



## **Children's Institute analysis of the 2009/10 budget for the Gauteng Department of Social Development**

12 June 2009

Debbie Budlender<sup>1</sup> and Paula Proudlock<sup>2</sup>

To see where Gauteng stands in relation to the other provinces, please see the comparative analysis of the budgets of all nine provincial departments of social development on [www.ci.org.za](http://www.ci.org.za)

### **Is the Gauteng social development budget adequate to implement the Children's Act?**

#### **Introduction**

Section 7(2) of the Bill of Rights in the South African Constitution places an obligation on the State to give effect to all the rights in the Bill of Rights. This includes children's rights to family care or alternative care, social services, and protection from abuse and neglect. To meet its obligation government must ensure that the required conditions and services to fulfil these rights are available. The new Children's Act [No 38 of 2005] as amended by the Children's Amendment Act [No 41 of 2007] now clearly sets out what services government must provide to give effect to the rights listed above. These include:

- partial care facilities (creches)
- early childhood development programmes
- prevention and early intervention services
- drop-in centres
- protection services (including a support scheme for child headed households)
- foster care and cluster foster care

---

<sup>1</sup> Debbie Budlender is a senior researcher at the Centre for Actuarial Research at the University of Cape Town and a specialist researcher with the Community Agency for Social Enquiry, a non-governmental organisation specializing in social policy research. Since the 1990s, her work has included a focus on government budgets. [debbieb@mail.ngo.za](mailto:debbieb@mail.ngo.za)

<sup>2</sup> Paula Proudlock is the Manager of the Child Rights Programme at the Children's Institute, University of Cape Town and co-ordinated the civil society network on the Children's Bill (Children's Bill Working Group) from 2003 to 2008. [paula.proudlock@uct.ac.za](mailto:paula.proudlock@uct.ac.za)

- adoption
- child and youth care centres (children's homes, places of safety, schools of industry, reform schools, secure care facilities, and shelters for street children).

To make these services available for the many vulnerable children that need them, government must allocate adequate budget to each service. The Act says that the provincial MECs for Social Development are responsible for providing and funding all these services with the budgets allocated to them by the provincial legislatures. Monitoring the budget allocations and expenditure for these services is therefore a good way of measuring a province's progress in giving effect to the Children's Act and therefore in giving effect to the rights of children.

This document therefore examines what the most recent budget estimates for the Gauteng Department of Social Development, as recorded under Vote 6, tell us about the provincial government's intentions in respect of implementing the Children's Act.<sup>3</sup>

### **Which parts of Vote 6 are relevant for the Children's Act?**

This submission focuses on the budget for the social welfare services programme (programme 2 of the department's budget), as it is this programme that provides for the majority of the services envisaged in the Act. There are three sub-programmes in the social welfare services programme which clearly contain Children's Act funding, namely:

- child care and protection;
- HIV and AIDS; and
- care and support to families.

We also discuss the sub-programme for crime prevention and support. This sub-programme is important for at least two reasons. Firstly, it includes some services prescribed by the Children's Act. Secondly, it covers services related to the Child Justice Act, and there are a range of linkages between the Children's Act and the Child Justice Act.

Other sub-programmes such as victim empowerment (within the social welfare services programme) and youth development (within the research and development programme) also contain pockets of Children's Act funding. The amounts are, however, likely to be small in

---

<sup>3</sup> As we write this paper, in the first half of 2009, the Children's Act has not come into full effect. Thus at this point the child care and protection system is still governed by the Child Care Act [No 74 of 1983]. However the founding clauses of the Children's Act are also in effect which means that the Child Care Act needs to be implemented taking into account these provisions of the new Children's Act. For the purpose of budget allocation, section 4 of the Children's Act, which is already in effect, is particularly pertinent. Section 4(2) obliges all spheres and departments of government to 'take reasonable measures to the maximum extent of their available resources to achieve the realisation of the objects of this Act'. Therefore even though the Children's Act is not yet in full effect, government is obliged to have already started allocating resources to enable the full implementation of the Act. A further factor to take into consideration in the budget analysis is that even though the new Children's Act is not in full effect, the majority of the services in the new Act are already required under the Child Care Act of 1983, which is in full effect. The Costing Report on the Children's Bill that was done in 2006 showed that government was only funding 25% of the services that it was obliged to fund under the Child Care Act of 1983 (Barberton, 2006). Therefore even under the Child Care Act there is an existing statutory obligation on government to prioritise rapid budget and service delivery growth for child care and protection services.

comparison to amounts in the other four sub-programmes. They are therefore not analysed here.

