8.1 Contextual Background

The national transport policy and previous resource by the Financial and Fiscal Commission (the Commission) supports the assignment of transport functions to the “lowest appropriate level of government” (DoT, 1996; FFC, 2013b). As illustrated conceptually in Chapter 7, assigning transport functions to municipalities can facilitate improved integrated planning and transport service delivery. Such municipalities would need to have full transport network authority for land passenger transport, which implies that they must design the network and decide how the network should operate. This means that no other entity or sphere of government would be allowed to make any network changes, unless the municipality had pre-identified such changes as essential for transport service delivery. Transport service delivery has been shown to be strongly linked with politics and is therefore susceptible to political manipulation, which may not have long-term benefits (Iles, 2005). Therefore, when reassigning functions to municipalities, it is important to ensure that long-term service delivery objectives override short-term political interests.

A number of additional questions raised in Chapter 7 are addressed in this chapter:

- What are the individual stakeholder requirements for assigning the transport function?
- What is the appropriate function assignment model for the South African context?
- What critical constraints need to be overcome to effect transport function assignment?
- What are the resource requirements for assigning the transport function?

After providing some background about the reassignment of transport functions and summarising relevant previous studies by the Commission, transport functions are profiled based on the South African transport legislation. The delivery of transport functions in the country is then assessed, followed by stakeholder inputs and perspectives about assigning the transport function. Local and international case studies are used to illustrate the successes and failures of devolving and consolidating transport functions. Lastly, the critical success factors for effective reassignment of functions are summarised, concluding with recommendations.

8.1.1 Assignment of transport functions

The movement of people and goods is necessary to support life and consists of two distinct aspects: mobility and access. Mobility refers to how fast one is able to move between any two points in space, while accessibility refers to the ease with which one is able to move between the two points. An efficient and effective transport system maximises both mobility and access. Passenger land transport (the focus of this chapter) aims to achieve the goal of moving large numbers of people – not vehicles – within a given time and space at low cost. Failure to provide such a public transport system increases societal unit costs and reduces the economy’s competitiveness. In South Africa, the absence of an efficient and effective public transport system risks violating some of the human
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Rights enshrined in the Constitution, such as freedom of movement and the right to equality. The delivery of desirable public transport services requires appropriate and effective institutional structures and rationalisation of functions across the national, provincial and local spheres of government.

The National Land Transport Act (No. 5 of 2009) (NLTA) empowers the Minister of Transport to assign functions to the most appropriate sphere of government, subject to Sections 99 and 156(4) of the Constitution, and Sections 9 and 10 of the Municipal Systems Act (No. 32 of 2000) (MSA). Section 99 of the Constitution states that assigning a function to a municipality must be agreed with the Municipal Council. The assignment must also be consistent with the Act of Parliament from which the function is exercised, and must only take effect upon proclamation by the president. Section 156(4) of the Constitution allows national and provincial spheres to assign any function to municipalities, if the function would be administered most effectively by the municipality and provided that the municipality has the capacity to administer the function. Sections 9 and 10 of the MSA extend consultations required to the Minister of Finance, Provincial Member of Executive Council for Finance, organised local government, the Commission, and the Minister of Cooperative Government and Traditional Affairs. These sections also refer to the need for appropriate funding and capacity in the municipality concerned. The municipality seeking to be assigned a transport function must also comply with the above requirements. The Commission, in particular, requires that the function assignment satisfy the detailed requirements listed in Annexure A (FFC, 2007), and the business plan to assign a transport function must indicate how each of the requirements in Annexure A is addressed.

The NLTA contains the land transport functions of the three spheres of government in South Africa, as summarised in Table 84. In brief, the role of national government is to define the country’s transport policy and strategy, for municipalities to implement with some support from the provinces. Section 11(iv) empowers the three spheres of government to assign functions to the most appropriate sphere of government. Furthermore, one or more adjacent municipalities may jointly undertake a function, or even establish a joint entity for the purpose of fulfilling the function.

Table 84: Transport functions for three spheres of government in the NLTA

| National                                      | Provincial
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formulating national transport policy and strategy.</td>
<td>Formulating provincial transport policy and strategy, within the framework of national policy and strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and coordinating national transport strategy.</td>
<td>Planning, coordinating and facilitating land transport functions in the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating provinces and addressing arrangements between the three spheres of government and public entities, to ensure the effective and efficient execution of the land transport function.</td>
<td>Coordinating municipalities, to ensure the effective and efficient execution of land transport in the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning functions to the most appropriate sphere of government.</td>
<td>Liaising with other government departments in the national and provincial spheres that have responsibilities that affect transport issues, with a view to coordinating land transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaising with other government departments in the national sphere that have responsibilities that affect transport issues, with a view to coordinating land transport.</td>
<td>Capacitating and monitoring provinces and municipalities that lack capacity or resources to perform their land transport functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating transport relations between the Republic and other countries and implementing international agreements.</td>
<td>Coordinating transport relations between the Republic and other countries and implementing international agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Act-specific functions in relation to applications for operating licences.</td>
<td>Performing Act-specific functions in relation to applications for operating licences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulating tourism transport.</td>
<td>Regulating tourism transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulating interprovincial road transport.</td>
<td>Regulating interprovincial road transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting as contracting authority for subsidised service contracts, interim contracts, current tendered contracts and negotiated contracts.</td>
<td>Acting as contracting authority for subsidised service contracts, interim contracts, current tendered contracts and negotiated contracts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Provincial

- Ensuring implementation of the provincial integrated development strategy and public transport strategy, with due attention to rural areas, focusing on less capacitated municipalities or those that do not fulfil their responsibilities in respect of transport service delivery, either by direct implementation or assistance.

