

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTOR IN TERMS OF SECTION 182(1)(b) OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA, 1996 AND SECTION 8(1) OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTOR ACT, 1994



REPORT NUMBER: 14 OF 2023/2024

ISBN NUMBER: 978-1-991244-47-5

INVESTIGATION INTO ALLEGATIONS OF FAILURE BY THE FUNCTIONARIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES TO ADHERE TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 74(2)(e) AND 74(3) OF THE CORRECTIONAL SERVICE ACT, 1998 AS AMENDED IN NOMINATING FOR APPOINTMENT BY THE MINISTER AND SUBSEQUENT DESIGNATION OF THE DCS' OFFICIAL(S) TO ACT AS SECRETARY OF THE PAROLE BOARD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
	LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	3
1.	INTRODUCTION	4
2.	THE COMPLAINT	5
3.	POWERS AND JURISDICTION OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTOR	7
4.	ISSUE IDENTIFIED FOR INVESTIGATION	9
5.	THE INVESTIGATION	9
6.	THE DETERMINATION OF THE ISSUE IN RELATION TO THE EVIDENCE OBTAINED AND CONCLUSIONS MADE WITH REGARD TO THE APPLICABLE LAW AND PRESCRIPTS	11
7.	OBSERVATIONS	19
8.	INTERVENTION	20
9.	CONCLUSION	21

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACRONYMS / ABBREVIATIONS	DESCRIPTION
Constitution	Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996
CSPB	Correctional Supervisions and Parole Board
DCS	Department of Correctional Services
DRC	Deputy Regional Commissioner
Department	Department of Correctional Services
Email	Electronic mail correspondence
HR	Human Resource
Public Protector Act	Public Protector Act, 1994
Resolution	General Public Service Sector Bargaining Council Resolution 1 of 2002
The Act	Correctional Service Act, 1998

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This is a Report of the Public Protector issued in terms of section 8(1) of the Public Protector Act, 1994, which provides *that “The Public Protector may, subject to the provisions of subsection (3), in the manner he or she deems fit, make known to any person any finding, point of view or recommendation, in respect of a matter investigated by the Public Protector”.*
- 1.2 This Report relates to an investigation into allegations of failure by the functionaries of the Department of Correctional Services (DCS) to adhere to the provisions of section 74(2)(e) and 74(3) of the Correctional Service Act, 1998 (the Act) as amended in nominating for appointment by the Minister of Justice and Correctional Services (the Minister) and subsequent designation of the DCS’ official(s) to act as Secretary of the Parole Board.
- 1.3 The report is submitted in terms of sections 8(1) read with 8(3) of the Public Protector Act, which empowers the Public Protector to make known the findings of an investigation, to affected parties for such persons to note the outcome of the investigation and to implement the recommendations, where applicable:
- 1.3.1 The National Commissioner of the DCS, Mr Makgothi Samuel Thobakgale;
- 1.3.2 The Minister of Justice and Correctional Services, Mr Ronald Lamola; and
- 1.3.3 The Complainant.
- 1.4 The Public Protector’s mandate is derived from section 182(1) of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 (the Constitution) and the Public Protector Act, 1994 (the Public Protector Act), to promote accountability, transparency, and fairness in the public sector. The Public Protector continuously reviews and monitors the information gathered from complaints lodged with the office, with the view to

identify the underlying root causes of the problems, complaints or undesired events within relevant public bodies or authorities.

1.5 The aim is to formulate and establish corrective actions to at least mitigate, if not eliminate, those root causes and to produce significant long-term improvements in public administration.

1.6 The point of departure is that any complaint might be a symptom of an underlying organizational failure, *inter alia* in areas such as systems, procedures and human error. By addressing the underlying deficiencies in the systems that are the causes of complaints, the Public Protector aims to reduce the number of individual complaints, in turn, working collaboratively with stakeholders to get the problems resolved and to provide constructive feedback that will enable it to address the root causes of complaints and prevent recurrence.

2. THE COMPLAINT

2.1 The complaint was lodged with the Public Protector on 22 October 2019 in terms of the Protected Disclosure Act, 2000. In the main, the Complainant alleged that:

2.1.1 The functionaries of the Department of Correctional Services (DCS) failed to adhere to the provisions of sections 74(2)(e) and 74(3) of the Correctional Service Act, 1998 (the Act) as amended, when appointing the acting Secretary of the Parole Board.