The analysis is based primarily on budget statement 2, the thick document that was tabled in the provincial legislature on budget day in early 2009 and that includes a separate chapter for each department (or “vote”).

A complicating factor in the analysis of Gauteng’s social development budgets is that the department records expenditure on infrastructure under programme 1, administration, rather than under the programme and sub-programme which has services that will be supported by the given infrastructure. For example, ideally construction of a secure care facility should be recorded under the sub-programme for crime prevention and support. This is done for some other provinces but is not done in Gauteng’s budget.

### **Analysis of the 2009/10 budget**

The budget documents that are tabled each year include the estimates for the coming budget year (in this case, 2009/10), as well as medium-term expenditure framework (MTEF) estimates for the following two “outer” years (2010/11 and 2011/12 in this case). Only the first of the three years is voted on by the legislature and becomes the official budget. The numbers for the two outer years are what government plans to spend in those two years, but with the understanding that plans for these two years might change. The publication of estimates for the outer two years allows us in the following year to compare government’s proposed official budget for the “new” first year with the second year estimate of the previous year, and also to compare the “new” second year estimate with the third year estimate of the previous year. This shows us clearly how government’s plans for specific years have changed between 2008 and 2009.

Table 1 compares the estimates published in the 2008 budget statement with those published in the 2009 budget statement. It does this for the four sub-programmes. The table illustrates both changes in amounts recorded for each year, as well as the annual percentage changes in amounts. The estimates for 2008/09 in the table in respect of the 2009 budget statement are the adjusted estimates, i.e. the original allocation plus any adjustment decided on in the mid-year supplementary budget.

The **child care & protection** services sub-programme is the sub-programme that most directly relates to the Children’s Act. It is also the biggest of the four sub-programmes studied in financial terms. Table 1 shows that substantially more is allocated for 2009/10 and 2010/11 in the 2009 budget statement than was indicated in the 2008 budget statement. Further, the adjusted budget for 2008/09 was 15% higher than the original allocation. As a result, the adjusted budget for 2008/09 is 84% higher than the allocation for 2007/08. Planned annual increases in the allocations are consistently well above inflation. These are pleasing findings, especially as some other provinces show the opposite pattern.

These increases are badly needed as in 2009/10 – despite being one of the wealthiest provinces – Gauteng still ranks only fourth on the per capita allocation if we divide the total allocation for this sub-programme by the estimated population aged 0-19 in 2007. Gauteng’s per capita

allocation for 2009/10 is estimated at R142 per child, as against the R92 per child average for all provinces combined. The highest per capita allocation is found in Free State, where the amount is R185 per child. However, if infrastructure allocations were included under this sub-programme, the average for Gauteng would be somewhat higher.

The relatively large increases for this sub-programme in Gauteng will see its percentage of the total social welfare services programme increase from the 41% planned for 2009/10, to 46% in 2011/12. This suggests that the province plans to increase the priority of these services. However, as will be seen below, this is perhaps being done at the expense of some other services that are important for children.

