

Zukiswa Kota and Ntsika Kota

REALISING THE RIGHT TO A HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT

WORKING PAPER 19 - March 2018

An analysis of the policy efforts, budgeting and enjoyment of
the right to a healthy environment in South Africa

OTHER PUBLICATIONS BY THE SOCIO- ECONOMIC RIGHTS MONITORING TOOL

Available at
www.spii.org.za

Webster, D and Selebalo, H 'Monitoring and Evaluating the Progressive Realisation of the Right to Water and Sanitation in South Africa: An update of the resource allocation, expenditure and enjoyment of the right to water and sanitation.' (2018) Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute, Working Paper 18.

Weyss, B, Webster, D and Selebalo, H 'Monitoring the right of access to health care in South Africa: An analysis of health budgets and indicators.' (2017) Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute, Working Paper 17.

Thandi Matthews 'Within its available resources' – An assessment South African government spending on socio-economic rights from 2008/09 to 2017/18' (2017) Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute, Occasional Paper.

Selebalo, H and Webster, D, 'Monitoring the right of access to adequate housing in South Africa: An update of the policy effort, resource allocation and enjoyment of the right to housing' (2017) Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute, Working Paper 16.

Daniel McLaren, 'Indicators to Monitor the progressive realisation of the right to decent work in South Africa' (2017) Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute, Working Paper 15.

Margaret Sagan 'Monitoring the right of access to social security and appropriate social assistance in South Africa' (2017) Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute, Working Paper 14.

Zukiswa Kota 'Realising the right to a healthy environment: an analysis of the policy efforts, budgeting and enjoyment of the right to a healthy environment in South Africa' (2016) Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute, Working Paper 13.

Matshidiso Motsoeneng 'Monitoring and Evaluating the Progressive Realisation of the Right to Water and Sanitation in South Africa' (2016) Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute, Working Paper 12.

McLaren, D, Moyo, B and Jeffery, J 'The right to food in South Africa: An analysis of the content, policy effort, resource allocation and enjoyment of the constitutional right to food' (2015) Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute, Working Paper 11.

Franklin, S and McLaren, D 'Realising the Right to Basic Education: An analysis of the content, policy effort, resource allocation and enjoyment of the constitutional right to a basic education (2015) Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute, Working Paper 10.

Hannah Dawson & Daniel McLaren 'A Framework for Monitoring and Evaluating the Progressive Realisation of Socio-Economic Rights in South Africa' (2015) Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute.

Hannah Dawson 'Public participation and citizen-based monitoring in realising socio-economic rights' (2014) Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute, Policy Brief 7.

Hannah Dawson & Daniel McLaren 'Monitoring the right of access to adequate housing in South Africa' (2014) Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute, Working Paper 8.

Khetho Lomahoza 'Monitoring the right to health care in South Africa' (2013) Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute, Policy Brief 2.

Hannah Dawson 'Monitoring the right to social security in South Africa' (2013) Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute, Policy Brief 1.

Hannah Dawson, Khetho Lomahoza & Tshego Monnana 'The right to social security and primary health care in Zandspruit informal settlement South Africa' (2013) Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute.

Stephanie Brockerhoff 'A Review of the Development of Social Security Policy in South Africa' (2013) Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute, Working Paper 6.

CONTENTS:

PREFACE	4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	4
FOREWORD	5
ACRONYMS	6
FIGURES	7
INDICATORS	10

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1	Introduction	11
1.2	3-Step Methodology	12
1.2.1	Step 1: Assess the Policy Effort	12
1.2.2	Step 2: Assess Resource Allocation & Expenditure	12
1.2.3	Step 3: Monitor and Evaluate Attainment of SERs	13
1.3	Objectives of Monitoring Tool	13

CHAPTER 2: THE RIGHT TO A HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT

2.1	The South African Context	14
2.2	International Frameworks and Treaty Obligations	16
2.3	Significant International Milestones	17

CHAPTER 3: INTERPRETING THE RIGHT AND CONSTITUTIONAL OBLIGATIONS

3.1	Constitutional Jurisprudence	20
3.2	Key Legislation and Policy Developments	24
3.3	Key Policy Developments	27
3.4	Conclusion	30

CHAPTER 4: BUDGET ANALYSIS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS AND RELATED MUNICIPAL GRANTS

4.1	Budget Analysis Motivation and Framework	31
4.1.1	Inflation and Nominal vs Real Figures	32
4.2	Overview of the Budget and Delivery Context	32
4.3	Recent Developments in the South African Environmental Sector	34
4.4	Over-arching Financial Management Trends: DEA	36
4.5	Budget Trends by Programme	39
4.5.1	Chemicals and Waste	39
4.5.2	Environmental Programmes	41
4.5.3	Biodiversity and Conservation	42
4.5.4	Climate Change Mitigation	45
4.5.5	Bucket Eradication Programme	45
4.6	Conclusion	47
4.6.1	Adequacy of Resource Allocation	48
4.6.1	Efficiency of Expenditure	48

	THE STATUS OF THE RIGHT TO A HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT:	
CHAPTER 5:	WHAT THE INDICATORS TELL US	
	5.1 The Development of Indicators	49
	5.2 South African Examples (Refer to Annexure 4 for detailed report references)	49
	5.3 International Examples	50
	5.4 Wish list and Limitations	51
	5.5 Indicators for the Right to Environment	52
CHAPTER 6:	CONCLUSION:	
	THE STATUS OF THE RIGHT TO A HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT	98
CHAPTER 7:	BIBLIOGRAPHY	100
ANNEXURES:		
	ANNEXURE 1: DETAILS OF MAIN PROGRAMMES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS	105
	ANNEXURE 2: ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT BY BUDGET VOTE (SOURCE: NATIONAL TREASURY)	106
	ANNEXURE 3: CPI TABLE	106
	ANNEXURE 4: INDICATOR DETAILS AND ANALYSIS	107

PREFACE

The **Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute** (SPII) is an independent research think tank that focuses on generating new knowledge, information and analysis in the field of poverty and inequality studies.

This working paper has been undertaken as part of the Monitoring the Socio-Economic Rights Monitoring Tool Project conducted by SPII in partnership with the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC).

Through a combination of policy and budget analysis and statistical indicators, the objective of the project is to provide a comprehensive constitutional and human rights based framework and set of tools to monitor the progressive realisation of socio-economic rights.

It is hoped that this project will be a useful tool for policy makers, for those that exercise oversight over the executive, including Parliament and the Chapter Nine institutions (particularly the SAHRC), and civil society. This paper in particular seeks to influence discussion and debate in relation to the fulfilment of Section 24 of the South African Constitution: the right to a healthy environment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

SPII would like to acknowledge and thank the various organisations and individuals that contributed to this report particularly for their valuable contribution to the policy review chapter of this report.

Please contact **Zukiswa Kota** (zukiswa.kota@gmail.com) or **Isobel Frye** (isobel@spii.org.za) for any questions, queries or requests, including around the data used for the paper, which we are happy to provide.

Funding is facilitated by the Foundation for Human Rights¹, which is funded by the Department of Justice and Constitutional Development and the European Union under the Sector Budget Support Programme – Socio-Economic Justice for All

FOOTNOTES:

1. Funding is facilitated by the Foundation for Human Rights which is funded by the Department of Justice and Constitutional Development and the European Union under the Sector Budget Support Programme – Access to Justice and the Promotion of Constitutional Rights

FOREWORD

"Trees are alive, so we react to them in very different ways. Quite often, we get attached to a tree, because it gives us food and fodder for our fires. It is such a friendly thing. When you plant a tree and you see it grow, something happens to you. You want to protect it, and you value it. I have seen people really change and look at trees very differently from the way they would in the past. The other thing is that a lot of people do not see that there are no trees until they open their eyes, and realise that the land is naked.

They begin to see that while rain can be a blessing, it can also be a curse, because when it comes and you have not protected your soil, it carries the soil away with it! And this is rich soil in which you should be growing your food. They see the immediate relationship between a person and the environment. It is wonderful to see that transformation, and that is what sustains the movement! People who live near the forest are among the first to see that the forest is being destroyed. People who live near water resources are the ones who notice that

these springs are being interfered with. People who are farmers recognise that the soil is being exposed and carried away by the rains. These are the people who should be the ones to draw attention to these problems at the local and national levels.

.....

The clarity of what you ought to do gives you courage, removes the fear, gives you the courage to ask.

.....

Courage. I guess that the nearest it means is not having fear. Fear is the biggest enemy you have. I think you can overcome your fear when you no longer see the consequences. When I do what I do, when I am writing letters to the president, accusing him of every crime on this earth, of being a violator of every right I know of, especially violating environmental rights and then of violence to women, I must have courage."

- Professor Wangari Mathaai.

Kenyan Nobel Laureate and Founder of the Greenbelt Movement, 2000²



Many communities in rural areas of South Africa live in areas of pristine natural beauty coupled with levels of social deprivation that lead to increased pressure on ecosystems and biodiversity as people try to make a living off the land.

- Photographer: **Ntsika Kota**

FOOTNOTES:

2. Extracts from a speech delivered in May 2004 entitled 'Speak Truth to Power' : <http://www.greenbeltmovement.org/wangari-maathai/key-speeches-and-articles/speak-truth-to-power>
The late Professor Maathai is renowned for her struggles for democracy, human rights and conservation in Kenya. She played an influential role on the African continent and internationally within the environmental governance sector

ACRONYMS

APP	Annual Performance Plan
AMD	Acid Mine Drainage
ENE	Estimates of National Expenditure
INEPG	Integrated National Electrification Programme Grant
RIBG	Regional Bulk Infrastructure Grant
BEP	Bucket Eradication Programme
ASEAN	The Association of South East Asian Nations
COP	Conference of Parties
CPI	Consumer Price Index
DEA	The Department of Environmental Affairs
DoRA	Division of Revenue Act
EIA	Environmental Impact Plan
GEF	Global Environment Fund
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GHS	General Household Survey
ICESCR	The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MIG	Municipal Infrastructure Grant
MTEF	Medium Term Expenditure Framework
MTSF	Medium Term Strategic Framework
NDP	National Development Plan
NEMA	National Environmental Management Act
NUSP	National Upgrading Support Programme
PES	Payment for Ecosystem Services
PM	Particulate Matter
Ppm	Parts Per Million
RDP	Reconstruction and Development Programme
RHIG	Rural Household Infrastructure Grant
SAEO	South Africa Environmental Outlook
SAHRC	South African Human Rights Commission
SANParks	South African National Parks
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SER	Socio-Economic Right
SPII	Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute
StatsSA	Statistics South Africa
UNEP	United Nation Environment Programme
UNFCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WfW	Working for Water
WoF	Working on Fire

LIST OF FIGURES:

Figure 1.	Summary of the 3-step Methodology	12
Figure 2.	Interactions between ecological systems, human wellbeing and social systems (Source: Constanza, 2000)	33
Figure 3.	Main Budget Allocations for the 2016/17 MTEF (Source: National Treasury 2016)	37
Figure 4.	Budget Allocation across all Programmes in Environment Affairs Department between 2007/08 and 2018/19	38
Figure 5.	Tonnes of Paper Recycled in South Africa since 2006	40
Figure 6.	Percentage Change in Allocations between 2014/15 and 2020/21	40
Figure 7.	Budget Allocation Trends for Biodiversity and Conservation, 2012 - 2018	44
Figure 8.	Community Reports of Limited or No Waste Removal by Province in 2016	46
Figure 9.	Overview of Schedule 6 Infrastructure Grants 2017/18 - 2020/21	46
Figure 10.	Schedule 6 Grant Reductions Between 2018/19 and 2020/21	47
Figure 11.	Access to Mains Electricity (percentage of population)	55
Figure 12.	Number of Households with Access to Mains Electricity, by Sex	56
Figure 13.	Access to Basic Sanitation (percentage of population)	56
Figure 14.	Access to Water (percentage of population)	57
Figure 15.	Number of Households who's Main Source of Water was Supplied by the Local Municipality, by Sex	58
Figure 16.	Access to Waste Removal Services (percentage of population)	59
Figure 17.	Rural Access to Waste Removal Services, by Province (percentage of population)	59
Figure 18.	Urban Access to Waste Removal Services, by Province (percentage of population)	60
Figure 19.	Metropolitan Area Access to Waste Removal Services (percentage of population)	60
Figure 20.	Number of National Parks	61
Figure 21.	Number of Visitors to National Parks	61
Figure 22.	Number of Black Visitors to National Parks	62
Figure 23.	Energy Generation by Source (TJ)	63
Figure 24.	Energy Consumption per Capita/MWh	64
Figure 25.	Paper Waste Recycled (tonnes)	64
Figure 26.	Total Waste Recycled, by Province (tonnes)	65
Figure 27.	Carbon Dioxide Emissions (thousands of metric tons CO ₂ equivalent)	65
Figure 28.	Methane Emissions (thousands of metric tons CO ₂ equivalent)	66
Figure 29.	Nitrous Oxide Emissions (thousands of metric tons CO ₂ equivalent)	66
Figure 30.	Hydrofluorocarbon Emissions (thousands of metric tons CO ₂ equivalent)	66
Figure 31.	Perfluorocarbon Emissions (thousands of metric tons CO ₂ equivalent)	66
Figure 32.	Fine Particulate Matter (PM 10) (micrograms per cubic metre)	67

LIST OF FIGURES:

Figure 33.	Emission from Eskom (relative particulate emissions in kg/MWh)	68
Figure 34.	Organic Water Pollutant Emissions per day (kg)	69
Figure 35.	Trophic Status of Dams (2012)	69
Figure 36.	Renewable Freshwater Resources (cubic metres per capita)	69
Figure 37.	Water Management Areas - Percentage Full (National)	70
Figure 38.	Provincial Summary- Dams Listed in State Reservoir Report (percent full)	70
Figure 39.	Total Dissolved Solids in Drainage Area, 2010 (mg/L)	71
Figure 40.	Total Sulphates in Drainage Area, 2010 (mg/L)	71
Figure 41.	Total Iron in Drainage Area, 2010 (mg/L)	72
Figure 42.	Percentage of Biome Protected, by Type (2015)	73
Figure 43.	Number of Ramsar Sites Protected	73
Figure 44.	Number of Biosphere Reserves	73
Figure 45.	Proportion of Terrestrial Areas Protected	74
Figure 46.	Proportion of Marine Areas Protected	74
Figure 47.	Percentage of River Ecosystem Types Protected, by Degree of Protection (2011)	74
Figure 48.	Wetlands Rehabilitation (cubic metres)	75
Figure 49.	Hectares of Invasive Alien Plants Treated/Cleared	75
Figure 50.	Proportion of South African Coastline with Marine Bioregions (2004)	75
Figure 51.	Proportional Protection Levels of National strategic Water Source Areas (2013)	76
Figure 52.	Number of Rivers Monitored by the River Health Programme	76
Figure 53.	Blue Drop Score (out of 100)	77
Figure 54.	Subjective Quality of Water: Not Free from Bad Smells (percentage of households)	77
Figure 55.	Subjective Quality of Water: Not good in taste (percentage of households)	78
Figure 56.	Subjective Quality of Water: Unsafe (percentage of households)	78
Figure 57.	Subjective Quality of Water: Not Clear (percentage of households)	79
Figure 58.	Ecological Footprint (hectares of biological productive land per capita)	79
Figure 59.	Percentage of Threatened Amphibian Species by Threat Category	80
Figure 60.	Percentage of Threatened Bird Species, by Threat Category	80
Figure 61.	Percentage of Threatened Mammal Species by Threat Category	81
Figure 62.	Number of Endemically Threatened Taxa (2015)	81
Figure 63.	Number of ISO 14001 Companies, National	82
Figure 64.	Number of ISO 14001 Companies, Provincial (2016)	82
Figure 65.	Number of TB Deaths, by Province	83
Figure 66.	Number of TB Deaths by Sex, National	83
Figure 67.	Infant Mortality (deaths per 1000 births)	84

LIST OF FIGURES:

Figure 68:	Percentage of Households that Experience Specific Kinds of Environmental Problems, National	84
Figure 69:	Food Access Severely Inadequate (percentage of households)	85
Figure 70:	Food Access Inadequate (percentage of households)	85
Figure 71:	Food Access Adequate (percentage of households)	86
Figure 72:	Community Experience of Irregular or No Waste Removal, by Sex (number of households)	87
Figure 73:	Community Experience of Littering, by Sex (number of households)	87
Figure 74:	Community Experience of Water Pollution, by Sex (number of households)	87
Figure 75:	Community Experience of Outdoor/Indoor Air Pollution, by Sex (number of households)	88
Figure 76:	Community Experience of Land Degradation/Over Utilisation of Resources, by Sex (number of households)	88
Figure 77:	Community Experience of Excessive Noise/Noise Pollution, by Sex (number of households)	88
Figure 78:	Community Experience of Other Problems, by Sex (number of households)	89
Figure 79:	Community Experience of Irregular or No Waste Removal, by Province (number of households)	89
Figure 80:	Community Experience of Littering, by Province (number of households)	90
Figure 81:	Community Experience of Water Pollution, by Province (number of households)	90
Figure 82:	Community Experience of Outdoor/Indoor Air Pollution, by Province (number of households)	91
Figure 83:	Community Experience of Land Degradation/Over Utilisation of Natural Resources, by Province (number of households)	91
Figure 84:	Community Experience of Excessive Noise/Noise Pollution, by Province (number of households)	92
Figure 85:	Community Experience of Other Problems, by Province (number of households)	92
Figure 86:	Oceans and Coasts Programme (unadjusted ZAR)	93
Figure 87:	Climate Change Programme (unadjusted ZAR)	93
Figure 88:	Biodiversity and Conservation Programme (unadjusted ZAR)	94
Figure 89:	Environmental Programmes (unadjusted ZAR)	94
Figure 90:	Chemicals and Waste Management Programme (unadjusted ZAR)	94
Figure 91:	Total Budget Allocation to the DEA (unadjusted ZAR)	95
Figure 92:	Number of Reported Incidents	95
Figure 93:	Total Number of Arrests	96
Figure 94:	Number of Inspections Conducted	96
Figure 95:	Number of Rhinos Poaced and related Arrests (2011)	97
Figure 96:	Number of Rhinos Poaced and related Arrests (2014)	97

LIST OF INDICATORS:

INDICATOR 1:	Access to Mains Electricity	55
INDICATOR 2:	Access to Basic Sanitation	56
INDICATOR 3:	Access to Water	57
INDICATOR 4:	Access to Waste Removal Services	58
INDICATOR 5:	Access to Natural Environment	61
INDICATOR 6:	Energy Sustainability	63
INDICATOR 7:	Waste Recycled	64
INDICATOR 8:	Emissions of Greenhouse Gas	65
INDICATOR 9:	Fine Particulate Matter	67
INDICATOR 10:	Water Supply	68
INDICATOR 11:	Acid Mine Drainage	71
INDICATOR 12:	Environmental Protection from the Government	72
INDICATOR 13:	Quality of Drinking Water	77
INDICATOR 14:	Ecological Footprint	79
INDICATOR 15:	Biodiversity	80
INDICATOR 16:	Responsible Environmental Management (Business)	82
INDICATOR 17:	Air Quality Impact on Health and Wellbeing	83
INDICATOR 18:	Health	84
INDICATOR 19:	General Environmental Problems Experienced	84
INDICATOR 20:	Food Security	85
INDICATOR 21:	Community Experience of Environmental Problems	86
INDICATOR 22:	Government Funding Allocated to the Department of Environmental Affairs	93
INDICATOR 23:	Environmental Infringements	95

CHAPTER ONE:

1. INTRODUCTION

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa guarantees justiciable socio-economic rights (SERs), including the right to a healthy environment for everyone in South Africa.³ Section 24(a) provides for protection of the environment towards ensuring the health and well-being of individuals, while section 24(b) concerns the forward-looking nature of the right to environment. This has important implications for the management of natural resources. In this regard the Constitution confers upon the state the duty to respect, protect, promote and fulfil environmental rights both by avoiding any activities that may result in a violation of the right as well as by engaging in activities that will result in the full realisation of the right. Sections 24(b)(i-iii) contain a range of positive obligations, which dictate that the state must be pro-active in realising environment rights. Such obligations include the adoption of progressive policies, resource allocation, planning and expenditure.

