

Criminal Justice System (CJS) Modernisation: follow-up meeting with SAPS and its stakeholders

Committee: Police

Chairperson: Mr F Beukman (ANC)

Date of Meeting: 10 Jun 2015

Minutes

Chairperson Opening Comments

The Chairperson provided a brief background to this meeting noting that the Committee was briefed by the SA Police Service (SAPS) on their Integrated Justice System (IJS), Technology Management System (TMS) and Criminal Justice System (CJS) projects on 13 May 2015 (*SAPS report on Criminal Justice System modernisation, Integrated Case Docket Management System (ICDMS) and Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Amendment Act (DNA Act) implementation*) where it came to the fore that there were challenges experienced in terms of the execution of some of the projects with some of the role-players. There were currently 73 technology projects run by SAPS of which 15 were linked to other departments. The Committee then decided to invite the other role players, including, Justice, Home Affairs and the State Information Technology Agency (SITA) to get a picture of the issues on the table. It was important that these projects were run effectively to meet policing outcomes. If there were certain bottlenecks they needed to be addressed. This was a complex environment and challenges ran from bid specifications, budget shortages, outdated technology, change of staff etc. so the aim of today's meeting was to determine the issues and find the solution to move forward effectively.

Committee Researcher Briefing

Ms Nicolette Van-Zyl Gous, Committee Researcher, began by noting that the National Development Plan (NDP) placed significant focus on the implementation of the recommendations of the Review of the South African Criminal Justice System (CJS) through the CJS Seven point plan, which was approved in 2007.

This process was started in 2005 because departments were working in 'silos' with little interaction. It was difficult to track individuals and information through the system. Implementation of projects

under the Technology Management Services (TMS) of the SAPS had been a significant concern for the last couple of years. Large amounts of resources had been allocated to the CJS and IJS. For the 2014/15 financial year, R1.14 bn was allocated and spent on the CJS/IJS projects. Some projects were started in 2003/04 and to date R6.673 billion had been spent on technology projects associated with the CJS/IJS review (bulk on the Criminal Resource Centre and the Forensic Science Laboratory).

The Committee last met on this subject on 13 May 2015 where it was briefed on a quarterly progress report regarding implementation and expenditure for the CJS, SAPS IJS and SAPS Transversal IJS projects. It became evident that SAPS experienced several challenges on transversal responsibilities and dependencies on other stakeholder departments, notably SITA, Department of Public Works (DPW) and Department of Home Affairs (DHA). The meeting was adjourned with the undertaking that the Committee would revisit with all stakeholders present. SAPS had 73 technology projects associated with the CJS/IJS Review, of which 15 projects were listed as having dependencies on other departments (20% of total number of projects). The listed projects had dependencies with

- DHA (HANIS Integration)
- DPW (Automatic DNA Equipment)
- SITA:
 - Electronic Plan Drawing
 - Facial Compilation
 - Biometric Enhancement Solution (Maintenance)
- Decentralisation of JUDDIS
- De-Stralab Licences upgrade
- SAN Storage (EC and KZN)
- 12 Analytical Solutions
- Automated Fingerprint Identifications Replacement
- End-user Deployment and Configuration
- Identity and Access Management (IDAM)
- SAPS Integrated Booking (Person)
- ICDMS (Administer Case)
- ICDMS (Investigate Case)

With the presentations from stakeholders the main areas of concern were with the development of user specifications (role of CSIR), evaluation criteria of bids and the adjudication of bids.

Ms Van Zyl-Gous then turned to look at budget allocation and expenditure 2014/15 noting of the R1.14bn CJS and IJS projects allocation, of which 100% was spent, against less than 50% at 31 December 2014. There were large disparities comparing expenditure at end 3rd quarter to 4th quarter and R553 million was spent in the last three months of the 2014/15 financial year. With the SAPS component there was over/under expenditure, a significant decreased allocation to the Criminal Record Centre (CRC) (less R109 million) and SAPS reported that expenditure on Visible Policing was 85% - this was incorrect and must be explained (in the previous presentation to the Committee on 13 May 2015).

The Chairperson was concerned about the last point and thought the Committee should keep an eye out on the presentations and who signed off on them.

Ms Van Zyl-Gous continued with the presentation looking at budget allocation and expenditure highlighting the most significant expenditure on CJS projects included:

- Criminal Record Centre – R1.465 billion
 - R554 million on Biometric Enhancement Solution
- Forensic Science Laboratories (FSL) - R1.462 billion
 - R350 million on Radio Frequency Identification (RFID)
- Provincial, Clusters, Police Stations and other Divisions – R967 million
 - R743 million on End User Equipment procurement
- Detective Services – R473 million
 - R449 million on End User Equipment procurement
- Visible Policing – R24.2 million
 - R15. 2 million on Network Infrastructure at Veritas Building

Most significant expenditure on IJS projects:

- Investigation Case Docket Management System (Administer Case)/ICDMS/E-docket – R613.5 million
- Property Control and Exhibit (PCEM) – R355 million
- Service Integration Bus (SIBUS) – R192 million

SAPS should provide a strategic, clear and succinct picture of the CJS/IJS projects and how these contributed to the CJS Review, tangible results for the almost R7 billion expenditure over the past

decade on the modernisation projects and dependencies on other departments should be clarified and addressed.

Discussion

Ms D Kohler Barnard (DA) noted that Maj. Gen. Adeline Shezi, Head: Quality, Forensic Division, SAPS, in the last engagement with the Committee, said e-dockets would simply never work yet and equipment became outdated. Was it correct to say that for the total spent on it, nothing was achieved?

Ms Van-Zyl Gous replied that there were some achievements on e-dockets with several magistrates and courts linked to some police stations but it was definitely not the amount the Committee wanted to see and not all the links were currently in place. The difficulty was that projects were running on a phased approach so different phases ran at different times of completion without the whole project being completed and this meant the benefit of the entire system was not enjoyed.

Mr J Maake (ANC) wanted to know what end-user procurement was.

Ms Van-Zyl Gous explained that these were devices SAPS used on ground and station level e.g. cellphones, laptops and other field devices and equipment.