**Table 1. Gauteng estimates for child-related programmes, 2007/08-2011/12 (R1 000s)**

	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Child care & protection services					
<b>2008/09 budget document</b>	253 879	427 724	449 353	590 798	
% increase over previous year		68%	5%	31%	
<b>2009/10 budget document</b>	269 242	496 578	600 438	715 452	834 422
% increase over previous year		84%	21%	19%	17%
Care & support to families					
<b>2008/09 budget document</b>	93 430	75 361	94 503	95 222	
% increase over previous year		-19%	25%	1%	
<b>2009/10 budget document</b>	80 946	95 273	90 697	95 232	99 517
% increase over previous year		18%	-5%	5%	4%
HIV and AIDS					
<b>2008/09 budget document</b>	138 130	178 301	189 045	210 912	
% increase over previous year		29%	6%	12%	
<b>2009/10 budget document</b>	176 049	178 201	190 931	211 012	220 507
% increase over previous year		1%	7%	11%	4%
Crime prevention and support					
<b>2008/09 budget document</b>	153 018	192 087	207 455	230 987	
% increase over previous year		26%	8%	11%	
<b>2009/10 budget document</b>	119 775	161 721	150 868	161 522	168 791
% increase over previous year		35%	-7%	7%	5%

The narrative part of the budget, in reviewing performance in 2008/09, reports that 10 000 children were provided for in respect of early childhood development (ECD), at a cost of R29 million. The department also hoped to have completed construction of 10 ECD facilities in “prioritised townships” by the end of the 2008/09 financial year. For 2009/10, the province reports plans to register and fund a further 200 ECD centres benefiting 10 000 children, at a cost of R29 million. It also plans to construct further ECD facilities in the priority areas, in collaboration with municipalities. The standard model for these facilities is said to be able to accommodate 120 children. During 2008/09, the department also increased the per child daily subsidy for creches from R9 to R11. This is still lower than the R12 paid by KwaZulu-Natal in 2008/09 and planned for Free State in 2009/10.

For the sub-programme **care & support services to families**, the allocation for 2009/10 is lower in the 2009 budget statement than the estimate published in the budget statement of

2008. The 2009/10 allocation represents a 5% decrease on the adjusted expenditure for 2008/09, and planned increases for the outer two years are 4-5%, which is likely to be only equal to inflation or even below inflation. These patterns are worrying.

For **HIV and AIDS** the estimates published in 2008 and 2009 for each year are very similar. Higher than expected inflation after the 2008 budget was published means that similar figures now represent less value than they did in the 2008 budget statement. The apparent lack of prioritisation of this item is surprising given the province's pride in their bana pele strategy.

In respect of performance during 2008/09, the budget statement reports that construction had begun on three community home-based care facilities that would provide after-school care facilities for orphans and vulnerable children (OVC). The statement reports that per capacity subsidy funding for children remained at the level of R1.60 per child per month, with a total allocation of R60.9 million benefiting an estimated 3 174 children. One assumes that the "per month" is an error.

In respect of plans for 2009/10, the department states that the bana pele programme will continue to provide school uniforms, school fee exemptions, school transport, nutrition, access to healthcare and psycho-social support to OVCs. The department will also continue with construction of four day-care centres for OVCs. Further, officials will collaborate with the Department of Justice in an attempt to ensure that foster care placements are completed within a six-month period.

**Crime prevention and support**, like care and support to families, shows a smaller allocation being made for 2009/10 than the adjusted estimate for 2008/09. In this case the allocation is 7% less than the adjusted estimate for 2008/09. The increases for the next years are also relatively small and likely barely to keep up with inflation. In absolute terms, the picture is very worrying in that the 2009/10 allocation reflected in the 2009 budget statement (R150.9 million) is less than three-quarters (72%) of the 2009/10 allocation reflected in the 2008 budget statement (R207.5 million). For 2010/11, the estimate published in 2009 is only 69% of the estimate published in 2008. This suggests serious deprioritisation of this programme just as the Child Justice Act comes into effect as the Act will commence on 1 April 2010.

There is very little narrative in relation to this sub-programme. However, the budget statement does record that the department expected to complete construction of a new secure care facility that would accommodate 260 children in February 2009. As noted above, the related budget would not be reflected within the budget for the sub-programme, but instead would be recorded under programme 1, administration.