The 2nd South African Environmental Outlook Report cautions that if certain key environmental risks or 'tipping points' are not managed adequately, South Africa will be placed at considerable risk of not transitioning

along a sustainable growth path but instead towards greater environmental degradation. These tipping points specifically relate to water availability, land degradation and greenhouse gas emissions.

The Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute (SPII), with the support of the Ford Foundation and Foundation for Human Rights, and in partnership with the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC), has therefore developed a methodology based on a combination of policy and budget analysis and statistical indicators to monitor and evaluate the progressive realisation of SERs in South Africa. This methodology developed by SPII builds on international best practice and combines various ways of monitoring SERs.

For a detailed outline of the objectives of the monitoring tool, three step methodology and anticipated use and users of the tool, please see the 2015 paper entitled 'A Framework for Monitoring and Evaluating the Progressive Realisation of Socio-Economic Rights in South Africa'.⁴


FOOTNOTES:

3. Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, Section 24
4. Hannah Dawson & Daniel McLaren 'A Framework for Monitoring and Evaluating the Progressive Realisation of Socio-Economic Rights in South Africa' (2015) Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute. Available at: www.spii.org.za.

1.2 3-STEP METHODOLOGY

The methodology developed by SPII is based on three distinct steps (see figure below). These steps include an analysis of the *policy effort* (Step 1) and the *allocation and expenditure of resources* for specific rights (Step 2). These two steps assist in *monitoring and evaluating the attainment of rights* (Step 3) on the ground through specific outcome indicators. A summary of the three steps is provided below.

Figure 1: Summary of the 3-step Methodology



STEP 1: ANALYSE THE POLICY EFFORT

The first step of the analysis takes a closer look at the underlying policies and legislation guiding the realisation of SERs. This step firstly assesses whether the actual content of social and economic policies adequately reflects the **Constitution and international treaty obligations** and international standards that the state has ratified.

Secondly, this step evaluates both the **content and implementation** of existing legislation, policy frameworks and government programmes to assess what gaps (in principle and in practice) exist. This assessment is based upon a fundamental human rights framework that includes non-discrimination, gender sensitivity, dignity, participation, transparency and progressive realisation.

An important component of evaluating the policy effort is an assessment of the **policy making process** in terms of transparency and public participation in decision-making by the relevant civil society organisations and communities specifically affected by the policy under review. Another important dimension is to analyse the departmental responsibilities and institutional arrangements to assess the **capacity challenges and accountability mechanisms** currently in place.

STEP 2: ASSESS RESOURCE ALLOCATION & EXPENDITURE

The second step assesses the reasonableness of the budgetary priorities in light of the obligations on the state and human right principles and standards. This requires an analysis of *first*, the **generation of government revenue**.

Second, an analysis of the **allocation and expenditure of such resources** to reduce disparities, prioritise the most vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, and progressively realise SERs, must take place. This step uses various budget analysis techniques to monitor planned (i.e. budget allocations) and actual resource expenditures at both national and provincial levels and therefore assesses the delivery and implementation of government policy and programmes as they relate to the realisation of rights.

Third, an analysis of the **budget cycle process** from the perspective of human rights principles of participation, non-discrimination, transparency and accountability. An assessment of resource availability cannot be separated from an analysis of institutional arrangements, human resources and local capacity which are necessary for the efficient and effective spending of budgets.

STEP 3: EVALUATE & MONITOR ATTAINMENT OF SERs

The third step measures the enjoyment of rights by rights holders and therefore monitors and evaluates the state's obligation to fulfil the realisation of SERs. This step evaluates the state's performance via the development of statistical indicators which provide a clearer and more specific illustration of SERs enjoyment on the ground over time. The outcome indicators make reference to the three dimensions of access (physical and economic), quality and adequacy over time. This requires that quantifiable and replicable indicators (proxies for the different dimensions of SERs) be developed along with agreed benchmarks and targets.

The indicators need to be aligned to data that is freely and easily available in annual surveys and data sets, and must be capable of being decomposed (disaggregated) by region, race, gender and age – wherever possible and useful. This allows disparities between e.g. different population groups or geographical region to be identified, and an assessment of the extent to which progress has been made over time.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF MONITORING TOOL

The 3-step methodology provides a comprehensive framework from which to monitor and assess progress made to date. *The purpose of the tool, however, goes beyond constitutional compliance and aims to achieve specific objectives:*

Clarify and unpack the **content of the SERs** and the **obligations on the State** to ensure access to and enjoyment of SERs is continuously broadened.

Determine the extent to which organs of the State have respected, protected, promoted and fulfilled their obligations. This involves identifying achievements, deprivations, disparities, and regression to illuminate both **causation and accountability** in terms of policies, resources spent, implementation and institutional capacity.

Provide **evidence** for **advocacy initiatives** and **legal interventions**, and make **recommendations** that will ensure the protection, development and universal enjoyment of SERs.

By applying the 3-step methodology, this paper provides a comprehensive analysis of the status of the right to a healthy environment in South Africa.

Chapter 2 of this report explores the content of the right to healthy environment

Chapter 3 then outlines key policy and legislative developments in relation to the environmental sector

Chapter 4 provides an assessment of the allocations and spending performance of the Department of Environmental Affairs primarily at the national level, as well as related municipal grants as a means of interrogating the adequacy, efficiency and effectiveness of government's budgeting for the right to healthy, protected environment.

Chapter 5 provides an explanation of the process of developing performance and impact indicators that can be tracked and monitored over time and a discussion of what these indicators tell us.

Chapter 6 combines the policy and budget analysis with evidence from indicators. This chapter provides an overall analysis of the status of the right to a healthy environment along with key recommendations aimed at contributing to enhancing steps towards the fulfilment of the right to a safe, healthy environment that is protected for present and future generations.

CHAPTER TWO:

THE RIGHT TO A HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT

2.1 THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT

South Africa is a water scarce country with a highly variable climate and runoff further exacerbated by climate change and climate change-related risks and uncertainties. Recent drought events have further highlighted the threat posed by these factors on the country's socio-economic stability. In addition to this –the country is faced with a future of increased frequency of intense weather events such as flooding which will have – and have had – a disproportionate impact on the most vulnerable.⁵ In 2016 South Africa was rated as the third largest economy after Nigeria and Egypt.⁶ By January 2018, South Africa remained in the top three – this time, according to the World Bank, alongside Angola and Nigeria. Rising government debt and fiscal slippage are key trends alongside strong positive growth within South Africa's agricultural sector.⁷ The country is also listed amongst the world's richest areas in terms of its biodiversity; being one of seventeen 'megadiverse' countries. This list of countries possesses less than 10% of the earth's surface despite supporting more than 70% of terrestrial biological diversity.⁸ This impressive economic and ecological context belies a complex socio-political history. The damage done by the policies of the racist apartheid government are keenly felt throughout South Africa, even 22 years after the advent of democracy.

The human rights landscape in South Africa is informed by the legacy of a system that

systematically ignored the fundamental rights of the majority of its people. One of the key objectives of the apartheid government, for instance, centred on a separate development ideology that, unlike in many other countries with similar policies, was also supported by strict legislation. As a consequence, the most socio-economically vulnerable (black majority) were disproportionately affected and forced to inhabit degraded environments that were also devoid of basic amenities such as sanitation, water, housing and waste removal. In many areas unsustainable land use practices resulting from conditions of overcrowding and resource deprivation further exacerbated the degradation of the natural environment.⁹ Unsustainable stocking rates combined with highly erodible soils and the dynamics inherent to communal land tenure had a heavy environmental impact (Meadows & Hoffman, 2003 in Bhorat et al. 2014).

In addition to this, marginalized rural communities were particularly prone to illnesses resulting from the use of fuelwood and other forms of energy with adverse environmental and respiratory impacts. The rich natural wealth of South Africa was directed almost completely towards enhancing the lifestyles of a minority, and resources were extremely unequally distributed with the majority of the people confined to 13% of the land by the Natives Land Act of 1913. Developments during apartheid were

FOOTNOTES:

5. Department of Environmental Affairs. Undated. National Climate Change Whitepaper: https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/legislations/national_climatechange_response_whitepaper.pdf
6. KPMG South Africa. May 2016. South African Economy not the Second largest in Africa Anymore www.sablog.kpmg.co.za/2016/05/south-africa-slips-to-third-largest-economy-on-the-continent/
7. World Bank. January 2018. Global Economic Prospects: Sub-Saharan Africa Analysis, <http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/575011512062621151/Global-Economic-Prospects-Jan-2018-Sub-Saharan-Africa-analysis.pdf>
8. Conservation International 2016
9. Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism. 1996, Green Paper on Environmental Policy for South Africa: Green Paper for Public Discussion October 1996.

focused on resource extraction and were highly unsustainable (Fox & Rowntree 2000). According to the Department of Health (2013:10); “...the health of poor urban people in South Africa is threatened more by environmental degradation caused by others than by lifestyle choices.” It is also worth highlighting that some of the major risk factors include air pollution, poor sanitation and hygiene, disease vectors chemical hazards and inadequate access to safe drinking water (Department of Health 2013).

The historical context shaping current South African environmental legislation is not only long (spanning hundreds of years of colonial and apartheid hegemony), but also complex. Various forms of natural conservation policies existed alongside laws enforcing inequality in access to and enjoyment of the country’s natural resources. Rabie (1991 in Fox & Rowntree 2000) sites examples of water pollution legislation in South African common law as early as 1652 and the proclamation of conservation areas in the former Cape Colony and Transkei areas from 1888.¹⁰ The progression of South African environmental legislation after World War 2 till 1970, according to Fox and Rowntree (2000), includes key watershed moments for the protection of natural resources in South Africa and globally.

With the advent of democracy came the recognition that the right to environment was a right long denied to the vast majority of South Africans. Section 24 of the South African Constitution therefore made the protection of the environment an important part of rectifying the unjust policies of the past. However, the task of ensuring that all have the right to an environment that is healthy, promotes wellbeing and supports development in a sustainable way is met with many challenges. This has meant that the people who are socio-economically vulnerable are also the

most likely to be adversely affected by climate change, unhealthy environments and polluted living and working conditions.

The poor provisioning of electricity and infrastructure requires many to still rely on dangerous and polluting wood, coal and gas fires for light, cooking and warmth.¹¹ South African economic reliance on resource extraction which requires dangerous and exhausting manual labour that is directly damaging to the environment combines with household pollution. This means that despite its relatively small population, South Africa is one of the world’s top 20 emitters of greenhouse gasses (GHGs).¹² Additional issues associated with primary resource extraction include long term environmental problems such as overuse and subsequent pollution of water, acid mine drainage, and the need to dispose of large quantities of toxic materials.

There are other impacts of South Africa’s reliance on resource extraction that have a direct bearing on human rights and underscore important questions in relation to the country’s mineral development and resource extraction policy processes. A key example is the Xolobeni Mineral Sands venture which, has been the source of a protracted battle between the rural Xolobeni community in the Eastern Cape and mining companies. The killing, in 2016, of outspoken environmental activist, Sikosiphi “Bazooka” Radebe who had been opposed to the proposed development was amongst two cases cited in a report published in 2017 by Global Witness.¹³ Similarly, in March 2018, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) launched an Environmental Rights Initiative to protect environmental activists. According to the UNEP, nearly 4 activists a week were killed around while doing the work to protect and conserve the right to a clean and healthy environment.¹⁴

FOOTNOTES:

10. Van der Linde and Feris (2010) emphasise that the regulation and protection of the environment are relatively new notion in South African law despite the continued provisions of certain aspects of environmental protection through common law.
11. Balmer, M. Household coal use in an urban township in South Africa, *Journal of Energy in Southern Africa*, Vol. 18, No. 3, August 2007: pp 27-32 www.npconline.co.za/MediaLib/Downloads/Home/Tabs/Diagnostic/MaterialConditions2/Household%20coal%20use%20in%20an%20urban%20township%20in%20South%20Africa.pdf
12. Nahman A, Wise R and de Lange, W. 2009. Environmental and resource economics in South Africa: Status quo and lessons for developing countries, *South African Journal of Science* 105(No. 9-10), September/October 2009: pp. 350-355.
13. Global Witness. 2017. *Defenders of the Earth: Global Killings of Land and Environmental Defenders in 2016*
14. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), 6 March 2018: Press Release: UNEP Call on Government and Business to Promote, Protect and Respect Environmental Rights: <https://www.unenvironment.org/news-and-stories/press-release/un-environment-calls-governments-and-business-promote-protect-and>

Finally, the overwhelming need for social and economic development has led government to prioritise economic and social development at the expense of environmental concerns. The result of these priorities is that the average South African's ecological 'footprint' (a measurement of the impact on the environment) of 2.8 global hectares (gha) is greater than the world average by 0.6gha and the African average of 1.6gha.¹⁵

The right to environment is thus a present and pressing issue for large numbers of South Africans. Without a healthy and pollution free environment, it is impossible for South Africans to enjoy many of their most basic rights. This was a fact clearly articulated with the introduction of post-apartheid environmental policy. The National Environmental Act (NEMA) Act 107 of 1998 stipulates that:

"...inequality in the distribution of wealth and resources, and the resultant poverty, are among the important causes as well as the results of environmentally harmful practices"
(NEMA Act 107 of 1998, Preamble)

2.2 INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORKS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

The concept of a right to environment is relatively new to the human rights discourse, having only gained prominence as a right in itself after the 1960's.¹⁶ As such, most international instruments developed before then do not explicitly refer to the right to environment. Nevertheless, human rights have been interpreted in a manner that recognises the right to environment. For instance, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) of 1976 notes that state parties must *"recognise the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living for himself and his family, including adequate food, clothing and housing, and to the continuous improvement of living conditions"*.¹⁷ The argument is often held that the right to a healthy environment should be included in this list.¹⁸ This is based on the premise that a healthy environment is essential for the attainment of an adequate standard

of living. Additionally, environmental rights are most often articulated in relation to public health. Further, protection of the environment is seen as an essential component of human survival and development.¹⁹ Article 12 (1) of the ICESCR states that everyone has the right to enjoy the *"highest attainable standard of physical and mental health"*, whereas Article 12(2)(b) notes that full realisation of the right to sound physical and mental health can be realised through *"the improvement of all aspects of environmental and industrial hygiene"*.²⁰ Similarly, Article 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)²¹ states that *"Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person"*, while article 25(1) of the same convention recognises that everyone has the right *"to a standard of living adequate for health and well-being of himself and his family"*.

FOOTNOTES:

15. Ibid.
16. United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, United Nations Report of the Independent Expert on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, John H. Knox www.ohchr.org/documents/hrbodies/hrcouncil/regularsession/session22/a-hrc-22-43_en.pdf
17. International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, New York, 3rd January 1976 www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CESCR.aspx
18. United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, United Nations Report of the Independent Expert on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, John H. Knox www.ohchr.org/documents/hrbodies/hrcouncil/regularsession/session22/a-hrc-22-43_en.pdf
19. United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), Analytical Study on the Relationship between Human Rights and the Environment: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, A/HRC/19/34 (16 December 2011) www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/HRCouncil/RegularSession/Session19/A-HRC-19-34_en.pdf
20. International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) (3 January 1976) www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/cescr.aspx. South Africa ratified this convention in 2015.
21. United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) www.ohchr.org/en/udhr/documents/udhr_translations/eng.pdf

1972 The notion of the right to environment as a human right was entrenched by the landmark United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, held from 5 to 16 June 1972 in Stockholm, Sweden. Based on deliberations and commitments made, the Conference released a declaration, commonly referred to as the Stockholm Declaration. The Declaration confirms the environment as essential to human well-being and the enjoyment of basic human rights such as the right to life itself. Principle 1 notes that, “[m]an²² has the fundamental right to freedom, equality and adequate conditions of life, in an environment of a quality that permits a life of dignity and well-being, and he bears a solemn responsibility to protect and improve the environment for present and future generations...”²³

Not only is there a right to a satisfactory environment, but also a responsibility to protect the environment for future generations through

inter-generational equity. The forward-looking feature of the right to environment makes it distinct from most other human rights. Its forward-looking nature is important given that most environmental rights are based on non-renewable resources and failure to protect the resources applicable to the right would mean that future generations are unable to access the right. Principle 20 confirms the importance of “*scientific research and development in the context of environmental problems*” and further, that states must support and assist the “*free flow of up-to-date scientific information and transfer of experience*”, the goal of which is to address environmental challenges.²⁴ The Principle is relevant here given the importance of having access to valid and reliable information, both towards resolving environmental problems, and to measure realisation of the right to a healthy environment, over time.

1980 On a global level, the World Conservation Strategy of 1980 was undoubtedly amongst the most important milestones relating to conservation. This document highlighted the importance of resource conservation through ‘sustainable development’ as well as the notion of the inextricable nature of development and conservation (Palmer & Neal 1994). According to du Plessis (2009), the African Charter on Human and People’s Rights, 1986²⁵ was the first international instrument to unambiguously distinguish the right to a generally satisfactory environment as a human right.²⁶ Article 24 of the African Charter confers on everyone “*the right to a general satisfactory environment*

favourable to their development.” The 1988 Additional Protocol to the American Convention on Human Rights in the Area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (Protocol of San Salvador), Article 11(1) also mentions the right to an environment, stating that “*everyone shall have the right to live in a healthy environment*”.²⁷ In addition, Article 18 of the 2003 Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa²⁸ (which South Africa ratified on the 17th of December 2004) declares that women “*shall have the right to live in a healthy and sustainable environment*” and confers on women “*the right to fully enjoy their right to sustainable development*”.²⁹

FOOTNOTES:

22. The gender specific language of this Declaration is an unfortunate result of social and cultural mores of this time period.
23. United Nations Environment Programme, Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (Stockholm Declaration) 1972 www.unep.org/Documents/Multilingual/Default.asp?documentid=97&articleid=1503
24. Ibid.
25. Ratified by South Africa on the 9th of July 1996.
26. Du Plessis, A (2009), Fulfilment of South Africa’s Constitutional Environmental Right in the Local Government Sphere. The Netherlands: Wolf Legal Publishers.
27. Additional Protocol to the American Convention on Human Rights in the Area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (“Protocol of San Salvador”). Available at: www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3b90.html.
28. African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights, Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa www.achpr.org/files/instruments/women-protocol/achpr_instr_proto_women_eng.pdf.
29. Ibid.

