

# Current Reality Analysis – Waterberg District Municipality

According to the Standard Key Performance Indicators for Disaster Risk Management Implementation<sup>1</sup>

Key:

No progress made	Partial progress	Progress partial but satisfactory Claimed completed but no evidence	Done
------------------	------------------	--	------

5 KEY PERFORMANCE AREA 1: ESTABLISH INTEGRATED INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY		Status/Remarks	Recommendation
No	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR		
<b>Arrangements for the development and adoption of an integrated disaster risk management policy framework for the district municipality and for any amendments thereto</b>			
1.	The Executive Mayor has established a District Intermunicipality Committee on Disaster Risk Management (DICDRM).	No – All DRM activities are channelled through the Advisory Forum.	This is an internal committee and should be established for future reference.
2.	The DICDRM have established mechanisms for developing and adopting disaster risk management policy.	No – The standard municipal mechanisms are used.	

<sup>1</sup> The South African Disaster Risk Management Handbook Series (Guidelines for the Implementation of Disaster Management)

3.	A disaster risk management policy framework that makes provision for an integrated, coordinated and uniform approach to disaster risk management has been developed and adopted by the municipal council.	The district policy has been redone as part of this project. It must be tabled at the Council and re-adopted.	Present (new) draft Framework to MDRMAF for comments. Finalise for tabling and adoption at Council
<b>5.1 Integrated direction and execution of policy</b>			
4.	The Executive Mayor has designated the department within which the municipal disaster risk management centre must function.	It has been done in the district, as well as in the local municipalities. (District – Community Services)	
5.	The job description and the key performance indicators for the position of the head of the disaster risk management centre have been developed, adopted and approved by the municipal council.	Done. (No evidence)	Supply evidence
6.	The head of the municipal disaster risk management centre has been appointed by the municipal council in accordance with the applicable legislation (written employment contract)	Done. (No evidence)	Supply evidence
7.	The municipal disaster risk management centre has been established by the municipal council and resourced in accordance with the minimum requirements (for structure, infrastructure and staffing) and is operating effectively in terms of predetermined operational protocols	Established but not resourced properly. There are currently only 2 staff members in the centre, this places them under a lot of pressure. All equipment as needed has not been supplied.	Capacitate current staff Budget for and appoint additional staff Budget for and obtain additional equipment

8.	The municipal council has identified and assigned roles and responsibilities of municipal departments, local municipalities and any other municipal entities involved in disaster risk management and included such in the job descriptions of key personnel. These are being applied effectively in terms of predetermined operational protocols	Partially done – mainly the local municipal roles and responsibilities are defined. (No evidence) It has not been done for the departments and other entities.	Urgently assign roles and responsibilities to all primary and secondary entities
9.	An organisational structure for the staffing of the municipal disaster risk management centre (which takes into account the skills necessary to manage known priority risks) and job descriptions linked to key performance indicators for the relevant posts have been developed, approved and adopted by the municipal council.	The current structure has been done and approved, but it only includes the two staff members as indicated above and is therefore insufficient.	Capacitate current staff Budget for and appoint additional staff
10.	The head of the centre has established mechanisms to ensure integration and joint standards of practice in the execution of disaster risk management policy throughout the district municipality.	The DRM Framework and Plan are used as guiding documents, no specific mechanisms has been established.	Establish mechanisms

<b>5.2 Integrated execution of disaster risk management policy across municipal departments and other municipal entities in the district municipality</b>			
11.	Every municipal department/entity, local municipality and any other municipal entity has developed a disaster risk management policy for its functional area which has been approved, adopted, incorporated into the municipal disaster risk management policy and is being implemented.	Local municipalities' policies were developed by a consultant in 2013 (the LMs claim that no consultation took place and therefore they do not take ownership). These have not yet been approved by the respective councils. No departments or entities have policies.	Advise all entities to complete this process
12.	Disaster risk management responsibilities have been integrated into the routine activities of the various sectors and disciplines within the relevant municipal departments or municipal entities and their substructures, reflected in the job descriptions of the relevant role players in each department or municipal entity and KPIs have been provided for the execution of those responsibilities.	No evidence of formal integration found	Ensure integration of activities as indicated
13.	Disaster risk management focal/nodal points have been identified by municipal departments, local municipalities and any other municipal entities and responsibilities for disaster risk management have been assigned and this function has been included in their job descriptions	No evidence of formal appointments found	Appoint focal/nodal points and include DRM function in their job descriptions
14.	A Municipal Interdepartmental Disaster Risk Management Committee (MIDRMC) has been established.	No – only the Advisory Forum has been established.	Establish MIDRMC