### Municipal

- Developing land transport policy and strategy within its area based on national and provincial guidelines, which includes its vision for the area and incorporates spatial development policies on matters such as densification and infilling as well as development corridors.
- Promulgating municipal by-laws and concluding agreements, as appropriate, in the municipal sphere.
- Ensuring coordination between departments and agencies in the municipal sphere that have responsibilities that affect transport and land use planning issues, and bringing together the relevant officials in its capacity as planning authority.
- Preparing transport plans for its area, ensuring the implementation thereof and monitoring its performance in achieving its goals and objectives.
- Financial planning with regard to land transport within or affecting its area, with particular reference to transport planning, infrastructure, operations, services, maintenance, monitoring and administration, with due focus on rehabilitation and maintenance of infrastructure.
- Managing the movement of persons and goods on land within its area by coordinating such movement.
- Encouraging and promoting the optimal use of the available travel modes so as to enhance the effectiveness of the transport system and reduce travelling time and costs.
- Developing, implementing and monitoring a strategy to prevent, minimise or reduce any adverse impacts of the land transport system on the environment in its area.
- Developing, operating and maintaining a land transport information system for its area.
- Encouraging, promoting and facilitating public consultation and participation in the planning, regulation and implementation of public transport, and applying the requirements of the Municipal Systems Act (No. 32 of 2000) in that regard.
- Marketing and promoting public transport and promoting publicity associated with the public transport system.
- Providing information to users or potential users of public transport.
- Promoting safety and security in public transport.
- Ensuring there is provision for the needs of special categories of passengers in planning and providing public transport infrastructure, facilities and services to meet their needs, in so far as possible by the system provided for mainstream public transport.
- Liaising on a continuous basis with the South African Police Service, Road Traffic Management Corporation, the relevant provincial and municipal law enforcement authorities or agencies, and the inspectors appointed under the Cross-Border Act No. 4 of 1998, with a view to ensuring coordinated transport law enforcement within its area.
- Applying traffic management techniques aimed at improving road traffic movement.
- Undertaking functions relating to municipal roads, as well as measures to limit damage to the road system.
- Planning, implementing and managing modally integrated public transport networks and travel corridors for transport within the municipal area and liaising in that regard with neighbouring municipalities.
- Service level planning for passenger rail on a corridor network basis in consultation with the Passenger Rail Agency of South Africa.
- Introducing, establishing or assisting in or encouraging, and facilitating the establishment of integrated ticketing systems, the managing thereof including through-ticketing and determining measures for the regulation and control of revenue-sharing among operators involved in those systems subject to standards set by the Minister of Transport.
- Setting standards for interoperability between fare collection and ticketing systems in its area.
- Formulating and applying travel demand management measures for its area.
- In the case of gross cost contracts for subsidised services, determining fare structures and fare levels and periodically adjusting fares after publishing the proposed adjustment for public comment.
- Determining concessionary fares for special categories of passengers.
- Exercising control over service delivery through the setting of operational and technical standards and monitoring and compliance therewith.
- Monitoring contracts and concessions.
- Concluding subsidised service contracts, commercial service contracts, and negotiated contracts with operators for services within their areas.
- Developing and managing intelligent transport systems for their areas.

Source: RSA (2009)
Table 85 summarises the overall organisational structure responsible for the transport functions in South Africa, showing the entities and their high-level strategic roles for all the three spheres of government. The table includes functions other than land passenger transport, which is the focus of this investigation. With over 300 entities involved in transport service delivery, the structure is large and continues to expand, especially in metropolitan municipalities with the formation of entities to manage the integrated public transport networks. Such a large structure would ordinarily require seamless coordinating in order to deliver on a coherent transport service delivery mandate. However, in practice the current transport institutional arrangement is prone to potential duplication of functions (FFC, 2013b). It therefore requires some rationalisation and this will mean more effective service delivery.

The consolidation of transport functions brings many benefits, such as fare integration, integrated marketing of public transport, integrated scheduling of services as well as funding and implementation of joint programmes (Meyer et al., 2005). Much of the success of public transport services in Germany and Switzerland is ascribed to using a “verkehrsverbund”, which is a coordinating institutional framework (Stone, 2011). A survey of transport functions in the United States found that entities that use integrated network planning tend to have improved public transport services (Rivasplata, Iseki and Smith, 2012). However, financial, technological, political and administrative hurdles have first to be overcome, while the entity managing the integration needs to be autonomous in order to define network standards (Meyer et al., 2005). Having uniform standards for the public transport network is especially beneficial to users, allowing them to travel seamlessly (Dodson et al., 2011). However, such a network needs to be designed and managed as an integrated network, not as isolated modes of transport, which is currently the case in South Africa (Walters, 2011).

What makes transport a priority for rationalising functions, particularly in South Africa, is that transport accounts for significant costs in household and business transactions (NPC, 2011). Furthermore, the spatial dislocations inherited from the apartheid era mean that the costs fall disproportionately on black and poor households. A more efficient transport system can translate into reduced household costs and reduced costs of doing business in the country, as well as contribute towards improved social inclusion (NPC, 2011). This study aims to identify the most appropriate model for assigning the transport functions and the associated resource implications.

### Table 85: Transport functions for three spheres of government in the NLTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sphere of government</th>
<th>Overall structure and strategic role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Department of Transport:</td>
<td>Formulating national transport policy and legislation; monitoring transport policy, and overseeing its agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Department of Transport agencies/entities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Passenger Rail Agency of South Africa (PRASA): Planning, managing and providing passenger rail services and associated infrastructure, as well as state-owned long-distance bus services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Road Traffic Management Corporation: Implementing transport policy relating to road traffic safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Road Traffic Infringement Agency: Implementing transport policy relating to the administration of road traffic infringements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Road Accident Fund: Administering the fund to compensate victims of road traffic accidents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Railway Safety Regulator: Regulating railway safety for both passenger and freight transport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cross-Border Road Transport Agency: Implementing transport policy relating to cross-border passenger and freight transport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Airports Company of South Africa (ACSA): Planning and managing of state-owned airports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ports Regulator of South Africa: Implementing transport policy in respect of regulation of sea port operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Air Traffic and Navigational Services: Planning and providing air traffic navigational services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- South African Maritime Safety Authority: Implementing transport policy relating to maritime safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- South African Civil Aviation Authority: Implementing transport policy relating to the regulation and management of aviation safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Enterprises:</td>
<td>Managing state-owned enterprises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.2 Research Methods

Both primary and secondary research methods were used. The primary research included stakeholder interviews and research workshops, while the secondary research entailed studying published research. The investigation was based on the idea that performance should be measured according to the extent to which transport can reduce costs (i.e. monetary, time, and environment) to society and can support inclusive growth.

