



Integrated Provincial Support Programme (IPSP)
Limpopo Province

IPSP Number IPSP2/LP/04/01A

Customer Satisfaction Survey
June 2003

Final Report

Compiled by
IBC Solutions (Pty) Ltd (IBC)
and
Leséle Services cc (Leséle)

Contact: Ian Strydom
Cell No 082 850 3139
e-mail ian.strydom@ibuscon.co.za





DISCLAIMER

While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the information and reports in this document, IBC Solutions (Pty) Ltd and Leséle Services cc. or its consultants do not accept any responsibility whatsoever for any errors or omissions or for any effect derived there from.

**Signed for and on behalf of IBC Solutions (Pty) Ltd and Leséle Services
cc:**

SIGNATURE

03 JULY 2003
DATE

IAN J. STRYDOM
NAME (PRINTED)

PROJECT MANAGER
DESIGNATION

**Signed for and on behalf of the Limpopo Provincial Government
ACCEPTED BY :**

SIGNATURE

03 JULY 2003
DATE

G. MAKOKO
SENIOR MANAGER_ - SERVICE DELIVERY CO-ORDINATION UNIT



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IBC Lesele was awarded the tender to conduct the 2003 Customer Satisfaction Survey to determine the level of customer satisfaction with service delivery.

The overall purpose of this project was to develop and implement a mechanism, including a set of baseline indicators, which can be used by the Provincial Government to :

- Assess the extent to which it is currently addressing the needs, wants, preferences and demands of its customers.
- Identify specific areas for improvement .
- Monitor and evaluate service delivery trends over time.
- Improve transparency and accountability and, ultimately, service delivery.

Overall analysis of the results indicates that the satisfaction level for external customers has improved from 29% from the last survey in 2002 to 34,1% in 2003, which is an improvement of 17.6%. Internal customers registered a satisfaction level of 54.7%. This is encouraging and may imply that the transformation service delivery program has had an impact on the behavior of public servants.

Identification of the priority areas for service delivery improvement was determined by taking into account the following perspectives:

- Provincial priorities
- District priorities
- Provincial Department priorities

a) Provincial Priorities

On a Provincial level, the high priority Districts are as follows (highest priority to lowest priority):

- Priority 1: Sekhukhune
 - Finance & Economic Development : all principles to be addressed.
 - Local Government & Housing : Value for Money principle to be addressed.
 - Office of the Premier : Access, Consultation, Courtesy and Services Standards principles to be addressed.
 - Public Works : all principles with the exception of Services Standards to be addressed.
 - Safety, Security & Liaison : Access, Information, Openness and Transparency and Value for Money principles to be addressed.
 - Sport, Arts and Culture : all principles to be addressed.
 - Transport : all principles to be addressed.

- Priority 2: Capricorn
 - Agriculture : Redress/Complaints Mechanisms and Value for Money principles to be addressed.
 - Finance & Economic Development : all principles with the exception of Services Standards Redress/Complaints Mechanisms to be addressed.
 - Local Government & Housing : Redress/Complaints Mechanisms principle to be addressed.
 - Office of the Premier : all principles with the exception of Information and Openness & Transparency to be addressed.
 - Public Works : all principles with the exception of Consultation and Courtesy to be addressed.
 - Safety, Security & Liaison : all principles to be addressed.
 - Sport, Arts & Culture : all principles with the exception of Consultation and Value for Money to be addressed.
 - Transport : all principles to be addressed.

- Priority 3: Bohlabela
 - Agriculture : all principles to be addressed.
 - Finance & Economic Development : all principles to be addressed.
 - Local Government & Housing : all principles with the exception of Consultation, Services Standards and Value for Money to be addressed.
 - Office of the Premier : all principles to be addressed.
 - Public Works : all principles to be addressed.
 - Safety, security & Liaison : Consultation, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms principles to be addressed.
 - Sport, Arts & Culture : all principles with the exception of Consultation to be addressed.

On a Provincial level, the high priority Departments are as follows:

- Priority 1: Transport
 - Sekhukhune : all principles to be addressed.
 - Capricorn : all principles to be addressed.
 - Vhembe : Redress/Complaints Mechanisms principle to be addressed.

- Priority 2: Public Works
 - Sekhukhune : all principles except Services Standards to be addressed.
 - Capricorn : all principles with the exception of Consultation and Courtesy to be addressed.
 - Bohlabela : all principles to be addressed.
 - Waterberg : principles of Access, Consultation and Value for Money to be addressed.
 - Vhembe : Redress/Complaints Mechanisms principle to be addressed.
 - Mopani : Redress/Complaints Mechanisms principle to be addressed.

- Priority 3: Office of the Premier
 - Sekhukhune : principles of Access, Consultation, Courtesy and Services Standards to be addressed.
 - Capricorn : all principles with the exception of Information and Openness & Transparency to be addressed.
 - Bohlabela : all principles to be addressed.
 - Waterberg : principles of Consultation, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms and Services Standards to be addressed.
 - Vhembe : principles of Access, Consultation, Courtesy and Services Standards to be addressed.

- Priority 4: Finance and Economic Development
 - Sekhukhune : all principles to be addressed.
 - Bohlabela : all principles to be addressed.

- Priority 5: Sport, Arts and Culture
 - Sekhukhune : all principles to be addressed.
 - Capricorn : all principles with the exception of Consultation and Value for Money to be addressed.
 - Bohlabela : all principles except Consultation to be addressed.
 - Waterberg : Redress/Complaints Mechanisms to be addressed.

- Priority 6: Agriculture
 - Capricorn : principles of Redress/Complaints Mechanisms and Value for Money to be addressed.
 - Bohlabela : all principles to be addressed.
 - Waterberg : principle of Redress/Complaints Mechanisms to be addressed.

b) District Priorities

The overall priority levels of all the Districts are as follows (high priority Districts are indicated in parenthesis):

- Priority 1: Sekhukhune (high)
- Priority 2: Capricorn (high)
- Priority 3: Bohlabela (high)
- Priority 4: Waterberg
- Priority 5: Vhembe
- Priority 6: Mopani

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction	8
2	Purpose of the Survey	9
3	Project Approach and Methodology	10
4.	Summary of Principle Satisfaction Results for all Provincial Departments	13
5	Findings	14
5.1	External (Customers) Survey 2003	14
5.1.1	Overall Satisfaction Results	14
5.1.2	Individual Principle Satisfaction Results	15
5.2	Internal (Staff) Survey 2003	21
5.2.1	Overall Satisfaction Results	21
5.2.2	Individual Principle Satisfaction Results	22
6	Measurement of Progress	28
7	Priorities and Recommendations for Service Improvement	33
7.1	Provincial Priorities	33
7.2	District Priorities	36
7.2.1	Sekhukhune District (high priority)	36
7.2.2	Capricorn District (high priority)	37
7.2.3	Bohlabela District (high priority)	38
7.2.4	Waterberg District	39
7.2.5	Vhembe District	39
7.2.6	Mopani District	40
7.3	Provincial Department Priorities	41
7.3.1	Provincial Department of Transport (high priority)	41
7.3.2	Provincial Department of Public Works (high priority)	42
7.3.3	Provincial Department of Office of the Premier (high priority)	43
7.3.4	Provincial Department of Finance & Economic Development (high priority)	44
7.3.5	Provincial Department of Sport, Arts & Culture (high priority)	45
7.3.6	Provincial Department of Agriculture (high priority)	46
7.3.7	Provincial Department of Safety, Security & Liaison (SAPS)	47
7.3.8	Provincial Department of Local Government & Housing	48
7.3.9	Provincial Department of Education	49
7.3.10	Provincial Department of Health & Welfare	49
8	Conclusion	66
9	Appendices	67
	Appendix A: Questionnaire - Customers	68
	Appendix B: Questionnaire – Self Rating (Internal)	69
	Appendix C: External Survey Results Graphs	70
	Appendix D: Internal Survey Results Graphs	71
	Appendix E: Qualitative Comments – Questionnaires	72

1 Introduction

- 1.1. The South African government launched a massive transformation programme since its inception in 1994. It involves introducing new ethos in public administration and implementing systems and mechanisms necessary to support managers in the implementation of this programme. Key to the success of the programme is the ability of government to assess, monitor and evaluate its performance on an ongoing basis.
- 1.2. Implementation of the White Papers on Transformation of the Public Service and the Batho Pele, which form part of the Government's vision to provide a high standard of service to all the people of South Africa is critical towards improving quality of life.
- 1.3. The commitment of the government to Batho Pele programme in 1998 brought with it the implementation of the White Paper on Transforming Public Service Delivery (18 September 1997).
- 1.4. As a result the Limpopo Provincial Administration introduced measures to improve and accelerate service delivery. It made attempts to set up baselines for various indicators, with the intention of improving monitoring of its performance over time. One such attempt was the introduction of customer surveys, introduction of service delivery standards both of which culminates with a statement of public service delivery commitment. Annually, customer surveys are undertaken together with various methods to assess performance, the results of which are documented in a citizens' report. The Premier and his Executive Council present this report to the people of the province publicly.

