Report on progress with the implementation of the Regulations relating to Minimum Uniform Norms & Standards for Public School Infrastructure

November 2016

1. Progress in relation to the 3 year backlogs (Nov 2016) viz. schools comprising entirely mud structures and schools without any basic services (water, sanitation & electricity)

1.1. Current status vs baseline

The process followed for reporting the status of schools without basic services in the schedule below is as follows:

a. The original number of schools on the baseline list identified as entirely lacking certain basic services is shown (note this preceded the subsequent condition assessments that were conducted by DBE (2013/14) and EC DoE (2014/15),
b. The number of schools which are no longer operational has been deducted from the baseline.
c. Then the number of schools which have been identified for rationalization has been deducted (the approach to this is described later herein).
d. From the balance remaining, the achievements per year in addressing these schools is noted.
e. Of the remainder not yet addressed, the number on intervention programmes in the current MTEF is given.
f. Of the balance remaining, the number of schools where the more recent condition assessments have revealed that the schools do in fact have access to the relevant basic service (albeit possibly limited) has been deducted. These schools are thus no longer top priority will form part of later interventions.
g. Of the balance remaining, an explanation is provided later in the text as to their status and way forward.

(figures in brackets indicate the number of schools in the ASIDI programme)
the final number of ASIDI schools to be addressed is subject to a re-alignment and rationalization process which is still under way.

Schedules to support the summary above, indicating the names of all the schools in each category are available, and can be included as annexures to this brief report.

It should be noted that the schools identified for potential rationalization may include schools where interventions, either by ASIDI or by the EC DoE have been implemented. These projects will have been initiated before the schools for rationalization were identified.

### 1.2. Approach per category

#### 1.2.1. Schools no longer operational

Since the identification of schools lacking basic services, as per the baseline lists, a number of schools have been closed, or are pending closure, due to their enrolment numbers having dwindled to the point where the schools have been closed and the remaining learners (if
any) accommodated elsewhere. This has been done in agreement with the local community. Such schools have thus understandably been no longer been targeted for intervention.

1.2.2. Projects due for rationalization in 2016

The MEC has recently declared that all one-teacher schools, i.e. schools with fewer than 40 learners, will be closed by the end of the 2016 academic year. There are 295 such schools which will be closed. These schools have therefore not been targeted for provision of any further basic services.

In the summaries above and attached schedules these schools are included in the category that follows.

1.2.3. Projects identified for potential rationalization by 2018

Many of the smaller schools in the Province are unviable and are being targeted for rationalisation or re-alignment with secondary schools. A total of 1 902 such schools have been identified. These have been issued with letters explaining the Department's intentions and requesting a response as to compelling reasons for maintaining the school. Based on such responses and subsequent interactions, decisions will be made regarding the future of the school. The intention is to have this process finalised by 2018.

In the light hereof the Department is delaying any major projects at such schools, and any necessary intervention in the interim is being limited to temporary classrooms, rainwater tanks, pit toilets and stock fencing.

1.2.4. Projects completed or under implementation

The projects completed or where interventions are currently under way are shown in the preceding summaries and attached schedules, together with year of completion where applicable. Where projects are currently under implementation, the status is indicated in the schedule.

There were also mud / inappropriate schools that were addressed by EC DoE as part of its infrastructure programme, but were not part of the ASIDI baseline. These are summarized in the schedule below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mud / inappropriate school projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2.5. Schools incorrectly classified as lacking basic services

An analysis of the balance of the schools remaining was done against the asset data derived from the condition assessments described earlier herein (as stated, the baseline lists were extracted from previous surveys as they preceded the recent condition assessments described above). Where a school was found to have access to the specific basic service, it has no longer been targeted for intervention as part of the initial three year priority programme. Further on site assessments will determine to what extent services are lacking, and then include the school in the seven year programme for insufficient services if necessary.

1.2.6. Projects not yet addressed

There are a number of schools which have not yet been addressed as shown in the summaries above. To establish the reasons for the school having been overlooked, and to address this as a matter of urgency where necessary, the Department has already commissioned the DRPW to undertake site assessments at these schools to determine the situation and the scope of work required to remedy the situation. The first of these assessment reports are already coming in, and the intention is to include any proposed intervention projects in the current project list (i.e. 2016/17) as part of the adjustment budget which is currently being prepared for tabling in the next month. It is therefore safe to say that where assessments reveal that interventions in terms of the 3 year norms and standards are required these will commence in 2016/17.