<b>5.3 Decentralised arrangements for disaster risk management across the area of the district municipality and local municipalities in the district</b>			
15.	The head of the centre has researched options for decentralised direction and execution of disaster risk management policy and legislation by strategically locating satellite disaster risk management centres to serve the municipal area in accordance with the directive issued by the National Disaster Management Centre (NDMC). The municipal council has established and resourced such centres (in terms of structure, infrastructure and staffing) in accordance with the minimum requirements and the centres are operating effectively in terms of predetermined operational protocols	No satellite centres are functioning. In Lephalale the centre has apparently been established but it is not staffed. Only Thabazimbi has a dedicated Disaster Management officer, the others are actually in other posts to which DRM has been added.	Ensure that satellite centres are established and functions properly
<b>5.4 Integrated execution of policy in local municipalities in the district</b>			
16.	The councils of the local municipalities in the district have established adequate institutional arrangements for the implementation of disaster risk management in the local municipalities, including a structure for coordinating disaster risk management planning and operations to engage stakeholder participation in disaster risk management	No	Establish necessary arrangements

<b>5.5 Stakeholder participation and technical advice in the district municipality</b>			
17.	The Municipal Disaster Risk Management Advisory Forum (MDRMAF) has been formally constituted and operates effectively in accordance with predetermined terms of reference and provides an opportunity for role players to communicate effectively with each other	The Advisory Forum has been established. Apparently regular meetings have been disrupted due to the flood disaster in March.	Ensure optimal operation of MDRMAF
18.	Technical task teams comprising the relevant role players and stakeholders from relevant sectors and disciplines have been established by the MDRMAF and they have developed their terms of reference. Technical task teams have developed and submitted their project management programme/s to the MDRMAF and progress reports have also been submitted according to predetermined protocols.	The TTT (Floods) is meeting regularly	Establish TTTs for all priority risks and other projects Assist TTTs in fulfilling their mandate
19.	The head of the municipal disaster risk management centre has full participation in integrated development planning and other relevant developmental planning processes and structures.	The HoC is a steering committee member and is attending the IDP meetings. (No evidence)	Supply evidence Optimise involvement
20.	The head of the centre has developed and implemented mechanisms for the recruitment, training and participation of volunteers in disaster risk management.	The only volunteers involved in DRM are those trained by the National Department of Rural Development and Land Reform in Mogalakwena.	Establish volunteer units as envisaged in the Act

21.	The head of the centre has established a current register of disaster risk management stakeholders and volunteers and it is maintained.	Yes (No evidence)	Provide the register and keep it updated Include volunteer units when established
22.	The head of the centre has established local disaster risk management committees in municipal wards and these are operate effectively in accordance with predetermined terms of reference.	No	Establish DRM Ward Committees Assist in fulfilling of mandate
<b>5.6 Co-operation with the national and provincial spheres, neighbouring municipalities and international role players</b>			
23.	The head of the centre has identified and implemented mechanisms to ensure the application of the principles of co-operative governance.	All co-operative governance is done through the Advisory Forum.	Provide evidence
24.	The head of the centre has established mechanisms to facilitate co-operation with the PDMC, neighbouring disaster risk management centres and with disaster risk management authorities in neighbouring countries.	As above.	
25.	The head of the centre has established networks and implemented mechanisms to ensure that the centre remains abreast of current global trends in disaster risk management, has established links with regional and international partners.	The district relies on the province which has a network of universities conducting research.	Ensure formal involvement in research.

<b>5.7 Disaster risk management reports to the municipal council</b>			
26.	The head of the centre has been submitting annual reports to the municipal council on its activities during the year, with copies to the NDMC, PDMC and local municipalities.	A draft report for the 2013-2014 financial year was done – not supplied.	Supply evidence
27.	The head of the centre has been submitting performance reports every meeting of the District Intermunicipality Committee on Disaster Risk Management (DICDRM) and the district intergovernmental forum as well as to meetings of the Mayoral Committee or the relevant portfolio or standing committee/s of the municipal council.	The DICDRM does not exist (see above). Standard quarterly performance reports are submitted and then included in the annual report.	Supply evidence
28.	The head of the centre has been submitting a report on priority risk reduction planning before the end of July.	Yes (No evidence of detail risk reduction planning found)	Supply evidence
29.	Priority risk reduction initiatives, strategies, plans and actions have been included in the IDP of the following year.	Though these initiatives were submitted, nothing was approved due to the lack of funds.	Supply evidence
<b>PERFORMANCE ENABLERS:</b>			
<b>ENABLER 1: INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION</b>			
<b>ENABLER 2: EDUCATION, TRAINING, PUBLIC AWARENESS AND RESEARCH</b>			
<b>ENABLER 3: FUNDING</b>			
<b>Devise and implement key supportive mechanisms to enable the achievement of the objective of establishing integrated institutional capacity</b>			
<b>ENABLER</b>	<b>KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR</b>		