2.1.2 The National Commissioner of the DCS has acted contrary to section 74(3) of the Act, which states that:

“The Commissioner must designate one of the correctional officials referred to in subsection 2(e) to act as a Secretary of a Board;

Section 74(2)(e) of the Act states that the Minister must appoint one or more correctional supervision and Parole Boards consisting of - ... (e) one official of the Department nominated by the Commissioner; and ...”

- 2.1.3 It is the obligation of the Minister to appoint members of the Correctional Supervision and Parole Boards. Further that the role of the National Commissioner in terms of section 74(2)(e) is to “*nominate*” a person that the Minister appoints. The Minister appoints the official(s) who are already appointed by the National Commissioner. In terms of section 74(3), the National Commissioner then designates the ministerial appointee to act as a secretary of the Board.
- 2.1.4 In terms of section 74(3) the position of the secretary of the Board is perpetually an acting position, for which paragraph 3.1.8 of the GPSSBC Resolution 1 of 2002 does not apply. Nothing suggest that the determination of the Minister for a period in terms of section 74(7)(a)(i) shall override the period permissible for acting for a person appointed in accordance with section 74(2)(e). In accordance with the latest GPSSBC Resolution 1 of 2001 the longest period of acting may not exceed 12 months.¹ Paragraph 3.1.5 of the GPSSBC Resolution 1 of 2002 specifies that “*allowance paid in respect of acting is non pensionable*”.
- 2.1.5 The Correctional Services Act, 1998, came into operation on 01 October 2004, therefore the terms of this Act should have been complied with from October 2004. Instead of compliance with the provisions stated above, the DCS appears to be in violation of the Act. The situation affects all Secretary appointments made after 01 October 2004 and the scenario that continues to date, has prevailed over fifty (50) Correctional Supervision and Parole Boards for fifteen (15) years.
- 2.1.6 Persons appointed in these positions have been promoted to the salary scale and benefits of the Senior Correctional Officer’s Level, when no Secretary appointee is

¹ Para 3 of the GPSSBC Resolution, 2002.

at a senior correctional officer level. Contrary to section 74(7)(a)(i) Secretary appointments are in effect made permanent rather than acting.

2.2 In support of his complaint, the Complainant furnished the Public Protector with copies of the advertisement in respect of the Correctional Supervision and Parole Board secretary positions advertised for various regions.

3. POWERS AND JURISDICTION OF THE PUBLIC PROTECTOR

3.1. The Public Protector is an independent constitutional institution established under section 181(1)(a) of the Constitution to strengthen constitutional democracy through investigating and redressing improper conduct in state affairs.

3.2. Section 182(1) of the Constitution provides that:

“The Public Protector has the power, as regulated by national legislation-

- (a) to investigate any conduct in state affairs, or in the public administration in any sphere of government, that is alleged or suspected to be improper or to result in any impropriety or prejudice;*
- (b) to report on that conduct; and*
- (c) to take appropriate remedial action.”*

3.3. Section 182(2) directs that the Public Protector has the additional powers and functions prescribed by national legislation. The Public Protector’s powers are regulated and amplified by the Public Protector Act which states, amongst others, that the Public Protector has the powers to investigate and redress maladministration and related improprieties in the conduct of state affairs.

3.4. Section 6(4)(c)(ii) of the Public Protector Act provides that, the Public Protector “*shall be competent at any time prior to, during or after an investigation, if he or she deems*

it advisable, to refer any matter which has a bearing on an investigation, to the appropriate public body or authority affected by it or to make an appropriate recommendation regarding the redress of the prejudice resulting from or make any other appropriate recommendation he or she deems expedient to the affected public body or authority.”

3.5. Section 6(9) of the Public Protector Act states that:

“Except where the Public Protector in special circumstances, within his or her discretion, so permits, a complaint or matter referred to the Public Protector shall not be entertained unless it is reported to the Public Protector within two years from the occurrence of the incident or matter concerned”.

3.6. Where an incident or matter reported to the Public Protector occurred more than two years prior to the reporting of the matter to the Public Protector, he/she is expected to exercise his/her discretion in terms of section 6(9) of the Public Protector Act to entertain the complaint based on special circumstances as envisaged in Rule 10(1) of the Public Protector Rules.

3.7. When the Public Protector commenced with the investigation, due consideration was given to the time period and the incidents that might have taken place more than two years, and whether or not there were special circumstances that would have permitted the Public Protector to entertain the matter.