8.3 Findings

8.3.1 Root cause analysis

South Africa’s transport function was assessed using a sustainable transport measurement framework proposed by Litman (2013), which is adapted for local conditions for land transport. Each transport system goal was assessed against objectives and associated performance indicators. Table 86 shows clearly critical gaps between what is required for a sustainable transport system and what is currently being delivered.

These transport system problems are best described as service delivery backlogs. Experiences elsewhere shown that addressing such backlogs requires focused interventions and the elimination of half-hearted implementation approaches. The integration of fares, marketing and scheduling is effective in consolidating transport functions (Meyer et al., 2005). An integrated public transport network also makes it easier to align the public transport subsidy (where appropriate) to network objectives. However, in South Africa, the public transport subsidy amounts to over R17-billion per annum. This total transport subsidy amount is equivalent to about R30 per month for every person living in South Africa, or R690 per subsidy beneficiary per month – or about 1 380km of “free travel” per month for the beneficiaries.
Economic:

- **Transport system efficiency.**
- **Transport system integration.**
- **Maximum accessibility.**
- **Efficient pricing and incentives.**

Performance indicators:

- **Productivity benchmarking.**
- **Per capita congestion delay.**
- **Efficient pricing (road, parking, insurance, fuel, etc.).**
- **Efficient prioritisation of facilities.**

Overview of Performance in South Africa:

- The South African transport system is suboptimal, consisting of isolated transport modes rather than an integrated network (Walters, 2011).
- The lack of a coherent strategy for managing congestions both on roads and in public transport means that the transport system tends to experience sharp directional peaks resulting in congestion in urban areas (based on various transport models). However, there is no coherent strategy for the management of congestion either on roads or in public transport.
- Transport policy provides for user-pays principle (DoT, 1996). However, there is no coherent strategy on transport user charges or levies.
- Most of the entities, including municipalities, do not have proper asset management systems, which makes budgeting and prioritising infrastructure development and maintenance difficult (Wall, Milford and Kubuzie, 2007).

Economic development:

- **Economic and business development**
- **Access to education and employment opportunities.**
- **Support for local industries.**

Overview of Performance in South Africa:

- Travel times are long, with 18% of work trips taking over an hour and a third of education trips taking more than 30 minutes (DoT, 2003). There is no coherent strategy on how to manage travel time.
- The Department of Transport and the Department of Trade and Industry have recently developed guidelines on the procurement of rolling stock infrastructure to support local industries.

Energy efficiency:

- **Minimise energy costs, particularly fuel imports.**
- **Per capita transport energy consumption.**
- **Per capita use of imported fuels.**

Overview of Performance in South Africa:

- Indications are that travel demand is very sensitive to fuel prices, to the extent that fuel consumption per registered vehicle has been declining over the recent past (Mokonyama and Mubiwa, In press). However, travel remains energy intensive, in terms of kilometres travelled per trip (based on various transport models), and reliant largely on fuel imports because South Africa meets only one-third of its own fuel demand (DoE, 2014).

Affordability:

- **All residents can afford access to basic essential services and activities.**
- **Availability and quality of affordable modes (walking, cycling, ridesharing and public transport).**
- **Portion of low income households that spend more than 10% of budgets on transport.**

Overview of Performance in South Africa:

- The largest proportion of trips in South Africa are in the form of walking (DoT, 2003). However, infrastructure to support walking is mostly unavailable or grossly inadequate (Maphakela et. al., 2013). There is no coherent strategy to provide non-motorised transport infrastructure in the country.
- Higher income households tend to spend a larger proportion of their disposable income on public transport. Higher income households tend to spend higher proportions of income on private transport. There is generally no coherent strategy on containment of transport costs (StatsSA, 2012).

Efficient transport operations:

- **Efficient operations and asset management maximises cost efficiency.**
- **Performance audit results.**
- **Service delivery unit costs compared with peers.**
- **Service quality.**

Overview of Performance in South Africa:

- As South Africa does not have comprehensive transport policy targets, reporting on service delivery progress is difficult. Service delivery progress tends to be measured in terms of the amount of money government spends relative to budgets, instead of the systematic impact of the expenditure. Therefore, indicators such as customer satisfaction in response to service quality, as well as unit costs of transport are generally unavailable.