<b>Enabler 1</b>	Mechanisms have been identified and developed to ensure that all relevant data in respect of the information management system is gathered and captured simultaneously in the process of establishing and maintaining institutional capacity	The unit system was implemented by the centre on a fixed contract for 3 years (which expired earlier in 2014) but no cooperation was received and the supposed users did not utilise the system.	Arrange for reintroduction of system
	Mechanisms for safe-keeping of accurate records of meetings, disaster risk management plans and strategies, reports, memoranda, correspondence, and policies and legislation with regard to disaster risk management are established and maintained	As above.	Ensure manual or Intranet safekeeping until system is reintroduced
<b>Enabler 2</b>	A specific communication strategy has been developed as supporting policy to the disaster risk management policy framework of the district municipality	The standard municipal communication strategy is used.	Adapt to focus on DRM
	Specific provision has been made to ensure that communities are able to participate in the communication strategy	There are public participation in imbizos held in local municipalities	Supply evidence
	A specific media policy for disaster risk management has been developed and implemented, has positive support and operates effectively	The standard municipal media policy is used.	Adapt to focus on DRM

	Education, training, public awareness, and research (knowledge management) needs in respect of institutional capacity have been analysed, and appropriate mechanisms have been identified and implemented to address the relevant needs	No – although SALGA has done a study, Waterberg did not participate.	Participate in all studies
	There is political support and buy-in for disaster risk management and commitment to its success in the district municipality	There is very limited support.	Find a champion to assist with overall buy-in
	Key personnel, external role players and stakeholders support, have bought into and are committed to the success of disaster risk management in the district municipality	No – the Advisory Forum is not attended well. The TTT (Floods) does not operate effectively due to lack of cooperation from the departments. Lack of funding for projects is a challenge.	As above
<b>Enabler 3</b>	Effective mechanisms are established to ensure sound financial management	Financial management is guided by the MFMA provisions.	Supply evidence
	A business plan and a budget for disaster risk management for the current and ensuing financial year have been prepared, submitted and approved	It has been prepared but was not approved. (No evidence)	Supply evidence
<b>6 KEY PERFORMANCE AREA 2: DISASTER RISK ASSESSMENT</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR</b>		

<b>6.1 Disaster risk assessment</b>			
1.	Comprehensive disaster risk assessments consistent with the supporting policy to the municipal disaster risk management policy framework have been conducted and disaster risks in the district have been assessed and prioritised according to the national criteria generated by the NDMC and PDMC.	No – only Stage 1 & 2 risk assessments were done. No GIS included in review (due to lack of funding)	Re-commission risk assessment with focus on dynamic risk profile Liaise with municipal GIS for inclusion of DRM model Commission comprehensive risk assessments based on risk profile
2.	The disaster risk assessment has been used to inform disaster risk management planning and the development and application of disaster risk reduction policies throughout the district.	No evidence of risk reduction policies being implemented – lack of funding a challenge	Implement as proposed in Framework and Plan
3.	The head of the centre has developed, established and documented mechanisms to consolidate, map and make accessible information on the priority disaster risks of the district municipality and the local municipalities in its area	No – GIS capacity does not exist.	Implement as proposed in Framework and Plan
4.	All departments and other municipal entities with responsibilities for disaster risk management in both the district municipality and the local municipalities in the district have been conducting systematic disaster risk assessments prior to the implementation of any risk reduction programmes.	Risk assessments have been commissioned by the Province. Departments and other entities have not conducted RA on their own.	Encourage all parties to contribute to the suggested dynamic risk profile by doing their own risk assessment and adding data to the knowledge bank

