |
| Short definition | The annual review of the Provincial Development Planning |
| | Intelligence Management Strategy during the first quarter |
| Purpose/importance | To ensure the continued efficiency, effectiveness and |
| | responsiveness of the strategy. |
| Source/collection of | The annual Provincial Development Planning Intelligence |
| data | Management Strategy evaluation report. |
| Method of calculation | The annual Provincial Development Planning Intelligence |
| | Management Strategy evaluation report. |
| Data limitations | With respect to the annual review there are no specific data |
| | limitations. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Completion of evaluation report Annually in Q4 to ensure the |
| | continued efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness of the |
| | programme. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Development Planning Intelligence Management and Research |

| Key Risks | The failure to complete the annual review and effect necessary |
|-----------|--|
| | revisions may result in the strategy becoming inefficient, |
| | ineffective and unresponsive. |

SUB-PROGRAMME 7.2: SPATIAL PLANNING AND LAND USE MANAGEMENT (INCLUDES THE RELATED MUNICIPAL SUPPORT).

| 7.2.1 | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of Provincial Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Governance and Performance Management System evaluation reports |
| Short definition | The evaluation of the Provincial Spatial Governance and Performance Management System. |
| Purpose/importance | Efficient, effective and responsive governance |
| Source/collection of data | Evaluation report and performance information |
| Method of calculation | Completion of evaluation report Annually in Q4 |
| Data limitations | With respect to the annual evaluation report there is no specific data limitations. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually (Q4) |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Completion of evaluation report Annually in Q4 to ensure and improve efficient, effective and responsive governance |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Spatial Planning and Coastal Impact Management |
| Key Risks | The failure to complete the annual review and effect necessary revisions may result in the system becoming inefficient, ineffective and unresponsive. |

| 7.2.2 | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Review Departmental Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Support and Capacity Building Strategy |
| Short definition | The review of the Departmental Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Support and Capacity Building Strategy. |
| Purpose/importance | Efficient, effective and responsive governance |
| Source/collection of data | Review report and performance information |
| Method of calculation | Completion of review report Annually in Q4 |
| Data limitations | With respect to the annual review report there is no specific data limitations. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually (Q4) |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Completion of review report Annually in Q4 to ensure and improve efficient, effective and responsive governance |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Development Management Region 1, 2, 3 |
| Key Risks | Lack of cooperation and coordination between the different organs of State and SALGA that work with the Department to implement the Strategy. |

SUB-PROGRAMME 7.3: REGIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT AND SPECIAL PROJECTS

| 7.3.1 | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of Regional Planning and Management Implementation Strategy evaluation reports |
| Short definition | Implementation and evaluation of the Provincial and Regional Planning and Management Implementation Strategy. |
| Purpose/importance | To ensure continued efficient, effective and responsive implementation |
| Source/collection of data | Provincial and Regional Planning and Management Implementation Strategy evaluation reports |
| Method of calculation | Completion of annual evaluation reports |
| Data limitations | With respect to the annual evaluation there are no specific data limitations. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually (Q3) |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Completion of the annual evaluation during the 3 rd Quarter. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Spatial Planning and Coastal Impact Management |
| Key Risks | Lack of cooperation and coordination between the different organs of State that work with the Department to implement the Strategy. |

| 7.3.2 | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Indicator title | Number of municipalities within which the RSEP/VPUU programme is implemented according to approved project lists |
| Short definition | Implementation of the RSEP/VPUU multi-year programme according to approved project lists in 6 Municipalities: Theewaterskloof; Drakenstein; Saldanha Bay; Swartland; Breede Valley; Cape Town. |
| Purpose/importance | The RSEP/VPUU programme is one of the strategic programmes of the Western Cape Government and the monitoring of the implementation of the programme is therefore important. |
| Source/collection of data | Annual programme |
| Method of calculation | Completion of evaluation report Annually in Q4 |
| Data limitations | With respect to the annual evaluation report there is no specific data limitations. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually (Q4) |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | RSEP/VPUU programme implemented according to approved project lists in 6 Municipalities: Theewaterskloof; Drakenstein; Saldanha Bay; Swartland; Breede Valley; Cape Town. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Development Facilitation |
| Key Risks | Lack of cooperation and coordination of the Municipalities and other organs of State who work with the Department to implement the programme. |

| 7.3.3 | | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Indicator title | Number of RSEP / VPUU programme review reports | |
| Short definition | The review of the RSEP/VPUU Programme. | |
| Purpose/importance | Efficient, effective and responsive governance | |

| Source/collection of data | Review report and performance information |
|---------------------------|--|
| Method of calculation | Completion of review report Annually in Q4 |
| Data limitations | With respect to the annual review report there is no specific data limitations. |
| Type of indicator | Output |
| Calculation type | Non-cumulative |
| Reporting cycle | Annually (Q4) |
| New indicator | Yes |
| Desired performance | Completion of review report Annually in Q4 to ensure continued efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness of the programme. |
| Indicator responsibility | Directorate: Development Management |
| Key Risks | The failure to complete the annual review and effect necessary revisions may result in the programme becoming inefficient, ineffective and unresponsive. |