2 Purpose of the Survey

The overall purpose of this project was to develop and implement a mechanism, including a set of baseline indicators, which can be used by the Provincial Government to:

- Assess the extent to which it is currently addressing the needs, wants, preferences and demands of its customers
- Identify specific areas for improvement
- Monitor and evaluate service delivery trends over time
- Improve transparency and accountability and, ultimately, service delivery

This was achieved through the development of a customer satisfaction survey, the administration thereof to a representative sample of customers of all Departments, and the compilation of a report identifying specific improvement initiatives.

In order to achieve the purpose, IBC Leséle and its partners, applied a rigorous research methodology consisting of the following primary phases:

- Phase I : Project Mobilisation, Communication and Control
- Phase II : Sample Selection and Survey Development
- Phase III : Survey Administration
- Phase IV : Survey Results Preparation and Presentation
- Phase V : Final Report Preparation and Presentation

IBC Leséle worked closely with personnel in all Departments in order to maximise buy-in and commitment throughout the five phases. This ensured that any recommended changes within any of the Departments would be embraced and implemented.

3 Project Approach and Methodology

A communication brief was compiled. The purpose of the brief was to inform government personnel of the impending survey and the objectives thereof.

Communication sessions were held in all districts with the Provincial co-ordinators from all departments, with numerous Community Groups, Focus Groups such as Traditional Leaders and their constituencies, School Governing Bodies (SGB's), Womens Groups and Youth Groups, to present the brief so as to create awareness and inform respective participants of both the objective and content of the, survey as well as to obtain qualitative input.

The Departmental stakeholders and the Office of the Premier determined the sample groups and sizes in conjunction with IBC Lesele.

A task team consisting of representatives from IBC Lesele and the Office of the Premier held a workshop to determine the structure and content of the questionnaires (both External and Internal), as well as the survey deployment dates.

By way of explanation, the External survey was the survey conducted amongst the customers such as the general public and suppliers to the Provincial Government, whilst the survey entitled Internal, was the survey conducted amongst the staff of the Provincial Government. Staff levels 1 – 8 , 9 – 13 and Provincial Departmental Heads were surveyed during the Internal survey.

The draft questionnaires were developed by IBC Lesele and presented to the representatives of the Limpopo Provincial Government for approval and signoff was obtained.

A survey deployment plan was developed and agreed to by all parties.

The task team personnel were informed as to the content and interpretations of the questionnaires, by means of workgroup training sessions.

The survey was deployed across all six districts and the Provincial Head Office by the IBC Lesele task team, in conjunction with Limpopo Provincial Government co-ordinators and The Training Team (a local consulting company) consultants. The survey was deployed between the dates of 05 May and 21 May 2003.

The survey deployment dates and locations were as follows :

- Capricorn District - 05 May 2003
- Sekhukhune District - 06 May 2003
- Waterberg District - 07 May 2003
- Vhembe District - 09 May 2003
- Mopani District - 12 May 2003
- Bohlabela District - 13 May 2003
- Provincial Departments - 19 – 21 May 2003

A total of 1 015 (unspoilt) questionnaires were collected from external respondents and 837 (unspoilt) questionnaires were collected from internal respondents. All external questionnaires yielded a total of 8 549 responses which together with the internal responses amounted to 9 386 total responses received from the survey.

The survey raw data was then analysed in two sections, viz. internal and external. The results were then charted in all possible permutations, for comparison purposes, by Province, by District, by Department and by Principle.

Areas for improvement were then identified by means of a Priority Ranking Matrix. This matrix provides specific determination of problem areas based on



the mean scores recorded, by the principles addressed in the questionnaires.

A Gap Analysis was also performed between the External and Internal Survey results.

Comparisons were then made between the 2002 Customer Satisfaction Survey results and the 2003 Customer Satisfaction Survey results to determine improvement trends.



4. Summary of Principle Satisfaction Results for all Provincial Departments

Principle	Provincial Department										Prov
	OP	Agric	Educ	F & ED	H & W	LG & H	PW	SS & L	SA & C	Trans	
Access	25.8	34.1	44.0	31.7	45.1	37.5	30.1	34.7	29.4	28.8	34.2
Consultation	25.2	33.3	45.6	29.2	46.5	35.7	31.1	35.7	36.1	29.7	34.8
Courtesy	28.1	33.3	41.0	28.5	44.2	34.4	29.7	35.7	29.5	28.9	33.3
Information	34.5	34.6	42.7	30.9	45.1	35.7	30.3	35.4	30.9	29.0	34.9
Openness/Transparency	36.1	36.2	41.3	31.5	43.6	36.1	29.8	35.3	29.6	28.5	34.8
Redress/Complaints Mechanisms	30.9	31.0	39.6	33.4	39.7	32.5	26.7	32.1	28.3	28.3	32.3
Services Standards	25.7	33.9	41.0	29.4	43.1	34.6	30.4	33.8	30.6	28.5	33.1
Value for Money	33.9	34.0	40.0	32.2	43.8	37.0	29.7	34.3	33.2	31.5	35.0

The above table summarises the satisfaction levels (in percentages) achieved by each of the provincial departments for each of the Batho Pele principles. The last column illustrates the provincial overall satisfaction level achieved for each principle.

Note : 1) The above results become the bench mark for improvement measurement in 2004.

2) All values illustrated above are percentages (%).

5 Findings

5.1 External (Customers) Survey 2003

5.1.1 Overall Satisfaction Results

- a) The province achieved an overall satisfaction level (for all Departments and Principles combined) of 34,1%. This means that, in essence, the citizens of the province perceive the overall service delivery performance to be low. This should however be compared to an overall 29% achieved last year, which represents an overall improvement of 17.6% on 2002.
- b) By District for all Departments and Principles combined, the overall satisfaction levels are as follows :-

District	Percentage (%)	Citizens Perception of Service Delivery
Mopani	44,5	Low to Average
Vhembe	39,4	Low to Average
Waterberg	38,4	Low to Average
Bohlabela	32,6	Low
Capricorn	27,1	Low
Sekhukhune	22,4	Very Low to Low

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by district in percentages (all principles combined), ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

- c) By Department for all Districts and Principles combined, the overall satisfaction levels achieved are as follows :-

Department	Percentage (%)	Citizens Perception of Service Delivery
Health and Welfare	43,9	Low to Average
Education	41,9	Low to Average
Local Government and Housing	35,5	Low
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	34,6	Low
Agriculture	33,9	Low
Finance and Economic Development	30,9	Low
Sport, Arts and Culture	31,0	Low
Office of the Premier	30,0	Low
Public Works	29,7	Low
Transport	29,2	Low

The previous table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by the provincial departments in percentages, ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

The common trend illustrated in the tables that follow suggest that the reason why the Education, Health and Welfare and Local Government and Housing Departments scored the highest, might well be directly attributable to the fact that these departments are very much in the public eye. Therefore, as a result, the citizens possibly had more knowledge of and interaction with these departments and were able to rate their service delivery performances more accurately.

5.1.2 Individual Principle Satisfaction Results

(a) Access

- The province achieved an overall satisfaction level of 34,2% for this principle. Hence, the citizens perceive the overall service delivery performance based on this principle, to be low.
- By Department for all Districts, the overall satisfaction levels achieved for this principle are as follows :

Department	Percentage (%)	Citizens Perception of Service Delivery
Health and Welfare	45.1	Low to Average
Education	44.0	Low to Average
Local Government and Housing	37.5	Low
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	34.7	Low
Agriculture	34.1	Low
Finance and Economic Development	31.7	Low
Public Works	30.1	Low
Sport, Arts and Culture	29.4	Low
Transport	28.8	Low
Office of the Premier	25.8	Low

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by the provincial departments for the principle of Access in percentages, ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

(b) Consultation

- The province achieved an overall satisfaction level of 34,8% for this principle. Hence, the citizens perceive the overall service delivery performance based on this principle, to be low.
- By Department for all Districts, the overall satisfaction levels achieved for this principle are as follows :

Department	Percentage (%)	Citizens Perception of Service Delivery
Health and Welfare	46.5	Low to Average
Education	45.6	Low to Average
Sport, Arts and Culture	36.1	Low
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	35.7	Low
Local Government and Housing	35.7	Low
Agriculture	33.3	Low
Public Works	31.1	Low
Transport	29.7	Low
Finance and Economic Development	29.2	Low
Office of the Premier	25.2	Low

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by the provincial departments for the principle of Consultation in percentages, ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

(c) Courtesy

- The province achieved an overall satisfaction level of 3,3% for this principle. This means that the citizens perceive the overall service delivery performance based on this principle, to be low.