---

Table 8.6: Summary of the state of transport service delivery based on the sustainable transport evaluation framework
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System goals</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Performance indicators</th>
<th>Overview of Performance in South Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity / fairness</td>
<td>• Transport system accommodates all users, including those with disabilities, low incomes, and other constraints.</td>
<td>• Transport system diversity.</td>
<td>South Africa does not have a coherent transport strategy for vulnerable groups such as persons with disabilities, and the elderly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Portion of destinations accessible by people with disabilities and low incomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety, security and health</td>
<td>• Minimise risk of crashes and assaults, and support physical fitness.</td>
<td>• Per capita traffic casualty (injury and death) rates.</td>
<td>South Africa has one of the world’s worst records on road traffic safety (WHO, 2013). Despite this, South Africa does not have a coherent strategy for road traffic safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Traveller assault (crime) rates.</td>
<td>Many of the public transport users, especially train users, feel vulnerable when using the transport system and fear becoming victims of crime (Page, Moeketsi and Schurink, 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Human exposure to harmful pollutants.</td>
<td>Public transport users are concerned and dissatisfied with safety of public transport vehicles (DoT, 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Portion of travel by walking and cycling.</td>
<td>Compared to EU standards, South African vehicles have significantly higher emission rates (Goyns, 2008). However, there is no coherent strategy on management of transport emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low income people generally walk and cycle over long distances because they cannot afford alternative modes of travel, whereas higher income people usually walk only for leisure purposes (Maphakela et al., 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>• Help create inclusive and attractive communities.</td>
<td>• Land use mix.</td>
<td>South Africa’s transport system is still suffering from the spatial distortions caused by the apartheid planning framework, which resulted in a transport system characterised by relatively long travel distances, especially for low income households (NPC, 2011). Town planning schemes are used as administrative tools to guide land-use development, rather than as instruments to address these historical distortions (Mokonyama, 2009). Furthermore, road reserves continue to be generally designed to accommodate vehicle travel as opposed to the movement of people (Mokonyama, 2010). This is despite the DoT publishing comprehensive guidelines for non-motorised facility design in 2003. The City of Cape Town is the only municipality that has adopted and implemented these guidelines on a large scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support community cohesion.</td>
<td>• Supportive of non-motorised modes e.g. walking and cycling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural heritage preservation</td>
<td>• Respect and protect cultural heritage.</td>
<td>• Quality of road and street environments.</td>
<td>South Africa has a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment framework that is diligently implemented for transport infrastructure projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support cultural activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air pollution control and climate stability</td>
<td>• Reduce global warming emissions.</td>
<td>• Per capita emissions of greenhouse gases (CO₂, CFCs, CH₄, etc.).</td>
<td>Emission rates of South African vehicles are much higher than contemporary EU standards (Goyns, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mitigate climate change impacts.</td>
<td>• Per capita emissions (PM, VOCs, NOₓ, CO, etc.).</td>
<td>A baseline greenhouse gas inventory for the transport sector was compiled by the DoT based on 2000 datasets. However, there is no coherent transport strategy for greenhouse gas emissions and climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce air pollution emissions.</td>
<td>• Air quality standards and management plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce exposure to harmful pollutants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent noise pollution</td>
<td>• Minimise traffic noise exposure.</td>
<td>• Traffic noise levels.</td>
<td>Traffic noise mitigation is usually part of the Environmental Impact Assessment framework for transport infrastructure projects. Through the South African Bureau of Standards, South Africa also has a framework for measuring and controlling of transport generated noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect water quality and minimise hydrological damages.</td>
<td>• Minimise water pollution.</td>
<td>• Per capita fuel consumption.</td>
<td>South Africa does not have a coherent strategy on the management of water pollution caused by the transport sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimise impervious surface area.</td>
<td>• Management of used oil, leaks and storm water.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Per capita impervious surface area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System goals</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Performance indicators</td>
<td>Overview of Performance in South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space and biodiversity protection</td>
<td>• Minimise transport facility land use.</td>
<td>• Per capita land devoted to transport facilities.</td>
<td>• South Africa has a comprehensive biodiversity protection framework implemented by the National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourage more compact development.</td>
<td>• Support for smart growth development.</td>
<td>Biodiversity Institute, which is taken into account as part of the EIA process for transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preserve high quality habitat.</td>
<td>• Policies to protect high value farmlands and habitat.</td>
<td>infrastructure projects. Nonetheless, from a transport perspective the implementation of this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>framework tends to be at a project level not at a system level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>• Clearly defined planning process.</td>
<td>• Clearly defined goals, objectives and indicators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated, comprehensive and inclusive planning</td>
<td>• Integrated and comprehensive analysis.</td>
<td>• Availability of planning information and documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong citizen engagement.</td>
<td>• Portion of population engaged in planning decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Least cost planning (most beneficial solutions are selected and funded).</td>
<td>• Range of objectives, impacts and options considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate funding for transport</td>
<td>• Sustainable revenue streams to fund transport service delivery.</td>
<td>• Level of funding for transport infrastructure implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Level of funding for transport systems and operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Level of funding for infrastructure maintenance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate human resource capacity</td>
<td>• Appropriately skilled work force to manage the transport system.</td>
<td>• Filled of vacancies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of appropriately skilled professionals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The National Land Transport Act (DoT, 2009) is clear on the types of transport plans that are in different spheres of government. Key among the types of plan is the municipal integrated transport plan (ITP) that guides transport service delivery at a municipal level. While these plans are clear on goals and objectives of the transport system, they tend to fall short in terms of auditable planning targets. These plans form part of the integrated development planning process, which incorporates public participation, and are generally available to the public.
- The identification of projects is not always in line with these plans. For example, many of the municipalities (including metropolitan municipalities) are implementing large-scale transport projects that are not even identified in their approved ITPs. Furthermore, other spheres of government, as well as agencies, implement projects and programmes in municipal jurisdictions that have not been incorporated in the ITPs. This in turn implies that the prioritisation of projects and programmes may not be optimal and best for the communities in the municipalities.
- The phrase ‘integrated transport planning’ is often used loosely. Municipalities are not exercising their transport network ownership to the advantage of implementing integrated transport systems. Public transport tends to be managed as isolated routes as opposed to a network.
- There is no coherent strategy for transport funding in South Africa.
- There is often a mismatch between funding requirements and actual funding for transport.
- There is no comprehensive transport infrastructure backlog analysis in the country. This is a result of poor transport asset management practices.
- Maintenance of transport infrastructure tends to be underfunded (Wall, Milford and Kubuzie, 2007).
- Transport service delivery in municipalities is often hampered by the shortage of appropriately skilled personnel, with inadequate skills levels for critical technical positions in municipalities (AGSA, 2013) and a dire shortage of engineering personnel in municipalities (Lawless, 2007).
8.3.2 Stakeholder inputs

Inputs from stakeholders on the main issues related to the reassignment of transport functions to municipalities were obtained at a workshop and through interviews. Stakeholders included National Treasury, the DoT, City of Cape Town, City of eThekwini, the Gauteng Department of Roads and Transport, South African Local Government Association (SALGA), City of Tshwane, National Ports Regulator, and Limpopo Provincial Government.