Table 2 summarises the information in relation to percentage increases for the four sub-programmes. It adds to the information in the previous table by giving three-year average increases for the MTEF period. As expected from our previous analysis, the three-year average increase for child care and protection is a healthy 19%. For HIV and AIDS the increase is 7%, which is likely to be around inflation or perhaps just above. For the remaining two sub-programmes the average annual increase is 1%. In real terms, this will mean a decrease in the value of the money allocated for these sub-programmes over the MTEF period. As a result, fewer services are likely to be available for children.

**Table 2. Nominal annual increases in budgets**

	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	3-year average
<b>Child care &amp; protection</b>	21%	19%	17%	19%
<b>Care &amp; support to families</b>	-5%	5%	4%	1%
<b>HIV and AIDS</b>	7%	11%	4%	7%
<b>Crime prevention and support</b>	-7%	7%	5%	1%

### Transfers to non-profit organisations

A large proportion of social welfare services are provided by non-profit organisations (NPOs, including both non-governmental organisations and community-based organisations) rather than by the department itself. In some cases, the department subsidises the NPOs concerned, although these subsidies generally do not cover the full cost or scope of the services. All provinces record the amounts allocated for “transfers to other institutions” in respect of each sub-programme. The majority of these transfers will go to NPOs and we therefore refer to this item as NPO allocations in this paper. The relevant allocations for Gauteng are shown in Table 3.

**Table 3. Estimates for transfers to NPOs within social welfare services programme, 2006/07-2011/12 (R1 000s)**

	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Total allocation	693 249	926 915	1 243 346	1 465 171	1 669 171	1 831 062
Transfers	515 583	669 438	781 198	827 866	1 018 983	1 151 610
Transfer as % of social welfare programme	74.4%	72.2%	62.8%	56.5%	61.0%	62.9%

The percentage of the social welfare programme budget allocated for transfers to NPOs is lower for 2009/10 than in any other year. The percentage for 2009/10, at 56.5%, is about 18 percentage points lower than the 74.4% of 2006/07. The percentage is set to increase over the MTEF years, but by 2011/12 will only reach 62.9%. It will thus take two years for the percentage to recover to last year’s level.

Some other provinces provide lists that give detail of allocations to particular organisations or categories of organisations. Gauteng apparently provides such a list in the annual report for the department. That list would reflect the past i.e. what transfers were made rather than, as in budget documents, what transfers are planned. Given Gauteng’s size, a full detailed list is probably inappropriate for a budget statement.

Gauteng does, unlike most other provinces, provide the sub-total of the transfer by sub-programme. Table 4 summarises the information for the four sub-programmes that most clearly link to the Children’s Act by recording the percentage that the transfers constitute of the total sub-programme allocation for each year from 2006/07 to 2011/12.

The table reveals that transfers to NPOs account for the full allocation for care and support to families, and for almost the full allocation for HIV and AIDS. The pattern is very different for child care and protection, where only around a fifth of the allocation goes to NPOs. The percentage of this sub-programme’s budget going to NPOs is set to rise to 24% by the end of

the MTEF period from the 17% for 2009/10. NPOs should thus benefit from the more generous allocations that are planned for this sub-programme, but will struggle in 2009/10.

Crime prevention and support lies somewhere between the NPO-dominated sub-programmes and child care and protection. The percentage allocated to NPOs fluctuates a lot from year to year. The highest percentage is recorded for 2006/07, but for no other year has the percentage been more than 45%. The percentage is lowest for 2009/10, at 36%. The budget statement reports that the allocation for transfers (presumably to NPOs) in respect of crime prevention and support were subject to a “radical” downward adjustment so that the department could afford a secure care centre in Soshanguve. This was reflected in a shift of funds from this sub-programme to programme 1, administration. The result is that for this sub-programme 2009/10 is once again a year in which the department has deprioritised NPOs. This will, in turn affect service delivery.

**Table 4. Transfers to NPOs as a percentage of allocation, by sub-programme, 2006/07-2011/12**

	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12
Child care & protection	18%	16%	18%	17%	20%	24%
Care & support to families		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
HIV and AIDS	97%	98%	95%	95%	96%	96%
Crime prevention & support	53%	41%	45%	36%	42%	42%

#### **“Earmarked” allocations**

Earmarked allocations usually represent spending of extra money which is added to the province’s equitable share and which the National Treasury, after discussion with the provincial departments, has encouraged provinces (through internal government communication) to spend on particular items which are national priorities.