1.3. Schools with pit latrines

The initial baseline indicated that there were 2 885 schools with pit latrines. In terms of the Regulations these are regarded as non-compliant, over and above any deficiencies there may be in terms of their number or condition. This number has subsequently been reduced to 810 due to subsequent interventions and re-evaluation of the data.

The DBE has acknowledged that in many cases its assessors incorrectly classified VIPs as pit latrines. This data is being checked as further assessments are undertaken, but a more systematic process needs to be initiated.

1.4. Court case schools
In terms of a court ruling, the Department was required to replace the mud structures at 5 schools in the Province. This was completed in the previous financial year. As part of the ruling, the Department was required to establish whether there were further schools comprising entirely mud structures, and to intervene accordingly. Circulars went out to all operational schools, and responses were received from 1 412 schools (note that 460 of these schools have been identified for potential rationalisation). Of the 1 412 schools, the DBE has identified 549 schools as entirely inappropriate and 527 schools as 1%-30% inappropriate. Together these categories total 1 076 schools, with an estimated rectification cost of R27bn. The number of schools and their replacement cost may reduce as a result of rationalisation.

1.5. Verification of baseline data

Spot checks and subsequent site evaluations in preparation for implementation have revealed that asset data from the condition assessments has not always been entirely accurate, more especially in the case of the DBE assessments. In particular, the distinction between pit latrines and VIPs has been problematic as indicated earlier herein. Water supply inconsistencies have also been picked up.

However, the condition assessments undertaken by DBE (3 039 in 2013/14) and EC DoE (2 450 in 2014/15) represent the best data currently available, and are being used for planning interventions. Site surveys are nevertheless carried out prior to implementation and these will reveal any inconsistencies which can then be taking into account when designing the specific intervention for a particular.

It also needs to be stated that the Department is training its new cohort of Works Inspectors (27 new appointees) in the use of the tablet-based EFMS Assess application to undertake condition assessments at schools. This will assist in expediting the process confirming asset and condition data and meet the GIAMA requirement of updating condition assessments at least every five years.

1.6. Conclusions

Between the Department and the DBE significant progress has been made over the past three years in meeting the overwhelming challenge of providing basic services to schools where these have been lacking entirely, to the extent that with a few exceptions the targets as per the Regulations are being met.

It is acknowledged that much work still needs to be done to address schools with pit latrines and schools with insufficient basic services. In this regard further intervention funding will be required.
The verification of asset data is also necessary as stated above, and this is being addressed as indicated in the section above.

2. Progress made since 2013 with other infrastructure projects

2.1. Introduction

The approach of the Department has been to implement the Norms & Standards by addressing the worst backlogs in terms of basic services first, taking into account the operational status and potential rationalisation and re-alignment. At the same time the Department is looking to the longer term needs of the schools identified for intervention, i.e. specialist facilities (laboratories, computer centres, etc.). The cost of these will impinge on the availability of funds to address insufficient basic services, and a careful balance must therefore be negotiated taking value for money and cost effectiveness into account.

NB:

The attached schedules set out all the projects completed since 2013, together with costs and summarized scope of work, including the projects reported under Section 1 above. Please note that in the short time available it has not been possible to extract the baseline schools form these schedules. Due to multiple projects on single sites, the data extract would have become distorted, resulting in unreliable output.

2.2. Summary of projects completed & expenditure per project

The attached schedule lists all projects completed since 2013, together with the total expenditure on each project. As indicated above, this schedule includes all projects, thus including ASIDI projects and basic services projects listed in Section 1 above.

The attached schedule lists all the schools in the Province, and indicates what projects were completed at each school in which financial year.

The information in the schedule is summarized in the schedule below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial year</th>
<th>No of EC DoE projects</th>
<th>Value of EC DoE projects</th>
<th>No of ASIDI projects</th>
<th>Value of ASIDI projects</th>
<th>Total No of projects (incl ASIDI)</th>
<th>Total value of projects (incl ASIDI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>R 912,309,749</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>R 569,380,237</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>R 1,481,689,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>R 1,041,685,971</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>R 763,231,775</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>R 1,804,917,746</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.3. Summary of projects under construction & expenditure to date

The numbers of projects currently under construction, both for Departmental implementation and ASIDI implementation, are set out in the attached schedule.