The Chairperson thought it was clear that from the last engagement with SAPS on this matter, it was important to look into the governance of projects, the correctness of technical data and financial information and outcomes.

Integrated Justice System (IJS) Theme: Deterrence of Crime in SA through CJS modernisation

Mr Godfrey Leseba, IJS Board Chairperson, began the presentation by providing some brief background noting that the IJS Programme was conceptualised upon approval of the National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS) by Cabinet in 1996 in order to modernise the Criminal Justice System. The Programme was further given impetus by a review of the South African Criminal Justice System seven-point plan (2007), Outcome 3 of the Justice Crime Prevention and Safety Cluster (JCPS) Cluster Delivery Agreement - "All people in South Africa are and feel safe" and the NDP vision 2030. The primary objective of the IJS Programme was to electronically enable and integrate the end-to-end

criminal justice business processes (i.e. from the report of a crime to the release of a convicted person), through technology solutions and to manage the related inter-departmental information exchanges across the CJS.

Mr Leseba explained the rationale behind the existence of the IJS Board for the deterrence of Crime in SA by, eliminating swapping of identity at Remand Detention Facilities, ensuring effective and instant linking of criminal records, bail status and “wanted” status of persons at the point of arrest so as to provide enough information about an arrested person to the prosecution prior to first court appearance (48 hrs), ensuring effective identification of criminals based on crime scene evidence (e.g. finger prints, DNA) and enabling rapid processing of cases through the courts by providing information about the case, person and exhibit seamlessly to speed up justice to victims of crime and punishment to perpetrators of crime.

Recent strategic decisions included changes to the IJS Board composition and reporting line, the Five Key Cluster Integration Priorities approved by Cabinet, assigned Senior Programme Managers to each of the three major work packages, implementation of the Interdepartmental Project Management Governance Framework and Tools, updated IJS Board Terms of Reference (TOR), enhancement of accountability for delivery and budget, improvement leadership of the Board and its sub-structures and adequate prioritisation of the programme by all parties.

The presentation then moved onto the JCPS cluster priorities and delivery work packages.

The Chairperson interjected to note that the Committee expected a high-level interrogation of the issues in the IJS, the number of projects run or coordinated by the IJS Board and who sat on the Board – today's meeting was focused on the projects of SAPS and other departments so the presenter really needed to cut to the chase because currently the expectations of the Committee was not met.

Mr Leseba responded that the brief he had did not go into details of what exactly the Committee required – his presentation was an overview of programmes, achievements and progress made at this stage.

Ms A Molebatsi (ANC) did not understand how an entity could come to Parliament and not know what was expected.

Mr L Ramatlakane (ANC) agreed that one of the problems was that the Committee did not have the whole day. Members wanted to see tangible deliverables in terms of project expenditure over the last ten years. The presenter needed to cut to the chase, get to the meat and details because the Committee was concerned about delivery and coordination.

Mr Leseba said he would go through the presentation but try to speed it up to focus on achievements so far. The programme had been around for quite a while and a lot of work had been done. It was not an easy journey in terms of challenges but he was certain the Board was on the right track in terms of value and deliverables which the people of SA expected. He continued by highlighting the IJS programme governance and the highly detailed integration progress.

The Chairperson asked if the integration progress was the envisaged system or the status quo.

Mr Leseba indicated that it was the status quo from an integration framework point of view. Some of the end point development was complete, like with SAPS where some electronic info could be moved from SAPS to the NPA and Department of Justice. However other integration end points were not yet developed like for the Department of Social Development and Correctional Services so no electronic information could be moved transversally.

Mr Z Mbhele (DA) had a crucial question noting that when the Committee interacted with SAPS, the nub of the issue was the challenge of transversal communication with other departments. He asked how the enhanced accountability measures, mentioned earlier in the presentation, showed impact and progress in unblocking bottlenecks and enabling things to move in a much more streamlined manner. The theory looked great and he acknowledged progress but where the presentation stated “achieved” or “completed” there were still long standing challenges and questions with certain systems. In short, what did enhanced accountability mean? Was it working? Was it showing progress?

Mr Leseba noted that accountability had improved quite significantly since structural reforms in the IJS programme which enabled those in the Board who were responsible for technology or core business in department. The IJS programme reported to collective in the JCPS Cluster - included reporting on budget progress and this had approved accountability quite significantly and brought

those responsible for technology and operations together for greater accountability. Consolidated approach in terms of relationship with SITA

Continuing with the presentation, case integration achievements were outlined which included CAS/ICDMS and ICMS Integrations for the electronic transmission of docket information which had now been deployed to all 1153 police stations (including military police stations) across the country and 509 of 627 Department of Justice and Constitutional Development (DOJCD) courts. Legal Aid SA notifications were enabled at 848 police stations and associated Justice Centres in order to send electronic messages for arrested persons that qualify for legal aid assistance to be assigned legal representation. With CAS/ICDMS, ECMS and ICMS Integrations, there was a further enhancement of the case integration which now include the National Prosecuting Authority (NPA) Electronic Case Management System (ECMS), NPA Electronic Charge Sheet (Electronic J15) and Case Outcome Integration was now deployed to 22 Courts in Gauteng, Western Cape and KZN by 31 March 2015 while post implementation support and change management interventions were currently underway to gradually operationalise the system and optimise utilisation. Legal Aid SA electronic Legal Aid Application (eLAA) user testing was in progress - production was planned for quarter three of 2015/16. With Correctional Services, the Integrated Inmate Management System (IIMS) pilot rollout at JHB Correctional Centre was concluded as planned on the 31st March 2015. Further functional enhancement was planned for implementation in the current financial year. With Social Development, there were preparations for integration with SAPS to deal with cases related to children in conflict with the law. This would allow for the assignment of a probation officer electronically.

Mr Leseba outlined the person integration achievements which included the Person Identification and Verification Application (PIVA) which was part of the implementation of the Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act. This Application entailed instant verification of SA ID's via DHA HANIS system using biometric devices. PIVA version 1 was ready for deployment pending the sign-off of the Standard Operating procedures. The solution was also to be used for Firearms Licence applications within SAPS. Person Architecture framework and designs have been drafted by SAPS to pave the way for creation of a unique person identifier, integrated booking and person tracking in downstream departments.