1992 Twenty years after Stockholm, the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development was held in Rio de Janeiro. At this event, more than 178 governments adopted the Rio Declaration as well as Agenda 21.³⁰ Glazewski (2005) notes that the Rio Declaration, which comprises 27 principles based on sustainable development, reconfirmed the principles contained in the Stockholm Declaration.³¹ The principles also include the right to public environmental information and public participation, the development of liability rules, the precautionary principle, 'the polluter pays' principle, the principle of environmental assessment, and others.³² The

principles also state that development must occur so as to equitably meet the "*needs of present and future generations*" in language similar to Section 24 of the Constitution.³³ Further environmental protection is recognised as being "*integral... and cannot be considered in isolation from development*".³⁴ In this manner, to undertake sustainable development is to protect the environment. The need for the representation of vulnerable groups (such as women, the youth, and disadvantaged persons) in environmental decision making is also mentioned.³⁵ Lastly, Agenda 21 is a plan of action to facilitate implementation of the right to a healthy environment.³⁶

2000s – Agenda 2030

Goal 7 of the Millennium Development Goals which was aimed specifically at ensuring environmental sustainability has now been replaced by a host of more elaborate, explicit Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). These include SDG 6 (clean water and sanitation), SDG 7 (clean and affordable energy), SDG 11 (sustainable cities and communities) SDG 12 (responsible production and consumption), SDG 14 ('life below water'), SDG 13 (Climate action), SDG 15 ('life on land').³⁷ The indicators used to measure the extent to which states achieved this target include the energy use from renewable and non-renewable sources, per capita carbon dioxide emissions, population with access to sanitation and water, ecological footprint and biodiversity. While the SDGs have been implemented for less than a year at present, the Millennium Development Goals Country Report (2013) shows, that although statistics are available for some portions of Goal 7, purely natural environment related statistics are lacking in some areas.³⁸ This challenge may become considerably greater given the ostensibly more comprehensive SDGs.

In addition to the instruments discussed above, there are a number of other international

instruments that entrench the right to a healthy environment. These include, inter alia, the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), United Nations World Charter for Nature of 1982, the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) Report on Sustainable Development (Brundtland Report) of 1987,³⁹ the United Nations Vienna Declaration and Program of Action (1993), and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), both of which South Africa has ratified.⁴⁰

Transboundary pollution is also a significant issue, with pollution and unsustainable resource extraction in one state potentially negatively impacting on other states.⁴¹ There are numerous treaties, conventions and regulations on transboundary pollution, including the Geneva Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (1979), the Harare Resolution on Prevention and Control of Regional Air Pollution in Southern Africa and its Likely Transboundary Effects (1998), the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Agreement on Transboundary Haze Pollution (2002). Unfortunately, measuring this

FOOTNOTES:

30. United Nations Environment Programme, The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, which was held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil on 3–14 June 1992. www.unep.org/Documents/Multilingual/Default.asp?DocumentID=78&ArticleID=1163.

31. Glazewski, J. (2005), *Environmental Law in South Africa*, 2nd edn. Durban: LexisNexis Butterworths.

32. Ibid.

33. United Nations Environment Programme, The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, which was held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil on 3–14 June 1992. www.unep.org/Documents/Multilingual/Default.asp?DocumentID=78&ArticleID=1163.

34. Ibid.

35. Ibid.

36. Ibid.

37. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Undated. The Sustainable Development Goals. www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/corporate/sustainable-development-goals-booklet.html.

38. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), The National Coordinating Committee for the Millennium Development Goals, Millennium Development Goals Country Report 2013 www.za.undp.org/content/dam/south_africa/docs/Reports/The_Report/MDG_October-2013.pdf. In particular see statistics related to proportion of land area and natural habitat.

39. South Africa was not one of the 21 representatives forming part of the Commission.

40. See du Plessis, 2009, pp: 48–56 (same as note 6 above) and Glazewski, 2005, pp.29–63 for extensive discussion of relevant international instruments. Also, see South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC), 7th Report on ESR, 2006–2009.

41. See Hanqin, X., Transboundary Damage in International Law <http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/samples/cam033/2002067377.pdf>.

form of pollution is extremely difficult. It had been hoped that this report would be able to provide indicators addressing transboundary pollution; however, there was insufficient data available to adequately measure this issue.

Finally, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Article 32(3) specifies that states must “*provide effective mechanisms*” to ensure justice for adverse environmental impacts on indigenous communities, and Article 29(1) protects the

environmental rights of indigenous peoples.⁴² The UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) further highlights the complex nature and potential breach of these communities’ forest rights resulting from conventional government legislation in various countries.⁴³ In South Africa, the CSIR recognises the important role played by ecosystem services in poverty alleviation. One such intervention is the Department of Environmental Affairs’ Working for Water Programme.⁴⁴

Table 1: List of Key International Treaties and Conventions⁴⁵

TREATY OR CONVENTION	PLACE AND DATE
Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development	New York, 25th September 2015
The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance, Especially with Respect to Waterfowl Habitat (the Ramsar Convention)	Ramsar, 2nd February 1971
The Convention on Fishing and Conservation of Living Resources of the High Seas	Geneva, 29th April 1958
The Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in the Atmosphere, Outer Space and Under Water	Moscow, 5th August 1963
The Agreement Concerning Rivers of Mutual Interest Between Portugal, Mozambique, Swaziland and the Republic of South Africa	13th October 1964
The International Convention Relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties	Brussels, 23rd November 1969
The Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter	London, Mexico City, Moscow 29th December 1972
The Vienna Convention on the Protection of the Ozone Layer	Vienna, 22nd March 1985
The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES)	Washington, 3rd March 1973
The Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer	Montreal, 16th September 1987
The Convention on Biological Diversity	Rio de Janeiro, 5th June 1992
The Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal	Basel, 22nd March 1989

FOOTNOTES:

42. United Nations, The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf.
 43. UN FAO 2000
 44. The Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR). 2007. Ecosystem Services Delivery www.csir.co.za/nre/ecosystems/.
 45. Adapted from Fox & Rowntree 2000 with some updated information.

CHAPTER THREE:

INTERPRETING THE RIGHT AND CONSTITUTIONAL OBLIGATIONS

The South African Constitution provides various guiding frameworks for the provisioning and promotion of a clean, safe and healthy environment. It entrenches substantive environmental rights. Section 24 of the Bill of Rights states that everyone has the right –

- a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and
- b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that –
 - i. prevent pollution and ecological degradation;
 - ii. promote conservation; and
 - iii. secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development.

Section 24(a) provides for protection of the environment towards ensuring the health and well-being of individuals, while section 24(b) concerns the forward-looking nature of the right to environment, which has important implications for the management of natural resources. Section 24, read with Section 7 of the Bill of Rights, confers upon the state the duty to respect, protect, promote and fulfil environmental rights. The state therefore has both negative obligations (must desist from any conduct that may result in a violation of the right) and positive obligations (to engage in activities that will result in the full realisation of the right) in respect of environmental rights. Sections 24(b)(i-iii), contain a range of positive obligations, which dictate that the state must be pro-active in realising environment rights. In accordance, du Plessis notes that section 24(b) provides an *“unambiguous, positive mandate directed at the legislative, executive and judicial branches of government”*.⁴⁶ This has bearings on the horizontal and vertical

applications of the right. This feature of the right to environment is particularly significant given the role that private actors play in economic development, which often occurs at the expense of environmental protection. The state therefore has a responsibility to provide access to remedies in case of violations, regardless of whether the violation results from actions of private actors or the state itself. As with all rights, it is important to note that the right to environment is read in the context of Section 9 of the Constitution and therefore respects the need for non-discrimination and equality. The Constitution also outlines responsibilities in terms of ensuring the delivery of services for a clean, healthy environment for all. Section 152, for instance, stipulates local government obligations. This must be read alongside the key sections in the Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000 as it also has important implications for budget allocations and programme implementation.

3.1 CONSTITUTIONAL JURISPRUDENCE

While there have been a number of environmental cases decided by the courts, most cases have had a small component of the environment, often with greater focus on associated rights such as water, land or housing. Generally, courts have heard cases directed towards the right to environment in relation to development.

Fuel Retailers Association of South Africa (Pty) Ltd vs. Director-General Environmental Management Mpumalanga and Others⁴⁷

FOOTNOTES:

- 46. Du Plessis, A (2009), Fulfilment of South Africa's Constitutional Environmental Right in the Local Government Sphere. The Netherlands: Wolf Legal Publishers.
- 47. Fuel Retailers Association of Southern Africa v Director-General: Environmental Management, Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Environment, Mpumalanga Province and Others 2007 (10) BCLR 1059 (CC). www.saflii.org/za/cases/ZACC/2007/13.html.

The Constitutional Court's consideration of this case serves mainly to highlight the importance of sustainable development as a means by which the right to environment should be considered. With Chief Justice Ngcobo presiding, the Court considered the question of social and economic development and the environment. It stated that economic and social development is necessary for the *"well-being of human beings"*, but that such development would not be sustainable without a healthy environment. In this manner, *"the environment and development are thus inexorably linked"*.⁴⁸

**In Minister of Public Works
and Others vs. Kyalami Ridge
Environmental Association
and Others [2001]⁴⁹**

The Constitutional Court (Chief Justice Chaskalson presiding) was unwilling to enforce the environmental protection aspects of National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) against the government's response to emergency housing for flood victims. While reiterating that government departments *"must carry out... environmental implementation and management plans"*, the Court nevertheless effectively ruled that the right to (even temporary) housing was more urgent than the right to environment.⁵⁰ More significantly, the Court determined that the provisions for environmental management

(including the need to ensure development that is environmentally sustainable) found in Section 2 of NEMA were limited to the "drafting and adoption of... environmental implementation and management plans, rather than to controlling the manner in which organs of state use their property".⁵¹

In addition, the Court interpreted the requirement for an assessment on the impact on the environment to be conducted when the activity *"will"* affect the environment instead of *"may"*; further weakening NEMA.

**In Government of the
Republic of South Africa
and Others vs. Grootboom
[2000]⁵²**

The Constitutional Court ruled that SERs are pressing, and that the state does have an obligation to fulfil such rights. However, the Court further ruled that SERs are subject to progressive realisation in accordance with the principle of 'reasonableness' and available resources. As the right to environment is a socio-economic right, this ruling would appear to directly impact on the realisation of this right, potentially delaying its implementation by the state in 'reasonable' cases. Although specifically focusing on the right to housing, the court declared that *"it is not possible to determine the minimum threshold for progressive realisation... without first identifying the needs and opportunities for the enjoyment of such a right"*.⁵³ The Court therefore did not supply a definition of minimum-core, apart

from to state that such a determination would require a large amount of research, and differ from one context to the next.

It is important to mention that, unlike other socio-economic rights, the Constitution does not include a stipulation concerning progressive realisation with regards to the right to environment. Therefore, although the right to environment is generally regarded as a socio-economic right, the judgements in the Grootboom case on the reasonableness of state's inaction with regards to the resources for the provisioning of this right may not be wholly applicable. The issue of progressive realisation and the right to environment should be more extensively explored by the courts.

**In Company Secretary of
ArcelorMittal South Africa vs.
Vaal Environmental Justice
Alliance [2014]⁵⁴**

The Supreme Court of Appeal ruled that the historical information owned by companies relating to their operational and strategic approach to the protection of the environmental must be made available as per Section 50(1) of the Promotion of Access to Information

Act (PAIA) (No. 2 of 2000). Further, the Court recorded that corporations *"must be left in no doubt that in relation to the environment... there is no room for secrecy and that constitutional values will be enforced"*.⁵⁵

FOOTNOTES:

48. Fuel Retailers Association of Southern Africa v Director-General Environmental Management, Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Environment, Mpumalanga Province and Others www.constitutionalcourt.org.za/uhbin/cgisirsi/2vQadOouUz/MAIN/129560026/9#top.
49. Minister of Public Works and Others vs. Kyalami Ridge Environmental Association and Others 2001 (7) BCLR 652 (CC) www.saflii.org/za/cases/ZACC/2001/19.pdf.
50. Minister of Public Works and Others vs. Kyalami Ridge Environmental Association and Others 2001 (7) BCLR 652 (CC) www.saflii.org/za/cases/ZACC/2001/19.pdf.
51. Minister of Public Works and Others vs. Kyalami Ridge Environmental Association and Others 2001 (7) BCLR 652 (CC) www.saflii.org/za/cases/ZACC/2001/19.pdf p 43.
52. Government of the Republic of South Africa and Others vs. Grootboom (Grootboom) 2001 (1) SA 46 (CC), 2000 (11) BCLR 1169 (CC) www.saflii.org/za/cases/ZACC/2000/19.pdf.
53. Government of the Republic of South Africa and Others vs. Grootboom (Grootboom) 2001 (1) SA 46 (CC), 2000 (11) BCLR 1169 (CC) www.saflii.org/za/cases/ZACC/2000/19.pdf pp 26 – 27.
54. Company Secretary of ArcelorMittal South Africa vs. Vaal Environmental Justice Alliance (69/2014) www.saflii.org/za/cases/ZASCA/2014/184.pdf.
55. Ibid p32.

**In Soobramoney vs. Minister
of Health (Kwazulu-Natal)
[1997]⁵⁶**

The Constitutional Court's judgement in this matter impacts on the state's obligation to provide for socio-economic rights. Chaskalson (presiding judge) ruled that the state's inability to provide treatment for Soobramoney (an unemployed, terminally ill man) did not violate his rights in terms of Section 27(3) (the right to emergency medical care) of the Constitution, as his required treatment was chronic. Instead, the Court ruled that the state's obligation in terms of Section 27(1) and (2) to provide health care was restricted by available resources. Therefore, the state should not be expected to provide for the immediate satisfaction of socio-economic rights in a non-emergency situation, where resources are not available to do so in a manner consistently across South Africa.

The Court defined an emergency as an *"occurrence that was sudden"* with *"no*

opportunity of making arrangements in advance", with *"urgency"* and *"immediate remedial treatment...in order to stabilise"* the occurrence in question.⁵⁷ In terms of the right to environment, this judgement shows that the alleviation of non-immediate threats to natural and human health may be limited by government resources. However, the interpretation of this judgement to allow government not to remedy environmental rights issues by claiming a lack of resources is only applicable if the right to environment is subject to progressive realisation. As has been mentioned previously, the right to environment is not limited in this manner by the Constitution.

A clear and authoritative constitutional ruling of the definition of the right to environment with regards to progressive realisation is necessary in order for the right to environment to be properly understood and protected.

**In The State vs. Blue Platinum
Ventures PTY LTD and Matome
Samuel Maponya [2015]⁵⁸**

Although only a magistrate's court, the decision of the court is significant in that it was the first time an executive of a company was held criminally liable for environmental damage. The

sentence was passed down, and the precedent it set may be used in future court decisions related to the environment.

DEFINING THE CONTENT OF THE RIGHT

The exact meaning of the right to environment as contained in section 24 of the Constitution remains unclear and elusive. Kotze and du Plessis (2009) argue that *"section 24(a) is exceptionally broad, and notions of "environment", "health" and "well-being" are each loaded with probable meaning"*.⁵⁹ Internationally, there is also the perception of a need for greater clarification and study on what defines the relationship between human rights and environmental protection.⁶⁰ Although section 24(b)(i-iii) is clearer on what positive steps the state must take to realise the right to an environment that is conducive to the health and well-being of individuals, it lacks clarity on the scope and reach of what it means to "promote conservation" or *"secure ecologically sustainable development"*. The Constitution's relative lack of clarity is a potential source of contestation. However, it does allow significant scope for the courts to interpret environmental rights, particularly as they relate to vulnerable groups. In this sense, the definition of environmental rights in the South African context is still evolving.

The Constitution does not state that the right to environment is subject to progressive realisation. However, it is important to emphasise the interconnectedness of all economic and social rights, including the right to a healthy environment. Further, there are elements of the right to environment which need to be addressed immediately, such as those which directly impact on human health, but which cannot reasonably be resolved without lengthy consultations and expense. Instances such as those which directly impact upon an individual's right to health in their living or working environment should be addressed as soon as possible. Where these instances constitute an emergency situation government must act immediately.

The vague and broad notions of environmental rights as contained in section 24 have serious implications for the planning, implementation and development of policies aimed at protecting the environment. Section 24 is helpful in this regard as it provides guidance on how the state

FOOTNOTES:

56. Soobramoney vs. Minister of Health (Kwazulu-Natal) www.saflii.org/za/cases/ZACC/1997/17.pdf.
57. Ibid p11-13.
58. The State vs. Blue Platinum Ventures PTY LTD and Matome Samuel Maponya <http://cer.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/S-v-Blue-Platinum-Ventures-16-Pty-Ltd-and-others--sentencing.pdf>.
59. Kotze LJ and du Plessis A (2009), Some Brief Observations on Fifteen Years of Environmental rights Jurisdiction in South Africa. http://law.pace.edu/sites/default/files/IJIEA/ciKotze_South%20Africa%203-17_cropped.pdf.
60. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, United Nations Report of the Independent Expert on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, John H. Knox www.ohchr.org/documents/hrbodies/hrcouncil/regularsession/session22/a-hrc-22-43_en.pdf.

can positively realise the right to environment. In particular, the state must put “*reasonable legislative and other measures*” in place. The courts have not yet defined reasonable legislative measures or what these other measures may entail in terms of this particular right, other than to say in *Soobramoney v Minister of Health* that a lack of resources is a valid reason for non-provision of rights in some circumstances.⁶¹ However, in contrast to other socio-economic rights, the fulfilment of the right to environment is not constitutionally subject to the reasonableness clause. The consequences of this have yet to be adequately considered by the Constitutional Court. The right is also subject to a number of general limitations contained in Section 36 of the Constitution.

Although a comprehensive definition of the right to environment is not available, the key aspects of the right include a healthy environment not detrimental to wellbeing and the concept of sustainable development, and inter and intra-generational equity.⁶²

The concept of ‘wellbeing’ is linked to health but is somewhat vague and harder to define; it can be said to disturb an individual without inflicting direct harm upon their health. For instance, a judge in the Eastern Cape High Court⁶³ declared that a “*stench*” in the working environment was harmful to wellbeing. The relatively vague definition of wellbeing has had consequences for the creation of indicators as it is sometimes hard to determine what aspect of wellbeing an indicator could be used to measure.