<b>6.2 Technical advisory committees</b>			
5.	A technical advisory committee (TAC) has been appointed by the MDRMAF prior to commissioning of the disaster risk assessments.	No	Appoint TAC as part of risk assessment process described above
6.	All proposed disaster risk assessments planned by departments and municipal entities in the district municipality and in local municipalities in the district are submitted to the Municipal Disaster Risk Management Centre, the Provincial Disaster Risk Management Centre and the NDMC for technical review and approval.	No risk assessments done by departments and municipal entities	Implement as proposed in Framework and Plan
<b>6.3 Disaster risk assessment reports</b>			
7.	Reports of all disaster risk assessments conducted by municipal departments and other entities in the district municipality and those in local municipalities in the district have been submitted to the district disaster risk management centre.	No – see above	Implement as proposed in Framework and Plan
8.	Copies of these reports has been submitted to the Provincial Cape Disaster Risk Management Centre and the NDMC for technical validation of findings by the national and provincial TACs before any actions based on the assessment findings were initiated.	No – see above	Implement as proposed in Framework and Plan

<b>PERFORMANCE ENABLERS:</b>			
<b>ENABLER 1: INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION</b>			
<b>ENABLER 2: EDUCATION, TRAINING, PUBLIC AWARENESS AND RESEARCH</b>			
<b>ENABLER 3: FUNDING</b>			
<b>Devise and implement key supportive mechanisms to enable the achievement of the objective of establishing a uniform approach to assessing and monitoring disaster risks</b>			
<b>ENABLER</b>	<b>KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR</b>		
<b>Enabler 1</b>	Mechanisms have been identified and developed to ensure that all relevant data in respect of the information management system is gathered and captured simultaneously in the process of conducting, monitoring and updating comprehensive disaster risk assessments	No GIS data are kept The unit system was implemented by the centre on a fixed contract for 3 years (which expired earlier in 2014) but no cooperation was received and the supposed users did not utilise the system.	Reintroduce system as suggested above
<b>Enabler 2</b>	Education, training, public awareness and research needs in respect of assessing disaster risk have been analysed and appropriate mechanisms have been identified and implemented to address the relevant needs	No	Implement as proposed in Framework and Plan Identify needs and provide training
<b>Enabler 3</b>	A business plan and a budget for conducting comprehensive disaster risk assessments, monitoring disaster risk and updating disaster risk information have been prepared, submitted and approved for the current and ensuing financial year	No	Implement as indicated above

7 KEY PERFORMANCE AREA 3: DISASTER RISK REDUCTION			
No	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR		
<b>7.1 Disaster risk management plans</b>			
1.	The head of the centre has developed and implemented a framework for disaster risk management planning in the district municipality.	The DRM Framework is used as guiding document.	Very little evidence of implementation was found – implement as intended
2.	All relevant municipal departments and municipal entities in the local municipalities in the district have submitted disaster risk management plans to the municipal, provincial and national disaster management centres.	No plans have been done by the municipal departments and municipal entities in the local municipalities in the district.	Encourage entities to submit plans
3.	Primary and support agencies have been identified and responsibilities have been assigned to the identified agencies for the development and implementation of each priority disaster risk management plan, programme and project.	No identification has been done.	Identify primary and support agencies and assign responsibilities
4.	The head of the centre has subscribed deadlines for the submission of disaster risk management plans by departments and municipal entities.	No	Implement as proposed in Framework

<b>7.2 Review of the disaster risk management policy framework and disaster risk management plans</b>			
5.	Municipal disaster management frameworks and plans have been revised at least every two years, as evidenced in annual reports submitted.	The previous review was in 2009, limited budget is a challenge.	Include review planning in future budgets
6.	Municipal disaster management frameworks and plans have been revised after a major disaster.	The current review is after the 2014 flood disaster.	
<b>7.3 Monitoring the effectiveness of disaster risk reduction initiatives</b>			
7.	The head of the centre has developed and implemented mechanisms and methodologies to monitor the effectiveness of disaster risk reduction initiatives	No	Implement as proposed in Framework and Plan
8.	Documented evidence of risk reduction programmes and projects have been consolidated by the head of the centre and have been included in annual reports.	No	Implement as proposed in Framework and Plan
9.	Information on risk reduction programmes have been made available on the municipality's website.	No	Implement as proposed in Framework and Plan