- By Department for all Districts, the overall satisfaction levels achieved for this principle are as follows :

Department	Percentage (%)	Citizens Perception of Service Delivery
Health and Welfare	44.2	Low to Average
Education	41.0	Low to Average
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	35.7	Low
Local Government and Housing	34.4	Low
Agriculture	33.3	Low
Public Works	29.7	Low
Sport, Arts and Culture	29.5	Low
Transport	28.9	Low
Finance and Economic Development	28.5	Low
Office of the Premier	28.1	Low

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by the provincial departments for the principle of Courtesy in percentages, ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

(d) Information

- The province achieved an overall satisfaction level of 34,9% for this principle. This means that the citizens perceive the overall service delivery performance based on this principle, to be low.
- By Department for all Districts, the overall satisfaction levels achieved for this principle are as follows :

Department	Percentage (%)	Citizens Perception of Service Delivery
Health and Welfare	45.1	Low to Average
Education	42.7	Low to Average
Local Government and Housing	35.7	Low
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	35.4	Low
Agriculture	34.6	Low
Office of the Premier	34.5	Low
Sport, Arts and Culture	30.9	Low
Finance and Economic Development	30.9	Low
Public Works	30.3	Low
Transport	29.0	Low

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by the provincial departments for the principle of Information in

percentages, ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

(e) Openness and Transparency

- The province achieved an overall satisfaction level of 34,8% for this principle. This means that the citizens perceive the overall service delivery performance based on this principle, to be low.
- By Department for all Districts, the overall satisfaction levels achieved for this principle are as follows :

Department	Percentage (%)	Citizens Perception of Service Delivery
Health and Welfare	43.6	Low to Average
Education	41.3	Low to Average
Agriculture	36.2	Low
Office of the Premier	36.1	Low
Local Government and Housing	36.1	Low
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	35.3	Low
Finance and Economic Development	31.5	Low
Public Works	29.8	Low
Sport, Arts and Culture	29.6	Low
Transport	28.5	Low

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by the provincial departments for the principle of Openness & Transparency in percentages, ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

(f) Redress / Complaints Mechanisms

- The province achieved an overall satisfaction level of 32,3% for this principle. This means that the citizens perceive the overall service delivery performance based on this principle, to be low.

- By Department for all Districts, the overall satisfaction levels achieved for this principle are as follows :

Department	Percentage (%)	Citizens Perception of Service Delivery
Health and Welfare	39.7	Low to Average
Education	39.6	Low to Average
Finance and Economic Development	33.4	Low
Local Government and Housing	32.5	Low
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	32.1	Low
Agriculture	31.0	Low
Office of the Premier	30.9	Low
Sport, Arts and Culture	28.3	Low
Transport	28.3	Low
Public Works	26.7	Low

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by the provincial departments for the principle of Redress/Complaints Mechanisms in percentages, ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

(g) Services Standards

- The province achieved an overall satisfaction level of 33,1% for this principle. This means that the citizens perceive the overall service delivery performance based on this principle, to be low.
- By Department for all Districts, the overall satisfaction levels achieved for this principle are as follows :

Department	Percentage (%)	Citizens Perception of Service Delivery
Health and Welfare	43.1	Low to Average
Education	41.0	Low to Average
Local Government and Housing	34.6	Low
Agriculture	33.9	Low
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	33.8	Low
Sport, Arts and Culture	30.6	Low
Public Works	30.4	Low
Finance and Economic Development	29.4	Low
Transport	28.5	Low
Office of the Premier	25.7	Low

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by the provincial departments for the principle of Services Standards

in percentages, ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

(h) Value For Money

- The province achieved an overall satisfaction level of 35,0% for this principle. This means that the citizens perceive the overall service delivery performance based on this principle, to be low.
- By Department for all Districts, the overall satisfaction levels achieved for this principle are as follows :

Department	Percentage (%)	Citizens Perception of Service Delivery
Health and Welfare	43.8	Low to Average
Education	40.0	Low to Average
Local Government and Housing	37.0	Low
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	34.3	Low
Agriculture	34.0	Low
Office of the Premier	33.9	Low
Sport, Arts and Culture	33.2	Low
Finance and Economic Development	32.2	Low
Transport	31.5	Low
Public Works	29.7	Low

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by the provincial departments for the principle of Value for Money in percentages, ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

5.2 Internal (Staff) Survey 2003

5.2.1 Overall Satisfaction Results

- (a) The province achieved an overall satisfaction level (all districts, departments and principles combined) of 54.7%. This means that the staff perceive their overall service delivery performance, to be average.
- (b) By District for all Departments and Principles combined, the overall satisfaction levels are as follows:

District	Percentage (%)	Staff's Perception of their Service Delivery
Bohlabela	60.9	Average
Capricorn	55.9	Average
Mopani	55.7	Average
Sekhukhune	53.9	Average
Vhembe	53.5	Average
Waterberg	48.3	Low to Average

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by district in percentages (all principles combined), ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

- (c) By Department for all Districts and Principles combined, the overall satisfaction levels achieved are as follows:-

Department	Percentage (%)	Staff's Perception of their Service Delivery
Office of the Premier	68.4	Average to High
Public Works	65.3	Average to High
Finance and Economic Development	57.6	Average
Agriculture	51.2	Average
Education	51.0	Average
Health and Welfare	50.9	Average
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	44.7	Low to Average
Sport, Arts and Culture	44.3	Low to Average
Local Government and Housing	37.4	Low
Transport	37.3	Low

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by

the provincial departments in percentages (all principles combined) , ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

5.2.2 Individual Principle Satisfaction Results

(a) Access

- The province achieved an overall satisfaction level of 56.2% for this principle. This means that the staff perceive their overall service delivery performance based on this principle, to be average.
- By Department for all Districts, the overall satisfaction levels achieved for this principle are as follows:

Department	Percentage (%)	Staff's Perception of their Service Delivery
Office of the Premier	69.6	Average to High
Public Works	64.8	Average to High
Finance and Economic Development	60.7	Average
Education	56.1	Average
Health and Welfare	54.0	Average
Agriculture	52.2	Average
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	44.1	Low to Average
Local Government and Housing	40.6	Low to Average
Sport, Arts and Culture	39.0	Low to Average
Transport	38.9	Low to Average

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by the provincial departments for the principle of Access in percentages, ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

(b) Consultation

- The province achieved an overall satisfaction level of 54.4% for this principle. This means that the staff perceive their overall service delivery performance based on this principle, to be average.

- By Department for all Districts, the overall satisfaction levels achieved for this principle are as follows:

Department	Percentage (%)	Staff's Perception of their Service Delivery
Office of the Premier	66.4	Average to High
Public Works	65.1	Average to High
Finance and Economic Development	54.9	Average
Agriculture	51.4	Average
Health and Welfare	51.0	Average
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	48.7	Low to Average
Sport, Arts and Culture	48.7	Low to Average
Education	47.0	Low to Average
Local Government and Housing	41.6	Low to Average
Transport	37.6	Low to Average

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by the provincial departments for the principle of Consultation in percentages, ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

(c) Courtesy

- The province achieved an overall satisfaction level of 53.1% for this principle. This means that the staff perceive their overall service delivery performance based on this principle, to be average.
- By Department for all Districts, the overall satisfaction levels achieved for this principle are as follows:

Department	Percentage (%)	Staff's Perception of their Service Delivery
Office of the Premier	72.4	Average to High
Public Works	62.1	Average
Finance and Economic Development	53.1	Average
Health and Welfare	51.1	Average
Agriculture	48.6	Low to Average
Education	47.2	Low to Average
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	46.8	Low to Average
Sport, Arts and Culture	42.6	Low to Average
Transport	37.0	Low
Local Government and Housing	32.8	Low

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by the provincial departments for the principle of Courtesy in

percentages, ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

(d) Information

- The province achieved an overall satisfaction level of 56.6% for this principle. This means that the staff perceive their overall service delivery performance based on this principle, to be average.
- By Department for all Districts, the overall satisfaction levels achieved for this principle are as follows:

Department	Percentage (%)	Staff's Perception of their Service Delivery
Office of the Premier	73.4	Average to High
Public Works	64.7	Average to High
Finance and Economic Development	60.8	Average
Health and Welfare	54.4	Average
Agriculture	52.2	Average
Education	51.1	Average
Sport, Arts and Culture	48.6	Low to Average
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	46.4	Low to Average
Transport	41.5	Low to Average
Local Government and Housing	35.2	Low

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by the provincial departments for the principle of Information in percentages, ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

(e) Openness and Transparency

- The province achieved an overall satisfaction level of 57.2% for this principle. This means that the staff perceive their overall service delivery performance based on this principle, to be average.