3.8. The exercise of a discretion referred to in terms of section 6(9) of the Public Protector Act to entertain this particular complaint was based on the following *special circumstances*² as envisaged in Rule 10(1) of the Public Protector Rules:

² In *Gordhan v Public Protector and Others* [2019] JOL 45246 (GP) and *Gordhan and Others v Public Protector and Others* (36099/2098) [2020] ZAGPPHC 777 (17 December 2020), the Supreme Court of Appeal (the SCA) and the High Court in Pretoria respectively, held that, it is only where special circumstances exist, that complaints that are older than two years can be entertained, and that, the particulars of the special circumstances must be succinctly set out.

- 3.8.1 The **nature of the allegations** which reveal the possibility of un-remedied irregularities and/or violations of the Act, arising from non-compliance with the relevant statutory provisions and due administration processes; and
- 3.8.2 The **opportunity to address wrongdoing and/or impropriety**, which may continue, if the matter is not investigated, was also taken into account.

4. ISSUE IDENTIFIED FOR INVESTIGATION

- 4.1. Based on the analysis of the complaint, the following issue was identified to inform and focus the investigation:
 - 4.1.1. Whether the functionaries of the Department of Correctional Services complied with the provisions of section 74(2)(e) and 74(3) of the Correctional Service Act, 1998 as amended, in nominating for appointment by the Minister and subsequent designation of the DCS' official(s) to act as Secretary of the Parole Board, and if not, whether such conduct was improper as envisaged by section 182(1)(a) of the Constitution and amounted to maladministration and improper conduct in terms of section 6(4)(a)(i) and(ii) of the Public Protector Act.

5. THE INVESTIGATION

5.1. The Investigation Process

- 5.1.1. The investigation was conducted in terms of section 182(1) of the Constitution read with sections 6 and 7 of the Public Protector Act. The Public Protector Act confers on the Public Protector the sole discretion to determine the format and procedure to be followed in conducting any investigation.
- 5.1.2. The investigation process included correspondence exchanged with the Complainant and the DCS. Meetings were also held with the Complainant and the

functionaries of the DCS. Documents obtained during the course of the investigation were analyzed and evaluated. The process also included consideration and application of the relevant law and prescripts.

5.2. **The Approach to the Investigation**

5.2.1. The investigation was approached using an enquiry process that seeks to determine:

5.2.1.1. What happened?

5.2.1.2. What should have happened?

5.2.1.3. Is there a discrepancy between what happened and what should have happened, and does that deviation amount to improper conduct and/or undue delay?

5.2.2. The question regarding what happened is resolved through a factual enquiry relying on the evidence provided by the parties and independently sourced during the investigation. In this case, the factual enquiry principally focused on whether the functionaries of the DCS complied with the provisions of section 74(2)(e) and 74(3) of the Act.

5.3. **Key sources of information**

5.3.1. **Documents and correspondence**

5.3.1.1. The complaint as contained in an undated and uncertified affidavit received via an email, dated 17 October 2019;

5.3.1.2. An email from DCS to the Public Protector with attachments relating to the recruitment and selection process of the Secretaries of the Parole Boards for different regions, dated 27 September 2021;

-
- 5.3.1.3. Allegations letter addressed to the erstwhile National Commissioner of the DCS, Mr Arthur Fraser (Mr Fraser), dated 02 October 2021;
 - 5.3.1.4. Response letter from the National Commissioner of the DCS, Mr MS Thobakgale (Mr Thobakgale), dated 22 March 2022; and
 - 5.3.1.5. Response letter from Mr Thobakgale; dated 27 June 2023.

Meetings

- 5.3.1.6. Meeting between the Public Protector Investigation Team (Investigation Team) and the Complainant on 04 November 2022; and
- 5.3.1.7. Meeting between the Investigation Team and functionaries of the DCS on 13 June 2023.

5.4. Legislation and other prescripts

- 5.4.1. Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996;
- 5.4.2. Correctional Services Act, 1998 as amended; and
- 5.4.3. Public Protector Act, 1994.