With the 28 KPIs and business intelligence highlights, this solution enabled the JCPS Cluster to measure the performance of the CJS using real production data to inform effective decision-making

with regard to inter alia capacity planning across the value chain. Achievements included the state of the art dashboard user interface which been completed and deployed to production and the deployment of 14 of the 28 KPI Business Intelligence solutions against a target of 9 KPI's in the reporting period. This was a ground-breaking achievement of the IJS Programme which was perceived as a tangible game changer. Work in progress included preparation for the data uploads for DCS and DSD KPIs, which were in progress as this will enable the deployment of additional KPIs.

Home Affairs: HANIS Expansion for Law Enforcement

The Acting CIO, DHA, provided a background to the presentation saying that the Department of Home Affairs (DHA) implemented a Citizens Biometric database known as HANIS and it consisted of about 41,3 million records. The Current HANIS software could run only on the specific (product locked) equipment and the system could only be maintained by the contracted supplier. The HANIS system was now running on old equipment and software that needed to be upgraded urgently since it could not be effectively maintained anymore. DHA Modernisation programme focused on the development of the National Identity System which included both the Biographic database (now called NPR) and the Biometric database (HANIS). The intention was to end the silo approach and focus on integration. To date DHA allowed third party verification through a service known as the online verification since 2010 and since enabled rollout out 1:1 integration verification functionality with SA Banking Risk Information Centre (SABRIC) and the IJS cluster. Noting the challenges with HANIS infrastructure lifespan, the Department had in the meantime assisted the SAPS with the ability to conduct 4-print searches which returned among others 10 fingerprints as they were on HANIS. The service was accessible from Brits Office and Bothongo Plaza. It was to be noted that the current service did not meet the total requirements and turnaround times of the SAPS.

With DHA's participation in the IJS, in the 2009/10 financial year, SAPS requested access to HANIS (fingerprint biometric databases). A separate quotation of R337 543 934 was received and that the technology was fairly new at that time. The cost would have resulted in the replication of the current HANIS which included cost for:

- 1:1 verification;
- 10 fingerprint capability search (with a 24 hour turnaround time);
- latent search;
- This cost excluded the Disaster Recovery Site;
- A proposal for technology refresh at R339 980 010 was received.

- A total of R677 523 934 based on the contract the Department already had with the services provider.
- It was then not advisable that the CJS replicate the similar database with the added functions at a cost as reflected above.

As a member of the JCPS Cluster, DHA had a responsibility to ensure that all the people of SA were and felt safe. The success of this outcome was based on eradication of crime in the country and expedition of criminal cases as fast as possible with all available evidence. In the effort to achieve this, SAPS had amended the Criminal Procedure Act 51, 1977. Chapter 5A of the Criminal Law act, stated the establishment of the:

- 1. Storage and use of finger-prints, body-prints and photographic images persons
 2. Speculative search against other databases
 3. National instructions relating to collection, storage, maintenance, administration and use of finger-prints, body-prints and photographic images.

The Department was thus required to give the JCPS access to its Biometric database.

The Acting CIO explained the challenge of obsolete hardware and software where at the time when IJS funds were available, HANIS infrastructure together with the Disaster Recovery System was reaching its end of life in March 2014. DHA engaged for two years to negotiate a reasonable proposal with the service provider to upgrade HANIS. The proposal received to refresh the hardware and the technology was R340 million payable over a two year period. The proposal for CJS requirements for software upgrade was at R337 543 934 million. The above proposals cost excluded the support and maintenance estimated at R116 078 946.00.

The total cost for both the technology refresh and the JCPS cluster legislative requirements was quoted at a total of R678 million over two financial years. DHA had been deviating from procurement processes for the past 10 years to renew the current service provider contract to maintain the current HANIS. Should DHA have opted to contract the services provider, it would have deviated by R793 million for one contract to upgrade the current system. DHA was also planning for the total overhaul of the backend system (HANIS, NIIS, NPR) to enable integration of system into a single National Identity System (NIS).

In terms of the way forward, the aim for the DHA and IJS was to have an integrated multi-modal biometric system for the country. There was adoption of the world class Automatic Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) services which primarily served the JCPS Cluster and various stakeholders to:

- Effectively support the provision of civilian database;
- Capture biometric checks at Ports of Entry;
- Track asylum seekers and visitors;
- Track sex offenders and verification of children with the need of the SAPS (Forensic Procedures Act 2013) the most urgent requirement – i.e. to search the HANIS system for matches with latent;
- Allow finger prints from crime scenes for searches on all 10 fingerprints;
- Future requirements for upgrades might include other biometrics e.g. face recognition which was already done by the SAPS AFIS; and
- Verify the identity of known persons, and to identify unknown persons that may be on the DHA database.

To achieve the system that was scalable and expandable in future, the DHA and IJS required a strategic partner to advise on the way forward on acquiring this specialised solution – partnership with CSIR through the SITA and to go out on an open bidding process to allow transparency and competitive process. A committee established by the DG of DHA, Commissioner of SAPS and DG of Justice and Correctional Services was established to give strategic direction, identification of financial support and monitoring of the project while the JCPS Cluster was to consider the funding of the upgrade of AFIS (HANIS) with an aim to cater for immediate SAPS requirements.