- By Department for all Districts, the overall satisfaction levels achieved for this principle are as follows:

Department	Percentage (%)	Staff's Perception of their Service Delivery
Office of the Premier	70.8	Average to High
Public Works	68.1	Average to High
Finance and Economic Development	62.5	Average
Education	54.2	Average
Health and Welfare	53.1	Average
Agriculture	50.9	Average
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	47.9	Low to Average
Sport, Arts and Culture	46.6	Low to Average
Transport	41.6	Low to Average
Local Government and Housing	39.0	Low to Average

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by the provincial departments for the principle of Openness & Transparency in percentages, ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

(f) Redress / Complaints Mechanisms

- The province achieved an overall satisfaction level of 48.8% for this principle. This means that the staff perceive their overall service delivery performance based on this principle, to be low to average.
- By Department for all Districts, the overall satisfaction levels achieved for this principle are as follows

Department	Percentage (%)	Staff's Perception of their Service Delivery
Public Works	62.8	Average to High
Office of the Premier	60.8	Average
Finance and Economic Development	48.9	Low to Average
Education	46.7	Low to Average
Agriculture	44.7	Low to Average
Health and Welfare	43.3	Low to Average
Sport, Arts and Culture	40.4	Low to Average
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	36.3	Low
Local Government and Housing	34.0	Low
Transport	28.9	Low

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by the provincial departments for the principle of Redress/Complaints

Mechanisms in percentages, ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

(g) Services Standards

- The province achieved an overall satisfaction level of 54.9% for this principle. This means that the staff perceive their overall service delivery performance based on this principle, to be average.
- By Department for all Districts, the overall satisfaction levels achieved for this principle are as follows:

Department	Percentage (%)	Staff's Perception of their Service Delivery
Public Works	66.3	Average to High
Office of the Premier	64.5	Average to High
Finance and Economic Development	57.7	Average
Health and Welfare	52.0	Average
Agriculture	51.7	Average
Education	51.7	Average
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	44.3	Low to Average
Sport, Arts and Culture	43.1	Low to Average
Transport	37.5	Low
Local Government and Housing	36.3	Low

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by the provincial departments for the principle of Services Standards in percentages, ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

(h) Value For Money

- The province achieved an overall satisfaction level of 55.9% for this principle. This means that the staff perceive their overall service delivery performance based on this principle, to be average.

- By Department for all Districts, the overall satisfaction levels achieved for this principle are as follows

Department	Percentage (%)	Staff's Perception of their Service Delivery
Office of the Premier	69.1	Average to High
Public Works	68.8	Average to High
Finance and Economic Development	62.1	Average
Agriculture	58.2	Average
Education	54.1	Average
Health and Welfare	47.8	Low to Average
Sport, Arts and Culture	45.6	Low to Average
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	42.9	Low to Average
Local Government and Housing	39.3	Low to Average
Transport	35.1	Low

The above table depicts the satisfaction levels achieved by the provincial departments for the principle of Value for Money in percentages, ranked from the highest to the lowest value.

6 Measurement of Progress

Satisfaction Survey Results vs. Previous Survey by Department

Department	Percentage (%)		
	2003	2002	Improvement
Health and Welfare	43.9	21.7	102.3
Education	41.9	22.7	84.6
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	34.6	21.9	58.0
Local Government and Housing	35.5	23.5	51.1
Agriculture	33.9	22.1	53.4
Transport	29.2	19.2	52.1
Office of the Premier	30.0	20.1	49.3
Sport, Arts and Culture	31.0	21.2	46.2
Finance and Economic Development	30.9	22.4	37.9
Public Works	29.7	21.5	38.1

There has been a marked improvement overall throughout all departments as can be seen from the above table.

- Health and Welfare recorded a 102,3% improvement (a shift from 21.7% in 2002 to 43.9% in 2003.)
- Education recorded a 84,6% improvement (a shift from 22.7% in 2002 to 41.9% in 2003.)
- Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS) recorded a 58,0% improvement (a shift from 21.9% in 2002 to 34.6% in 2003.)
- Local Government and Housing recorded a 51.1% improvement (a shift from 23.5% in 2002 to 35.5% in 2003.)
- Agriculture recorded a 53.4% improvement (a shift from 22.1% in 2002 to 33.9% in 2003.)
- Transport recorded a 52.1% improvement (a shift from 19.2% in 2002 to 29.2% in 2003.)
- Office of the Premier recorded a 49.3% improvement (a shift from 20.1% in 2002 to 30.0% in 2003.)

- Sport, Arts and Culture recorded a 46.2% improvement (a shift from 21.2% in 2002 to 31.0% in 2003.)
- Finance and Economic Development recorded a 37.9% improvement (a shift from 22.4% in 2002 to 30.9% in 2003.)
- Public Works recorded a 38.1% improvement (a shift from 21.5% in 2002 to 29.7% in 2003.)

Satisfaction Survey Results vs. Previous Survey by Principle

Access	Percentage (%)		
	2003	2002	Improvement
Department			
Health and Welfare	45.1	31.0	44.1
Education	44.0	30.5	44.3
Local Government and Housing	37.5	29.5	27.1
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	34.7	28.5	21.8
Agriculture	34.1	31.0	10.0
Sport, Arts and Culture	29.4	27.0	8.9
Transport	28.8	28.0	2.9
Public Works	30.1	30.5	-1.3
Finance and Economic Development	31.7	33.5	-5.4
Office of the Premier	25.8	28.0	-7.9

There is a significant improvement from 2002 on results achieved for the Access principle for seven out of the ten departments surveyed. Public Works, Finance & Economic Development as well as The Office of the Premier showed a decline for this principle ranging from 1.3% to 7.9%.

Satisfaction Survey Results vs. Previous Survey by Principle

Consultation	Percentage (%)		
	2003	2002	Improvement
Department			
Health and Welfare	46.5	18.0	158.3
Education	45.6	21.5	112.1
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	35.7	15.0	138.0
Agriculture	33.3	16.8	98.8
Local Government and Housing	35.7	20.0	78.5
Sport, Arts and Culture	36.1	20.5	76.1
Public Works	31.1	17.8	75.3
Finance and Economic Development	29.2	16.3	79.6
Transport	29.7	18.5	60.5
Office of the Premier	25.2	15.8	60.1

The previous table illustrates a marked improvement across all ten departments for the Consultation principle, ranging from 158.3% achieved by Health and Welfare to 60.1% achieved by the Office of the Premier .

Satisfaction Survey Results vs. Previous Survey by Principle

Courtesy Department	Percentage (%)		
	2003	2002	Improvement
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	35.7	19.8	80.8
Education	41.0	25.8	59.3
Health and Welfare	44.2	30.5	44.9
Transport	28.9	16.8	72.6
Local Government and Housing	34.4	22.8	51.3
Public Works	29.7	18.5	60.5
Agriculture	33.3	23.3	43.3
Sport, Arts and Culture	29.5	20.0	47.5
Office of the Premier	28.1	24.3	16.0
Finance and Economic Development	28.5	25.0	14.0

The above table illustrates a marked improvement across all ten departments for the Courtesy principle, ranging from Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS) with an improvement of 80.8% to 14.0% achieved by Finance and Economic Development.

Satisfaction Survey Results vs. Previous Survey by Principle

Information Department	Percentage (%)		
	2003	2002	Improvement
Education	42.7	19.5	119.0
Health and Welfare	45.1	24.0	87.9
Office of the Premier	34.5	20.5	68.3
Agriculture	34.6	22.6	53.1
Local Government and Housing	35.7	23.8	50.0
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	35.4	25.0	41.6
Finance and Economic Development	30.9	21.0	47.1
Sport, Arts and Culture	30.9	22.3	39.0
Transport	29.0	22.0	31.8
Public Works	30.3	24.4	24.2

The above table illustrates a marked improvement across all ten departments for the Information principle, ranging from Education with an improvement of 119.0% to 24.2% achieved by Finance and Economic Development.

Satisfaction Survey Results vs. Previous Survey by Principle

Openness & Transparency	Percentage (%)		
	2003	2002	Improvement
Department	2003	2002	Improvement
Health and Welfare	43.6	21.3	105.2
Education	41.3	20.0	106.5
Agriculture	36.2	20.3	78.3
Office of the Premier	36.1	20.3	78.3
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	35.3	21.0	68.1
Finance and Economic Development	31.5	20.5	53.7
Local Government and Housing	36.1	25.7	40.5
Transport	28.5	19.8	44.4
Sport, Arts and Culture	29.6	21.0	41.0
Public Works	29.8	25.8	15.5

The above table illustrates a marked improvement across all ten departments for the Openness & Transparency principle, ranging from Health and Welfare with an improvement of 105.2% to 15.5% achieved by Public Works.

Satisfaction Survey Results vs. Previous Survey by Principle

Redress / Complaints Mechanisms	Percentage (%)		
	2003	2002	Improvement
Department	2003	2002	Improvement
Health and Welfare	39.7	21.3	86.9
Education	39.6	25.5	55.3
Office of the Premier	30.9	20.6	50.0
Finance and Economic Development	33.4	24.8	35.1
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	32.1	26.5	21.1
Transport	28.3	22.8	24.6
Agriculture	31.0	26.0	19.2
Local Government and Housing	32.5	28.5	14.0
Sport, Arts and Culture	28.3	25.0	13.2
Public Works	26.7	25.0	6.8

The above table illustrates a marked improvement across all ten departments for the Redress / Complaints Mechanisms principle, ranging from Health and Welfare with an improvement of 86.9% to 6.8% achieved by Public Works.