This information is summarized in the schedule below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Departmental</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>ASIDI</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No of projects under construction</td>
<td>Expenditure to end 2015/16</td>
<td>Expenditure to date 2016/17</td>
<td>Total expenditure to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>R 301,964,264</td>
<td>R 275,081,797</td>
<td>R 577,046,062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 to date</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>R 64,170,334</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>R 59,201,811</td>
<td>R 123,372,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Achievability of meeting the Norms & Standards

3.1. Introduction

The Department considers it necessary at this early stage to record its concerns regarding the longer term achievability of the Norms & Standards. In this regard comprehensive feedback is being compiled as per the recent request from our National Department. However, in order to contextualize the enormity of the challenge, a brief overview is provided below.

3.2. Condition backlog

The Department currently has 5 487 operational public ordinary schools in the Province. The condition of each of the assets has recently been assessed, either by DBE or the Department itself. This has enabled the Department to determine the extent of both the maintenance backlog (in terms of condition) and the facilities backlog (in terms of the Regulations relating to Minimum Uniform Norms & Standards for Public School Infrastructure).
The condition of the Department’s fixed assets is summarised below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is thus a substantial maintenance backlog, with is currently estimated in the order of R5bn.

In addition, industry norms indicate that an annual budget of at least 2% of the replacement value of the building should be made available for its maintenance. This would imply an annual maintenance budget requirement of almost R1,2bn.

### 3.3. Facilities Backlog

- The Regulations set out timeframes for the provision of the various categories of facilities required for a school. The estimated monetary value of the backlogs for each of the timeframes, in terms thereof, is summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three Year Timeframe (Nov 2013 - Nov 2016)</td>
<td>No basic services (water, sanitation &amp; electricity) and schools comprising entirely of inappropriate structures</td>
<td>R 2,691,359,182.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Year Timeframe (Nov 2013 - Nov 2020)</td>
<td>Classrooms, inappropriate structures, insufficient basic services, fencing &amp; security, connectivity</td>
<td>R 11,724,621,184.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Year Timeframe (Nov 2013 - Nov 2023)</td>
<td>Multipurpose classrooms, libraries, laboratories, computer labs</td>
<td>R 12,703,703,501.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventeen Year Timeframe (Nov 2013 - Nov 2030)</td>
<td>Administration areas, nutrition centres, parking bays, sports fields</td>
<td>R 25,483,374,817.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>R 52,603,058,690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The diagram below shows the required annual budget (including maintenance and escalation) required to meet the backlog needs by 2030; also shown is the anticipated
budget. From these it can be seen that there is a huge annual shortfall, from which it is clear that the targets cannot be met within the current budgetary scenario.

- From the table in Item 2.1 it can be seen that an amount of R11.7bn will be required to meet the backlog of facilities in the 7 year timeframe. To this must be added the schools with pitlatrines (non-compliant), which is estimated at approximately R2bn. This means a backlog of R14bn to be addressed in the next 4 years, which is more than double current annual funding.

- It is also apparent from the earlier table that the outer year backlogs will be even more challenging (more funding needed, no ASIDI). It therefore needs to be acknowledged at this early stage that achievement of the promulgated norms and standards will not be possible unless a different dispensation is considered.

- Timeframes for converting pitlatrines
  Consideration should be given to extending the timeframe for converting pitlatrines to VIPs or other acceptable sanitation. The prevalence of pitlatrines in the Eastern Cape makes the current 3 year timeframe unachievable. Where pitlatrines are still functional there may be a much greater need for other facilities at a particular school.

3.4. Effects of rationalization

3.4.1. The rationalization of small schools is a reality which will have a profound effect on infrastructure delivery in the medium term. There are almost 2 000 schools (36%) that have been identified for potential rationalization, and this will potentially
then also have infrastructure implications for nearby schools which must accept additional learners.

3.4.2. With regard to the norms & standards, it will not be logical to address backlogs at any schools which are likely to be affected by potential rationalization – both from the point of view of closure or possible expansion. The timeframes for provision of the required basic services (2020: 7 year timeframe) at such schools would thus depend on finalization of the rationalisation processes for the relevant schools, which might not fall within the prescribed dates.
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