The Acting CIO said the committee of the three DG's had agreed upon the phased approach to upgrade HANIS. DHA was issued a purchase order to appoint SITA to facilitate the process of development of specifications through CSIR assistance. The following process will be:

- Track/ Phase 1
- Due diligence analysis to fully understand the scope of the requirements and challenges with the current system (both hardware and software): June – December 2015
- Assess the current status of HANIS System.
- Extensive research to provide technical advice on:
- Global best practice on implementation of the National Identity Systems

- Benchmarking international trends and standards for the use of biometrics technology on National Identity Systems
- Best practices and trends regarding multi modal biometrics systems
- Documentation and recommendation based on scenario analysis
- The end product of phase 1 was the consolidated User Specification Requirements
- Contract re-negotiation with the current service provider for software maintenance and data migration.
- Track/ Phase 2
- Formal system engineering process from the functional specifications to the tender strategy for the new multi-modal biometric identification system:
 - Develop detailed URS using system engineering tools;
 - Develop detailed Functional Design Specifications (FDS);
 - Develop a high-level solution architecture;
 - Propose a tender strategy inclusive of DHA special requirements
 - Update the Request for Bid (RFB)
 - Advertisement, evaluation and award.
- Track/Phase 3
- Develop database consolidation plan and schedule
- Database consolidation
- Migration of data to the new system
- Testing and implementation

SITA : Criminal Justice System

Ms Magosi Maupi, SITA Executive: Customer Relations, began the presentation by looking at SITA's role, status, time and what was outstanding on following programmes:

- Identity and Access Management (IDAM): SAPS signed an Information Security SLA with SITA in 2014-2015 and the security assessment formed part of the service delivery. At present SAPS had no IDAM solution. SAPS had compiled a bid specification and expected to go out on tender for a solution in the 1st quarter of this year. SAPS requested that SITA advise on the IDAM bid and then further participate in the proposed bid with the expectation for SITA to manage, configure and support the IDAM solution upon procurement and implementation.

- National Photo Image System (NPIS): SITA performed all the Maintenance and Enhancement activities related to the National Photo Image System and Identity System. This supported all the digital photos received from the SAPS. The hardware (webcams) had been acquired by the SAPS and were in the process of being deployed
- Property Control and Exhibit Management (PCEM): The PCEM contract was signed between SAPS and an external service provider. This contract expired. At present there were two systems available for the management of property items and exhibits known as PCEM Version 1.1 and PCEM 1.x. The PCEM Version 1.1 was developed to manage the FSL and was presently deployed at four main SAPS Forensic Science Laboratories. The PCEM Version 1.x was developed to manage the SAPS 13 Stores needs for Visible Policing (Vispol) and at present had not been deployed.
- Facial Compilation: SITA assisted the SAPS in the Facial compilation tender specification through the procurement process
- Criminal Record and Information Management System (CRIM): SITA had maintained the CRIM system for the past 15 years. It was one of the SAPS legacy systems for supporting the Criminal Record Centre and the system interfaced with the Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS)

Ms Masupi continued with the presentation by looking at SITA's role, status, time and what was outstanding on the following programmes:

- Investigate Case Docket Management System (ICDMS): in November 2009 SITA received an order for the development of the ICDMS Administer Case that will deliver an end to end business process, application, ICT and integrations required to manage and administer criminal cases , inquests and enquiries from the time an incident was reported until the case was archived. The project consisted of two phases (1) the first phase was the Administer Case which had been completed and the second phase was the Investigate Case for which SITA delivered a Project Charter to SAPS
- Docket Scanning Solution: The purpose of the Document Scanning Solution system was to store records in the Electronic Content Document Management System (ECDMS)

- Automated Vehicle Location System (AVL): Tracking devices were installed into the SAPS vehicles to track and trace the vehicle movement. This was done by a 3rd party supplier through an agreement between SAPS and the supplier. This contract expired and SAPS requested SITA to publish a tender for support of AVL.
- National Network Upgrade Programme: The objective of the program focused on the upgrading of the SAPS absolute Technology Infrastructure. This included renewal of data and voice cabling, network equipment, consolidation of servers, data carriers and voice over IP
- Networks Video Conferencing (VC): SAPS directly, prior to 2010, acquired VC equipment through SITA Transversal Contract 431 which did not include maintenance and support. SAPS therefore required maintenance on existing equipment and a procurement contract to replace and expand
- IJS SITA transversal development capability: SITA developed the integration endpoints and interfaces as per the specifications compiled and approved by the IJS transversal team. A team had been established in SITA to focus on integrations required across systems and departments
- National Forensic DNA Database (NFDD): SITA appointed a team to assist the SAPS in the implementation of the NFDD (CODIS) solution. The team had started the preparation of the environment from where the system will operate.
- LABWARE: A software solution procured by SAPS directly, which managed workflow of all specimen in the forensic LAB
- Forensic Science Laboratory Admin System: Administration system behind the forensic science laboratory

Discussion

The Chairperson asked if, by analysing the presentation made by SAPS in May and the one made by SITA now, if it was correct to say more projects were taken on by the CSIR, from a technical point of view, and what SITA thought about this.

The SITA Deputy CEO said the role of the CSIR was to focus more on research, innovation and developing SA-made specifications, which was a highly specialised field and not necessarily to replace SITA's role as the ICT of government.

A CSIR representative added that the role of the CSIR was to provide support especially in areas where technical expertise was needed to draw up technical specifications properly, where they

could, and to partner with SITA. In short, there was no danger that the CSIR was taking over the role of SITA. The CSIR's role was to understand the current hardware technically and functionally and look at technology trends globally when developing end-user equipment for the country.

The Chairperson then asked for the presentation of the Department of Public Works.

Mr Mandla Mabuza, DPW DDG: Key Account Management, noted that he did not have a presentation but he would respond to questions of accommodation and infrastructure etc. DPW was present to support its sister department, SAPS. DPW had given SAPS the go ahead to install technology on state owned properties while there was a different dispensation for dealing with leased buildings.

Ms Molebatsi asked why there was a deviation from the norm set in the Committee for departments making presentations.

Ms Kohler Barnard was absolutely stunned and speechless as never in her 10 years in Parliament had she experienced a department appearing with no presentation. She failed to understand how a gathering of this magnitude did not expect a presentation. She felt this was tantamount to treating the Committee with contempt and lived up to the very notion that Public Works did not work.

The Chairperson found it really unfortunate that all other departments were prepared – the Committee would have to get DPW's presentation next week. This was the first time he experienced a department coming to a Committee without any presentation. He would convey his displeasure to the Chairperson of the Portfolio Committee of Public Works, Mr Ben Martins.

Mr Mabuza responded that DPW was not directly involved in the technology services only in the facilities of SAPS. He proceeded to read out the letter from the Committee inviting stakeholders to the meeting. The letter basically said the DPW was requested to be part of the meeting dealing with the CJS. Should the Department wish to make any presentation, it would be appreciated if such presentation be forwarded to the Committee. He communicated with SAPS on whether any specific information should be provided and, to the best of his knowledge, there was no need for DPW to do so.