Satisfaction Survey Results vs. Previous Survey by Principle

Services Standards	Percentage (%)		
	2003	2002	Improvement
Department			
Health and Welfare	43.1	14.5	197.2
Education	41.0	18.5	121.6
Sport, Arts and Culture	30.6	11.5	166.1
Public Works	30.4	12.0	153.3
Transport	28.5	12.8	122.7
Local Government and Housing	34.6	19.3	79.8
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	33.8	18.8	80.3
Office of the Premier	25.7	12.3	108.9
Agriculture	33.9	21.5	57.7
Finance and Economic Development	29.4	21.8	35.3

The above table illustrates a marked improvement across all ten departments for the Services Standards principle, ranging from Health and Welfare with an improvement of 197.2% to 35.3% achieved by Finance and Economic Development.

Satisfaction Survey Results vs. Previous Survey by Principle

Value for Money	Percentage (%)		
	2003	2002	Improvement
Department			
Health and Welfare	43.8	17.3	153.2
Education	40.0	24.0	66.7
Local Government and Housing	37.0	21.8	70.2
Agriculture	34.0	19.3	76.7
Transport	31.5	17.8	77.5
Finance and Economic Development	32.2	21.8	48.2
Public Works	29.7	19.5	52.3
Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)	34.3	24.3	41.6
Office of the Premier	33.9	24.3	39.5
Sport, Arts and Culture	33.2	25.5	30.2

The above table illustrates a marked improvement across all ten departments for the Services Standards principle, ranging from Health and Welfare with an improvement of 153.2% to 30.2% achieved by Sport, Arts and Culture.

7 Priorities and Recommendations for Service Improvement

It is clear from the overall results for Limpopo Province (overall customer satisfaction levels of 34,1%) that service delivery improvement requires attention throughout the Province. However, a Province-wide service delivery improvement intervention would be both a costly and prolonged exercise. It is therefore felt that quicker, more meaningful improvements will be obtained at a lower cost, both from a financial and human perspective, by identifying priority areas and embarking upon shorter, more focused interventions.

This section identifies the priority areas from the following perspectives:

- Provincial priorities
- District priorities
- Provincial Department priorities

For clarification of the principles, refer to questionnaires in Appendices A & B.

7.1 Provincial Priorities

On a Provincial level, the high priority Districts are as follows (highest priority to lowest priority):

- Priority 1: Sekhukhune
 - Finance & Economic Development : all principles to be addressed.
 - Local Government & Housing : Value for Money principle to be addressed.
 - Office of the Premier : Access, Consultation, Courtesy and Services Standards principles to be addressed.
 - Public Works : all principles with the exception of Services Standards to be addressed.
 - Safety, Security & Liaison : Access, Information, Openness and Transparency and Value for Money principles to be addressed.
 - Sport, Arts and Culture : all principles to be addressed.
 - Transport : all principles to be addressed.
- Priority 2: Capricorn
 - Agriculture : Redress/Complaints Mechanisms and Value for Money principles to be addressed.
 - Finance & Economic Development : all principles with the exception of Services Standards Redress/Complaints Mechanisms to be addressed.
 - Local Government & Housing : Redress/Complaints Mechanisms principle to be addressed.

- Office of the Premier : all principles with the exception of Information and Openness & Transparency to be addressed.
- Public Works : all principles with the exception of Consultation and Courtesy to be addressed.
- Safety, Security & Liaison : all principles to be addressed.
- Sport, Arts & Culture : all principles with the exception of Consultation and Value for Money to be addressed.
- Transport : all principles to be addressed.

- Priority 3: Bohlabela
 - Agriculture : all principles to be addressed.
 - Finance & Economic Development : all principles to be addressed.
 - Local Government & Housing : all principles with the exception of Consultation, Services Standards and Value for Money to be addressed.
 - Office of the Premier : all principles to be addressed.
 - Public Works : all principles to be addressed.
 - Safety, security & Liaison : Consultation, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms principles to be addressed.
 - Sport, Arts & Culture : all principles with the exception of Consultation to be addressed.

Note: High priority Districts are colour-coded in the tabulated results on pages 50 - 52.

On a Provincial level, the high priority Departments are as follows:

- Priority 1: Transport
 - Sekhukhune : all principles to be addressed.
 - Capricorn : all principles to be addressed.
 - Vhembe : Redress/Complaints Mechanisms principle to be addressed.

- Priority 2: Public Works
 - Sekhukhune : all principles with the exception of Services Standards to be addressed.
 - Capricorn : all principles with the exception of Consultation and Courtesy to be addressed.
 - Bohlabela : all principles to be addressed.
 - Waterberg : principles of Access, Consultation and Value for Money to be addressed.
 - Vhembe : Redress/Complaints Mechanisms principle to be addressed.
 - Mopani : Redress/Complaints Mechanisms principle to be addressed.

- Priority 3: Office of the Premier
 - Sekhukhune : principles of Access, Consultation, Courtesy and Services Standards to be addressed.
 - Capricorn : all principles with the exception of Information and

- Openness & Transparency to be addressed.
- Bohlabela : all principles to be addressed.
 - Waterberg : principles of Consultation, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms and Services Standards to be addressed.
 - Vhembe : principles of Access, Consultation, Courtesy and Services Standards to be addressed.
- Priority 4: Finance and Economic Development
 - Sekhukhune : all principles to be addressed.
 - Bohlabela : all principles to be addressed.
 - Priority 5: Sport, Arts and Culture
 - Sekhukhune : all principles to be addressed.
 - Capricorn : all principles with the exception of Consultation and Value for Money to be addressed.
 - Bohlabela : all principles with the exception of Consultation to be addressed.
 - Waterberg : principle of Redress/Complaints Mechanisms to be addressed.
 - Priority 6: Agriculture
 - Capricorn : principles of Redress/Complaints Mechanisms and Value for Money to be addressed.
 - Bohlabela : all principles to be addressed.
 - Waterberg : principle of Redress/Complaints Mechanisms to be addressed.

Note: High priority Provincial Departments are colour-coded in the tabulated results on pages 56 - 61.

7.2 District Priorities

The overall priority levels of all the Districts are as follows (high priority Districts are indicated in parenthesis):

- Priority 1: Sekhukhune (high)
- Priority 2: Capricorn (high)
- Priority 3: Bohlabela (high)
- Priority 4: Waterberg
- Priority 5: Vhembe
- Priority 6: Mopani

7.2.1 Sekhukhune District (high priority)

Within Sekhukhune the following Departments achieved low customer satisfaction levels across all principles and have been designated as priority 1:

- Priority 1: Finance and Economic Development
- Priority 1: Sports, Arts & Culture
- Priority 1: Transport

Within the above Departments, wide-scale interventions are required to improve service delivery.

Within Sekhukhune, the following Departments achieved low customer satisfaction levels on certain principles (indicated in parenthesis). The order of priority of these Departments is as follows:

- Priority 4: Public Works (Access, Consultation, Courtesy, Information, Openness and Transparency, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms, Value for Money)
- Priority 5: Office of the Premier (Access, Consultation, Courtesy, Services Standards)
- Priority 5: Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS) (Access, Information, Openness and Transparency, Value for Money)
- Priority 7: Local Government and Housing (Value for Money)

Within these Departments more focused interventions are required to address the principles with low customer satisfaction levels.

Note: High priority Departments and principles are colour-coded in the tabulated results on page 50.

7.2.2 Capricorn District (high priority)

Within Capricorn the following Departments achieved low customer satisfaction levels across all principles and have been designated as priority 1:

- Priority 1: Safety, Security and Liaison
- Priority 1: Transport

Within the above Departments, wide-scale interventions are required to improve service delivery.

Within Capricorn, the following Departments achieved low customer satisfaction levels on certain principles (indicated in parenthesis). The order of priority of these Departments is as follows:

- Priority 3: Public Works (Access, Information, Openness and Transparency, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms, Services Standards, Value for Money)
- Priority 4: Finance & Economic Development (Access, Consultation, Courtesy, Information, Openness and Transparency, Services Standards, Value for Money)
- Priority 5: Sport, Arts & Culture (Access, Courtesy, Information, Openness and Transparency, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms, Services Standards)
- Priority 6: Office of the Premier (Access, Consultation, Courtesy, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms, Services Standards, Value for Money)
- Priority 7: Agriculture (Redress/Complaints Mechanisms, Value for Money)
- Priority 8: Local Government and Housing (Redress/Complaints Mechanisms)

Within these Departments more focused interventions are required to address the principles with low customer satisfaction levels.

Note: High priority Departments and principles are colour-coded in the tabulated results on page 51.

7.2.3 Bohlabela District (high priority)

Within Bohlabela the following Departments achieved low customer satisfaction levels across all principles and have been designated as priority 1:

- Priority 1: Agriculture
- Priority 1: Finance & Economic Development
- Priority 1: Office of the Premier
- Priority 1: Public Works

Within the above Departments, wide-scale interventions are required to improve service delivery.

Within Bohlabela, the following Departments achieved low customer satisfaction levels on certain principles (indicated in parenthesis). The order of priority of these Departments is as follows:

- Priority 5: Sport, Arts & Culture (Access, Courtesy, Information, Openness and Transparency, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms, Services Standards, Value for Money)
- Priority 6: Local Government & Housing (Access, Courtesy, Information, Openness and Transparency, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms)
- Priority 7: Safety, Security & Liaison (Consultation, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms, Services Standards)

Within these Departments more focused interventions are required to address the principles with low customer satisfaction levels.