The following questions were raised at the initial workshop:

- What political accountability is required to ensure that the assignment of transport functions is sustainable?
- Is current funding for transport sufficient even to address existing transport problems in municipalities?
- How should funding follow the assignment of functions to municipalities?
- Should the current transport backlogs be addressed before reassignment of functions takes place?
- What plan should be followed to implement the assignment of transport functions to municipalities?
- What are the requirements to fulfil transport aspects of the NDP?

These questions are addressed in Table 85, but more detailed inputs received from stakeholders are given below.

National Treasury

National Treasury supports the assignment of functions as provided for in the NLTA, so long as it results in improved and more efficient transport service delivery, which is currently inefficient and poorly provided. Furthermore, given resource constraints and the need to provide context-appropriate solutions, the focus must be on cities rather than adopting a wholesale approach for all municipalities. Municipalities, whether they take on new functions or not, are encouraged to seek innovative ways of generating revenue to fund public transport and should not rely solely on national funds, such as the Public Transport Infrastructure Systems Grant. National Treasury also pointed out that municipalities are entitled to submit requests for the assignment of transport functions, but only the City of Cape Town had made a formal request (at the time of the interview).

Department of Transport (DoT)

According to the DoT, if not all functions are shifted to municipalities, the correct term to use is “assignment”, not “devolution” because, legally, devolution cannot be asymmetric. The DoT has identified two critical functions for assignment: contracting function (i.e. managing public transport contracts, inclusive of the design, adjudication, awarding, and monitoring of the contracts) and the licensing function (i.e. receiving and adjudicating operating licence applications). In fact, in terms of the NLTA, municipalities are supposed to manage (by default) any new public transport contracts and can be assigned the management of older contracts. The DoT supports the reassignment of functions but is concerned about the technical capacity constraints across all the three spheres of government to implement the NLTA fully.
The City of Cape Town

The City recently established Transport for Cape Town (TCT), an entity designed with the purpose of consolidating all transport functions in the City for more focused transport service delivery (see Figure 68 for the structure). To date, TCT has prepared business plans for the reassignment of both contracting and licencing functions to the City. Once fully operational, the contracting function is estimated to cost in the order of R50-million per annum and the licensing function R100-million per annum. If both plans are approved, the City of Cape Town will become the first municipality to have an authority that controls its road-based public transport network. For now, the City intends entering into performance agreements with the PRASA until it has a better understanding of passenger rail transport.

Figure 68: Transport for Cape Town structure

The City of eThekwini

The eThekwini Transport Authority (ETA) was established in terms of the now-repealed National Land Transport Transition Act (No. 22 of 2000) (NLTTA). The ETA, with a political head, was given the responsibility of coordinating all transport functions in the city. However, many transport functions are still spread across the three spheres of government. In 2009, the NLTA replaced the NLTTA. Given that the NLTA has done away with TA arrangements, the City of eThekwini is in the process of reconfiguring the ETA to meet legislative requirements. The City found that, unlike an ordinary city transport department, the ETA had quick turnaround times for decision making and was able to attract and retain technical skills. Because of not having the full contracting and licencing functions, the ETA was largely reliant on the KwaZulu-Natal provincial government.
Problems experienced with the province included data used to verify the status of route licences not being up to date, which made assessing whether to grant operating licences difficult. The City also found it difficult to coordinate municipal plans with provincial and national transport strategies, as the Provincial Land Transport Framework (a legislative provincial mandate) and the National Land Transport Strategic Framework (the legislative national mandate) were not updated. A particular problem in the city is the management of freight transport, as it is unclear which sphere of government should take responsibility, particularly regarding budgetary matters. The City is willing to take over some of the province-owned roads that currently function as local roads, on condition that the province first restore and maintain the roads to acceptable levels. Past experiences warrant a dedicated transport law enforcement function for the city. For example, metropolitan police can shift resources to priorities other than transport priorities identified by the Municipal Transport Authority. This may be to the detriment of transport service delivery. The City has not yet implemented the coordination structures provided for in the NLTA, such as the Intermodal Planning Committee, because it is waiting for guidance nationally from the DoT regarding the terms of reference for the structures.

**Gauteng Department of Roads and Transport**

In line with Section 12(1) of the NLTA, the Gauteng Department of Roads and Transport recently established the Gauteng Transport Commission (GTC), an entity whose purpose is to coordinate transport programmes in the Gauteng Province. Extensive transport functional area overlap across the Gauteng municipalities, which makes the entity necessary. The GTC is not a mere coordinating structure but is intended to direct transport-related expenditure in the province. Decisions made by the GTC will be binding to the province and all the Gauteng municipalities.

---

**Figure 69: Proposed Type A SALGA transport function structure**
SALGA

SALGA is in the process of promoting two specific structures for transport in municipalities, which are presented in Figures 69 and 70 as Type A and Type B. The Type A structure is proposed for municipalities with more resources, while Type B is for lesser resourced municipalities, which lack organisational structures to deal with transport functions.

Annexure B provides an alphabetical list of the current provincial DoT structures for all nine provinces. What is striking is how the structures differ significantly from province to province, while in some provinces, the transport portfolio contains functions that are not directly related to transport such as social crime policing and buildings. The differing structures show that different approaches will be required for function assignments in different provinces.
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8.3.3 Proposed model for allocating and devolving transport functions

Previous investigations into improving transport service delivery through reconfiguring institutional structures have generally proposed three models:

(i) An institutional structure that coordinates transport functions across different spheres of government. For example, the Transport Coordinating Committees (instituted under the repealed NLTTA) between Gauteng Province and municipalities, and Intermodal Planning Committees instituted nationally through the NLTA. The coordination takes the form of scheduled meetings agreed to by member institutions, to discuss matters of common interest. This type of structure is good for sharing information but has weak decision making and accountability, because the member institutions are not bound by the structure’s decisions.