The Chairperson said that critical infrastructure projects, currently run by DPW, were essential for SAPS to do its job. It was critical that the Committee received the full picture.

Mr Maake noted that the letter of invitation did make it seem like a presentation was an option and not an instruction and therefore provided leeway, technically.

The Chairperson said the essential point was that people had to account – the Committee could not evaluate progress in terms of CJS and IJS without a presentation

Ms Vanessa Lynch, Deputy Chair: National Forensic Oversight and Ethics Board, asked SITA if the decision had been made to implement CODIS and when it was anticipated this would take place.

Lt. Gen. JK Phalane, SAPS Divisional Commissioner: Forensic Services, said that SAPS had since opted to have a security assessment on CODIS in collaboration with the State Security Agency. Once there was an outcome of the assessment, SAPS would then provide an internal instruction.

Mr Mbhele asked DHA for clarity on its participation in the IJS and the separate quotation of R337 543 934 which was for new technology. This was the same figure reflected for the cost of the proposed software upgrade for CJS requirements. There was also a proposal for technology refresh of R339 980 010 – was he correct to say that this was referring to the point of a proposal received to refresh the hardware and technology of R340 million repayable over two years? He wanted to know the difference between the sums of money associated with each level of refreshing and upgrade. He asked this because in the Committee's previous engagement on the matter with SAPS, Members were told of the escalation of the cost relating the HANIS major overhaul after incremental upgrades were not done. He sought further clarification on DHA deviating from procurement practices for the past ten years to renew the current service provider contract to maintain the current HANIS and what was meant when the presentation said, should the Department have opted to contract the service provider, it would have deviated by R793 million for one contract to upgrade the current system.

The DHA Acting CIO answered that the HANIS system was developed in 1999 and commissioned in 2000. The upgrade for both the software and tech refresh (hardware) was done in 2009 and in 2010 there was a CJS requirement with a proposed quotation of R337 543 934 only for the software refresh in order to ensure the CJS requirement was met. The R340 million quotation was for the

hardware upgrade which was requested in 2013 as the hardware was then reaching the end of its life. There was a R116 million was for the maintenance of the system through a contract renewal with the same service provider. The point on deviation was explaining that the DHA would have deviated by R793 million (total amount) if they opted to contract the same service provider.

Ms Kohler Barnard noted the IJS was a decade old but she felt as if this was the beginning of the decade again with things almost ready or about to start – it seemed like a bottomless pit of cash for these various departments to dive into with no outcomes. She noted the SAPS AFIS contract expired three years ago yet the Department was only looking at tenders now- had the system now totally collapsed? What was causing the delay with this crucial programme? She saw signs in stations that this system had collapsed. Surely DHA must have known that the HANIS infrastructure had a lifespan limit – why was the contract not ready before the current contract expired for there to be a seamless transfer. There seemed to be no forward planning and instead everything ground to a halt – she could not believe how a contract was allowed to expire and wanted an explanation for this. Where were the hand-held HANIS fingerprint systems? She asked this because these were valuable pieces of equipment that hackers could use to gain access to systems. She had never been to a station where she saw the e-docket system working yet the IJS Board presentation stated that the electronic transmission of docket information had now been deployed to all 1153 police stations – did all these stations have the technology? How many stations were fully equipment and using the e-dockets and had been trained? She wanted a list of the stations where the system was working. 10 years down the line, there was still no moves to integrate with the HANIS system. She wanted a completed date for any of the projects mentioned today and the funds spent to date.

Ms Masupi responded that the AFIS system did not collapse and it was working but the system needed modernisation.

The DHA Acting CIO explained the contract had not yet expired even though the system required the upgrade of both the software and hardware. DHA had a plan to integrate both the national population register and the biometric system for there to be one single integrated system called the national identity system. However, the Department, together with the IJS, decided for a modular process and to upgrade HANIS both software and hardware. SITA and the CSIR were engaged to do the specifications for the Department to go out on an open tender process

Mr Vusi Mkhize, DHA DDG: Civil Services, outlined that the question on the handheld devices might be misdirected because DHA never had such equipment for fingerprint verification.

Mr Leseba explained that he was not referring the investigative case docket management system (e-docket) but other basic docket information transferred from the station to the court to prevent the re-capturing of information from scratch.

Lt. Gen. Phalane clarified that the Member in fact was referring to AVL and not AFIS – the matter was being taken of.

Maj. Gen. EN Mavundla, SAPS Component Head: Technology Governance Management, spoke to ICDMS which was a new version of CAS to better the transmission of the electronic docket. ICDMS was implemented at 591 stations, as previously reported, but IJS could access the information to enable them to present an accused on court either from CAS or ICDMS.

Ms Molebatsi asked SITA why the PCEM version x1 was not deployed. SITA was not a new organisation but almost, if not all, projects were only starting or about to start when the Committee should be told of how programmes were running, tangible progress and challenges. SITA seemed to have many problems with approval by the Board etc – where was the problem? How was it expected that SAPS should function properly without the support of SITA?

Ms Masupi replied that there were problems with the initial PCEM 1.1 which was why a proposal to realign the system had been submitted to the CSIR to comment and assist. There was a special board to sit on procurement tender issues as was due to sit on 12 June 2015 – any projects above the R50 million threshold went to the board of directors.

Ms Riah Phiyega, SAPS National Commissioner, said that PCEM version 1 was working while version x1 was not which was why SAPS took it to the CSIR to look at what else could be done to ensure the version did come to the fore and that SAPS could do its work. It would have been good to use the basis of 1 to go to x1 but there was a different contractor.

Lt. Gen. Phalane aligned himself with the National Commissioner had said about SITA and that version x1 of PCEM was fully operational and functional within the FSL-environment. The problem was with lack of maintenance contract of version x1 and the matter was referred to the CSIR.

Dysfunctions in version x1 were coming closer to version 1 and SAPS needed to beg if there were challenges. There was no way, from a forensic laboratory perspective, that SAPS could afford a day where it could not manage the exhibits so management of this was critical.