Note: High priority Departments and principles are colour-coded in the tabulated results on page 52.

7.2.4 Waterberg District

Within Waterberg, the following Departments achieved low customer satisfaction levels on certain principles (indicated in parenthesis). The order of priority of these Departments is as follows:

- Priority 1: Office of the Premier (Access, Consultation, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms, Services Standards)
- Priority 2: Public Works (Access, Consultation, Value for Money)
- Priority 3: Agriculture (Redress/Complaints Mechanisms)
- Priority 4: Sport, Arts & Culture (Redress/Complaints Mechanisms)

Within these Departments more focused interventions are required to address the principles with low customer satisfaction levels.

Note: High priority Departments and principles are colour-coded in the tabulated results on page 53.

7.2.5 Vhembe District

Within Vhembe, the following Departments achieved low customer satisfaction levels on certain principles (indicated in parenthesis). The order of priority of these Departments is as follows:

- Priority 1: Office of the Premier (Access, Consultation, Courtesy, Services Standards)
- Priority 2: Local Government and Housing (Courtesy)
- Priority 2: Public Works (Redress/Complaints Mechanisms)
- Priority 2: Transport (Redress/Complaints Mechanisms)

Within these Departments more focused interventions are required to address the principles with low customer satisfaction levels.

Note: High priority Departments and principles are colour-coded in the tabulated results on page 54.

7.2.6 Mopani District

Within Mopani, the following Department achieved low customer satisfaction levels on one principle (indicated in parenthesis):

- Priority 1: Public Works (Redress/Complaints Mechanisms)

Within this Department a more focused intervention is required to address the principle with low customer satisfaction levels.

Note: High priority Departments and principles are colour-coded in the tabulated results on page 55.

7.3 Provincial Department Priorities

The overall priority levels of all the Provincial Departments are as follows (high priority Provincial Departments are indicated in parenthesis):

- Priority 1: Transport (high)
- Priority 2: Public Works (high)
- Priority 3: Office of the Premier (high)
- Priority 4: Finance and Economic Development (high)
- Priority 5: Sport, Arts and Culture (high)
- Priority 6: Agriculture (high)
- Priority 7: Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)
- Priority 8: Local Government and Housing
- Priority 9: Education
- Priority 10: Health and Welfare

7.3.1 Provincial Department of Transport (high priority)

Within the Provincial Department of Transport, the following District Departments achieved low customer satisfaction levels across all principles and have been designated as priority 1:

- Priority 1: Sekhukhune District Department of Transport
- Priority 1: Capricorn District Department of Transport

Within the above District Departments, wide-scale interventions are required to improve service delivery.

Within the Provincial Department of Transport, the following District Department achieved low customer satisfaction levels on one principle and has been designated as a priority 3:

- Priority 3: Vhembe District Department of Transport (Redress/Complaints Mechanisms)

Within this District Department a more focused intervention is required to address the principle with low customer satisfaction levels.

Note: High priority District Departments and principles are colour-coded in the tabulated results on page 56.

7.3.2 Provincial Department of Public Works (high priority)

Within the Provincial Department of Public Works, the following District Department achieved low customer satisfaction levels across all principles and has been designated as priority 1:

- Priority 1: Bohlabela District Department of Public Works

Within the above District Department, a wide-scale intervention is required improve service delivery.

Within the Provincial Department of Public Works, the following District Departments achieved low customer satisfaction levels on certain principles (indicated in parenthesis). The order of priority of these District Departments are as follows:

- Priority 2: Sekhukhune Department of Public Works (Access, Consultation, Courtesy, Information, Openness and Transparency, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms, Value for Money)
- Priority 3: Capricorn Department of Public Works (Access, Information, Openness and Transparency, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms, Services Standards, Value for Money)
- Priority 4: Waterberg Department of Public Works (Access, Consultation, Value for Money)
- Priority 5: Vhembe Department of Public Works (Redress/Complaints Mechanisms)
- Priority 6: Mopani Department of Public Works (Redress/Complaints Mechanisms)

Within these District Departments more focused interventions are required to address the principles with low customer satisfaction levels.

Note: High priority District Departments and principles are colour-coded in the tabulated results on page 57.

7.3.3 Provincial Department of Office of the Premier (high priority)

Within the Provincial Department of Office of the Premier, the following District Department achieved low customer satisfaction levels across all principles and has been designated as priority 1:

- Priority 1: Bohlabela District Department of Office of the Premier

Within the above District Department, a wide-scale intervention is required to improve service delivery.

Within the Provincial Department of Office of the Premier, the following District Departments achieved low customer satisfaction levels on certain principles (indicated in parenthesis). The order of priority of these District Departments is as follows:

- Priority 2: Sekhukhune District Department of Office of the Premier (Access, Consultation, Courtesy, Services Standards)
- Priority 3: Capricorn District Department of Office of the Premier (Access, Consultation, Courtesy, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms, Services Standards, Value for Money)
- Priority 4: Vhembe District Department of Office of the Premier (Access, Consultation, Courtesy, Services Standards)
- Priority 5: Waterberg District Department of Office of the Premier (Consultation, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms, Services Standards)

Within these District Departments more focused interventions are required to address the principles with low customer satisfaction levels.

Note: High priority District Departments and principles are colour-coded in the tabulated results on page 58.

7.3.4 Provincial Department of Finance & Economic Development (high priority)

Within the Provincial Department of Finance & Economic Development, the following District Departments achieved low customer satisfaction levels across all principles and have been designated as priority 1:

- Priority 1: Sekhukhune District Department of Finance & Economic Development
- Priority 1: Bohlabela District Department of Finance & Economic Development

Within the above District Departments, wide-scale interventions are required to improve service delivery.

Note: High priority District Departments and principles are colour-coded in the tabulated results on page 59.

7.3.5 Provincial Department of Sport, Arts & Culture (high priority)

Within the Provincial Department of Sport, Arts & Culture, the following District Department achieved low customer satisfaction levels across all principles and has been designated as priority 1:

- Priority 1: Sekhukhune District Department of Sport, Arts & Culture

Within the above District Department, a wide-scale intervention is required to improve service delivery.

Within the Provincial Department of Sport, Arts & Culture, the following District Departments achieved low customer satisfaction levels on certain principles (indicated in parenthesis). The order of priority of these District Departments is as follows:

- Priority 2: Bohlabela District Department of Sport, Arts & Culture (Access, Courtesy, Information, Openness and Transparency, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms, Services Standards, Value for Money)
- Priority 3: Capricorn District Department of Sport, Arts & Culture (Access, Courtesy, Information, Openness and Transparency, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms, Services Standards)
- Priority 4: Waterberg District Department of Sport, Arts & Culture (Redress/Complaints Mechanisms)

Within these District Departments more focused interventions are required to address the principles with low customer satisfaction levels.

Note: High priority District Departments and principles are colour-coded in the tabulated results on page 60.

7.3.6 Provincial Department of Agriculture (high priority)

Within the Provincial Department of Agriculture, the following District Department achieved low customer satisfaction levels across all principles and has been designated as priority 1:

- Priority 1: Bohlabela District Department of Agriculture

Within the above District Department, a wide-scale intervention is required to improve service delivery.

Within the Provincial Department of Agriculture, the following District Departments achieved low customer satisfaction levels on certain principles (indicated in parenthesis). The order of priority of these District Departments is as follows:

- Priority 2: Sekhukhune District Department of Agriculture (Access, Consultation, Courtesy, Information, Openness and Transparency, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms, Services Standards, Value for Money)
- Priority 3: Capricorn District Department of Agriculture (Redress/Complaints Mechanisms, Value for Money)
- Priority 4: Waterberg District Department of Agriculture (Redress/Complaints Mechanisms)

Within these District Departments more focused interventions are required to address the principles with low customer satisfaction levels.

Note: High priority District Departments and principles are colour-coded in the tabulated results on page 61.

7.3.7 Provincial Department of Safety, Security & Liaison (SAPS)

Within the Provincial Department of Safety, Security & Liaison, the following District Department achieved low customer satisfaction levels across all principles and has been designated as priority 1:

- Priority 1: Capricorn District Department of Safety, Security & Liaison

Within the above District Department, a wide-scale intervention is required to improve service delivery.

Within the Provincial Department of Safety, Security & Liaison, the following District Departments achieved low customer satisfaction levels on certain principles (indicated in parenthesis). The order of priority of these District Departments is as follows:

- Priority 2: Sekhukhune District Department of Safety, Security & Liaison (Access, Information, Openness and Transparency, Value for Money)
- Priority 3: Bohlabela District Department of Agriculture (Consultation, Information, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms, Services Standards)

Within these District Departments more focused interventions are required to address the principles with low customer satisfaction levels.

Note: High priority District Departments and principles are colour-coded in the tabulated results on page 62.