(ii) A service level agreement, as promoted by NLTA regulations. Although none exist yet in South Africa, an example would be a municipality entering into a service level agreement with PRASA that covers services offered by PRASA within the jurisdiction of the municipality. Practical challenges of such an agreement include non-uniformity across different municipalities (and the effect on customer experiences), and limited enforcement powers of municipalities over autonomous public sector bodies such as PRASA. In the absence of incentive provisions within the service level agreements, such as increased payment for achieving service goals, the enforcement of such agreements may be subject to legal processes of mediation and arbitration.

(iii) A municipal transport authority, which is a model that has received much attention in the past and has been used successfully in other parts of the world. However, to date its success in
South Africa has been very limited mainly because of the transport authority’s limited powers and underfunding of the function (as shown in the Commission’s previous research (FFC, 2013a) into eThekwini municipality).

The ideal transport function assignment model needs to take into account the practical challenges that are unique to South Africa. The model should be affordable. For example, in City of Cape Town, with over 40 specialist personnel, just taking over the contracting and regulatory functions alone will require an estimated additional 7% on the current transport operating budget, excluding initial setup costs (Transport for Cape Town, 2013). Practical considerations, as described in Table 86, suggest that in the short term, many municipalities may not have the resources (both human and financial) required to effectively take over transport functions. SALGA, without quantifying the problem, has described local government as generally having a poor skills base and lacking training and career paths for personnel. Local government also tends to underinvest in personnel, particularly where technical, management and leadership skills are required.

A differentiated approach is needed because municipalities have very different levels of challenges, as highlighted in a report on the state of local government (DCoG, 2009). The Commission has proposed that municipalities be classified as metropolitan municipalities, secondary cities, large towns, smaller towns and rural municipalities (FFC, 2011). Metropolitan municipalities were ranked as having a local rates and tax revenue generation capacity of 1.00, followed by secondary cities, large towns, smaller towns and rural municipalities with self-generated revenue capacities of 0.59, 0.46, 0.30 and 0.04 respectively.

In the light of the above, a dual approach to assigning transport functions should be adopted, through a combination of:

(i) The direct assignment of functions to municipalities, municipal partnerships or municipal entities (in terms of Section 76a of the Municipal Systems Act), provided they demonstrate the necessary ability and capacity.

(ii) The formation of a national entity for coordinating passenger transport service delivery to assist municipalities that are unable to deliver adequately on the functions. This is justifiable in terms of Section 76b of the Municipal Systems Act.

The Municipal Service Partnerships (MSPs) promoted in the White Paper (DCoG, 2004) are similar to the conceptual framework of a national entity for coordinated passenger transport service. MSPs aim to improve municipal service delivery through partnership arrangements between municipalities and public institutions, the private sector, non-governmental organisations or community-based organisations. One example is the Municipal Infrastructure Support Agency (MISA), which was established to provide technical advice and support, including capacity building, to municipalities in order to optimise municipal infrastructure provision and maintenance (DCoG, 2013).

The proposed national entity will pool resources required to design, implement and manage passenger transport network systems in selected municipalities. In due course, once they have sufficient resources, the municipalities can take over all the network management functions, including contracting and regulation. The entity can also act as an incubator for the selected municipalities to enable them to take on additional transport functions. The White Paper on National Transport Policy (DoT, 1996) recommended agencies for roads, aviation safety and the maritime safety be established, to “allow for more professional focused service provision” (DoT, 1996). The proposed national entity will need to be guided strictly by the municipal ITPs, which form an integral part of their integrated development plans (IDPs). IDPs are key instruments for managing municipalities (including the allocation of resources) in terms of the Municipal Finance Management Act (No. 56 of 2003) (MFMA) and the MSA. Transport developments by other state entities, for example PRASA and Transnet, must be an integral part of ITPs. Therefore, the proposed entity will need to ensure that municipalities have proper ITPs and to perform these primary functions:
• Facilitation of the preparation of municipal ITPs.
• Technical review of the ITPs.
• Technical oversight for the implementation of the ITPs.
• Public transport network design, control and management.
• Public transport contracting.
• Public transport regulation.
• Management of transport asset management systems, such as public transport facilities, roads, and bridges.
• Transport system monitoring and evaluation.

The above functions require a multidisciplinary team that includes transport planners, public transport service designers, transport and contract law experts, project managers, transport economists and mathematical statisticians.

Furthermore, the proposed entity should be based on a model that ensures that:

• The entity is an autonomous public entity established in terms of national legislation. Autonomy is particularly important for entities adjudicating public transport contracts and operating licences.

• Municipalities retain executive power over their respective jurisdictions, including the decision to either adopt or reject the recommendations from the proposed entity.

• The entity has both executive and technical arms. The executive arm is responsible for ensuring that the entity fulfils its strategic mandate sustainably, while the technical arm is solely responsible for ensuring effective and efficient transport service delivery.

• The entity is able to recruit personnel and to procure specialist professional services.

• The entity prepares a budget whose costs are covered by appropriation from the national fiscus. As beneficiaries of the entity’s services, municipalities should contribute equitably to the entity’s funding. The entity needs to be completely funded so that it can focus on its service delivery mandate. This is justifiable because the cost of poor transport service delivery is likely to be far higher than the entity’s funding requirements.

• The entity is accountable to an appropriate national government department.

• Risks associated with the implementation of the proposed entity, together with possible mitigation actions, are summarised below:

• The ITPs, from which the entity derives its operational mandate, are not properly formulated and do not address the needs of the respective municipalities in a sustainable manner. To mitigate this risk, the entity must be resourced with appropriately qualified and experienced personnel.

• Municipalities implement plans that are contrary to the entity’s recommendations, resulting in the entity becoming effectively redundant. This risk will be minimised by developing trusting relationships between the municipalities and the entity and by forming a tripartite relationship involving the municipality, the entity and the communities being served by the municipality in order to ensure accountability.
• Municipalities develop a permanent dependency on the entity and neglect to strengthen their own capabilities. To mitigate this risk, an approved plan must be developed, with clearly defined timelines, on how the municipality will be assisted to take over the functions.