Gauteng, in the discussion of 2009/10, refers to earmarked allocations for implementation of the Older Persons’ Act, Children’s Act and Child Justice Bill. The budget statement does not give further details on these.

#### **Allocations for government personnel**

Salaries for government employees are budgeted for under the title “Compensation of employees”. The allocation for this item in the social welfare budget for 2009/10 is a startling 105% higher than the adjusted allocation for 2008/09. In contrast, the increases in the amount for 2010/11 and 2011/12 are only 6% and 4% respectively. The increases for the outer years of the MTEF seem unrealistic even if staff numbers remain constant.

The table on staff numbers shows a similar pattern. There is a massive increase for the social welfare programme from 1 200 in 2008/09 to 2 327 in 2009/10. The number remains constant for 2010/11 but then increases slightly to 2 394 in 2011/12. The budget narrative states that the province expects to see a significant increase in the number of probation officers, assistant probation officers, and care workers for implementation of the Children’s, Older Persons’ and Child Justice Acts. However, the table of performance indicators shows a constant number of

probation officers employed by government across the four years 2008/09 to 2011/12. Similarly, the number of professionals employed by government to render child care and protection services within the community is a constant 613 over the four years. There is thus an apparent contradiction between different parts of the budget statement. It also seems somewhat over-ambitious to expect that the staff complement can be nearly doubled in the course of one year.

The budget statement refers at several points to the occupation-specific dispensation (OSD) for social workers. This was meant to come into effect during 2008/09, but will do so instead during 2009/10 as the agreement for social workers was finally concluded in the first week of May 2009. The 2009/10 budget would thus need to cover both the increased salaries for 2009/10, and backpay in respect of these increases for the 2008/09 budget year. It is not clear how much of the increase in compensation to employees represents provision for this.

### **Performance indicators**

All programmes are required to publish performance (output) indicators. Some provinces record planned targets only for the immediate budget year. Some publish targets for each of the MTEF years but do not publish the target or performance for the past financial year. Gauteng is exemplary in terms of format in that it publishes targets for each of the MTEF years as well as providing the estimated outcome for 2008/09. This facilitates meaningful assessment of the targets.

A nationally agreed list<sup>4</sup> specifies 49 indicators for child care and protection, eight for care and support to families, 18 for HIV and AIDS, and 19 for crime prevention and support. Four provinces publish all, or almost all, the specified indicators. Gauteng publishes more or less the full complement for three of the sub-programmes, but only 38 of the 49 specified indicators for child care and protection services.

There are too many indicators to allow all of them to be repeated in this short paper. We can, however, offer some comments.

In Gauteng, there are a range of instances in which the planned performance for 2009/10 (as well as subsequent years) is less than for 2008/09. This is the case in respect of children in registered secure care run by government, children assessed, children referred to criminal court, pre-sentence reports for children in conflict with the law, registered drop-in centres managed by NPOs, number of child-headed households assisted, and number of parental programmes implemented, among others. One of the more startling examples of this problem relates to the number of child-headed households receiving services from HCBC organisation. For the MTEF years the number is given as 3 820, 3 000 and 3 200 respectively. Thus for this indicator there is also a decrease between 2009/10 and 2010/11. This follows a much more alarming drop from the 2008/09 estimate of 7 582.

The number of organisations providing services of various types and the related number of beneficiaries increases but the indicators do not mention if this will happen through government funding

---

<sup>4</sup> See the appendix of the comparative analysis of all nine provincial budgets for this national list. [www.ci.org.za](http://www.ci.org.za)

The number of children accessing child and youth care facilities increases markedly for both government- and NPO-run facilities, but the number of professionals employed increases only in respect of shelters managed by NPOs. As noted above, the number of probation officers employed by government is set to remain constant at 120.