7.3.8 Provincial Department of Local Government & Housing

Within the Provincial Department of Local Government & Housing, the following District Departments achieved low customer satisfaction levels on certain principles (indicated in parenthesis). The order of priority of these District Departments is as follows:

- Priority 1: Bohlabela District Department of Local Government & Housing (Access, Courtesy, Information, Openness and Transparency, Redress/Complaints Mechanisms)
- Priority 2: Sekhukhune District Department of Local Government & Housing (Value for Money)
- Priority 3: Vhembe District Department of Local Government & Housing (Courtesy)
- Priority 5: Capricorn District Department of Local Government & Housing (Redress/Complaints Mechanisms)

Within these District Departments more focused interventions are required to address the principles with low customer satisfaction levels.

Note: High priority District Departments and principles are colour-coded in the tabulated results on page 63.

7.3.9 Provincial Department of Education

Within the Provincial Department of Education there are no immediately priorities.

Note: High priority District Departments and principles are colour-coded in the tabulated results on page 64.

7.3.10 Provincial Department of Health & Welfare

Within the Provincial Department of Health & Welfare, the following District Department achieved low customer satisfaction levels on one principle (indicated in parenthesis):

- Priority 1: Waterberg Department of Health & Welfare (Redress/Complaints Mechanisms)

Within this District Department a more focused intervention is required to address the principle with low customer satisfaction levels.

Note: High priority District Departments and principles are colour-coded in the tabulated results on page 65.

**Limpopo Province – Sekhukhune District
District/Department Performance, Ranking and Priorities for Service Delivery Improvement**

District	Ranking of District (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	District Department	District Departmental Performance on Principles (Evaluation Criteria)									Ranking of Dept within District (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	
			Access	Consultation	Courtesy	Information	Openness & Transparency	Redress, Complaints Mechanisms	Services Standards	Value for money	Total (Dept Performance)		
Sekhukhune	1	Agriculture	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	16	8
		Education	4	4	4	2	2	4	2	4	4	26	9
		Finance & Economic Development	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1
		Health & Welfare	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	10
		Local Government & Housing	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	15	7
		Office of the Premier	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	12	5
		Public Works	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	9	4
		Safety, Security & Liaison	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	12	5
		Sport, Arts & Culture	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1
		Transport	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1

Note: Colour coding indicates areas requiring immediate priority.

**Limpopo Province – Capricorn District
District/Department Performance, Ranking and Priorities for Service Delivery Improvement**

District	Ranking of District (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	District Department	District Departmental Performance on Principles (Evaluation Criteria)									Ranking of Dept within District (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)
			Access	Consulation	Courtesy	Information	Openness & Transparency	Redress, Complaints Mechanisms	Services Standards	Value for money	Total (Dept Performance)	
Capricorn	2	Agriculture	2	4	2	4	4	1	2	1	20	7
		Education	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	10
		Finance & Economic Development	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	11	4
		Health & Welfare	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	30	9
		Local Government & Housing	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	29	8
		Office of the Premier	1	1	1	4	4	1	1	1	18	6
		Public Works	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	10	3
		Safety, Security & Liaison	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1
		Sport, Arts & Culture	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	2	12	5
		Transport	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1

Note: Colour coding indicates areas requiring immediate priority.

**Limpopo Province – Bohlabela District
District/Department Performance, Ranking and Priorities for Service Delivery Improvement**

District	Ranking of District (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	District Department	District Departmental Performance on Principles (Evaluation Criteria)									Ranking of Dept within District (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	
			Access	Consultation	Courtesy	Information	Openness & Transparency	Redress, Complaints Mechanisms	Services Standards	Value for money	Total (Dept Performance)		
Bohlabela	3	Agriculture	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1
		Education	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	8
		Finance & Economic Development	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1
		Health & Welfare	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	8
		Local Government & Housing	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	4	13	6	
		Office of the Premier	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1	
		Public Works	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1	
		Safety, Security & Liaison	2	1	2	4	4	1	1	4	19	7	
		Sport, Arts & Culture	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	5	
		Transport	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	8	

Note: Colour coding indicates areas requiring immediate priority.

**Limpopo Province – Waterberg District
District/Department Performance, Ranking and Priorities for Service Delivery Improvement**

District	Ranking of District (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	District Department	District Departmental Performance on Principles (Evaluation Criteria)									Ranking of Dept within District (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)
			Access	Consul-tation	Cour-tesy	Infor-mation	Openness & Trans-parency	Redress, Complaints Mechanisms	Services Standards	Value for money	Total (Dept Performance)	
Waterberg	4	Agriculture	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	22	3
		Education	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	29	8
		Finance & Economic Development	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	27	7
		Health & Welfare	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	31	10
		Local Government & Housing	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	30	9
		Office of the Premier	1	1	3	3	3	1	1	3	16	1
		Public Works	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	18	2
		Safety, Security & Liaison	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	24	5
		Sport, Arts & Culture	3	3	3	3	4	1	3	3	23	4
		Transport	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	24	5

Note: Colour coding indicates areas requiring immediate priority.

**Limpopo Province – Vhembe District
District/Department Performance, Ranking and Priorities for Service Delivery Improvement**

District	Ranking of District (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	District Department	District Departmental Performance on Principles (Evaluation Criteria)									Ranking of Dept within District (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)
			Access	Consulation	Courtesy	Information	Openness & Transparency	Redress, Complaints Mechanisms	Services Standards	Value for money	Total (Dept Performance)	
Vhembe	5	Agriculture	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	28	5
		Education	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	29	6
		Finance & Economic Development	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	29	6
		Health & Welfare	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	8
		Local Government & Housing	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	22	2
		Office of the Premier	1	1	1	3	4	3	1	4	18	1
		Public Works	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	22	2
		Safety, Security & Liaison	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	8
		Sport, Arts & Culture	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	8
		Transport	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	22	2

Note: Colour coding indicates areas requiring immediate priority.

**Limpopo Province – Mopani District
District/Department Performance, Ranking and Priorities for Service Delivery Improvement**

District	Ranking of District (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	District Department	District Departmental Performance on Principles (Evaluation Criteria)									Ranking of Dept within District (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	
			Access	Consul-tation	Cour-tesy	Infor-mation	Openness & Trans-parency	Redress, Complaints Mechanisms	Services Standards	Value for money	Total (Dept Performance)		
Mopani	6	Agriculture	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24	2
		Education	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	9
		Finance & Economic Development	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	27	7
		Health & Welfare	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	9
		Local Government & Housing	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24	2
		Office of the Premier	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24	2
		Public Works	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	22	1
		Safety, Security & Liaison	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	27	7
		Sport, Arts & Culture	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24	2
		Transport	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24	2

Note: Colour coding indicates areas requiring immediate priority.

Limpopo Province – Provincial Department - Transport
Provincial/District/Department Performance, Ranking and Priorities for Service Delivery Improvement

Provincial Department	Ranking of Provincial Department (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	District Department	District Departmental Performance on Principles (Evaluation Criteria)									Ranking of District Dept. within Provincial Dept. (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	
			Access	Consultation	Courtesy	Information	Openness & Transparency	Redress, Complaints Mechanisms	Services Standards	Value for money	Total (Dept Performance)		
Transport	1	Sekhukhune	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1
		Capricorn	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1
		Bohlabela	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	5
		Waterberg	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	5
		Vhembe	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	22	3
		Mopani	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24	4

Note: Colour coding indicates areas requiring immediate priority.

**Limpopo Province – Provincial Department – Public Works
Provincial/District/Department Performance, Ranking and Priorities for Service Delivery Improvement**

Provincial Department	Ranking of Provincial Department (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	District Department	District Departmental Performance on Principles (Evaluation Criteria)								Ranking of District Dept. within Provincial Dept. (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	
			Access	Consultation	Courtesy	Information	Openness & Transparency	Redress, Complaints Mechanisms	Services Standards	Value for money		Total (Dept Performance)
Public Works	2	Sekhukhune	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	9	2
		Capricorn	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	10	3
		Bohlabela	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1
		Waterberg	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	18	4
		Vhembe	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	22	5
		Mopani	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	22	5

Note: Colour coding indicates areas requiring immediate priority.

**Limpopo Province – Provincial Department – Office of the Premier
Provincial/District/Department Performance, Ranking and Priorities for Service Delivery Improvement**

Provincial Department	Ranking of Provincial Department (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	District Department	District Departmental Performance on Principles (Evaluation Criteria)									Ranking of District Dept. within Provincial Dept. (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)
			Access	Consultation	Courtesy	Information	Openness & Transparency	Redress, Complaints Mechanisms	Services Standards	Value for money	Total (Dept Performance)	
Office of the Premier	3	Sekhukhune	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	12	2
		Capricorn	1	1	1	4	4	1	1	1	14	3
		Bohlabela	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1
		Waterberg	4	1	3	3	3	1	1	3	19	5
		Vhembe	1	1	1	3	4	3	1	4	18	4
		Mopani	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24	6

Note: Colour coding indicates areas requiring immediate priority.