Health is both a quantitative and qualitative issue, however in terms of the right to environment, health impacts tend to be more focused on the negative effects caused by toxic pollution. For this reason, the indicators provided do consider certain human health related measurements. However, it was a challenge to attempt to include health indicators while still remaining focused on the environment. There are minimum standards of air and water quality (for instance) that the government must enforce to ensure the right

to environment is not violated.⁶⁴ An essential question is to what extent the state must act in a non-emergency situation, when acting would require a significant reallocation of resources.⁶⁵ However, basic indicators such as human health, access to water, food and sanitation must also be considered and are therefore represented in the indicators included in this report. Further to this, policies concerning the connection between human wellbeing and environmental health would be incomplete without an acknowledgement of ecosystem services.⁶⁶ Adding to this complexity is the extent to which these ecosystem services which are connected to the right itself can be adequately quantified and valued.

Sustainable development is mentioned in the Brundtland Report⁶⁷ and in Section 24 of the Constitution. It is defined as development that caters to current needs, whilst preserving the ability of future generations to meet their needs. Sustainable development is thus firmly linked to inter and intra-generational equity which requires that current and future generations are able to equitably enjoy natural resources. Therefore, to develop unsustainably and damage the environment prejudices the rights of future South Africans and is a clear violation of their rights as stated in Section 24 of the Constitution.

Finally, it must be recognised that as much as the right to environment is a South African concern, the complete fulfilment of this right will require engagement with regional and international institutions and companies. As an example the issue of climate change is only one of the many environmental threats that has both a South African and international element. Many factors that damage the South African environment operate on an international level and therefore originate outside of government’s areas of direct control.⁶⁸ Unfortunately, this is extremely hard to accurately measure and therefore indicators specifically addressing the concerns of transboundary pollution have been regrettably left out.

FOOTNOTES:

61. Kotze LJ and du Plessis A (2009), Some Brief Observations on Fifteen Years of Environmental rights Jurisdiction in South Africa http://law.pace.edu/sites/default/files/IJIEA/ciKotze_South%20Africa%203-17_cropped.pdf,
62. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, United Nations Report of the Independent Expert on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, John H. Knox www.ohchr.org/documents/hrbodies/hrcouncil/regularsession/session22/a-hrc-22-43_en.pdf.
63. *Hichange Investments (Pty) Ltd v Cape Products Company (Pty) Ltd t/a Pelts Products & Others* (2004) <http://cer.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2010/08/Highchange-Investments.doc> p 21.
64. See World Health Organisation, WHO Air quality guidelines for particulate matter, ozone, nitrogen dioxide and sulphur dioxide, Global update 2005; Summary of risk assessment http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2006/WHO_SDE_PHE_OEH_06.02_eng.pdf p 15. These minimum standards are good indicators of the right to environment and will be used as such in this report.
65. As an example, economically and strategically important oil refineries that refine 60% of South Africa’s oil are situated in the South Durban Basin near residential areas. The residents of this area have long had negative health impacts from the emissions of the refineries and thus had their right to live in a healthy environment damaged. The refineries are too economically important to close, but the community is too large to be relocated. The short case study in this report briefly considers this issue.
66. These are the service that human beings derive from the natural environment. An example of an ecosystem service is the (ISET 2008)
67. United Nations, Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf.
68. See Section 2(a) International Frameworks and Treaty Obligations for examples of international agreements that South Africa is involved with. Many international frameworks and obligations address issues such as climate change and ozone layer depletion that impact on, and are caused by the actions of, all nations. In particular, South African reliance on coal and relative over consumption has potential to contribute negatively towards global environmental issues.

3.2. KEY LEGISLATION AND POLICY DEVELOPMENTS

There are many acts of legislation dealing with the right to environment.⁶⁹ While a wide range of national legislation exists to regulate environmental management in South Africa there are also numerous province-specific laws as detailed below. It is also worth noting that while the vagueness of the provision for the right in Section 24 presents a challenge for definition and containment, the National Department of Health (2013) has defined the related concept of environmental health to account for;

“those aspects of human health, including quality of life that is determined by physical,

chemical, biological, social and psychosocial factors in the environment.”

Further- in relation to addressing environmental hazards, the Department states that environmental health refers to;

*“...the theory and practice of assessing, correcting, controlling and preventing those factors in the environment that can potentially affect adversely the health of present and future generations”.*⁷⁰

The most significant national and provincial legislation is listed below:

Table 2: Summary of Significant National and Provincial Legislation

LEGISLATION	DESCRIPTION
NATIONAL LEGISLATION	
National Health Act (No. 63 of 1977)	
Environmental Conservation Act (No. 73 of 1989)	The Act provides for the protection and utilisation of the natural environment. Specifically- the Act creates provisions for the relevant state authority to identify, name and declare a site as a protected area.
Mine Health and Safety Act (No. 29 of 1996)	This Act is significant for its role in regulating the mining environment in relation to the safeguarding of employees' health and safety. Amongst its provisions is employees' right to refuse to work under dangerous conditions as well as the promotion of general health and safety.
Water Services Act (No. 108 of 1997)	The Water Services Act provides a framework for the provisioning of water and sanitation services. Amongst other things- it sets service standards and norms and standard for delivery tariffs. Water services institutions are obliged by the Act to take reasonable steps to ensure everyone's right to basic sanitation and water supply.
National Environmental Management Act (No. 107 of 1998)⁷¹ (NEMA)	Potentially the most significant Act. NEMA mandates that <i>“development must be socially, environmentally and economically sustainable”</i> . In addition NEMA describes how sustainable development must take place and specifically mentions that Environmental Justice must occur so that the environmental impacts of development not be distributed in such a manner as to <i>“unfairly discriminate against any person, particularly vulnerable and disadvantaged persons”</i> . Finally, NEMA explains that environmental impact assessments must be considered with every application for environmental authorisation.

FOOTNOTES:

69. For a complete listing of all legislation related to the environment, please see: www.environment.gov.za/legislation/actsregulations and the Department of Environmental Affairs Strategic Plan <http://db3sqepoi5n3s.cloudfront.net/files/docs/110607stratplan.pdf>.
70. Department of Health National Environmental Health Policy 4th December 2013 Government Gazette no. 37112. P.7.
71. NEMA is an evolving Act and has had a number of amendments, including amendments in 2002, 2003, 2002, 2008, 2009, 2013, and 2014 that expand governmental powers with regards to environmental protection and give more emphasis to penalties for environmental infringements. Significant changes that the Amendments have made to the Act include increased powers for the Minister of Minerals and Energy that includes allowing the Minister to direct any holder of mining rights to upgrade their existing environmental management plan where the Minister is of the opinion that environmental damage may occur. A section detailing penalties for environmental infringements, and allowing for an increase in penalties and punishments, was added in 2009 and expanded in 2013. Environmental management inspection was also strengthened, with the inter-departmental Environmental Management Inspectors (EMIs), the Green Scorpions, being appointed in terms of the 2008 Amendment to NEMA.

Table 2: Continued.

National Water Act (No. 36 of 1998)	The Act explicitly recognizes water as scarce resource in South Africa and seeks to provide reform to National Water laws while allowing for the equitable allocation, redistribution and management of water resources.
National Forests Act (No. 84 of 1998) & Forestry Laws Amendment Act (No. 35 of 2005)	The Act and its Amendment is designed to allow for the preservation of national forests. The Act also extends the regulatory powers of the Minister of Environmental Affairs, as well as allowing increased criminal sanctions with respect to activities within forests.
Marine Living Resources Act (No. 18 of 1998)	This Act provides for the protection of the marine ecosystem and the sustainable usage of marine living resources in an equitable manner.
Local Government Municipal Systems Act (No. 32 of 2000)	This Act considers the means by which municipalities can move towards social and economic development in a manner that is “in harmony with their local natural environment”. Specifically Section 4(2)(d) requires municipalities to provide services in an environmentally sustainable manner. Section 78(1)(a)(i) mandates that municipalities assess the direct and indirect costs and benefits of any project including the impact on the environment.
Animal Act (No. 7 of 2002)	This Act relates to regulations pertaining to animal health.
Mining and Petroleum Resources Development Act (MRPDA) (No. 28 of 2002)	The Act is designed to ensure sustainable and equitable extraction and utilisation of South Africa’s natural resources. The Act specifically mentions the need for greater participation of previously disadvantaged groups in the mining sector. Further, the Act requires “holders of mining and production rights” to “contribute towards the socio-economic development of the areas in which they are operating”.
Environment Conservation Amendment Act (No. 50 of 2003)	This Act concerns the transportation and disposal of waste. More significantly, it discusses the regulations regarding environmental impact reports. Environmental impact reports are required to be done before any development may occur in order to preserve the natural environment and ensure sustainable development.
National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act (No. 10 of 2004)	This Act works within the framework established by the NEMA in order to protect biological resources and regulate their usage in a sustainable and equitable manner. The Act also establishes the National Biodiversity Institute.
National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act (No. 57 of 2003)	The Act calls for the creation of a national register of protected areas so as to ensure those areas are managed properly. The Act is designed to “provide protection and conservation of ecologically viable areas representative of South Africa’s biological diversity and its natural landscapes and seascapes”
National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act (No. 10 of 2004)	This Act operates within the framework of the NEMA and considers (amongst other issues) the sustainable use of “biological resources” in an equitable manner, as well as the protection of species and ecosystems considered in need of national protection.

National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act (No. 39 of 2004)	The Act seeks to reform the law regulating air quality in order to protect the environment by providing “reasonable measures for the prevention of pollution and ecological degradation and for securing ecologically sustainable development while promoting justifiable economic and social development.”
Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Amendment Act, (No. 49 of 2008)	This Amendment seeks to create clear accountability in the management of environment matters in relation to prospecting, mining, exploration or production to align to the Mineral and Resource Development Act to NEMA. The Act places this responsibility on relevant national Minister.
National Environmental Management: Waste Act (No. 59 of 2008)	This Act focuses on the lack of proper waste management and the negative impact this has on local and global health. It also considers the necessity of sustainable development in terms of avoiding or reducing the creation of waste through recycling, re-use and recovery. The Act also recognizes that waste can be used as a resource that offers potential economic opportunities.
National Environmental Management: Integrated Coastal Management Act (No. 24 of 2008)	This Act establishes a system of integrated coastal and estuarine management in the Republic. The Act ensures that development and the use of natural resources within the coastal zone is socially and economically justifiable, and ecologically sustainable. It further determines the responsibilities of organs of state in relation to coastal areas. Lastly the Act controls dumping at sea and pollution in the coastal zone.
Environmental Impact Assessment EIA Regulations 2010	Regulates the submission of an EIA which requires an assessment be done on potential impacts to the environment (including sustainability) before any development can take place.
National Framework for Air Quality Management (2012)	The development of this Framework in aligned to requirements in Section 7 of the National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act (No. 39 of 2004).
Infrastructure Development Act (No. 23 of 2014)	This Act reiterates the requirement for an environmental assessment in terms of NEMA with respect to any strategic integrated project.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION⁷²

Orange Free State Conservation (Ordinance 8 of 1969)

Orange Free State Townships (Ordinance 9 of 1969)

Natal Nature Conservation (Ordinance 15 of 1974)

Gauteng Nature Conservation (Ordinance 12 of 1983)

FOOTNOTES:

72. Van der Linde and Feris (2010) characterise environmental frameworks at the provincial and local government as providing complementary – and unique – support to South African environmental law.

A range of important environment-related draft bills and policies were published for public comment over the preceding year.

Table 2a: Summary of Recently Released Draft Bills and Policies (Source: Parliamentary Monitoring Group⁷³)

Publication Date	Title
March 2018	National Environmental Management Laws Amendment Bill [B14 -2017]
February 2018	Draft Conservation Agriculture Policy
December 2017	Draft Carbon Tax Bill
October 2017	Climate Finance in South Africa
August 2017	Draft Waste Tyre Regulations
July 2017	Draft Mine Water Management Policy
May 2017	Marine Spatial Planning Bill [B9 -2017]
April 2017	Draft National Biodiversity Offset Policy

3.3. KEY POLICY DEVELOPMENTS

South Africa's environmental policy development has been – and continues to be – intricately connected to global policy discourse. The World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) was an international summit hosted in Johannesburg in 2002. At the summit, South Africa and the international community reaffirmed their commitment to the principles of the Rio Declaration through the signing of the **Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development**.⁷⁴ This Declaration focuses on sustainable development, poverty eradication, responsible use of natural resources, health and the protection of vulnerable groups. However, it has been argued that there have been no substantial *“positive impacts on reducing poverty, emissions and equality since this summit”*.⁷⁵

The 2011 United Nations Climate Change Conference was hosted in Durban on the 11th of December 2011 with the intention of developing a treaty to limit carbon emissions. Although a treaty was not signed, this conference nevertheless realised a serious commitment by the South African government and other nations to consider international treaties concerning environmental matters, especially those related

to climate change through the **Durban Platform for Enhanced Action**.⁷⁶

The Green Economy Accord of 2011 represents an agreement between government, business and labour in South Africa. The Accord, established after COP 17, commits each of these parties to tangible targets in achieving low carbon -based economic development growth through renewable energy. The Accord signifies the recognition (through its Commitment 2) that new sources of public and private funding will need to be sourced if green economy investment levels are to grow at the required pace.

The **Sustainable Development National Action Plan and Strategy** (2011), builds on the National Framework for Sustainable Development (NFSD) (2008). The Plan contains 20 headline indicators and 113 interventions and requires that the National Committee on Sustainable Development work with all sectors of society. The strategic objectives for the National Strategy for Sustainable Development and Action Plan (NSSD 1) include commitments to sustainable development and ecosystem

FOOTNOTES:

73. Parliamentary Monitoring Group (PMG), <https://pmg.org.za/committee/108/>
74. United Nations, World Summit on Sustainable Development: Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development www.un-documents.net/jburgdec.htm.
75. Rennkamp B., Energy Research Centre, University of Cape Town Research Report Series: Sustainable development planning in South Africa: a case of over-strategizing? www.erc.uct.ac.za/Research/publications/13-Rennkamp-Sustainable-Development_Planning.pdf.
76. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Draft decision -/CP.17, Establishment of an Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action https://unfccc.int/files/meetings/durban_nov_2011/decisions/application/pdf/cop17_durbanplatform.pdf

use, as well as promoting a green economy and responding to climate change. The NSSD 1 covers 2011 to 2014, with the NSSD 2 due to be launched in 2015.

The **National Development Plan 2030 (NDP 2030) / Vision 2030** is government's substantive vision for development over next fifteen years, and was launched in 2012. Designed to allow for *"interventions to ensure environmental sustainability and resilience to future shocks"*, the NDP 2030 considers a clean environment an important element of a decent standard of living.⁷⁷

In order to ensure sustainable management of the environment, the NDP 2030 dictates the need to:⁷⁸

Protect the national environment in all respects, leaving subsequent generations with at least an endowment of at least equal value.

Enhance the resilience of people and the economy to climate change.

Extract mineral wealth to generate the resources to raise living standards, skills and infrastructure in a sustainable manner.

Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve energy efficiency.

In order to achieve the above, the NDP 2030 requires that an environmental management framework consider that developments with *"serious environmental or social effects need to be offset by support for improvements in related areas"*.⁷⁹ The amount of land under protection must be properly investigated and sustainable targets set to increase protection where necessary. The NDP also requires that

a *"set of indicators for natural resources"* be made available in the form of annual reports to *"inform policy"*.⁸⁰

In terms of climate change, the NDP 2030 proposes that the 2010 Integrated Resource Plan (which calls for the procurement of *"at least 20 000MW"* of renewable electricity) as a means of reducing *"carbon emissions from the electricity industry from 0.9kg per kilo-watt hour to 0.6kg per kilowatt-hour"*.⁸¹ The mining and mineral processing sector must improve its energy efficiency by 15 per cent by 2030. The NDP further states that *"over short term, policy needs to respond... to protect the natural environment and mitigate the effects of climate change, long term actions require "realistic, bold strategies and global partnerships"*.⁸²

The **National Environmental Health Policy of 2013** is aligned to the NDP 2030 and is intended to serve as a framework within which South African Environmental Health Services should be provided. A key component of this framework is the inclusion of monitoring and evaluation responsibilities in the implementation of activities defined within the realm of environmental health services. This, according to the policy, includes the assessment of environmental risks and hazards including waste management, pollution control and water quality control. The policy also aims to give effect to the Libreville Declaration of 2008 and promote intergovernmental promotion for the implementation of its goals. Section 1 of the policy recognises the significant contribution of avoidable environmental factors to the country's quadruple burden of disease.⁸³ Lastly- the policy place an important emphasis on the need to recognise and address, particularly in relation to health determinants the distinct needs of men, women, children and special population groups.

FOOTNOTES:

77. National Planning Commission, National Development Plan 2030: Our Future – Make it Work (Executive Summary) www.education.gov.za/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=09T%2BvV0a5Sg%3D&tabid=628&mid=2062 p 24.
78. National Planning Commission, National Development Plan 2030: Our Future – Make it Work (Executive Summary) www.education.gov.za/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=09T%2BvV0a5Sg%3D&tabid=628&mid=2062, pp 37 - 38.
79. Ibid p 38.
80. Ibid.
81. Ibid.
82. Ibid.
83. This includes the World Health Organisation estimation that across the African continent, 70% of child deaths are attributed to environmental risk factors.

Operation Phakisa is an initiative designed to fast-track the realisation of the goals of the NDP 2030. The first phase of the Operation focuses on *“unlocking the economic potential of South Africa’s oceans”* and will be led by the Department of Environmental Affairs.⁸⁴

The **Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF)** is *“Government’s strategic plan”* for 2014–2019 and *“provides long-term coherence and continuity to the planning system”*.⁸⁵ Three MTSF periods are envisaged as part of the NDP 2030. In terms of this report, the MTSF considers environmental rights in the form of MTSF Outcome 10. The first phase of Outcome 10 of the MTSF (2014–2019) considers the *“creation of a framework for implementing the transition to an environmentally sustainable, low-carbon economy”*.⁸⁶ The second phase (2019–2024) focuses on the *“implementation of sustainable development programmes”* and targets *“a peaking of greenhouse gas emissions”*.⁸⁷ The third and final phase of the MTSF expects that emissions will be *“reaching a plateau by 2030”*.⁸⁸

The **National Groundwater Strategy of 2016** consists of a detailed review of the 2010 Groundwater Strategy and aims to enhance recognition of the strategic and valuable role played by groundwater in a water scarce country such as South Africa. It encompasses guidelines for the protection and management of groundwater resources.

The **Draft Strategy to Address Air Pollution in Dense Low-Income Settlements** was published in June 2016. The strategy is designed to address the threat to human and environmental health resulting from the exceeding of ambient air quality standards. Amongst the strategies proposed to address the problems are the establishment of a National Coordinating Committee on Residential Air Pollution and – importantly – the provision of subsidised, affordable energy alternatives.⁸⁹ At the time of publication – it was not possible to ascertain the stage at which the draft was within the approval process.