6. THE DETERMINATION OF THE ISSUE IN RELATION TO THE EVIDENCE OBTAINED AND CONCLUSIONS MADE WITH REGARD TO THE APPLICABLE LAW AND PRESCRIPTS

- 6.1 **Whether the functionaries of the Department of Correctional Services complied with the provisions of section 74(2)(e) and 74(3) of the Correctional Service Act, 1998 as amended, in nominating for appointment by the Minister and subsequent designation of the DCS' official(s) to act as Secretary of the Parole Board, and if not, whether such conduct was improper as envisaged by**

section 182(1)(a) of the Constitution and amounted to maladministration and improper conduct in terms of section 6(4)(a)(i) and(ii) of the Public Protector Act.

Common cause

- 6.1.1. The DCS has internally and externally advertised posts with salary level 10 under the title “*Secretary of the Parole Board*” and appointed Secretaries of the Parole Board in terms of Section 3(5)(g) of the Correctional Services Act, since October 2004.

Issue in dispute

- 6.1.2. The issue for the Public Protector’s determination is whether the functionaries of the DCS complied with the provisions of section 74(2)(e) and 74(3) of the Correctional Service Act, 1998 as amended in nominating for appointment by the Minister and subsequent designation of the DCS’ official(s) to act as Secretary of the Parole Board.

The Complainant’s version

- 6.1.3. The Complainant contended that the National Commissioner of the DCS has acted contrary to Section 74(3) of the Act, by advertising and irregularly appointing the acting Secretary of the Parole Board as a permanent position rather than an acting position and so was done without involving the Minister as envisaged in the Act.

Response by DCS

- 6.1.4. On 02 September 2021, the Public Protector raised the allegations with the erstwhile National Commissioner of the DCS, Mr Fraser. On 27 September 2021, the DCS Deputy Director Human Resource and Utilisation, Mr Thabiso Mokotjo (Mr Mokotjo),

provided the Public Protector with the documents in relation to the recruitment and selection of the Secretaries of the Parole Boards, which included the advertisements, internal memoranda submissions and appointment letters. The Investigation Team then followed up with the Office of the National Commissioner for a narrative relating to the position of DCS on the allegations.

- 6.1.5. On 22 March 2022, the Public Protector received a letter from the National Commissioner of the DCS, Mr Thobakgale, wherein he stated the following:
- 6.1.5.1. That the DCS has already submitted to the Public Protector all the source documents with regard to the recruitment and selection process;
- 6.1.5.2. It must be noted that in terms of section 65(1) of the Public Service Regulations, 2016, an Executive Authority shall ensure that vacant posts in the Department are advertised as efficiently and effectively as possible, to reach the entire pool of potential applicants, including designated groups;
- 6.1.5.3. The process of advertising external and internal posts is dealt with within all regions in consultation with the National Head office for approval. The post advertisements for external vacancies are placed in accordance with the DCS' contract of agreement with approved service providers for advertising purposes;
- 6.1.5.4. As a result of the above-mentioned policy, a recruitment process was correctly followed in terms of the process of advertising and appointing the Secretaries of the Parole Boards in the DCS; and
- 6.1.5.5. The allegations of irregularities and abuse of power lodged by the Complainant to the Public Protector are not correct as all processes of recruitment and appointment were followed by the DCS in line with the prescribed policies.

Meeting between the Investigation Team and officials of the DCS

- 6.1.6. On 13 June 2023, the Investigation Team held a meeting with officials from the DCS led by Mr P Killian, Director: Code Enforcement, to seek clarity in respect of the process followed to comply with the provisions of section 74(2)(e) and 74(3) of the Act.
- 6.1.7. During the meeting, DCS' officials stated that the appointments of the acting Secretaries of the Parole Boards were not done in accordance with sections 74(2)(e) and 74(3) of the Act.
- 6.1.8. It was agreed at the meeting that the DCS will indicate how it will henceforth comply with the provisions of section 74(2)(e) and 74(3) of the Act, in writing.

Additional response by DCS

- 6.1.9. In a letter dated 27 June 2023, Mr Thobakgale responded further to the Public Protector and stated that:
- 6.1.9.1. During the meeting held on 13 June 2023, the DCS conceded that appointments of the acting Secretaries of the Parole Boards were not done in compliance with section 74(2)(e) of the Act.
- 6.1.9.2. It was further agreed during the meeting that the DCS will indicate how it will correct the appointment of the acting Secretaries of the Parole Boards and that the Public Protector considers such corrective steps in issuing an Intervention Report. The proposed interventions to correct the current non-compliance are as follows:

- (a) Renaming of the financed posts to “*Parole Board Administrator*” on the PERSAL³ system of the DCS. This process can be finalised within thirty (30) days of issuing the final report;
- (b) Informing all current officials in the posts in writing that posts will be renamed and the process that will be followed in future. This process will not prejudice the incumbent officials in that they will continue to do the same work, with no changes in their salaries and benefits. This process can be finalised within sixty (60) days; and
- (c) The advertising of the “*Parole Board Administrator*” post, in future will include that applicants must note that in terms of the provisions of the Act, the appointed candidate can be nominated, as determined by the National Commissioner to serve on the Parole Board for approval by the Minister and that the National Commissioner can designate the appointed candidate to act as the Secretary of the Parole Board.