Ms M Mmola (ANC) asked how Home Affairs worked with a system which was not upgraded. She wanted clarity on the hardware refresh. To SITA, she asked if the Board was functional or sitting. What was meant by “awaiting final SAPS instruction on implementation of CODIS”?

Lt. Gen. Phahlane said the AFIS process was very frustrating. SAPS submitted the specifications to SITA timeously because SAPS knew the contract was coming to an end. Knowing the turnaround time of 90 days, it was thought this was enough time to run the process before the contract expired whether the contract was renewed or a new contractor was brought on board. There were three key players in the AFIS space and SAPS thought it best to play the space, in terms of Treasury regulations, and not to condone monopolisation. Money could not be pumped into a refresh while there was no long-term contract. It was important for the latest technology to be deployed in the space for full functionality. There was a to-and-fro communication between SAPS and SITA but he questioned why the various disciplines in SITA were not sitting together to interrogate the specifications. It was hoped there would be an AFIS vehicle before the end of the year.

Mr Ramatlakane wanted to know the names of who actually comprised the IJS Board. On the IJS Board presentation, he did not quite understand how the JCPS cluster priorities coordinated with the delivery work packages. Was the IJS transversal hub producing intended results? He noticed that some slides in presentation said something was complete while another slide would say incomplete – which one was correct? Was CAS online and working live? Was there an example of a case where the system was used?

Could information be provided on the actual implementation of the CAS and the level of progress or implementation in each province? He asked why only courts in Gauteng, Western Cape and KZN had the electronic charge sheets – was this because of slow roll-out? The cost of maintenance was not alluded to in any of the presentations – was it the norm that maintenance costs were excluded from contracts? Did this mean the departments were responsible for maintenance costs? This sounded slightly strange to him and that service providers should also be responsible for maintenance as part of the contract. Would such costs be categorised as fruitless or unforeseen expenditure? He wanted to understand this in terms of the Public Finance Management Act (PFMA). He asked DHA for an explanation on the deviation from procurement processes for the last ten years and the figure for

deviation year on year. Any technology required refreshment because it changed as the Committee spoke. To SITA, he asked if the entity was up to the task. Some projects had been running for ten years but was there value for money spent in terms of what had been delivered to date coupled with what still had to be done or completed. SAPS were delayed by other stakeholders while money was spent and technology became outdated. Was this not simply just burning money or would the taxpayer just pay again in the coming financial year? Would it be best to sub-contract projects to the private sector? Would this deliver results? This was the core question to answer. The Home Affairs presentation was better than the IJS Board one because it focused on details and he grasped certain matters more tangibly than with the presentation by the IJS Board. He was interested to hear where each of the presenting stakeholders put themselves, on scale from one to ten, in terms of IJS/CJS roll out with expenditure to date. He asked DHA if there were sufficient built-in safety measures in the event of systems crashing between the change of hands between service providers.

Ms Masupi said that SITA did not have the IDAM solution in-house but was assisting SAPS with the specification and the intent was to publish the tender to get the solution. There were in-house skills within SAPS for maintenance. The entity scored itself three on a scale between one and five because there were still other departments which were not fully integrated.

The DHA Acting CIO responded that there was a disaster recovery site to duplicate whatever was happening on the production side (which was a building of DHA declared a national key point). Upgrade of HANIS then referred not only to the production side but also the side of disaster and recovery. The equipment at the disaster recovery site was running on newer technology and infrastructure compared to the production side.

Mr Leseba replied that 22 courts over three provinces was the first round of courts the system would gradually be rolled out to. Gradually the system would be rolled out further in terms of the deployment plan. With the priorities vs. work packages, he explained which package was linked to which priority as was clearly outlined in the presentation. Members of the IJS Board were appointed by name by each accounting officer of the departments involved. The IJS specified the calibre of incumbent it was looking for – someone who was the ultimate leader/decision-maker of IT in the department. A representative of operations was also sought. The list of all members appointed to the Board could be provided to the Committee. The IJS vehicle was working, in his view, to transform the CJS for the citizens of SA. The vehicle enabled integrated planning, ensured the prioritisation in the cluster and that there were common focus areas for the ultimate modernisation of the CJS in the

end. It was not all smooth sailing and there were challenges being dealt with. He was very encouraged with cooperation over the last couple of years in terms of the current leadership of the Board – there was vast improvement around cooperation and increased involvement of the accounting officers. The IJS was not producing all expected results at the same time but it was producing expected results as seen in the key performance indicators which showed the visible and tangible results produced to enable the cluster to plan the building of capacity, pinpoint where the problems were in the CJS and identify training needs. With the transversal hub, some departments had completed the fundamental building blocks to allow for integration but overall, proper integration was a journey and there were individual and collective responsibilities. Each department would have to ensure the basics were in place for transformation of applications to run the business whether by virtue of introducing new systems or modifying and enhancing existing systems to ensure there was integration. In a nutshell, there was gradual movement to transform the CJS going forward. On a scale from one to five, he put the IJS Board on a three in terms of the integration journey as there was still a long way to go and challenges to overcome by the Board had what it took to make it work.

Mr Maake sought clarity on whether the Board members were elected by name or by title – the explanation provided was not very clear.

Mr Leseba clarified that members of the IJS Board were appointed in writing by each accounting officer by name.

Mr Maake understood the appointment was by name parallel to designation in the field of IT in the department. He noted that the NDP stated that all people were and must feel safe and this was what he expected from SAPS. All the other institutions and entities were to support SAPS in meeting this objective. If integration was not done, it meant SAPS was actually given leeway to give excuses and blame delays on other stakeholders. He agreed that Public Works was the biggest culprit but he was glad to hear, in the last Committee meeting, from the Deputy Minister of Police that a committee had been formed between SAPS and Public Works and that this might solve some of the problems. He emphasised that the aim of today's meeting was not for Members to interrogate stakeholders but to ensure all people were and felt safe as Members were public representatives. The Committee needed to help where this was not happening and to go and report to their constituencies that progress was being made. If SAPS was not performing, they were actually threatening the jobs of Members. He asked DHA about the point that "the current HANIS software can run only on the

specific (product locked) equipment and the system can only be maintained by the contract supplier” – he found this unacceptable and that there should be some transfer of skills to the DHA employees. This was more concerning when the presentation stated that the “current service did not meet the total requirements and turnaround times of the SAPS”. This pointed to the fact that SAPS could not fulfil its mandate – why were the systems not talking to each other? He asked DHA if the disaster recovery system mitigated the system crashing.