According to the MTSF, the government must protect South Africa’s *“rich natural and environmental resources”*, and *“capacity constraints in compliance monitoring and enforcement”* which must be addressed.⁹⁰ The most relevant targets for the MTSF in terms of this report are:⁹¹

Stabilisation and reduction of CO₂ (a 34% reduction in emissions of CO₂ from “business as usual” by 2020 (42% by 2025). Implementation of climate change responses in six critical sectors.

Increasing the percentage of the coastline with at least partial protection from 22.5% in 2013 to 27% in 2019.

Increasing the compliance of mines with the National Water Act from 35% in 2013 to 60% in 2019.

The MTSF calls for the creation of an Environmental Management Framework *“to ensure that policies and programmes address long-term needs and that unavoidable environmental losses are offset by investments in related areas”*. This also includes *“improved management of waste”* and *“investment in recycling infrastructure and services”*.⁹²

Outcome 10 of the MTSF is to *“Protect and Enhance Our Environmental Assets and Natural Resources”* and considers the following needs:⁹³

Sub-outcome 1: Ecosystems are sustained and natural resource are used efficiently

Sub-outcome 2: An effective climate change mitigation and adaptation response

Sub-outcome 3: An environmentally sustainable, low-carbon economy resulting from a well-managed just transition

Sub-outcome 4: Enhanced governance systems and capacity

Sub-outcome 5: Sustainable human communities

FOOTNOTES:

84. eThekwin Municipality website www.durban.gov.za/Resource_Centre/new2/Pages/Pres-Zuma-to-launch-Operation-Phakisa.aspx.
85. South African Government, Medium-term Strategic Framework (MTSF) 2014–2019 www.gov.za/sites/www.gov.za/files/MTSF_2014-2019.pdf pp 4 – 5.
86. The Presidency, Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, Draft Outcome 10 MTSF 2014–2019 www.thepresidency-dpme.gov.za/news/MTSF/Outcome%2010%20Environment%20MTSF%20Chapter.pdf p 1.
87. Ibid.
88. Ibid.
89. Department of Environmental Affairs 2016. Draft Strategy to Address Air Pollution in Dense Low-Income Settlements, Government Gazette Notice No.356 of 2016.
90. South African Government, Medium-term Strategic Framework (MTSF) 2014–2019 www.gov.za/sites/www.gov.za/files/MTSF_2014-2019.pdf p 29.
91. South African Government, Medium-term Strategic Framework (MTSF) 2014–2019 www.gov.za/sites/www.gov.za/files/MTSF_2014-2019.pdf p 30.
92. South African Government, Medium-term Strategic Framework (MTSF) 2014–2019 www.gov.za/sites/www.gov.za/files/MTSF_2014-2019.pdf p 30.
93. The Presidency, Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, Draft Outcome 10 MTSF 2014–2019 www.thepresidency-dpme.gov.za/news/MTSF/Outcome%2010%20Environment%20MTSF%20Chapter.pdf p 4.

Positively, the MTSF shows the government's recognition of the deficiencies in the current manner in which environmental concerns are addressed. It is hoped that the MTSF could lead to significant improvements in environmental management and protection. The **Back to Basics** programme has the potential to improve waste management and removal.

Other key developments in policy include The Gaborone Declaration, the Libreville Declaration of 2008 and the Cancun Declaration of Like Minded Megadiversity Countries of 2002; each of which recognise the significant role not only of diversity but of the role of regional government co-operation for its management and the promotion of human wellbeing.

The King III Report is also worth noting here given its considerations of socio-economic and environmental matters through a leadership,

sustainability and corporate citizenship focus. Zipplies (2008) in his critique of South African environmental legislation is at pains on the one hand to laud its progressive nature and on the other to criticise its weak implementation mechanisms. There is an extensive array of criticism levelled against the various National Environmental Management Acts (relating to air quality, protected areas, biodiversity etc.). These range from poor public participation mechanisms⁹⁴, inadequate focus on human health⁹⁵ and inadequate prioritisation of biodiversity conservation in relation to environmental impact assessment legislation. Researchers, law experts and environmental activists have made observations over the years indicating the need to acknowledge the dynamism of the environmental law, legislation and policy landscape.

3.4. CONCLUSION

It is clear that there is no shortage of international agreements and conventions that create an enabling environment for sustainable development and more responsible resource extraction and use. At both the international and national scale, however, there remain legislative gaps that constrain both the realisation of these principles as well as concrete measures of the right to a healthy environment. This chapter has illustrated the significant arsenal of environmental policy and legislation that has been developed in South Africa particularly post-1994. Underpinned by the Constitution and international conventions that the country has not only ratified but in some instances played an influential role in developing, the right to a healthy environment is undoubtedly integral to the state's human rights obligations. However, the poorly defined scope of Section 24 of the Constitution has limiting implications for the planning, implementation and development of policies aimed at protecting the environment. While Section 24 does state that

the government must put "*reasonable legislative and other measures*" in place, the courts have not yet defined reasonable legislative measures or what these other measures may entail in terms of the right, nor what it explicitly means to "*promote conservation*" or "*secure ecologically sustainable development*", for instance. On the other hand, there is significant scope for the courts to interpret environmental rights, particularly in connection promoting the rights of vulnerable groups.

Ultimately, while there is little doubt that South African environmental legislation is progressive and dynamic there is still a great need for deeper consideration of the inextricability of human wellbeing and environmental health. It is for this reason that the indicators discussed in Chapter 4 provide an important opportunity for policy makers in particular to consider the current chasm within the provisions and implementation of Section 24.

FOOTNOTES:

94. In relation to the NEMA Protected Areas Act No. 57 of 2003
95. In relation to the NEMA Air Quality Act No. 39 of 2004

CHAPTER FOUR:
BUDGET ANALYSIS OF
THE DEPARTMENT
OF ENVIRONMENTAL
AFFAIRS AND RELATED
MUNICIPAL GRANTS

**4.1. BUDGET ANALYSIS
MOTIVATION AND
FRAMEWORK**

The South African Government’s obligation to fulfil Section 24 – the right to a healthy environment – is dependent upon reasonable and appropriate budgeting at the various spheres of government. In South Africa, each year a Division of Revenue Act (DoRA) is passed by parliament setting out the division of nationally raised revenue among the three spheres of government: national, provincial and local. The portion of the budget allocated to the Department of Environmental Affairs for its programmes is divided across these spheres. This human rights budget analysis will look budget allocations and spending performance primarily at the national level of government and at related municipal grants in order to interrogate the reasonableness of government’s budgeting for the right to a healthy environment.

Applying a human rights lens to budget analysis raises several key questions:

Adequacy	Are resource allocations to the relevant departments and entities <i>sufficient</i> to address the need for environmental protection and human wellbeing, and are they <i>increasing in real terms over time</i> ? Are there any regressive spending patterns?
Efficiency	<p>Are the funds intended to fulfil this right being spent efficiently? I.e. in full and on their intended purpose? Are there any under or over-expenditure patterns?</p> <p>If so, why? Are institutions <i>capable</i> and prepared to spend the funds allocated to them and has adequate <i>planning</i> taken place to ensure that this is the case?</p> <p>If significant under-spending is occurring, are ineffective allocations being re-directed to better performing programmes? Are audits of spending conducted to ensure accountability and improved performance?</p>
Priority	Are these resources being utilised to prioritise the needs of the <i>most vulnerable</i> and to <i>reduce disparities</i> in access to environmental resources? Is the spending <i>equitable</i> and <i>reasonable</i> given the greatly varying needs of different sections of the South African population?
Equity	Are resources being distributed fairly across provinces and municipalities considering their respective social, economic and demographic conditions?
Effectiveness	Is the spending effective? Are <i>targets</i> being met? Does rigorous <i>monitoring</i> occur?

These and other related questions are fundamental to the realisation Section 24.

4.1.1. INFLATION AND NOMINAL VS REAL FIGURES

Inflation is the term used to describe general increases in the prices of goods and services in the economy. Inflation erodes the value of money because rising prices mean that R1 today buys you slightly more than R1 tomorrow. Departmental Annual Reports and Treasury documents tend to only provide the **nominal** amounts allocated in the budget each year, unadjusted for the effect of inflation. This makes comparing spending patterns over time difficult as the value of the amounts allocated in previous years (i.e. what they can buy) has changed. Therefore, when conducting an analysis of government budgets over time, it is important to take the effects of inflation into account. Converting nominal amounts to **real** amounts equalizes the value of money over time, which allows us to compare much more accurately the allocations and expenditures for different years.

Crucially, using real amounts tells us whether government budgets have increased in **real terms** each year, or in other words, if budgets have increased at a rate below, in line with, or above inflation. This is important because, if budgets increase at a slower rate than inflation, they really aren't increasing at all. For example, if the total cost of a state subsidised house

was R100,000 in 2010, and government was spending R1,000,000 on its subsidised housing programme, it would be able to build 10 houses. However, if the annualised inflation rate for that year was 10%, by the end of the year, the cost of a state-subsidised house would be R110,000. The cost of building 10 houses in 2011 would therefore have risen to R1,100,000. If government failed to increase its programme budget by 10% or more, it would no longer be able to afford to build 10 houses. That would mean less houses built per year, which could be seen as regression rather than progress on improving access to housing for the poor.

In South Africa, the most widely used measurement of general inflation is the Consumer Price Index (CPI), which is tracked by Statistics South Africa (StatsSA). Adjusting the nominal amounts provided in DEA's reports and by National Treasury in the Estimates of National Expenditure (ENE) to real amounts requires us to make a calculation using 'inflaters' which are based on the annual CPI inflation rate provided by StatsSA. The CPI inflation rate and inflators used in this budget analysis to convert nominal amounts to real amounts are shown in the Annexure.

4.2. OVERVIEW OF THE BUDGET AND DELIVERY CONTEXT

The South African National Development Plan outlines access to water and sanitation as well as a clean environment as central components of a decent standard of living.⁹⁶ Ensuring adequate provisioning for the former is dependent on infrastructure planning and implementation arrangements that are, according to the NDP, not only overly complex but ineffective:

"In general, human settlements are badly planned, with little coordination between those installing water reticulation infrastructure and those responsible for providing bulk infrastructure"

This poor coordination has a direct impact on the ability of the relevant departments to effectively allocate resources in order to fulfil their obligations to give effect to the right of citizens to an environment that is not harmful to their health or wellbeing (Vote 27). An additional mandate is that which is held by the Department of Water and Sanitation (Vote 36) to ensure the delivery of services in accordance with people's rights to sufficient water and food. Section 24 of the South African Constitution of 1996 guarantees everyone:

FOOTNOTES:

96. NDP 2011


- a) the right to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well-being; and
- b) to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that-
 - i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation;
 - ii) promote conservation; and
 - iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development.

The aforementioned complexity of the planning and implementation terrain is also reflected in related budget frameworks. One instance is within the allocation of funds to address critical water and environmental infrastructure projects, which is a function that currently spans across several different departments. As such, a thorough analysis of the extent to which the South African government effectively allocates and spends funds towards the realisation of Section 24 requires an analysis of the various interlinked programmes within and between departments such as Water and Sanitation, Environmental Affairs, Human Settlements and to some extent Health⁹⁷ and Agriculture. This, however, is not within the ambit of this budget analysis which exclusively seeks to interrogate mainly the resource allocation and

expenditure trends across key programmes of the Department of Environmental Affairs ('the Department' or DEA).

Determining government spending trends towards the realisation of the right to a healthy environment is perhaps as complex as understanding the legislative context governing this right. At the core of this is the assumption that government programmes in their design have not only accounted for processes of redress, equality and equitable distribution of resources, but that this has been balanced with an accurate valuation of the natural resource base necessary to meet this right in addition to mechanisms for its protection. This resource complexity encompasses economic, social, spiritual, cultural and environmental aspects (Figure 2).

Figure 2: Interactions between ecological systems, human wellbeing and social systems⁹⁸



The analysis focusses primarily – although not exclusively – on the resource allocation and expenditure trends within the National Department of Environmental Affairs⁹⁹ over the fiscal period between 2006/07 and 2017/18.

Constanza (2000) argues that in order to determine the value of something, it is necessary to quantify or understand its contribution towards achieving a specific objective. In the case of steps towards the realisation of the

FOOTNOTES:

97. An analysis of the policy environment relating to the right to a healthy environment indicates that in its definition of environmental health and in the formulation of relevant policy- the national Department of Health clearly envisions itself as a fundamental stakeholder in the oversight and implementation of key programmes to achieve a healthy, safe environment for all in South Africa. Specifically- the Department of Health is the lead department in the National Environmental Health Policy of 2013 which not only recognises the need for interdepartmental co-operation but calls on the functions of municipalities through- amongst others the Municipal Systems Act of 2000.

98. Constanza, R. 2000. Social Goals and Valuation of Ecosystem Services

99. While the Department has undergone name change(s) from its status as The Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism in 2006 it shall- for ease of reference- be referred to interchangeably as 'The Department' or 'DEA' throughout this report.

right to a healthy environment specifically and sustainable development generally, this budget analysis also attempts to provide an idea of how the South African government has attempted to weigh specific priorities in terms of investment of public funds (see 'investment' in Figure 2). In both the 2017 Medium Term Budget and Policy Statement and 2018 National Budget, the Minister of Finance lists the reduction of inequality, promoting public health and environmental sustainability as key national goals.¹⁰⁰ It is therefore pertinent to interrogate the extent to which the broader goals of environmental sustainability have been a focus of South African fiscal policy over the years by focussing on specific programmes. While some of these

programmes are specific to the Department of Environmental Affairs others are connected to other departments and – testament to the complexity of this topic – others involve more than one department. It is not possible within the scope of this analysis however, to consider the comprehensive list. It is also not possible within this analysis to interrogate fully the provincial and municipal performance and delivery although it is important to note that these are significant spheres of budget implementation and expenditure. Some of the programmes analysed, however, relate to Municipal Grants as per Schedule 6 of the 2016 Division of Revenue Bill and as such provide some insight to local government expenditure trends.¹⁰¹

4.3. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN ENVIRONMENTAL SECTOR

Over the past two financial years (2016/17 and 2017/18) there have been some marked developments in relation to legislative and policy amendments within the environmental sector that have budgetary implications. Amongst these is the introduction by the National Treasury of the Carbon Tax Bill for consideration by Parliament and for public comment. This – being the second draft of the Bill – was published in December 2017 with the formal tabling in Parliament expected by mid-2018. This follows the Minister of Finance's announcement in the 2017 Medium Term Budget Policy Statement.¹⁰² The move signifies the South African government's acknowledgment of carbon tax as an integral policy component of a national response to climate change.

In April 2016, South Africa along with 174 other countries ratified the Paris Agreement, signifying significant steps towards international collaborative initiatives in the transition to greener, climate resilient economies. South Africa has played a significant role in global climate discussions and research over the two decades of the Conference of Parties which has

included the hosting of events such as COP17 in Durban.¹⁰³ The most recent resolutions from COP21 and the resulting Paris Agreement signed in April 2016 will have important implications for South African policy makers and business alike.¹⁰⁴ One such change is the Carbon Tax Bill. At these landmark negotiations, the South African government was lead negotiator for the Africa group of countries and chaired the Group of 77 plus China.

The 2016/17 financial year marked the beginning of the country's voluntary implementation of the 5-year greenhouse gas emission mitigation system which is a commitment aligned with both the Paris Agreement as well as with the NDP. According to the Department of Environmental Affairs' 2016 Budget and Policy Statement, this would require businesses to submit carbon budgets alongside pollution prevention plans, amongst other requirements. In relation to state measures to address climate change and pollution, there are requirements for the establishment of more efficient transport systems that function on reduced carbon emissions.¹⁰⁵ South Africa's ratification of the Paris Agreement specifically requires that

FOOTNOTES:

100. www.vulakemali.gov.za/ <http://www.treasury.gov.za/documents/national%20budget/2018/sars/Budget%202018%20Highlights.pdf>
101. Republic of South Africa 2016, Division of Revenue Bill 2016/17 www.treasury.gov.za/legislation/bills/2016/bills2016_bill02-2016.pdf
102. The first draft of the Carbon Tax Bill was published in November 2015
103. At this – the 17th annual meeting of the Conference of Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) – 2015 was set as the deadline for the establishment of a new universal protocol to limit greenhouse gas emissions. It was envisaged that implementation of the protocol would commence in 2020. The UNFCCC is an international treaty adopted aimed at dealing with human-induced climate change.
104. The 21st Conference of Parties (COP21) was hosted in Paris, France in December 2015. COP21 was positioned as an unmatched opportunity to address the many shortcomings and disappointments emanating from a range of climate negotiation pre-dating it.
105. Department of Environmental Affairs, Budget and Policy Speech 2016/17 Delivered by Minister Edna Molewa 3rd May 2016 Available Online: <http://www.gov.za/speeches/minister-edna-molewa-tables-department-environmental-affairs-20162017-budget-vote-policy> Accessed: 7th September 2016

the country's GHG emissions peak in 2020 to 2025, plateau for a ten year period from 2025 to 2035 then decline from 2036 onwards. The Paris Agreement comes into operation in 2020, increasing the urgency of reducing emissions and meeting the commitments. According to the NDC, carbon tax is an important part of the package of measures to reduce emissions in tandem with appropriate regulations and incentives.

According to the National Treasury, the Bill will enable South Africa to "meet its nationally-determined contribution (NDC) commitments in terms of the 2015 Paris Agreement...and to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions in line with the National Climate Change Response Policy and National Development Plan".¹⁰⁶

The following is worth underscoring from the announcement by the Treasury;

"The actual date of implementation of the carbon tax will be determined through a separate and later process by the Minister of Finance through an announcement during 2018, or at the Budget 2019, taking into account the state of the economy... the implementation date of the carbon tax will be complemented by a package of tax incentives and revenue recycling measures to minimise the impact in the first phase of the policy (up to 2022) on the price of electricity and energy intensive sectors such as mining, iron and steel..."

And that as a means of minimising the impact on the price of electricity during the early stages;

..." a credit for (or reduction in) the electricity generation levy and the renewable electricity premium (built into the current price of electricity) will also be introduced. Some revenue recycling measures have already been introduced, such as the energy efficiency savings tax incentive ... to help with the transition to a lower carbon economy. The effective recycling of revenues to be collected will mitigate any possible short-term negative impacts on the economy and jobs."¹⁰⁷

The carbon tax represents an attempt at 'dis-incentivising' future carbon –intensive investment in South Africa and to effect the polluter pays principle by ensuring that the real cost of GHG emissions to the environment and society are accounted for in the prices of related activities. What remains to be seen, however, is how revenue from the tax will be utilised to further the cause and the extent to which innovation o support the development of clean energy alternatives can be supported.