### **Comparing what has been allocated to what is actually needed**

The costing of the Children's Bill commissioned by government from Cornerstone Economic Research<sup>5</sup> provides the basis for comparison of what is needed with what has been allocated. There are some limitations in this comparison. Firstly, the costing assumed that the 2005/06 budget year would be the first year of implementation. We are now discussing the 2009/10 budget, and there has been fairly substantial inflation over the intervening three years. To accommodate this, we adjust the Cornerstone estimates using the latest consumer price index of 151.0 (for January 2008) and the index of 125.4 of three years earlier (January 2005). We use the 2008 inflation rate so that our analysis will be easily comparable with the analysis we did of the 2008 budgets of all provinces.

The second limitation is that the bill used as the basis for the costing underwent some changes before being passed by Parliament. We have not been able to adjust for these changes, but they should not make a significant difference to the overall costs.

Thirdly, as discussed above, it is not possible to determine exactly which allocations relate to services to children covered in the Children's Act. For the purposes of the comparison, we take the full allocations for child care and protection, HIV and AIDS and care & support services to families. This over-estimates the amount allocated for implementation of the Children's Act as some of the expenditure for HIV and Aids and care & support to families are not related to the Act. This over-estimate must be balanced against some allocations in other sub-programmes that will help with implementation of the Children's Act. For example, as noted above, some of the allocation for crime prevention and support should be used for activities related to the Children's Act.

The costing team considered four different scenarios, namely:

- ♀ Implementation Plan (IP) low scenario
- ♀ Implementation Plan(IP) high scenario
- ♀ Full Cost (FC) low scenario
- ♀ Full Cost (FC) high scenario

The IP and FC scenarios use different estimates of demand. For the IP scenarios, the costing team asked each department to describe current levels of delivery for each service and how they planned to increase delivery in line with the Bill. Thus these levels do not measure total demand or actual need. Instead, they mainly measure current (very inadequate) service delivery. For the FC scenarios, the costing team used other evidence to estimate how many children

---

<sup>5</sup> Barberton C (2006) *The cost of the Children's Bill: Estimate of the cost to government of the services envisaged by the comprehensive Children's Bill for the period 2005 to 2010*. Pretoria: Cornerstone Economic Research.

actually need services. These scenarios are a more realistic and objective estimate of the levels of need.

The high and low scenarios reflect different levels of quality of service delivery. The high scenario costs 'good practice' standards for all services, while the low scenario uses 'good practice' standards for services classified by the costing team as important, but lower standards for services classified by the costing team as non-priority.

To simplify matters, for the purpose of this comparison we consider only the highest and lowest estimates, namely the IP low and FC high. We look only at the estimates for Years 1-3, which we take as the basis for comparison with the three MTEF years. It is, in fact, open to debate as to which of the costing years government should currently be making allocations. The Children's Act was passed in 2005, but the Amendment Act was passed only in 2007 and the full Act (as amended) will only be put into full effect in late 2009 at the earliest. Ideally, government should have started implementing and making related allocations in 2007/08 after the 2005 Act was partially put into effect in July 2006. However, the Amendment Act covers the services for which provinces are responsible, and one could thus argue that 2009/10 should be treated as Year 1. We use this conservative approach, and thus compare the allocation for 2009/10 with year 1.

An additional reason why this approach is conservative is that the costing report shows that many of the services prescribed in the Children's Act (as amended) were already required in terms of the Child Care Act of 1983 and should, therefore, have been adequately funded even before the Children's Act comes into effect.

Table 5 shows the estimated costs for years 1-3 for Gauteng Social Development, including both the original estimates and the estimates adjusted for inflation. As can be seen, the inflation adjustment makes a fairly substantial difference. For year 1, for example, the IP low original estimate was R1 207 million while the adjusted estimate is R1 454 million.