<b>7.4 Integrating disaster risk reduction plans into other developmental plans</b>			
10.	The head of the centre has ensured that response and recovery plans and disaster risk reduction plans, programmes and projects are incorporated into IDPs, spatial development frameworks, environmental management plans and other strategic developmental plans and initiatives in the district municipality and in the local municipalities in the district.	No – even though IDP officials were supplied with suggested plans, none were included.	Implement as proposed in Framework and Plan
<b>PERFORMANCE ENABLERS:</b>			
<b>ENABLER 1: INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION</b>			
<b>ENABLER 2: EDUCATION, TRAINING, PUBLIC AWARENESS AND RESEARCH</b>			
<b>ENABLER 3: FUNDING</b>			
<b>Devise and implement key supportive mechanisms to enable the achievement of the objective of establishing disaster risk reduction strategies and plans</b>			
<b>ENABLER</b>	<b>KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR</b>		
<b>Enabler 1</b>	Mechanisms have been identified and developed to ensure that all relevant data in respect of the information management system is gathered and captured simultaneously in the development of disaster risk reduction strategies and plans	The uniti system was implemented by the centre on a fixed contract for 3 years (which expired earlier in 2014) but no cooperation was received and the supposed users did not utilise the system.	Reintroduce system



<b>Enabler 2</b>	Education, training, public awareness and research needs in respect of disaster risk reduction have been analysed and appropriate mechanisms have been identified and implemented to address the relevant needs	No	Link formally with research and training institutions Utilise NETaRNA report from NDMC Identify needs and provide training
<b>Enabler 3</b>	A business plan and a budget for development of disaster risk reduction strategies and plans, as well as the implementation and monitoring thereof have been prepared, submitted and approved for the current and ensuing financial year	Plans were submitted but not approved – no evidence supplied.	Supply evidence
<b>8 KEY PERFORMANCE AREA 4: DISASTER RESPONSE AND RECOVERY</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR</b>		
<b>8.1 Dissemination of early warnings</b>			
1.	The head of the centre has ensured the technical identification and monitoring of prevailing hazards and has prepared and issued hazard warnings of significance (where applicable) in the district municipality's area.	Yes (No evidence)	Supply evidence
2.	The head of the centre has developed and implemented communication mechanisms and strategies to ensure that such warnings are disseminated immediately in order to reach at-risk communities, areas and developments as speedily as possible.	Yes (No evidence)	Supply evidence

3.	The head of the centre has identified and established strategic inter-sectoral, multidisciplinary and multi-agency communication mechanisms and has ensured that such communication mechanisms are accessible to at-risk communities and areas in the district municipality's area.	Yes (No evidence)	Supply evidence
4.	The head of the centre has facilitated the development of a disaster risk management communication plan for the district municipality, which has been documented, adopted and implemented by the municipal council.	No – the standard district communication plan is used	Adapt plan to focus on DRM
<b>8.2 Disaster impact assessments</b>			
5.	The head of the centre has established mechanisms for the application of disaster impact assessments using uniform methodologies.	Yes (No evidence)	Supply evidence
6.	The head of the centre has documented mechanisms for conducting disaster impact assessments in the district municipality and it has been included in disaster risk management plans	Yes (No evidence) Damage assessments are done by the sector departments – DRM staff must reply on them with assistance from the fire staff due to lack of own staff	Supply evidence Capacitate staff

<b>8.3 Classification of disasters and declaration of states of disaster</b>			
7.	The head of the centre has coordinated and managed responses to non-security related disasters and states of disaster classified as local disasters.	Yes – 2014 flood disaster	Declaration of flood disaster 2014 shows evidence
8.	The head of the centre has established mechanisms for the rapid and effective classification and declaration of disasters in accordance with national and provincial guidelines.	Yes – 2014 flood disaster	
9.	The head of the centre has make recommendations to the council on whether a local state of disaster should be declared in terms of sections 23 and 55 of the DM Act.	Yes – 2014 flood disaster	
<b>8.4 Disaster reviews and reporting</b>			
10.	The head of the centre has developed and monitored the implementation of mechanisms for conducting routine disaster reviews and for reporting on disaster reviews undertaken.	Yes (No evidence)	Supply evidence
11.	The head of the centre has submitted reviews and research reports of significant events, trends and disasters occurring in the district municipality to the municipal disaster risk management centre, the PDMC and the NDMC. This has also been disseminated to other stakeholders.	No	Research reports and disseminate