• Conflicts with other state organs such as PRASA and Transnet. This risk should be minimised by ensuring that all state entities are guided by municipal ITPs, which are an integral part of their strategic and operational plans.

Table 88 summarises the key advantages and disadvantages of the three proposed models.

Table 88: Summary of key advantages and disadvantages of transport function execution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Institutional coordination | • Low setup costs.  
  • Improved communication among role-players. | • Weak joint decision-making ability.  
  • Low accountability. |
| Service level agreements | • Expectations among role-players transparently communicated. | May lead to legal disputes when targets are not met. |
| Authority control with direct assignment of functions to a municipality. | • Focused service delivery interventions.  
  • Increased economies of scale at a municipal level. | Requires significant increase in resources per municipality. With the relatively large number of municipalities in South Africa this becomes unaffordable in the short term. |
| Assignment to national entity | • Improved transport service delivery in poorly resourced municipalities.  
  • Focused service delivery interventions.  
  • Increased economies of scale at a national level. | Requires trusting relationships between the entity and the municipalities. |

8.3.4 Implementation action plan

The implementation plan requires the following:

• Stakeholder mapping and consultation.
• Institutional relationships and the roles of the institutions required to implement the recommendations.
• Legal requirements.
• Resource requirements.
• Transition management.
• Implementation time-frames.
• Cost implications for different stakeholders.

Stakeholder mapping and consultation

The key stakeholders that will be required to be consulted are:

• National Treasury: to agree to fiscal implication of assignment of functions.
• Department of Public Service and Administration: to address any shift in human resources that may be required.
• Department of Cooperative Government and Traditional Affairs: to ensure that intergovernmental relations requirements are addressed.
• Department of Transport: to ensure that it is in the best interests of transport service delivery.

• Organised local government: to ensure that the interests of the municipalities are taken into account.

• Organised labour: to ensure that the interests of affected workers are taken into account and that labour law requirements and agreements are honoured.

• The Financial and Fiscal Commission: to ensure that financial and fiscal disciplinary principles are adhered to.

Legal requirements

Given the diversity of organisational needs and structure, every assignment process will be different. However, each municipal business plan must comply with the constitutional legislative requirements and domain-specific legislation, such as the NLTA, the MSA and the MFMA. The proposed national entity must be established as a legal entity, which will require legislation to be passed, and assigned necessary administrative, governance and operational powers to support the execution of its functions.

Resource requirements

Capital and operational budgets will be required, and the initial costs could be particularly high because of the need to procure equipment and attract skilled human resources.

Transition management

The implementation of assignment of transport functions should take place strictly in terms of a business plan prepared by the receiving municipality or the national entity.

Implementation time-frames

Assignment of functions should be phased in accordance with the business plan submitted by the municipality or national entity.

Cost implications for different stakeholders

For direct assignment to municipalities, the receiving municipality is likely to have increased capital and operational costs, but the actual cost implications will depend on the size of the municipality and the complexity of its transport network. Personnel from the assigning party, which was previously responsible for the functions, may need to be redeployed or transferred to the municipality. The equitable share would also need to be appropriately adjusted, to reflect the change in budget requirements for both the receiving and assigning parties. In the case of the national entity, the entity should be completely funded through the national fiscus, with additional revenue from the municipalities that receive support. The entity should be established only if its establishment and operating costs are far less than the collective costs of poor transport service delivery.
8.4 Conclusion

The assignment of transport functions to the lowest competent level of government is a South African transport policy mandate. Transport is of particular interest because inefficient transport service delivery has a significantly negative effect on social exclusion and the economy. However, current transport service delivery is fragmented, and the impetus required to make the necessary changes is lacking.

While the assignment of necessary transport functions is supported, South Africa faces practical challenges arising from constraints such as technical skills in municipalities and affordability.

A dual transport function assignment model is proposed for South Africa. The model consists of: (i) direct assignment to municipalities, municipal partnerships or municipal entities, provided they have prepared business plans and demonstrate the necessary capacity to carry out additional transport functions, and (ii) the formation of a national entity to coordinate passenger transport service delivery to assist municipalities that are unable to resource additional transport functions. This entity will also have the capability to be an incubator for delivering technical capacity within member municipalities. The implementation action plan that is proposed includes stakeholder mapping and consultation, legal requirements and resource requirements.

8.5 Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Authority network control is fundamental to effective transport service delivery. Although municipalities are empowered to have control over their network, this is not happening in practice.

The Commission recommends that all the municipal ITPs clearly indicate how the municipalities intend to exercise control over the network, including the required resources. This should be one of the minimum requirements for the preparing and gazetting of integrated transport plans.

Recommendation 2: Transport service delivery is a highly technical endeavour that requires specialised skills and resources. The lack of such skills in municipalities, whose mandate is to implement transport policy, is a critical constraint that slows down service delivery.

The Commission recommends that minimum organisational designs are formulated to enable municipalities to manage modern transport systems. This is one of the critical interventions to unlock service delivery constraints. Findings from this investigation should be used to inform the process.

Recommendation 3: ITPs are the primary tool for transport service delivery. Indications are that these plans are formulated more for legislative compliance rather than as service delivery tools. In many municipalities, including metropolitan municipalities, ITPs are either outdated or non-existent.