**Table 5. Costing estimates for Gauteng Social Development (Rm)**

	Original estimate			Adjusted for inflation		
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
<b>IP low</b>	1 207	1 498	1 884	1 454	1 804	2 269
<b>FC high</b>	7 211	8 423	9 778	8 683	10 142	11 774

Table 6 shows the sum of the allocations in the 2009/10 budget documents that might facilitate implementation of the Children's Act. For 2009/10, the sum of the allocations for the three sub-programmes is R882 million, rising to R1 022 million in 2010/11 and R1 154 million in 2011/12. The final rows of the table show that this total amount represents 73% of the IP low costing estimate in 2009/10, but this decreases to 68% and then 61% respectively for years 2 and 3. The 2009/10 total represents only 12% of the FC high estimate for each of the three years. The allocations are clearly seriously inadequate given that the costing suggested that the first year of the IP low scenario met only about 30% of the total demand for services provided for in the Bill when using the most reliable estimates available of objective need. The decrease in the percentage covered is especially worrying as this will increase the gap between the high levels of need and the low levels of service delivery.

**Table 6. Combined Children’s Act-related allocations (R1 000s)**

	<b>2009/10</b>	<b>2010/11</b>	<b>2011/12</b>
Child care & protection	600 438	715 452	834 422
Care & support to families	90 697	95 232	99 517
HIV and Aids	190 931	211 012	220 507
<b>Total</b>	<b>882 066</b>	<b>1 021 696</b>	<b>1 154 446</b>
As % of IP low	73.1	68.2	61.3
As % of FC high	12.2	12.1	11.8

## **Conclusion**

The text of Gauteng’s budget statement for 2009 places strong emphasis on the Children’s Act and related issues. For example, the section of the introduction that deals with “key policy areas and development” includes a paragraph on the Children’s Act, two paragraphs on the Child Justice Bill, a paragraph on the financial awards policy for NPOs, and a paragraph on recruitment and retention strategy of social workers. Only two other issues are covered in this section. The bulk of this important section therefore focuses on Children’s Act-related issues.

Similarly, only five “key assumptions” that informed the 2009/10 budget are named, and three of the five are related to the Children’s Act or Child Justice Act, while a fourth focuses on youth. The relevant assumptions are:

- Expansion of ECD and community home-based care services
- Implementation of the OSD for social workers
- Implementation of out-of-school youth programme (which probably falls in the research and development programme)
- Expansion of services to children in conflict with the law.

Our analysis suggests that this emphasis in the narrative is not consistently reflected in the budget figures. Overall, the trend in the allocations for child care and protection are pleasing, while those for care and support services to families and crime prevention and support are extremely worrying. Further, even for child care and protection there are some measures on which the budget shows worrying trends.

Across all sub-programmes there is evidence of NPOs being short-changed, especially for 2009/10.

## References

Barberton C (2006) *The cost of the Children's Bill: Estimate of the cost to government of the services envisaged by the comprehensive Children's Bill for the period 2005 to 2010*. Cape Town: Cornerstone Economic Research.

Budlender D and Proudlock P (2009) *Analysis of the 2009/10 Budgets of the 9 provincial departments of Social Development: Are the budgets adequate to implement the Children's Act?* Children's Institute. [www.ci.org.za](http://www.ci.org.za)

Child Care Act No 74 of 1983

Children's Act No 38 of 2005

Children's Amendment Act No 41 of 2007

Dorrington R & Bourne D. December 2008. "Re-estimated provincial HIV antenatal survey prevalence for 2007 and a reinterpretation of the national trend" in *South African Medical Journal* 98(12).

National Department of Health. 2007. The National HIV and Syphilis Prevalence Survey South Africa. Pretoria

Statistics South Africa. 2007. Community Survey 2007. Statistical Release P0301. Pretoria.

Statistics South Africa. 2009. Consumer Price Index February 2009. Statistical Release P0141. Pretoria.

Gauteng Provincial Treasury (2008) *Vote 6: Department of Social Development*

Gauteng Provincial Treasury (2009) *Vote 6. Department of Social Development*  
<http://www.treasury.gov.za/documents/provincial%20budget/2009/Budget%20Statements/GT/Default.aspx>