Mr Mkhize said the architecture of HANIS dealt with identification and verification. The requirements of SAPS were being met at a particular minimalist level. SAPS indicated the need for latent fingerprint verification so DHA needed to realign systems to meet these demands and requirements in terms of the upgrade and this was the intention. Currently, some verification was able to be done if someone was arrested and for DHA to communicate with SAPS as to the identification of the person. There was a modernisation plan to have a single view of the citizens of the country as well as visitors and this plan was in place. The meeting of the needs of SAPS and the IJS were prioritised at this stage so the focus shifted to the upgrade of HANIS for there to be a better system moving forward.

The Chairperson asked if current governance system was effective in terms of coordination for the 13 projects external to SAPS and on which it depended on other stakeholders. Was the transversal hub effective in coordination between the projects because the IJS Board presentation did not make material reference to the overall state and spending of these 13 projects? There were discrepancies between what SAPS presented on 13 May and what the IJS Board was currently saying, for example, with the electronic transmission of docket information. He found that SAPS was really trying to get out of the status quo and the Committee thought the steps taken by SAPS were laudable but looking at the bigger governance picture, was everyone where they should be in terms of integration and coordination? There was also a role for CSIR to play with systems and evaluation. To SAPS, he noted that 73 complex and integrated projects were run by SAPS on IJS/CJS but the Committee’s researchers found discrepancies between the real spend and what SAPS presented to the Committee on some projects – internally, how did SAPS ensure the information brought before the Committee was checked and was correct? Discrepancies were a concern to the Committee.

Nat. Comm. Phiyega said there were a number of areas to deal with, for example, video conferencing should not need to take so many years to resolve. SAPS was a large organisation with over 200 000 members but it was important for members to talk to each other, clusters, stations etc

– this was one of the projects which should have been given priority and speed to assist SAPS to deliver as the customer. SAPS was now looking at advice and support in other areas because SITA was just a shop. With the external environment and governance, as one of the accounting officers in the JCPS Cluster she could say that the IJS Board had a slow start but currently she could vouch that the matter was given attention and the decision to fully migrate the Board to the Department of Justice, under the leadership of Mr Leseba, was starting to yield fruit. Each of the accounting officers in the Cluster needed to appoint the relevant people to serve on the CJS/IJS Board. The accounting officers sat together to prioritise projects and to take accountability for feedback and progress in terms of these priorities. Treasury also did a virtual analysis to look at the flow of resources in terms of priorities and to hold the departments accountable. The journey was still long but she took comfort that the Board, as it was currently structured and managed, was starting to go somewhere. For the Board to be effective, each department needed to sort out their own basics to be effective participants in the integrated platform. The CSIR had become advisers and guiders to look at the gaps in the system and what needed to be modified for a sound technology plan– it was thought this gap would be filled by SITA but they did the buying. SAPS had limited resources which needed to be used skilfully and productively. With internal governance, sorting out the basics of SAPS was crucial. When she arrived at SAPS there was no technology plan and the technology infrastructure was not defined in an integrated fashion. Now, with the CSIR, this was being done and the technology plan was being defined with a governance approach to ensure there was no working in silos. This was a journey but the progress would be shared with the Committee. SAPS now had a project office to produce reports on technology projects in terms of progress and challenges – this was being done with the CSIR. This made her more comfortable as an accounting officer. She was happy with the help received from CSIR and it was hoped that things would be better in terms of buying backed by sound scientific and technical research with innovation to fill the gaps. Some of the issues which bedevilled the process were underlying interests. The protracted time lags were a big worry, for example, with AVL – SAPS needed to manage its cars, where they were going and how they were being utilised but the chief procurement officer was looking into the manner. Some projects took three or four years – this could not be the case if SAPS was serious about service delivery. She had written to SITA on the matter and that maybe there was a need to converse on the challenges together with the IJS Board to ensure there was effective cooperation. SAPS was the customer of SITA – 50% of SITA’s business came from SAPS so they needed to think about how to take care of and satisfy the customer to keep the country safe and secure.

Lt. Gen. Phalane confirmed what was said in the DHA presentation was the current state of affairs with no discrepancies in terms of figures. While there were still challenges in the refreshing of the HANIS infrastructure, the amounts related to integration. A site was piloted to access HANIS directly and this pilot was a success and was now in the second month of implementation at the Criminal Records Centre. However, further roll-out would be hampered with the challenges around refresh and resources required to enable further integration. In short, SAPS was currently able to directly access the HANIS system for verification. There was still a long way to go but he wanted to go on record to confirm what was reported by DHA was correct.

The Chairperson asked the National Commissioner what the major concerns and problems were with Public Works, in preparation for the meeting next week. This was important to look at because Public Works had 50% of SAPS leases. He sought comments on the shooting incident recently at the Alexandra police station. The matter raised questions around police station safety and the handling of firearms. The Committee needed the assurance around SAPS member wellness and what more could be done to ensure there were early warning systems in place if there were problems and firearm management at police stations.

Nat. Comm. Phiyega said that on DPW, the issue was with the number of leases on a month to month basis and looking at whether it was best to lease or buy. The state of SPAS buildings was also an issue. As part of refinement of technology systems there was awareness that some systems were the lifeblood of SAPS which needed prioritisation and needed longevity as significant investments.