The Commission recommends a comprehensive review of the quality of municipal ITPs, with a view to identifying gaps that need to be addressed.
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### Annexure 8.A: FFC Checklist for the Assigning of Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFC Function Shift Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposed shift of the function respect, promote and fulfill the provisions of the Constitution that apply to delegation and assignment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the contemplated shift fit in with a general framework of an established government policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the decision to assign or delegate a function based on what is appropriate for the Republic as a whole, rather than on what is appropriate for a particular sphere of government or organ of state?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the assigning or delegating department or organ of state accept responsibility for constantly monitoring or reviewing the function assigned or delegated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has an agreement been reached between the parties to assign or delegate a function by consensus and not forced on either party?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the benefits for government as a whole in the Republic been thoroughly explored and understood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it explicit that the authority role will be transferred in full when a function is shifted by assignment between spheres of government or other organs of state?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there evidence that the function is being shifted as a whole and that it will not be split between spheres of government?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes equitable, efficient, affordable, economical and sustainable access to basic services by all customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves to place responsibility of providing services as close as possible to the communities the services are meant to serve (subsidiarity).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimises costs of services to consumers and customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieves economies of scale in the delivery of services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimises jurisdictional spill overs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits the greatest number of residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes the least disrupting effect on the delivery of services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes a safe and healthy environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes efficient, effective, accountable public administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes cooperative government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses the historical inequalities in society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A precise description of the provider role to be performed by the recipient authority is available and specifies: service levels; performance indicators; risks transferred to the recipient authority; remuneration to which the recipient authority is entitled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has agreement been reached between the parties?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has compliance with financial conditions been ensured?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has compliance with labour requirements been ensured?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has compliance with legislative requirements been ensured?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the Financial and Fiscal Commission been requested to assess the financial and fiscal implications of the legislation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the policy of the department been formulated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the policy been captured in the statutes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the function to be shifted been adequately defined so as to eliminate all ambiguity and to attribute authority and responsibility for that specific function?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the definition comprehensive and included in the appropriate memorandum of understanding, delegation or the assigning legislation or proclamation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FFC Function Shift Checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the Department understand that when the function is shifted the resources employed to render the function must be shifted with the function?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the Minister of Finance directed other than that the transfer of functions must also include the transfer of funds available to the transferring sphere of government for the purpose of performing such transferred function or obligation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the equitable share allocations in terms of the DORA been recalculated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a revision of the formula used for integrated capital grants (such as the provincial and municipal infrastructure grants) been recalculated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the process for the reallocation of any revenue raising powers associated with the function been documented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a conditional grant, rather than adjustment of the equitable share been proposed as an alternative route for the funding of the function through a transitional period?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the process and timing of the shift of the equitable share allocations for the financing (assigned, but not delegated or deconcentrated functions) to be transferred to the province, municipality or municipalities responsible for the function before the assignment is implemented, been understood and is it realistic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has any “future financial commitment” (as contemplated in Section 66 of the PFMA) been authorised by clearly defined authorities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a plan been documented for settling all contractual obligations and paying all money owing, including intergovernmental claims, within the prescribed or agreed period and before transferring any funds to the entity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has there been an assessment of the risks associated with the proposed function shift?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the assigning authority established a monitoring function that must assist in identifying and developing the ability of the new authority to fulfil its mandate following the function shift?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 72: Free State

MEC: Eastern Cape
Department of Roads and Public Works

Head of Department

Programme: Transport Regulations
- Law Enforcement
- Transport Administration and Licensing
- Operation Licences and Permits

Programme: Civilian Oversight
- Complaints Registry and Investigations
- Policy and Research
- Monitoring and Evaluation

Programme: Crime Prevention and Community Police Regulations
- Social Crime Prevention
- Community Policing and Liaison
- Promotion of Safety

Programme: Transport Infrastructure
- Infrastructure Planning
- Infrastructure Design
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- Maintenance
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Programme: Transport Operations
- Public Transport Services
- Transport Safety Compliance
- Transport Systems
- Infrastructure Operation

Programme: Administration
- Financial Management
- Corporate Support
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- Strategic Planning and Research Development
- Security Management
Figure 73: Gauteng

MEC: Gauteng
Department of Roads and Transport

Head of Department
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Figure 74: KwaZulu-Natal
Figure 75: Limpopo

MEC: Limpopo Department of Roads and Transport

Head of Department
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Figure 76: Mpumalanga
Figure 77: North West

MEC: North West Department of Public Works, Roads and Transport

Head of Department

Programme: Administration
- Sub-Programme: Office of The MEC
- Sub-Programme: Management of The Department
- Sub-Programme: Corporate Services
- Sub-Programme: Departmental Strategy
- Sub-Programme: Maintenance
- Sub-Programme: Immovable Asset Management
- Sub-Programme: Facility Operations

Programme: Public Works Infrastructure
- Sub-Programme: Programme Support
- Sub-Programme: Programme Support Infrastructure
- Sub-Programme: Design
- Sub-Programme: Construction
- Sub-Programme: Maintenance

Programme: Transport Infrastructure
- Sub-Programme: Programme Support
- Sub-Programme: Programme Support Infrastructure
- Sub-Programme: Planning
- Sub-Programme: Infrastructure Planning
- Sub-Programme: Transportation
- Sub-Programme: Maintenance

Programme: Transport Operations
- Sub-Programme: Programme Support
- Sub-Programme: Programme Support Operations
- Sub-Programme: Public Transport Services
- Sub-Programme: Transport Systems
- Sub-Programme: Infrastructure Operations

Programme: Community Based / EPWP
- Sub-Programme: Programme Support
- Sub-Programme: Community Based / EPWP
- Sub-Programme: Development
- Sub-Programme: Innovation and Empowerment
- Sub-Programme: Coordination and Compliance Monitoring
Figure 78: Northern Cape

MEC: Northern Cape
Department of Public Transport, Safety and Liaison

Head of Department

Programme: Transport Regulation
  - Law Enforcement
  - Transport Administration and Licensing
    - Road Safety Education

Programme: Administration
  - Office of the MEC
  - Management
    - Financial Management
    - Corporate Services

Programme: Civilian Oversight
  - Policy and Research
  - Monitoring and Evaluation
    - Regional Coordination

Programme: Crime Prevention and Community Police Relations
  - Social Crime Prevention
  - Community Police Relations

Programme: Transport Operations
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      - Transport Safety and Compliance
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Figure 79: Western Cape