6.1.9.3. Considering that the functioning of the fifty-two (52) Parole Boards is crucial for the management of DCS in consideration of inmates for placement on parole and community corrections, the Parole Boards are continuous, and their administration cannot be interrupted. Any interruption will imply that offenders may not appear before the Parole Board on the date of consideration, this would be prejudicial to inmates and can lead to litigation.

6.1.9.4. The administration of profile submissions (application for parole) involves more than just acting as the Secretary during Parole Board meetings. All profile submissions must be checked, verified, and corrected before they can be placed

³ PERSAL is a standardized Human Resource and Payroll system for all the Central Government Departments and Provincial Administrations. (Concept definition sourced at <http://persal.treasury.gov.za>) on 06 September 2023.

before the Parole Boards, as such, this requires constant interaction between the administrator of the Parole Board and the specific correctional centre.

- 6.1.9.5. When a Parole Board's term ends, the Minister appoints an interim Board, hence the administration of the Parole Board is continuous to ensure that there is no prejudice against the inmates.
- 6.1.9.6. The DCS therefore created the post of the Secretaries of the Parole Boards (on the level of a senior correctional officer) as permanent and it is on the structure. The posts are filled through the normal recruitment process.
- 6.1.9.7. DCS erred in its interpretation of section 74(2)(e) of the Act in that: -
- (a) The posts that were advertised and filled as "*Secretary of the Parole Board*"; all these years were not supposed to be referred to as "*Secretary of the Parole Board*";
 - (b) The Minister did not appoint the officials nominated by the National Commissioner to the Parole Boards in terms of section 74(2)(e) of the Act;
 - (c) The National Commissioner did not designate the persons appointed by the Minister, to act as Secretary of the fifty two (52) Parole Boards in terms of section 74(3) of the Act; and
 - (d) It must be noted that the administrative functions of the Parole Boards require a permanent post to ensure consistency and effective functioning of the Parole Boards.
- 6.1.9.8. The table below indicates the appointments of these officials were done through the normal recruitment process in terms of section 3(5)(g) of the Act:

Region	Number of Parole Boards	Number of “secretaries” of Parole Boards posts funded on the DCS structure (and PERSAL)	
		Filled	Vacant
Eastern Cape Region	9	9	0
Free State & Northern Cape	7	6	1
Gauteng	13	11	2
KwaZulu Natal	5	5	0
LMN Region	9	8	1
Western Cape Region	9	7	2
	52	46	6

Applicable law

Correctional Service Act, 1998 as amended

6.1.10. Section 3(5) of the Act provides that “*the Department is under the control of the Commissioner, who must, without derogating from the generality of subsection (2)-*

(g) Appoint, remunerate, promote, transfer, discipline or dismiss correctional officials in accordance with this Act, the Labour Relations Act and the Public Service Act;”

6.1.11. Section 74(1),(2) and (3) provides for the Correctional Supervision and Parole Boards and stipulates the following:

(1) “*The Minister may-*

(a) name each Correctional Supervision and Parole Board;

(b) specify the seat for each Board;

(c) determine and amend the area of jurisdiction of each Board.

(2) *The Minister must appoint one or more Correctional Supervision and Parole Boards consisting of-*

- (a) a chairperson;
- (b) a vice-chairperson;
- (c)
- (d)
- (e) one official of the Department nominated by the Commissioner; and
- (f) two members of the community.