The progressive rollout of renewable energy as outlined in the policy chapter of this report is central to national infrastructure development within the environmental sector. By September 2016, the Department had reportedly authorised 137 renewable energy applications, equating to 5719 Megawatts. In the 2018 estimates of national expenditure, however, the Department of Energy announced a reduction in the total allocation towards clean energy programme. In nominal terms, an annual average reduction at a rate of 15.8% is expected over the MTEF. This

is underpinned by overarching fiscal constraints but does not bode well for the sector and is a trend worth observing. In terms of fiscal responses to South Africa's commitments in the transition to a greener economy, the Green Fund was established in 2012. The Fund has a current budget of approximately R 1.1 billion and is aimed primarily at supporting research and innovation.

The Climate Change Adaptation Strategy also identifies priority interventions in areas such as agriculture, water and sanitation, biodiversity, health, human settlements, and Disaster Risk Reduction. A stark observation however, is the general lack of connectivity between the relevant departments in these sectoral arrangements and – perhaps more tellingly – in the planned budget allocations. A particularly missing link is that which should exist between the Department of Health's recently published National Environmental Health policy, and the explicit budgetary allocations. The policy as discussed in Chapter 2 of this report is progressive in its illustration of the interconnected nature of

FOOTNOTES:

106. South African National Treasury: Media Statement: Release of Carbon Tax Bill For Introduction in Parliament and Public Comment, 14 December 2017

107. Ibid.

human wellbeing, environmental health and safety and the range of socio-economic and environmental rights attached to this. In this way, the connections defined in the National Health policy and as illustrated in Figure 1 above that ties human rights intimately to the environment are not as clearly realised through the budget as will be outlined below.

The Department of Environmental Affairs is also supported through donor funds such as from the German Development Bank and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to carry out various climate adaptation and biodiversity projects. These are not included in this analysis, however but are worth considering for their contribution to what is an ever tightening fiscal envelope by many accounts. GEF funding for

WfW is based on the programme's unique model in which payment for ecosystem services (PES) forms a central component of the funding and delivery model.

The definition of PES varies widely. For the purposes of this report the GEF definition will be used. The PES concept relates to arrangements between buyers and sellers of environmental goods and services in which "those that pay are fully aware of what it is that they are paying for, and those that sell are proactively and deliberately engaging in resource use practices designed to secure the provision of the services" (GEF, 2014). In South Africa, GEF has provided funding for the WfW over several years based on its strong PES component.

4.4. OVER-ARCHING FINANCIALMANAGEMENT TRENDS: DEA

The ability of government departments and their accounting officers to manage funds efficiently, effectively and in a transparent manner and as prescribed by the Public Finance Management Act (PFMA) of 1999 has a direct bearing on the extent to which allocated funds are used for the intended purpose of addressing socio-economic needs. The findings

of the supreme audit institution can therefore provide important indicators as to the nature of expenditure management and general performance of a government department. Table 3 is an illustration of the audit findings by the Auditor-General of South Africa on the Department of Environmental Affairs over a decade since 2006/07.

Table 3: Audit Outcomes for the Department of Environmental Affairs: 2006/07 to 2015/16¹⁰⁸

Year	Opinion	Key Audit Findings	Expenditure outcomes as % of Final Appropriation
2015/16	Unqualified	No emphasis of matters	99%
2014/15	Unqualified audit	No emphasis of matters	99.1%
2013/14	Unqualified audit	No emphasis of matters	99%
2012/13	Unqualified audit	No emphasis of matters	96%
2011/12	Unqualified audit	The Auditor-General noted a forensic investigation into alleged fruitless and wasteful expenditure within the Zeekoeivlei Nature Reserve construction projects.	98%
2010/11	Unqualified audit	No emphasis of matter	96%
2009/10	Unqualified audit	Extensive unexpected effort was required to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to verify the performance against predetermined objectives.	99.8%
2008/09	Unqualified audit	Emphasis on two matters	99.8%
2007/08	Unqualified audit	No significant emphasis of matters	99.9%
2006/07	Unqualified audit	21% overall departmental vacancy rate-including the vacant post of Chief Financial Officer within the same financial year.	99.9%

FOOTNOTES:


108. Source: Department of Environment Affairs Annual Reports 2006/07, 2007/08, 2008/09, 2009/10, 2010/11, 2011/12, 2012/13, 2013/14, 2014/15, 2015/16

When considering the overall financial performance of the Department it is evident that there has been a generally stable and positive audit history over the years with unqualified audit outcomes representing the most common finding by the Auditor-General. Secondly, the Department has a history of spending between 96% and 99% of its annual budget across all economic classifications. It is noteworthy that even in a year where high vacancy rates were noted by the Auditor-General (including that of Chief Financial Officer at the beginning of the year) - the overall financial performance of the Department remained generally positive. This may be attributable to a longstanding or institutionalised strategy towards public resource management that has enabled the Department to mitigate against disruptions within its human resource domain. Under-expenditure of less than 2% of a budget is considered acceptable by normal accounting standards. It must be noted, however, that

given the fact that the Department is allocated less than 1% of the total national budget, any under-expenditure has potential consequences for the delivery of public services even where it may be within the acceptable region of accounting standards.

In 2018/19, the Department of Environmental Affairs is allocated a total of R 7.11 billion of which R 3.87 billion has been set aside for one programme alone. Figure 3 depicts the overarching resource allocation trends by programme. The highest budget allocation year on year is set aside for Programme 6 (Environmental Programmes) whose objective is to ensure the rolling out of expanded public works and green economy projects in the environmental sector (Annexure Table 1). Between 2018/19 and the outer year of the MTEF, the budget for this programme is set to decrease from 57.3% of the total allocation to 54.39%. Figure 3 illustrates an important budget shift in the Department's programmes.

Figure 3: Main Budget Allocations for the 2016/17 MTEF (Source: www.vulekamali.gov.za 2018)



In 2014/15, Chemical and Waste Management was allocated the smallest proportion of the total budget at 1.27%. This has changed in the 2018/19 budget with this programme seeing an increase to 6.09% of the total budget – the fifth largest. This equates to a significant increase of 28.48% in real terms from 2017/18. Programme 2 accounts for 2.63% of the budget and is intended to facilitate the creation of an environment in which enforcement and compliance with environmental law is ensured. The allocation to Biodiversity and Conservation was the third largest budget line item after Environmental Programmes and Administration

– at 11.2% of the 2016/17 budget, a total of R 718.2 million. In 2018/19 – Biodiversity and Conservation accounts for only 10.17% of the overall budget.


As discussed in preceding Chapters of this report – South Africa's energy generation regime continues to consist of a mix of coal, renewables and nuclear which is a subject that is heavily contested with many civil society organisations critiquing the state's responses to what is often termed an 'energy crisis'. In 2016, for example, the environmental activist organisation Greenpeace decried the

increased budget allocation for goods and services related to South Africa's nuclear energy investment, arguing instead that the allocation could be better prioritised to social programmes such as education.¹⁰⁹

Many environmental activists and practitioners have also argued that while NEMA legislation is itself strong- enforcement of environmental

law is weak. One such example is noted by the South African Institute for International Affairs in relation to the lack of technical skills at the municipal level to ensure adherence to coastal environmental legislation in the first instance and in the second where funding for some coastal management interventions competes with terrestrial interventions within a resource constrained context.¹¹⁰

Figure 4: Budget Allocation across all Programmes in Environment Affairs Department between 2014/15 and 2020/21



The Department has 7 main programmes; two of which are primarily administrative in their function i.e. programmes 1 and 2 (Administration and Legal, Authorisation and Compliance as seen in Annexure 1).

The majority of programmes in the Department reflect budget increases from 2014/15 (Figure 4). The most notable change between 2014/15 and 2020/21 is reflected in the budget for Programme 3: Oceans and Coasts whose mandate includes coastal conservation and management programmes. In December 2009, the Integrated Coastal Management Act No. 24 of 2008 was promulgated.¹¹¹ While it may be possible that this spike in expenditure related to the implementation of this Act, it has been noted that this is amongst the many progressive legislative tools that at the locus of implementation (local government) is often categorised as an unfunded mandate.¹¹²

It is therefore unlikely that this change was attributed to increased compliance-related activities. There is also no direct link made in the relevant Annual Performance Plan (APP).

From 2011/12 it is evident that the allocation to Environmental Programmes (Programme 6) far outweighs all programmes in the Department (Figure 3). This programme also accounts for the most significant increase in real terms over the entire period at 17.23% (Table 2). Between 2015/16 and 2016/17, however, it accounts for a less significant increase in real terms at only 5.25%.

The overall allocation for the DEA increased in real terms by an average of 7.45% between 2007/08 and 2018/1; that is from R 1.56 billion to a projected R 6.76 billion. Between 2015/16 and 2016/17, the allocation increased in real terms by a mere 2.76% (Table 2).

FOOTNOTES:

109. Greenpeace Africa, 11th March 2016, Fukushima 5 Years On: South Africa Prioritises Nuclear over Economy and Education www.greenpeace.org/africa/en/Press-Centre-Hub/Fukushima-5-years-on-South-Africa-prioritizes-nuclear-over-economy-and-education-1/
110. Chevallier, C. 2015. South African Institute for International Affairs (SAII) June 2015: Occasional Paper 218 Governance of Africa's Resources Programme, Promoting the Integrated Management of South Africa's Coastal Zone www.saiia.org.za/occasional-papers/831-promoting-the-integrated-governance-of-south-africa-s-coastal-zone/file
111. Another notable change resulting from the macro restructuring of several national departments was the split in 2009/10 of tourism as a standalone department from what was previously the Department of Environment Affairs and Tourism (DEAT).
112. Chevallier, 2015

Amongst the functions of the DEA is to ensure compliance with waste management legislation at various levels and by various public and private entities. This also entails providing support to municipalities for waste and chemical disposal. It is therefore noteworthy that this specific line item represents the lowest allocation across the entirety of the period under review. In addition the introduction of a programme dedicated specifically for the management of chemicals and waste occurred – according to the 2013/14 Annual Report – only at the beginning of the 2013/14 financial year in acknowledgement of severe underfunding of this important function at the expense primarily of poor, underserved communities.¹¹³ Within this context of environmental management, the lack of relevant technical skills and capacity in municipalities was an additional factor leading to the formation of the programme.

4.5.1. CHEMICALS AND WASTE

South African Municipalities continue to exhibit significant problems related to poor delivery of waste management services. In 2018 – it is estimated that South Africa generates 42 million cubic metres of waste per annum.¹¹⁴ Despite international trends to shift away from landfilling towards reuse, recycling and prevention and the country's own policies promoting this; South Africa still disposes of 90% of its waste via landfill sites.¹¹⁵ In essence – responses to the policy and legislative changes have been very slow. This underscores the importance of the Chemical and Waste programme which has in previous years seen marked decrease in its allocation.

Prior to the 2017/18 financial year, this programme received the lowest allocation – remaining below R 200 million. It is encouraging, however, to note a substantial increase in the allocation from a R 94.97 million in 2016/17 to R 417.34 million in 2018/19 (Table 4)). Amongst the stated objectives for the programme is to increase the percentage of waste tyres diverted from landfill sites in South Africa to 100% by March 2021. The current percentage of waste tyre diversion is 60%.¹¹⁶ Figure 6 highlights the impressive change in the allocation to the programme between 2014/15 and 2020/2; the highest and most significant increase across the DEA's programmes.

In spite of the government's underscoring of this sector as a source of jobs, the realisation of this as both for both job creation and as an effective response to the country's burgeoning waste management problems is still far from being achieved. An objective of this programme is also to provide opportunities for income generation through waste management and despite this being a potentially lucrative industry – poor

governance and lack of capacity continue to pose serious obstacles (Godfrey & Oelofse, 2017; Burger, 2014). Recycling targets across all waste streams remain unmet in all provinces and while governance failures are noted there is undoubtedly a need to reconsider the viability of this programme at the current funding levels and strategies.


Solid waste management in South Africa is a function of municipalities as specified in Section 156(1) (a) of the Constitution. By 2012, the South African government was supposed to have provided all households with access to proper waste removal services. This target has not been met and although significant progress has been made towards achieving it, lack of access remains highest in rural municipalities (Fakoya, 2014). More detail is provided in Chapter 5 of this report. Figure 8 depicts the number of reports by province by communities of limited or no waste collection at the municipal level. Three provinces; Mpumalanga, Kwazulu-Natal and Gauteng are notable with the highest numbers of reports. A mix of highly congested, high growth settlements and poor performing municipalities influences low or no waste management.

Further to this, Fakoya (2014) lists municipal administrative weakness, officials' lack of awareness of the breadth and scope of waste management requirements and mismatched technical skills in core operational positions. This is a criticism shared by Mjoli (2012) with a similar view that staff appointed to either carry out planning, oversight or actual implement of waste management programmes are often not able to fulfil their performance indicators due to being underskilled.

FOOTNOTES:

113. Despite this assertion – the programme was allocated funds in the two financial years preceding 2013/14 and in the years prior to that – components of waste management formed part of another programme.
114. McNeill, J. 2018. BizTrends 2018: Innovation critical to the Future of Waste Management in South Africa: <http://www.bizcommunity.com/Article/196/721/171976.html>
115. Godfrey, L. and Oelofse, S. 2017. Historical Review of Waste Management and Recycling in South Africa. Resources 6 (57)
116. National Treasury 2018. Estimates of National Expenditure: Vote 27: Environmental Affairs, p.570

Figure 5: Tonnes of Paper Recycled in South Africa between 2006 and 2017



The management of waste or lack thereof in South Africa is undoubtedly both an environmental and social justice issue. A result of apartheid-era spatial planning policies was that black people were forced to live near polluted mining land, industrial dumps and landfills. While waste services were well-developed in urban, mainly white settlements, the opposite was true in township and rural areas where the majority lived. According to Hallowes (2011) the accumulation of human waste, uncollected refuse, air pollution and contaminated water continues to be part of the realities faced by many residents of South

African townships - as highlighted in Chapter 5 of this report.

The inequality of the system is exacerbated by the fact that more affluent communities whose waste is also better managed – generate more waste than poorer communities who effectively live closer to the peripheries where such waste is ultimately dumped. The DEA¹¹⁷ outlines the fact that while population growth is slowing down in South Africa, households’ demand for goods and services is increasing as are the numbers of households which has a direct influence on waste and waste management systems.

Figure 6: Average Percentage Change in Allocations between 2014/15 and 2020/21 in real terms




Figure 4 illustrates the overall budget trends for the entire Department. A notable change in the overall allocation between 2014/15 and 2020/21 is that of a mere 7.45% increase in the budget in real terms. Over the MTEF the Department has been allocated in real terms a mere increase of 1.21%. Changes that are indicative of aforementioned budget

priorities include a 11.03% nominal increase in the Climate and Air Quality budget and a substantial 31.85% for Chemical and Waste Management between 2017 and 2018. Interestingly the long term budget allocations for Waste Management also reflect the single highest increase in real terms over the MTEF at 32.5%. The overall Department budget over

FOOTNOTES:

117. Department of Environmental Affairs, SOER 2016

the MTEF sees a mere 1.97% increase from 2017/18.

Also worth noting is the decrease in allocation for Climate Change and Air Quality at a between 2017/18 and 2018/19; 2.67% in real terms, reflecting negatively on overall responses in budgetary terms by the state

to climate change priorities. Similarly – over the MTEF – the programme’s allocation is expected to increase by a negligible 2.04% in real terms. This year-on-year decrease, however, is likely cushioned by funding from international donors which is a feature of DEA budgets.

Table 4: Overall DEA Budget:
2014/15 –2020/21

R Million	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18 Adjusted Appropriation	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Average Nominal % Change (2014 to 2021)
Administration	731.34	832.49	827.90	863.05	948.20	1 021.95	1 090.01	5.12%
Legal, Authorisations & Compliance	100.62	131.42	154.30	179.78	189.32	203.47	217.23	10.10%
Oceans & Coasts	349.26	368.66	502.68	468.46	492.00	508.05	538.73	5.57%
Climate Change & Air Quality	229.29	246.11	295.48	294.87	294.51	305.69	323.79	4.41%
Biodiversity & Conversation	643.07	699.86	738.72	696.52	773.35	800.15	845.83	3.49%
Environmental Programmes	3 549.61	3 579.64	3 766.91	392.82	387.13	4 106.96	4 334.53	2.53%
Chemicals & Waste Management	71.88	79.74	94.97	417.34	550.25	585.58	619.13	36.02%
Total	5 675.06	5 937.92	6 380.97	6 848.21	7 112.53	7 531.84	7 969.31	4.34%

4.5.2. ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMMES

As mentioned previously, this programme is allocated the single largest budget of all the programmes of the DEA. The mandate of this programme is therefore high on the government’s priority list. Two sub programmes in particular stand out: the Environmental Protection and Infrastructure Programme and the Working for Water and Working on Fire Programme. Both of these programmes have a long history and were initially interdepartmental in terms of their administration. Working for Water (WfW) emanated from the realisation by the South African government of the interplay between economic development and ecological health and therefore of the need for state

interventions in the environmental sector to take this fact into account. The inception of this programme was officially in 1995 under the leadership of the Minister of Water Affairs and Forestry, Kader Asmal.¹¹⁸ The programme initially involved the Departments of Water Affairs and Forestry, the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism and the Department of Agriculture. From its inception it has had a strong focus on ensuring socio economic benefits from activities within the environmental sector. The current version of the programme has the following amongst its strategic objectives:

FOOTNOTES:

118. UNEP undated

1. Ecosystem services restored and maintained
2. Enhanced contribution of the environmental sector towards sustainable development and transition to a green economy
3. Improved socio economic benefits within the environmental sector¹¹⁹

Between 2012/13 and the end of the 2016/17 MTEF both the WfW, WoF and Environmental Protection sub-programmes combined were allocated more than 90% of the total budget with the exception of the 2015/16 appropriation of 89.9%, likely as a result of a trade-off with the Green Fund allocation. The Green Fund increased from R 250 million in 2014/15 to R 300 million in 2015/16. In 2018/19 – 98% of the sub programme's budget was set to be shared between these two programmes; a total of R 3.90 billion. Focussing on the individual programmes, the larger proportion of the budget is allocated to the WoF and WfW programmes annually. This allocation rose from R 1.45 billion in 2012/13 to a projected R 2.41 billion in 2018/19 representing an average increase over the entire period in real terms of 4.38%. A less positive change over the period under review can be seen for the first sub programme which has decreased by an average of 0.57% since 2012 and by 13.91% between 2015/16 and the current financial year (Table 3).