12.	The head of the centre has conducted disaster reviews in accordance with the review programme developed by the NDMC in terms of section 4.2.3 of the NDMF.	Yes (No evidence)	Supply evidence – only review found was that of Red Cross
<b>8.5 Integrated response and recovery operations</b>			
13.	The head of the centre has identified and assigned primary responsibility to relevant organs of state for contingency planning for each known priority hazard. Supporting agencies have been identified and have been assigned responsibilities.	Roles and responsibilities are guided by the DRM Plan, no formal assignments done.	Identify role-players Assign responsibilities
14.	Primary and support agencies assigned for each priority hazard have been clustered into a technical task team and the organs of state assigned with primary responsibility have facilitated the development by the technical task team of a contingency plan for the relevant known priority hazards.	No TTTs (other than one for flooding due to the recent disaster) have been established	Establish TTTs for all contingency plans
15.	The primary agency has ensured that such plans are reviewed and updated annually as well as following significant events and disasters that have occurred.	No	Supply evidence
16.	The head of the centre has identified agencies with responsibilities for the various operational activities associated with disaster response and recovery.	No – the DRM plan is used as guiding document.	Supply evidence

17.	The head of the centre has identified lead agencies and assigned primary responsibility to lead agencies to facilitate the development of Field Operations Plans (FOPs) for each operational activity. In addition, support agencies have been identified and allocated responsibilities.	The lead agencies have FOPs	Supply evidence
18.	Primary and support agencies assigned for each operational activity have been clustered into a technical task team and the agency assigned with primary responsibility has facilitated the development by the technical task team of the relevant FOP	No	Form appropriate TTTs
19.	The head of the centre has ensured that such FOPs are reviewed and updated at the same time as contingency plans are reviewed and updated.	No	Ensure FOPs are developed
20.	All response and recovery stakeholders have developed standard operating protocols for their functional areas and have ensured that all operational personnel understand and are well versed in the procedures.	Yes – all agencies have their own SOPs	Supply evidence
21.	The head of the centre has ensured the development and implementation of plans to standardise and regulate the practice and management of multi-agency response and recovery operations in the district municipality's area.	No – the DRM plan is used as guiding document.	Develop appropriate plans

22.	The head of the centre has been monitoring the implementation of and compliance with such regulations and directives by conducting multi-agency response debriefings after each significant event or disaster.	Debriefings have been done after the recent flood disaster.	Supply evidence
<b>8.6 Relief measures</b>			
23.	The head of the centre has ensured the development and implementation of policy for the management of relief operations in the district municipality's area.	No	Develop relief policy Ensure buy-in/ownership from stake-holders
24.	The head of the centre has monitored the implementation of and compliance with such policy, regulations and directives through debriefings and reviews after each significant event or disaster.	In the recent flood the role-players participated in response but they did not co-ordinate through the DRMC	Monitor compliance after development of policy
<b>8.7 Integrated reconstruction and rehabilitation measures</b>			
25.	The head of the centre has established multidisciplinary technical task teams for post-disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction projects.	TTT (Floods) exists – due to recent disaster	Supply evidence
26.	The head of the centre has identified a lead agency and assigned primary responsibility to the lead agency for the management of each project using nationally adopted project management methodologies.	The departments report on where they are the lead agency	Supply evidence

27.	Lead agencies have been assigned with responsibilities for the development and implementation of post-disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction projects and have been ensuring that all projects and programmes undertaken maintain a developmental focus.	The departments report on where they are the lead agency	Supply evidence
28.	The head of the centre has established mechanisms to monitor progress with such projects and programmes.	Currently a progress report is tabled at every meeting The departments report on where they are the lead agency	Supply evidence
<b>PERFORMANCE ENABLERS:</b>			
<b>ENABLER 1: INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION</b>			
<b>ENABLER 2: EDUCATION, TRAINING, PUBLIC AWARENESS AND RESEARCH</b>			
<b>ENABLER 3: FUNDING</b>			
<b>Devise and implement key supportive mechanisms to enable the achievement of the objective of disaster response and recovery</b>			
<b>ENABLER</b>	<b>KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR</b>		
<b>Enabler 1</b>	Mechanisms have been identified and developed to ensure that all relevant data in respect of the information management system is gathered and captured simultaneously in the development of response and recovery strategies and plans	The unit system was implemented by the centre on a fixed contract for 3 years (which expired earlier in 2014) but no cooperation was received and the supposed users did not utilise the system.	Reintroduce system

<b>Enabler 2</b>	Education, training, public awareness and research needs in respect of response and recovery have been analysed and appropriate mechanisms have been identified and implemented to address the relevant needs	No	Link formally with research and training institutions Identify needs and provide training
<b>Enabler 3</b>	A business plan and a budget for development of response, recovery and rehabilitation strategies and plans, as well as the implementation and monitoring thereof have been prepared, submitted and approved for the current and ensuing financial year	Yes – Every sector department has an approved business plan submitted to NDMC, Province and District (No evidence)	Supply evidence