(3) *The Commissioner must designate one of the correctional officials referred to in subsection (2) (e) to act as a secretary for a Board....”*

Analysis

- 6.1.12. The evidence at the Public Protector’s disposal indicates that the DCS advertised administrative positions under the title “*Secretary of the Parole Board*” in terms of section 3(5)(g) of the Act, thereby failing to create a distinction between the administrative position and the acting Secretary of the Parole Board, which is a position envisaged by the provisions of section 74(2)(e) and 74(3) of the Act. According to Mr Thobakgale, the functioning of the Parole Boards is a continuous administrative function that cannot be interrupted and as a result, it requires the permanent appointment of an administrator, this was done in terms of section 3(5)(g) of the Act.
- 6.1.13. In terms of the overall evidence at the Public Protector’s disposal, the DCS’ functionaries conceded that they erred and did not follow or adhere to the provisions of section 74(2)(e) of the Act. Mr Thobakgale indicated that DCS will henceforth take corrective measures in this regard, by nominating the official of the DCS to be appointed by the Minister as a member of the Correctional Supervision and Parole Board in compliance with section 74(2)(e) of the Act.

Conclusion

- 6.1.14. Based on the facts before the Public Protector, it is concluded that DCS did not adhere to the provision of section 74(2)(e) and 74(3) of the Act, which require that an official of the DCS must be nominated by the National Commissioner and appointed by the Minister to be a member of the Correctional Supervision and Parole Board, thereafter, be designated by the National Commissioner to act as a Secretary of the Correctional Supervision and Parole Board.

7. OBSERVATIONS

- 7.1 In light of the above information and evidence, the Public Protector makes the following observations:
- 7.1.1 Even though the functionaries of the DCS did not adhere to the provisions of section 74(2)(e) and 74(3) of the Act, which require that an official of the DCS must be nominated by the National Commissioner and appointed by the Minister to be a member of the Correctional Supervision and Parole Board, these duties have been performed by officials appointed by the National Commissioner in terms of section 3(5)(g) of the Act, which empowers the NC to appoint staff for the DCS.
- 7.1.2 Following the intervention of the Public Protector, the Mr Thobakgale undertook and committed to take steps to correct the appointment of the acting Secretaries of the Parole Boards, which shall include *inter alia* renaming of the existing funded posts to “*Parole Board Administrator*” on PERSAL, while ensuring consistency and effective functioning of the Parole Boards.
- 7.1.3 In light of the corrective action to be taken by the DCS as indicated above, the Public Protector is of the view that, where the state institution has already taken action or implements remedial steps based on its own internal practices and prescripts, within

its sphere of administration, it should be allowed an opportunity and the space to correct the improper conduct and fully address the maladministration concerned.

- 7.1.4 The constitutional principle of separation of powers was reiterated in *Economic Freedom Fighters v The Speaker of the National Assembly and Others and Democratic Alliance v The Speaker of the National Assembly and Others*⁴ where the court held the following:

“The principle of separation of powers, on the one hand, recognises the functional independence of branches of government. On the other hand, the principles of checks and balances focuses on the desirability of ensuring that the constitutional order, as a totality, prevents the branches of government from usurping power from one another...”

8. INTERVENTION

The National Commissioner of the DCS

- 8.1 It is therefore recommended to the National Commissioner of the DCS, in terms of section 6(4)(c)(ii) of the Public Protector Act, that:
- 8.1.1 Within ninety (90) calendar days from the date of this report, the DCS’ functionalities should embark on a consultative process with all relevant and affected stakeholders to get their concurrence regarding the renaming of the funded posts of “*Secretary of the Parole Board*” to “*Parole Board Administrator*” on PERSAL system of the DCS;
- 8.1.2 Within sixty (60) calendar days from the date of this report inform the incumbents regarding the renaming of the funded posts of “*Secretary of the Parole Board*” to

4 CCT 143/15 and CCT 171/15 at para 91.

“Parole Board Administrator” on PERSAL system of the DCS, and the implications thereof; and

8.1.3 Within sixty (60) calendar days of this report issue a circular communicating the necessary changes in order to ensure compliance with section 74 of the Act.

9. CONCLUSION

9.1. The Public Protector will monitor the process of implementing the proposed intervention measures to remedy the non-compliance with the provisions of section 74(2)(e) and 74(3) of the Act until finalisation by the DCS.

9.2. The DCS is to provide a report to the Public Protector on the implementation of the intervention measures referred to in paragraph 8 within ninety (90) calendar days of the date of this report.



ADV KHOLEKA GCALEKA
ACTING PUBLIC PROTECTOR
OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA
DATE: 29 SEPTEMBER 2023

Assisted by: Mr VX Dlamini

Acting Executive Manager: Investigations Branch