The importance of the WfW sub programmes cannot be underestimated. Turpie et al. (2008), for instance, state that WfW has been hailed as one of the most successful interventions of its kind based on its accomplishments in relation to social empowerment, water conservation and biodiversity. It is estimated that the ecological cost of the alien invasive plants and animals

-which the programme seeks to address – are in excess of R 6,500 million per annum.¹²⁰ These impacts are most heavily felt through losses in agriculture harvests and a reduction in ecosystem services such as grazing and water for livestock. In 2012/13, the DEA cleared 532 701 hectares of alien invasive species. In the 2013/14 financial year the DEA set a target of 863 067 hectares and by the end of that financial year had surpassed its target by approximately 62%.¹²¹ While the DEA states that resources were not diverted from other programmes in order to achieve this significant (positive) deviation from its targets- this does beg the question about the extent to which the DEA is able to set strategic targets that seek to optimise available time and resources. Within the 2013/14 fiscus for instance, nearly 50% of the planned targets were exceeded without any reported shifting of funds or reprioritisation of resources to do so. The majority of the remaining targets were met with no significant deviations whether negative or positive. While one cannot argue that the DEA's ability to effectively 'over achieve' can be viewed positively, there is need to be circumspect regarding the extent to which targets set and allocated resources are not overly conservative. In 2014/15, the DEA sought to clear 169 045 hectares of invaded land and again reported exceeding its target by 22%.¹²²

4.5.3. BIODIVERSITY AND CONSERVATION

Section 24 (b) (i) of the Constitution obliges the South African government to promote conservation and to ensure the protection of the environment for present and future generations. The Biodiversity and Conservation Programme consists of eight sub programmes that seek to promote precisely this. In determining the country's commitment to this aspect of environmental management it is worth noting that up until 2017/18, the average real growth amounted to a mere 0.01%. A more positive

trend following the 2017/18 medium term budget shows an increase in nominal terms of 3.49% between 2014/15 and 2020/21.

The findings of the 2016 South African Environmental Outlook Report paint a dire portrait of the state of the country's environment. With only 14% of riverine ecosystems still intact (down from 18% in 2012), 57% threatened, 40% of terrestrial ecosystems categorised as threatened and a rapidly

FOOTNOTES:

119. Department of Environmental Affairs, Annual Report 2013/14
120. Department of Environmental Affairs, State of the Environment Report 2016
121. Department of Environmental Affairs, Annual Report 2013/14
122. Department of Environmental Affairs, Annual Report 2014/15

deteriorating natural resource base resulting from biodiversity loss and over-exploitation – there is cause for alarm.¹²³ Thirteen years ago, King et al. (2005) highlighted that more than 50% of the country's wetlands had already been destroyed – with 71% remaining unprotected in 2012. In South Africa, as with the general global trends outlined in this report, it is the poorest populations that are made most vulnerable by environmental degradation and climate change (King et al. 2005).

Figure 7 depicts the allocations to the Biodiversity and Conservation programme. The programme overall sees a marginal increase of 4% in nominal terms between 2017 and 2018. This is despite biodiversity and sustainability being key policy priorities nationally and provincially. This is, however a welcome improvement in the allocation to this programme when compared with previous years in which the programme saw decreases to its annual allocation (see Paper 13 in these series).

It is disconcerting to note continued decreases or stagantion in allocation to budgets for protected areas such as isiMangaliso (4.93%) and SANParks between 2017 and 2018 (Figure 7). This follows from trends observed in preceding years. In the Western Cape, for instance, the 2016/17 Estimates of Provincial Revenue and Expenditure (EPRE) indicated that as a result of budget reprioritisation, CapeNature¹²⁴ which is supported by the DEA and funded provincially by the Western Cape Department of Economic Development and Environmental Affairs, has had been negatively affected with compromises in programmes and human resourcing needing to be made. Given the aforementioned fiscal environment that requires careful prioritisation of limited resources – it is also incumbent on the DEA to be innovative in mobilising additional funds. In the early years of the WfW programme, for instance, utilised the harvested alien invasive species to build coffins, school desks


and other types of furniture – providing additional employment in the process. In this way, there is also the possibility of generating an income from the waste products of WfW activities.

In addition to this is the opportunity to seek PES funding from international donors as well as creating more sustainable PES funding mechanisms locally. Turpie et al. (2008) argue that as a result of the increasing scarcity of water in South Africa, support for research into the connections between alien invasive clearing and water supply has been significant. The results of some of this research have in turn influenced government allocations, according to Turpie et al. (2008). It is also notable that in addition to being funded through the tax base the clearing of alien invasive species has also received voluntary funding support making it a unique programme with a strong replicability element and clear buy-in from the government, research institutes, non-governmental organisations and international donors. Furthermore, in a country with high unemployment rates, a substantial unskilled labour base, PES schemes such as this have the added value of potentially contributing to poverty alleviation targets. WfW is labour intensive, increases water yields, contributes to land rehabilitation and biodiversity and (potentially) local entrepreneurship. While neither the WfW programme nor PES are perfect – they offer a great by way of financing opportunities for conservation, land rehabilitation and the protection of precious water resources. An important avenue that the DEA and various government departments must consider is the identification of ways not only to enhance the efficacy of the PES component but of maximising the flow between this and overall service delivery components. In other words – it is important to ensure that the WfW programme and similar initiatives strike a sustainable balance between what some may consider to be the commodification of nature, ecosystem service yields and service delivery.


FOOTNOTES:

-
123. Department of Environmental Affairs. 2012. 2nd South Africa Environment Outlook. A report on the state of the environment. Department of Environmental Affairs, Pretoria. 328 pp.
124. CapeNature is a public institution mandate relates to biodiversity conservation in the Western Cape. The institution is governed by the Western Cape Nature Conservation Board Act 15 of 1998 and is mandated to promote and ensure nature conservation; render services and provide facilities for research and training; and generate income.

Figure 7: Budget Allocation Trends for Biodiversity and Conservation (2014/15 – 2020/21)



Map 1: Location of 19 South African National Parks ¹²⁵



Covering less than 4% of the country's land surface, South African national parks represent environmental protection, heritage preservation, and environmental education opportunities and provide an array of social and economic services. Their distribution presents a unique prospect to provide genuine spaces to create equitable opportunities for access,

enjoyment and education. Despite efforts by the DEA to promote access to previously excluded communities living near national parks, statistics collected for this are not published publically. However, anecdotal evidence points to minimal success outside of formal school tours and special events (see further detail as per Indicator 5b in Chapter 4 of this report).

FOOTNOTES:

125. Source: SANParks: <https://www.sanparks.org/parks/>

Confirming this struggle to create inclusive access to their parks, the Chair of the Western Cape Conservation Board wrote in the 2014/15 CapeNature Annual Report;

“The historical trend towards exclusivity, with respect to access to CapeNature-managed reserves and protected areas, is changing. Successful conservation is critically dependent on the awareness and concern as well as responsibility of our citizenry. Therefore, in order to instil a love for the natural environment and an understanding and appreciation for the value of biodiversity, CapeNature is striving to facilitate access to all”

By that same token, however, budget cuts will make it increasingly difficult for publically funded parks to accommodate this important need while maintaining high standards of service and environmental protection. There is an urgent need for the DEA and its SANParks affiliates to identify innovative methods of

generating revenue to ensure this. Not only is this important to promote equitable access for all but it is also vital in changing public agency and awareness of the inextricability of their livelihoods and wellbeing from the health and ecological integrity of the natural environment.

4.5.4. CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION

Despite earlier chapters of this report indicating some fundamental changes in this sector – there does also appear to be some stagnation. In 2009, Raubenheimer¹²⁶ stated that the South African government’s work in the climate change sector was extraordinary and that its work within the international climate policy arena was laudable. One example cited is the country’s cutting edge research driven by the Department of Science and Technology. According to Raubenheimer (2009: 144) however, despite preceding budget allocations promoting this alignment, what was clearly missing was a complementary response in South Africa’s industrial, energy generation and transport policies. The same is arguably true in 2018 given limited policy advances in this regard and – as mentioned previously – limited plans for ring-fencing of the limited revenue from ‘green’ taxes.

Beginning in 2008 and spanning a decade, the DEA budget also presents a useful platform from which to track the South African government’s commitment to climate change mitigation. The year 2008 in particular coincides roughly with various commitments to move away from previous growth-without-constraints scenarios.¹²⁷

Greenhouse gas emissions in particular are listed as a significant tipping point for South Africa. With the envisioned development of significant coal-fired power stations already approved and underway (Medupi and Kusile) and another in the pipeline, combined with increasing traffic volumes and coal to liquid based refineries, South Africa will have a future of increased emissions. Additionally, the country will continue to be one of the most significant emitters globally.¹²⁸

4.5.5. BUCKET ERADICATION PROGRAMME AND SCHEDULE 6 GRANTS

There are fewer direct violations of the right to a healthy environment than the indignity of inadequate ablution facilities. Within the Water and Sanitation Services Programme is the indicator:

“Number of existing bucket sanitation systems in formal settlements replaced with adequate sanitation services per year” which was introduced in 2014/15 and according to the 2015/16 ENE;

The indirect bucket eradication programme grant was due to end in 2015/16 but will be extended to 2016/17 to complete the eradication of bucket sanitation systems in formal residential areas.

FOOTNOTES:

-
126. Raubenheimer, S. 2009. Chapter 11: Your Government Our Government. pp. 139-155 In Zipplies, R (Ed). 2009. Bending the Curve: Your Guide to Tackling Climate Change in South Africa. Africa Geographic.
127. Ibid.
128. DEA, 2016, 2nd South African Environmental Outlook (SAEO)

The bucket eradication programme (BEP) is a component of the rollout of basic services and informal settlement upgrading. Furthermore, funds were previously transferred out of the Human Settlements Development Grant (2016/17) allocation in order to allow for the extension of the bucket system eradication grant.¹²⁹ This shifting of budget line items and programmes present a useful lens by which to compare delivery of these services across a grouping of earmarked grants at the same sphere of government. However, in terms

of accountability and long term tracking, programmatic shifts as with the BEP also make it difficult to accurately track efficiency. Several researchers have indicated the challenges of coordination in such instances and the adverse impact on delivery. Not only has this grant been extended into the current financial year (2018/19) – but it has been allocated a nominal increase of R 196.12 million, indicating incomplete project targets and a failure by the South African government to meet this pressing need.

Figure 8: Community Reports of Limited or No Waste Removal by Province in 2016





Figure 9: Overview of Schedule 6 Infrastructure Grants 2017/18 – 2020/21 (Million Rands)¹³⁰



FOOTNOTES:

129. 2015/16 MTBPS Technical Notes: www.treasury.gov.za/documents/mtbps/2015/mtbps/Technical%20annexure.pdf


130. National Treasury 2018. Division of Revenue Bill 2018

In addition to the BEP, other important Schedule 6 Grants include those depicted in Figures 9 and 10; each of which are components of what the ENE 2018 categorises as the “Community Development” function. The overview in Figure 9 illustrates the allocations to these grants over the 2018/19 MTEF. Between 2018 /19 and 2019/20 the Water Services Infrastructure Grant is expected to increase from an allocation of R 3.48 billion to R 3.70 billion – a marginal increase in nominal terms. Similar changes are expected over the MTEF across all three programmes. A particular objective of the programmes within this cluster is the provision of infrastructure to low-income communities. It is worth noting, therefore, that this function will see a net reduction in its baseline from 2017/18 of 4.6% in nominal terms or R 29.7 billion over the MTEF to R 614.4 billion. Included in this is a net decrease in 2018/19 of R 300 million for the electrification programme, R 700 million for the Eskom electrification grant and R 78 million

for the Water Services Infrastructure Grant (Figure 10). Importantly, the latter programme is mandated to fund the replacement of 11 844 bucket toilets in the Northern Cape and Free State Provinces.¹³¹

An important question arises from the observed net reductions in the baseline; how will these reductions impact on the programmes and the delivery of services for municipal sanitation, electrification and water infrastructure? These are all areas of fundamental importance in which delivery has been both slow and inconsistent. It can be expected that with such significant baseline reductions – many of the planned project will be delayed or deferred. In which areas will these delays be effected? How will the Departments involved ensure that adequate interim measures are put in place to avoid further infringements on the rights to water, sanitation and healthy environments?

Figure 10: Schedule 6 Grant Baseline Reductions Between 2018/19 and 2020/21



The right to a healthy environment implicitly creates accountability lines within and between different government departments. Key infrastructure grant allocations aimed at addressing access to water and sanitation require the involvement of the Departments of Water and Sanitation, Energy and Human Settlements.

4.6. CONCLUSION

This budget analysis has outlined the key programme changes and budget trends across specific programmes and grants related to provisioning for the environment. Perhaps most notable of the changes is the increase in the allocations to the Chemical and Waste

Management budget; 36.02% between 2014/15 and 2020/21 in nominal terms and 28.48% in real terms year-on-year from 2017/18. This is an encouraging increase given South Africa’s history of weak waste management despite robust legislation.

FOOTNOTES:

131. National Treasury 2018. Estimates of National Expenditure 2018: Vote 36: Water and Sanitation, p.753

The DEA reflects a rather remarkable history not only in its overall audit outcomes but in its general expenditure. While the scope of the analysis has not allowed for in-depth coverage of the sector, it is evident the key programmes such as the WfW and WoF sub programmes have seen some serious improvements in terms of their governance, administration and resourcing. This suggests a greater capacity to effectively manage budgets at the national level which is not mirrored at the municipal level.

Having said this, the analysis has also uncovered a degree of lethargy in terms of the accurate

setting of performance targets by the DEA. The exceeding of targets over some years and in several programmes suggests that there is room for less conservative and more strategic planning if the South African government intends to address significant environmental challenges and respond adequately to global demands for more sustainable development. There are various trends which have contributed to limiting the adequacy, efficiency and effectiveness of resources allocated to realise the right to a healthy environment. Listed below are key findings and recommendations emanating from this analysis.

4.6.1. ADEQUACY OF RESOURCE ALLOCATION

The DEA receives significant donor funding from sources such as the UNDP, UNEP, GEF and the German Development Bank for various programmes. While this has not been included in this analysis, the role of these funds must

be considered in further research in order to provide a more comprehensive picture of all state and non-state financing and their impact on the DEA's delivery environment.

4.6.2. EFFICIENCY OF EXPENDITURE

The DEA undoubtedly has a positive history of clean financial performance exhibiting expenditure within 2% since 2006/07. The Department has also received affirmation for its good accounting standards from the AG of South Africa. Allocated funds are used for their intended purpose according to audit reports. This happens largely within the planned timeframes and with seemingly transparent, accountable reporting. The efficiency of strategic planning, which is associated with resource allocation within public resource management, raises some questions, however.

National government must work to support conservation by at the very least avoiding further budget cuts to programmes that are already strained and reliant on donor funding to a substantial degree. Environmental issues can no longer be under-prioritised as they have been if South Africa is to meet its SDG obligations. The DEA remains in a good position to motivate for additional funding through the enhancing of the PES component of programmes. Reiterating previous recommendations by SPII; The DEA must harness existing research capacity within its own entities as well as other government

departments to ensure that the PES innovations are enhanced and feed back into funding for environmental programmes and service delivery targets. Thirdly, the DEA must garner additional support both locally and internationally through PES financing schemes in addition to actively fostering sustainable voluntary PES payments.

Over the past 12 years, the DEA has obtained unqualified audit opinions from the Auditor-General of South Africa. There is, therefore, little doubt that the DEA is working within a tight fiscal space given the overall constrained financing environment. The DEA must therefore motivate for additional funds and push for recognition of ecosystem services given their importance for human wellbeing and fostering of sustainable development overall. Finally – it seems pertinent that the South African government consider clear mechanism by which not only to implement polluter pays mechanisms but also by which to support clean alternative solutions to meet national energy demands. There is a need to explore additional revenue streams to support the list of environmental priorities highlighted throughout this report.

CHAPTER FIVE:

The status of the right to a healthy environment: what the indicators tell us

SPII's monitoring of socio-economic rights combines analysis of the content and implementation of government policies and budgets with an assessment of their outcomes on the ground. This requires the development of performance and impact indicators relevant to the right to a healthy environment that can be tracked and monitored over time.

5.1. THE DEVELOPMENT OF INDICATORS

The indicators developed during previous research and deliberations with experts have remained largely unchanged; however, any amendments to the original list of indicators is detailed in Annexure 4 of this report. It is worth noting that following the original publication (September 2016) – there has been some progress in the inclusion of access and quality indicators at both the international and national level. A case in point is an increasing focus on energy poverty and its impact on women and children. The process of developing indicators was initiated with a review of international and local policies, conventions and jurisprudence on the content of environmental rights.

In the development of the earlier version of this report – an important consideration included ensuring input from relevant government departments. Unfortunately, this was not realised to the extent hoped for, owing to unresponsive officials both in the report's development and in subsequent engagements following its publications. It is hoped, however, that through additional engagement with and interrogation

of extensive government and parliamentary reports – planned roundtable discussions with key departmental officials will elicit the level of engagement hoped for using the updated version. Details of stakeholder engagements are provided in Annexure 4 of this report.

Discussions with various stakeholders have shown that environmental monitoring is often conducted by corporations rather than government or public organisations. Corporations tend to conduct environmental audits themselves, and then treat this information as confidential. Gaining access to this information may therefore prove problematic. In some cases, it may be necessary to use PAIA to gather this information¹³². A wide range of technical reports, statistical publications, government documents and academic research reports were consulted in addition to international, regional and national guidelines and benchmarks for environmental health and protection. Key examples are listed below;

5.2. SOUTH AFRICAN EXAMPLES (REFER TO ANNEXURE 4 FOR DETAILED REPORT REFERENCES)

The **Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) Environmental Sustainability Indicators Technical Report**. The first Environmental Sustainability Indicator Technical Report was published in 2009 and includes environmental systems and resources such as air, water, land and biodiversity.

—
Statistics South Africa (Stats SA): Selected development indicators from 2013¹³³ and the 2016 General Household Survey consider water pollution, air pollution, land degradation, excessive noise pollution. The survey also monitors the percentage of households that have used pesticides in dwelling, pesticides in the garden, herbicides and weed killers used during the past 12 months. The use of such chemicals can directly impact on the quality of the environment.

—
The **Work Programme 2013/2014** is produced annually by Statistics South Africa to allow for the monitoring of national developmental goals. The Programme considers a range of indicators including the environmentally sustainable use of resources.

FOOTNOTES:

132. See Company Secretary of Arcelormittal South Africa v Vaal Environmental Justice Alliance (69/2014) for an example of the successful use of PAIA to gain access to environmentally relevant information. Available from: <http://www.saflii.org/za/cases/ZASCA/2014/184.pdf>.
133. Statistics South Africa, Selected Development Indicators, 2013. Available from: <http://beta2.statssa.gov.za/publications/P03182/P031822013.pdf>

South Africa's Annual **Climate Change Reports**: The Department of Environmental Affairs publishes a Climate Change Report annually. The report is intended to reflect on progress in relation to the country's actions to respond to climate change risks and impacts. The report also has the objective of determining how such actions contribute to the national priorities of reducing poverty and inequality. The first of these reports was published in 2015.

The **Environmental and Sustainable Development Indicators, North West Province** provides a proposed set of potential indicators which include waste management, atmospheric and climate change, biodiversity, natural heritage, land use and human settlements.