**Limpopo Province – Provincial Department - Finance and Economic Development
Provincial/District/Department Performance, Ranking and Priorities for Service Delivery Improvement**

Provincial Department	Ranking of Provincial Department (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	District Department	District Departmental Performance on Principles (Evaluation Criteria)									Ranking of District Dept. within Provincial Dept. (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)
			Access	Consultation	Courtesy	Information	Openness & Transparency	Redress, Complaints Mechanisms	Services Standards	Value for money	Total (Dept Performance)	
Finance & Econ Development	4	Sekhukhune	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1
		Capricorn	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	11	3
		Bohlabela	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1
		Waterberg	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	27	4
		Vhembe	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	28	5
		Mopani	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	30	6

Note: Colour coding indicates areas requiring immediate priority.

**Limpopo Province – Provincial Department – Sport, Art and Culture
Provincial/District/Department Performance, Ranking and Priorities for Service Delivery Improvement**

Provincial Department	Ranking of Provincial Department (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	District Department	District Departmental Performance on Principles (Evaluation Criteria)									Ranking of District Dept. within Provincial Dept. (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)
			Access	Consultation	Courtesy	Information	Openness & Transparency	Redress, Complaints Mechanisms	Services Standards	Value for money	Total (Dept Performance)	
Sport, Art and Culture	5	Sekhukhune	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1
		Capricorn	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	2	12	3
		Bohlabela	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	2
		Waterberg	3	3	3	3	4	1	3	3	23	4
		Vhembe	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	6
		Mopani	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24	5

Note: Colour coding indicates areas requiring immediate priority.

**Limpopo Province – Provincial Department - Agriculture
Provincial/District/Department Performance, Ranking and Priorities for Service Delivery Improvement**

Provincial Department	Ranking of Provincial Department (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	District Department	District Departmental Performance on Principles (Evaluation Criteria)									Ranking of District Dept. within Provincial Dept. (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	
			Access	Consultation	Courtesy	Information	Openness & Transparency	Redress, Complaints Mechanisms	Services Standards	Value for money	Total (Dept Performance)		
Agriculture	6	Sekhukhune	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	16	2
		Capricorn	2	4	2	4	4	1	2	1	20	3	
		Bohlabela	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1	
		Waterberg	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	23	4	
		Vhembe	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	28	6	
		Mopani	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24	5	

Note: Colour coding indicates areas requiring immediate priority.

**Limpopo Province – Provincial Department – Safety, Security and Liaison (SAPS)
Provincial/District/Department Performance, Ranking and Priorities for Service Delivery Improvement**

Provincial Department	Ranking of Provincial Department (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	District Department	District Departmental Performance on Principles (Evaluation Criteria)									Ranking of District Dept. within Provincial Dept. (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)
			Access	Consultation	Courtesy	Information	Openness & Transparency	Redress, Complaints Mechanisms	Services Standards	Value for money	Total (Dept Performance)	
Safety, Security and Liaison	7	Sekhukhune	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	12	2
		Capricorn	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	1
		Bohlabela	2	1	2	4	4	1	1	4	19	3
		Waterberg	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	5
		Vhembe	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	5
		Mopani	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	27	4

Note: Colour coding indicates areas requiring immediate priority.

**Limpopo Province – Provincial Department – Local Government and Housing
Provincial/District/Department Performance, Ranking and Priorities for Service Delivery Improvement**

Provincial Department	Ranking of Provincial Department (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	District Department	District Departmental Performance on Principles (Evaluation Criteria)									Ranking of District Dept. within Provincial Dept. (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	
			Access	Consultation	Courtesy	Information	Openness & Transparency	Redress, Complaints Mechanisms	Services Standards	Value for money	Total (Dept Performance)		
Local Govt and Housing	8	Sekhukhune	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	15	2
		Capricorn	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	29	5
		Bohlabela	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	4	13	1
		Waterberg	3	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	30	6
		Vhembe	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	22	3
		Mopani	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24	4

Note: Colour coding indicates areas requiring immediate priority.

**Limpopo Province – Provincial Department - Education
Provincial/District/Department Performance, Ranking and Priorities for Service Delivery Improvement**

Provincial Department	Ranking of Provincial Department (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	District Department	District Departmental Performance on Principles (Evaluation Criteria)									Ranking of District Dept. within Provincial Dept. (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)
			Access	Consultation	Courtesy	Information	Openness & Transparency	Redress, Complaints Mechanisms	Services Standards	Value for money	Total (Dept Performance)	
Education	9	Sekhukhune	4	4	4	2	2	4	2	4	26	1
		Capricorn	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	4
		Bohlabela	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	4
		Waterberg	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	3	29	2
		Vhembe	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	29	2
		Mopani	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	4

Note: Colour coding indicates areas requiring immediate priority.

**Limpopo Province – Provincial Department – Health and Welfare
Provincial/District/Department Performance, Ranking and Priorities for Service Delivery Improvement**

Provincial Department	Ranking of Provincial Department (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	District Department	District Departmental Performance on Principles (Evaluation Criteria)									Ranking of District Dept. within Provincial Dept. (Lowest performing to highest performing, i.e. highest priority to lowest priority)	
			Access	Consultation	Courtesy	Information	Openness & Transparency	Redress, Complaints Mechanisms	Services Standards	Value for money	Total (Dept Performance)		
Health and Welfare	10	Sekhukhune	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	3
		Capricorn	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	30	2
		Bohlabela	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	3
		Waterberg	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	4	29	1
		Vhembe	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	3
		Mopani	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	32	3

Note: Colour coding indicates areas requiring immediate priority.

8 Conclusion

On reflection, it is quite evident that the province still has many daunting challenges ahead that need to be addressed. However, encouragement should be taken from the fact that there has been an overall improvement in most sectors in the province.

Overall analysis of the results indicates that the Provincial Administration was able to improve the satisfaction level of external customers from 29% from the last survey in 2002 to 34.1% in 2003 which, is an improvement of 17.6%. On a provincial level, internal customers registered a satisfaction level of 54.7%. This is encouraging and may imply that the transformation service delivery program has had an impact on the behavior of public servants.

The Department of Health and Welfare, achieved the highest satisfaction level of 43,9% on the overall service delivery in the province and followed by the Department of Education with a 41,9% satisfaction level. This may be due to the fact that these departments (Health & Welfare and Education) have the closest relationship with the citizens on a daily basis and improved services. It must, however, be stated that the fact that the Education, Health and Welfare and Local Government and Housing Departments scored the highest, might well be directly attributable to the fact these departments are very much in the public eye. Therefore, as a result, the citizens had more knowledge of and interaction with these departments and were able to rate their service delivery performances more accurately.

Mopani district citizens registered the highest overall satisfaction of 44,5% compared to other districts. Results from the districts also reflect that Sekhukhune District at 22,4% is the most unsatisfactorily serviced district. There is a need to fast-track service delivery in the nodal points. As borne out by the survey results, Sekhukhune, Capricorn and Bohlabela districts require the highest priority with regard to further investigation and improvement initiatives development. On a Provincial Department level, the Transport, Public Works, Office of the Premier, Finance and Economic Development, Sport, Arts and Culture and Agriculture Departments require further investigation with a view to the development of initiatives to improve service delivery.

The statistical information reflects that there is no match on the level of satisfaction of internal and external clients. This implies that all departments should put more effort on the improvement of services they are rendering.



9 Appendices

Appendix A: Questionnaire – Customers

Appendix B: Questionnaire – Self Rating (Internal)

Appendix C: External Graphical Results

Appendix D: Internal Graphical Results

Appendix E: Qualitative Comments Extracted From The Questionnaires





Appendix A: Questionnaire - Customers





Appendix B: Questionnaire – Self Rating (Internal)





Appendix C: External Survey Results Graphs





Appendix D: Internal Survey Results Graphs



Appendix E: Qualitative Comments – Questionnaires

a) Internal

- Incompetent and unskilled people in certain positions.
- Unskilled and incompetent people in wrong positions.
- My department should handle problems more professionally and must avoid resignations that are taking place on a monthly basis.
- Long serving personnel with proper qualifications should be considered for managerial positions, rather than employing people from outside.
- Our Human Resource Department is very poor.
- Facilities for disabled people should be made available.
- More equipment such as computers and vehicles needed urgently.
- The department is not doing enough to consult with customers on new services.
- Corruption, tribalism and nepotism are major problems. Contractors are the relatives of the Government officials.
- Promotions favoured only for their relatives.
- Managers of departments withhold information not to be released to the public for their own benefit.
- Managers are lazy to comply with regulations.
- There are few complaints in this area regarding policing and the level of crime is down.
- Placement of staff is done unprofessionally.
- Not enough money is being spent on the offices but rather on meetings at Avontura.

b) External

- Council does not respond to complaints about poor quality housing.
- Health and Welfare does not care about us, there is no clinic here.
- We have no graveyards.
- Try to come and talk to rural customers not only people in the towns.
- There is no job creation in the area.
- Mobile clinic only comes around once a month.
- The Department of Housing aLocal Government must stop helping the rich people but also the poor people.
- We need jobs not promises.
- Houses are not given to those people that need them, but to people officials know.
- Department of Transport must build tarred roads to our villages.
- I hate all departments because they do nothing for us in the rural areas.