Lt. Gen. LJ Mothiba, SAPS Provincial Commissioner: Gauteng, provided an account of the Alexandra police station issue explaining that on 3 June 2015, at around 17:30, a certain women arrived at the police station accompanied by a neighbour and her uncle. The three went to the office of the Major who was the Senior Detective on duty and was on stand-by on this particular day. While the three were explaining matters, a Constable, linked to the Alexandra Magistrates Court, arrived at the station and went to the office of the Visible Policing (VISPOL) Commander. The Constable complained that his wife assaulted and injured him showing marks on his hands. Later the VISPOL Commander asked the Constable to look for his wife to attend to the matter. The Constable went to the office of the Station Commander complaining that his wife was at the station opening a case against him. The Station Commander advised the Constable to allow his wife to proceed opening up the case because it would be investigated and he would be provided with a chance to state his side of the story. Just before 18:30, he was informed of the shooting at the station. Preliminary

investigation found that the Constable accessed a firearm from the Community Service Centre on the pretext that he was going to escort prisoners. He was given the firearm without the Warrant Officer following the prescribed procedure. The Constable's firearm was confiscated during March as a result of a domestic violence incident pertaining to a number of girlfriends, of which one was the deceased. After accessing the firearm, the Constable went to the Detective's office where he found the Major with the victim's uncle and neighbour. The Constable shot everyone in the room and they all died. It transpired that the Major called another Constable to his office and when the member arrived he stumbled on the shooting incident but he was missed by the bullets. The Constable went out the station and took a taxi home. Members of the Tactical Response Team (TRT) were waiting for the Constable when he arrived home. The Constable wanted to shoot the members of the TRT but the TRT members shot the Constable and he died on the scene. There was a disciplinary investigation under way to look exactly at what happened and who failed SAPS. There was also an investigation to look at the surrounding circumstances to make recommendations on how to avoid situations of this nature. The families were debriefed extensively by psychologists and social workers together with the SAPS members from the station. The station was not being guarded because of the lack of security guards but the Constable had access to the station as a member so his coming and going would not raise questions as he worked there. His access to the firearm was part of the disciplinary investigation – the member was not supposed to be in possession of the firearm or issued with one and the station commander, member who gave him the firearm and relief commander were suspended. This particular situation shocked SAPS in Alexandra and the investigation underway would assist in how to avoid future situations. When the firearm was confiscated in March after the domestic complaint was laid, no processes were activated to look into the fitness of the member to possess a firearm. Members of the station were not informed that they were not supposed to issue this particular member with a firearm – this would also be part of the investigation.

The Chairperson appreciated the thorough report.

Lt. Gen. CN Mbekela, SAPS Deputy National Commissioner: Corporate Service Management, added that the Constable had first been referred to Employee Health and Wellness (EHW) services in November 2011 in order to get support. Sometime later the Constable was referred to EHW again to deal with his anger issues as it became clear he did not have the ability to deal with his anger. In March 2015 he was referred again for counselling and support but it became clear his referral was always based on insubordination – he was always aggressive towards the commanders threatening

to harm them. He continued to show signs of anger which led to the station taking away his firearm in March. The Constable was first a reservist before he actually became a member during the dispensation enrolling reservists into the organisation. From the day of the incident, the EHW in the province was deployed to the station to do counselling and debriefing of groups and individuals for the SAPS members and family members of the deceased in totality. EHW decided to roll-out a rigorous programme of self-management and anger management. There was benchmarking of other EHW services internationally for training of peer councillors from spiritual services or from other services to be able to assist at station level. In a nutshell, EHW played a role in trying to calm the situation and ensure that everybody was counselled and support. The member in question himself received EHW support on a number of occasions.

Nat. Comm. Phiyega said the person appointed to conduct the investigation was on the level of Major General and he was already busy with regulation 12. The investigation would assist in the necessary disciplinary processes to conclude and assist SAPS operationally to attend to some loopholes. If there was an all encompassing integrated system, it would be much easier to capture information relating to firearms and for the information to be available to all members who needed – this was something SAPS TMS was looking into. Not only was the gun of the member in question removed but his job was also changed to be a court orderly- a position which did not require a firearm so there was a level of operational intervention by the station. SAPS was also working with its medical aid to increase benefits around psychological work and counselling services as it times members might be reluctant to use internal resources. SAPS were looking at using a mixed model of in-house and external services, a matter which had been explored even before this incident. This was an opportunity to learn but it was an incident which weighed heavy on the heart but SAPS was doing as much as it could to reduce such incidents. No stone would be left unturned and SAPS was looking into security in terms of physical infrastructure. In this case, the member worked in the station, had access to the environment and knew where to go.

The Chairperson took note of the input and the Committee would monitor the issue going forward even when dealing with amendments to the Firearm Bill in the next few months as well as to ensure the roles of station and cluster commanders. This was a very unfortunate incident and the Committee had already expressed condolences to the families.

Ms Molebatsi asked if the amount spent on some of the projects in the last financial year equated to fiscal dumping.

Mr Ramatlakane asked for an integrated report which touched on the 73 projects in question and for the report to speak to all elements discussed today and anticipated timeframes for completion. Such a report could reach the Committee by mid-August perhaps through coordination by the IJS Board incorporating all stakeholders. There were a number of questions to ask but the Committee did not have the time so an integrated approach would assist with oversight.

The Chairperson agreed and thought this was a good suggestion because such a report would assist with monitoring.

Ms Kohler Barnard thought the Committee needed to know every project, the date for when it was started, what it needed in order to complete the entire system integration, budget, expenditure and what the completion date would be – this was needed for oversight. It seemed there was never an end in sight. Every time there was a meeting on the matter it always seemed as if things were nearly there or about to start when the Committee actually needed cold hard deadlines – the Committee could not do oversight on what it received today.

Mr Mbhele sensed that one of the key challenges in the environment was one of scale and trying to coordinate a big ecosystem. He asked if the ecosystem and environment would be more optimal if procurement powers were delegated to provincial or cluster level in some instances. As in any big ecosystem or machine, there were pockets of excellence able to jump ahead quicker than others. Best practice models could then be developed and shared with other areas.

Ms Lynch questioned the blockages created through the chemistries employed and that there seemed to be a procurement issue with the new DNA kits being used. The integrity of the database rested on the data being inputted and she was concerned about compromising this integrity.

The Chairperson suggested the answers to the questions be provided in writing due to the lack of time. The Committee would await the report in August because for SAPS to move forward, technology was critical.

The meeting was adjourned.