The **South African National Atmospheric Emissions Inventory System (NAEIS)** is an online national reporting platform that holds inventories of both air pollutants and greenhouse emissions. The system offers new innovative ways to report emissions as is required by the National Environmental Management Air Quality Act of 2004. The NAEIS objective is to provide all stakeholders with relevant, up to date and accurate information on South Africa's emissions profile for informed decision making.

The **Environmental Sustainability Indicator Report State of Environmental Systems** integrates nine datasets into a set of 20 indicators of environmental sustainability. The goals of this report are to allow for the ability to protect the environment in a sustainable manner, and allow for an assessment of government's successes in this regard. Using these indicators, government intends to create a **State of Environmental Systems Environmental Sustainability Indicator Report**.

The Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, **South African Water Quality Guidelines**. The water quality guidelines provide a large amount of information on dangerous contaminants found in water, including means by which the contaminants may be measured.

5.3. INTERNATIONAL EXAMPLES

Aligned with Agenda 2030, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) were developed. Amongst these is the objectives of tackling climate change, eradicating poverty, fighting inequality and promoting people's wellbeing while protecting the planet by 2030. As with the previous iterations of the goals (MDGs) – the SDGS include a more comprehensive list of environmental indicators to (amongst others) natural habitat loss, CO₂ emissions, Ozone-Depleting Substances (ODS), the protection of terrestrial and marine areas, species threatened with extinction, populations using improved drinking water source, populations using improved sanitation facility and the use and availability of electricity.

The **OECD Environmental Indicators: Development, Measurement and Use Reference Paper** of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development supplies indicators that can be used at national and international levels. This paper is designed to provide a means of measurement to allow for the incorporation of sustainable development into developmental policies and frameworks.

The **Organisation for Economic Development and Co-operation and Development (OECD)** Data portal facilitates comparisons and sharing of key global data. The data portal features more than 200 frequently-requested indicators, including environmental data on air and climate, water resources, municipal waste and forest resources.

The **OECD Key Environmental Indicators** presents a list of indicators, including the measurement of:

- Climate change measured by CO₂ and greenhouse gas emission intensities.
- Ozone layer measured by the presence and manufacture of ozone depleting substances.
- Air quality measured by Sulphur Oxides (SO_x) and Nitrous Oxides (NO_x) emission intensities.
- Waste generation measured by the increase in municipal waste.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science's American Association for the Advancement of Science **Manual on Environmental Health Indicators and Benchmarks: Human Rights Perspectives** provides a framework and suggestions on indicators that can be used to measure environmental health. Amongst other factors, these indicators include:

- Air Quality (indoor and outdoor pollution and the impact on human health).
- Water Quality and Sanitation (sources of water contamination, drinking water standards, sanitation and waste disposal).

Environmental Indicators: A Systematic Approach to Measuring and Reporting on Environmental Policy Performance in the Context of Sustainable Development by the World Resources Institute. This document provides indicators that can be used to measure environmental issues, including acidification, toxic dispersion, solid waste disposal, and composite pollution.

The United Nations Environment Programme **Key Environmental Indicators: Tracking progress towards environmental sustainability**. This document tracks ozone layer depletion, climate change, natural resource use, environmental governance and chemicals and waste.

The World Health Organisation, **WHO Air quality guidelines for particulate matter, ozone, nitrogen dioxide and sulphur dioxide, Global update: Summary of risk assessment** provides clear and specific measurements that are to be used as guidelines for a healthy environment.

5.4. WISH LIST AND LIMITATIONS

As noted in first version of this report – SPII research was hamstrung to some extent by gaps in government and research institutions' data collection in relation to specific indicators. The indicators were created using a methodology which prioritised the output of reliable, reputable and disaggregated data sources over comparable, timeframes – and regularly updated. This resulted in the discarding of some potential indicators that did not meet these criteria. Ease of access to data was another important criterion.

Examples of such indicators that had to be discarded include:

Riparian Vegetation Index (RVI): measures the health and presence of riparian vegetation (plants that contribute towards the overall health of the aquatic ecosystem) in waterways.

Fish Index (FI) and Stream Fish Assemblages: measures the extent to which fish presence and species differ from the natural state.

Soil Health: measurement of Soil Organic Matter shows the presence of organic matter in soil which is directly related to soil quality and fertility.

Index of Habitat Integrity (IHI): measures the type and presence of riparian habitats in order to assess the significance of human impact on riparian and in stream ecosystems.

Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity (BIBI): measures the condition of the benthic area (located at the bottom of water systems) to assess the relative health of the ecosystem.

SASS: Measures the presence, species and health of invertebrate (especially macroinvertebrate) in river systems as a means of determining overall aquatic ecosystemic health¹³⁴. The Department of Water Affairs (DWA) Annual Report (2013/14) mentions that the Mini-SASS is "ready for use"¹³⁵

FOOTNOTES:

134. Dickens C., Graham P., The South African Scoring System (SASS) Version 5 Rapid Bio assessment Method for Rivers, African Journal of Aquatic Science 2002, 27: 1-10. Available from: <http://www.dwa.gov.za/IWQS/rhp/methods/dickens%20and%20graham.pdf>,
135. Department of Water Affairs, Annual Report 2013/14, available from: <https://www.dwa.gov.za/documents/AnnualReports/DWA%20ANNUAL%20REPORT%202013-14.pdf>. Page 15.

A significant challenge throughout this report was sourcing data for indicators suitable for comparison over time. A good example of this is that although the data provided by SANBI and South African Air Quality Information System (SAAQIS) is significant, it was determined to be inadequately available for this report as it did not provide coverage of most regions of South Africa.

There are also a number of reports and discussions potentially yielding significant indicators, but whose data is only available for the specific time period mentioned in the report (usually only a year or so). As such, data and indicators from sporadic reports is unfortunately not sufficient for inclusion as per this research project's methodology.

An added issue (as noted by the stakeholders) is the emphasis placed on data collection and the submission of reports from private companies. In this case, although data may be available, accessing this data can prove to be problematic without the costly and timely use of PAIA. There is also the question of bias where business is expected to collect data and submit reports that could be used against them in the manner of fines, or the ordering of potentially costly actions to adhere to environmental legislation and commitments.

There is also a lack of capacity and resources

from government. As an example, ideally water should be continuously sampled to ensure minimum standards are met; however there are obviously insufficient resources to measure every river and every water source. Even if additional government resources were made available, the collection and analysis of the massive amounts of data would be impractical.

The issue of attribution is another area of uncertainty; as an example, where a river is polluted it is generally extremely hard to determine the exact source of contamination. This problem is exacerbated when seemingly innocuous contaminants from one source combine with contaminants from another source in a mix that then becomes toxic. This issue is made even more complex when considering the potential impact of transboundary pollution.

As with all studies, the quality of this report and indicators rests heavily on the reliability of data. Although care has been taken, some indicators such as the Quality indicators Community Experience of Environmental Problems and General Environmental Problems Experienced, as well as some variables like Subjective Quality of Drinking Water are based upon subjective questions that allow for differing interpretations. Thus, it must be remembered that even where the data comes from valuable and trusted sources such as Stats SA, it is potentially prone to bias and misunderstanding.

5.5. INDICATORS FOR THE RIGHT TO ENVIRONMENT

According to the methodology followed in this report, using the research conducted, and the assistance of stakeholders, the indicators measuring the right to environment have been created and divided into Access Indicators, Adequacy Indicators and Quality indicators. It is important to remember that the indicators below work best when combined with one another and that some variables in one indicator, could also be used to provide additional insight into a related indicator. As an example the Access indicator Access to Water should be considered along with the Adequacy indicator Water Supply and Acid Mine Drainage, as well as the Quality

indicator Quality of Water Supply. The links between so many indicators is indicative of the fundamental link of the many aspects of right to environment, and the manner in which this right impacts on other rights.

Finally, the indicators have been designed to clearly show the variables that influence them. In this way, it is intentionally made possible to 'cherry-pick' certain aspects of the indicators, or even to use the variables themselves directly.

Please refer Annexure 4 for a more detailed explanation of the indicators.

ACCESS	ADEQUACY	QUALITY
ACCESS TO MAINS ELECTRICITY	ENERGY SUSTAINABILITY	QUALITY OF DRINKING WATER
Physical access to electricity from mains supply ¹³¹	Sources of energy ¹³²	Blue Drop Score (out of 100) ¹³⁴
ACCESS TO BASIC SANITATION	Energy Consumption per capita ¹³³	Subjective Quality of Drinking Water ¹³⁵
Percentage of households with access to basic sanitation ¹³⁶	WASTE RECYCLED	ECOLOGICAL FOOTPRINT
ACCESS TO WATER	Paper Waste Recycled ¹³⁷	Ecological Footprint ¹³⁹
Percentage of households with access to piped or tap water in their dwellings, off-site or on-site by province, 2002–2013 ¹⁴⁰	Total Waste Recycled ¹³⁸	BIODIVERSITY
ACCESS TO WASTE REMOVAL SERVICES	EMISSIONS OF GREENHOUSE GAS	Percentage of Threatened Amphibian Species ¹⁴⁶
Physical access to waste removal, determined by the removal of refuse (whether by municipality or private arrangement) at least once a week ¹⁵⁰ .	CO ₂ emissions per capita ¹⁴¹	Percentage of Threatened Bird Species ¹⁴⁷
ACCESS TO NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	CH ₄ emissions ¹⁴²	Percentage of Threatened Mammal Species ¹⁴⁸
Number of National Parks ¹⁵⁵	N ₂ O emissions ¹⁴³	Number of endemic threatened taxa ¹⁴⁹
Number of visitors to national parks ¹⁵⁶	HFC emissions ¹⁴⁴	RESPONSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT (BUSINESS)
Number of black South African visitors to national parks ¹⁵⁷	PFC emissions ¹⁴⁵	Number of ISO 14001 companies ¹⁵⁴
	FINE PARTICULATE MATTER (PM)	AIR QUALITY IMPACT ON HEALTH AND WELLBEING
	Fine Particulate Matter (PM 2.5) ¹⁵¹	Number of TB deaths by province ¹⁶⁴
	Fine Particulate Matter (PM 10) ¹⁵²	Number of deaths from diseases of the respiratory system ¹⁶⁵
	Emission from Eskom ¹⁵³	HEALTH
	WATER SUPPLY	Infant Mortality (ages 0 – 4) per 1000 live births ¹⁶⁹
	Organic Water Pollutant Emissions Per Day ¹⁵⁸	GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED
	Trophic Status of Dams ¹⁵⁹	Percentage of households who experience specific kinds of environmental problems ¹⁸²
	Renewable freshwater resources per capita ¹⁶⁰	FOOD SECURITY ¹⁸³
	Drainage Region Summary - Percentage Full ¹⁶¹	Food access severely inadequate (Percentage of households)
	Water Management Areas - Percentage Full ¹⁶²	Food access inadequate (Percentage of households)
	Provincial Summary - Percentage Full ¹⁶³	Food access adequate (Percentage of households)

FOOTNOTES:

All footnote sources can be found on the next page.

ACCESS	ADEQUACY	QUALITY
	ACID MINE DRAINAGE (AMD)	COMMUNITY EXPERIENCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS¹⁸⁴
	Total Dissolved Solids in water ¹⁶⁶	Irregular or no waste removal
	Sulphate levels in water ¹⁶⁷	Water Pollution
	Iron levels in water ¹⁶⁸	Outdoor / Indoor air pollution
	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BY GOVERNMENT	Land degradation / over utilisation of natural resources
	Percentage of biome protected ¹⁷⁰	Excessive noise / noise pollution
	Number of Ramsar sites protected ¹⁷¹	Other
	Number of Biosphere Reserves ¹⁷²	Littering
	Proportion of terrestrial areas protected ¹⁷³	GOVERNMENTAL FUNDING ALLOCATED TO DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS¹⁸⁵
	Proportion of marine areas protected ¹⁷⁴	Oceans and Coasts (unadjusted)
	% of river ecosystem types protected / degree of protection ¹⁷⁵	Climate Change and Air Quality (unadjusted)
	Wetlands Rehabilitation ¹⁷⁶	Biodiversity and Conservation (unadjusted)
	Number of hectares of invasive alien plants treated/cleared ¹⁷⁷	Environmental Programmes (unadjusted)
	Area (ha) of land restored and rehabilitated ¹⁷⁸	Chemicals and Waste Management (unadjusted)
	Proportion of South African coastline within marine bioregions ¹⁷⁹	Total budget allocation to the DEA (unadjusted)
	Protection Levels of national Strategic Water Source Areas ¹⁸⁰	ENVIRONMENTAL INFRINGEMENTS¹⁸⁶
	Number of Rivers Monitored by the River Health Programme ¹⁸¹	Number of reported environmental incidents
		Total number of arrests
		Number of inspections conducted

FOOTNOTES:

136. Stats SA - General Household Survey 2016.
137. Department of Environmental Affairs.
138. Department of Energy.
139. Department of Water Affairs.
140. Stats SA - General Household Survey 2016.
141. Stats SA - General Household Survey 2016.
142. South African Waste Information Centre.
143. South African Waste Information Centre.
144. Department of Environmental Affairs.
145. Stats SA - General Household Survey 2016.
146. Department of Environmental Affairs, International Energy Agency.
147. Department of Environmental Affairs
148. World Bank Development Indicators
149. Department of Environmental Affairs, Greenhouse Gas Inventory.
150. Department of Environmental Affairs, Greenhouse Gas Inventory.
151. Department of Environmental Affairs.
152. Department of Environmental Affairs.
153. Department of Environmental Affairs
154. SANBI Red List Statistics
155. Stats SA - General Household Survey 2013-2016.
156. No data
157. World Bank. Development Indicators
158. Eskom Annual Reports.
159. Department of Environmental Affairs, South African Bureau of Standards
160. SANParks Annual Reports
161. SANParks Annual Reports.
162. SANParks Annual Reports.
163. Knoema.Data Atlas
164. Department of Environmental Affairs

165. World Bank Development Indicators
166. Department of Water and Sanitation
167. Department of Water and Sanitation
168. Department of Water and Sanitation
169. Stats SA - Mortality and causes of death in South Africa, 2015: Findings from death notification.
170. Stats SA - Mortality and causes of death in South Africa, 2015: Findings from death notification.
171. Department of Water and Sanitation, ACID Report.
172. Department of Water and Sanitation, ACID Report.
173. Department of Water and Sanitation, ACID Report.
174. Stats SA - Mid-year population estimates, 2017.
175. SANBI Red List Statistics
176. Ramsar Sites Information Service.
177. Fifth National Report to the Convention on Biological Diversity, South Africa.
178. MDG Country Report 2013.
179. MDG Country Report 2013.
180. SANBI.
181. SANParks, Annual Report 2012/2013.
182. SANParks, Annual Report 2012/2013.
183. SANParks, Annual Report 2012/2013.
184. Department of Environmental Affairs.
185. Department of Environmental Affairs.
186. Department of Environmental Affairs.
187. Stats SA - General Household Survey 2016.
188. All variables from Stats SA - General Household Survey 2009-2016.
189. Data for all variables from Stats SA - General Household Survey 2009-2016.
190. Data for all variables from Department of Environmental Affairs.
191. Data for all variables from Department of Environmental Affairs.

ACCESS INDICATORS - (INDICATOR 1) ACCESS TO MAINS ELECTRICITY

DATA SOURCE:

General Household Survey
2016 (StatsSA)
Disaggregation by sex of head
of household available from
2009 onwards (from GHS
2009-2016)


DESCRIPTION: Lack of access to clean, safe and affordable energy has a direct, adverse impact on people's wellbeing and livelihoods. The United Nations Development Programme defines this as energy poverty.

In 2003, the South African government launched the Free Basic Electricity programme as a means of supporting indigent household towards meeting heating and energy needs. People with access to mains electricity tend to burn far less fuel wood. As such, access to mains electricity can significantly reduce local air pollution. Access to mains electricity also reduces the amount of deforestation and damage to flora, as energy generation without electricity tends

to involve the burning of combustible material such as wood and grass. In addition, the use of mains electricity also reduces levels of indoor air pollution and can significantly improve human health. The extent to which access to mains electricity reduces pollution is highly dependent on the source of the energy. It is also important to note the elevated vulnerability to indoor air pollution of children, older persons and those whose immune systems have been compromised. The impact on women and children is particularly dire. The UNDP states that on an annual basis, 4.3 million people die as a result of energy pollution with the majority of these being women¹⁹².

INDICATOR 1a: By province,
percentage of population

Figure 11: Access to Mains
Electricity (percentage of
population)



In relation to access to mains electricity, the Eastern Cape showed the largest increase between 2002 and 2015. At the beginning of the period the province exhibited the lowest levels of access at 55% access, increasing by about 30 percentage points to match the two other low performing provinces in 2015; KwaZulu Natal and Gauteng at just over 80% access. The Western Cape was consistently the province exhibiting highest levels of access from 2002 to 2009 when it was surpassed by the Free State after a decrease from the highest recorded value in 2007 of about 97% access. From 2012 to 2014, there was no clear leader in access, and all the provinces were within 15 percentage points of each other, with a maximum of about 93%. The Northern Cape

and Limpopo provinces emerged as leaders in the short 2015-2016 period. In 2002, the range was 35 percentage points with a maximum value of 90%. This range narrowed to approximately 12%, with a maximum access level of about 93% in 2016.


While this generally bodes well in terms of overall access for South Africans, the data suggests that access remained lowest in predominantly large, rural provinces such as the Eastern Cape and Kwa-Zulu Natal. It is particularly noteworthy that between 2015 and 2016 all provinces show decreased access to mains electricity – albeit marginal in some instances. This is possibly attributable to changes in the classification of eligibility for free electrification.

FOOTNOTES:

192. United Nations Development Programme, Gender and Sustainable Energy Policy Brief 4, 2017, Available from: <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/womens-empowerment/gender-and-sustainable-energy.html>

INDICATOR 1b: By sex of head of household: number of households, national

Figure 12: Number of Households with Access to Mains Electricity, by Sex (thousands)



Both Male and Female led households showed an upward trend over the total time range (2009-2016). Male-led households showed a very slight decrease over 2011/2012, which was not matched by female-led households. The difference between the numbers of households in each category decreased from approximately 3 million in 2009 to approximately 2 million households in 2016.

ACCESS INDICATORS - (INDICATOR 2) ACCESS TO BASIC SANITATION


DATA SOURCE:
General Household Survey
2016 (StatsSA)

DESCRIPTION: Access to sanitation significantly improves local environmental quality and human health. Sanitation is defined as the '*collection, removal, disposal or treatment of human excreta and domestic wastewater, and the collection, treatment and disposal of industrial wastewater where this is done by or on behalf of a water services*

*authority*¹⁹³ ". The proper treatment and disposal of faecal waste made possible by access to basic sanitation, reduces water and land pollution and significantly reduces the risk of cholera and other diseases. Therefore, access to basic sanitation is vital for an environment that is healthy and promotes human and natural wellbeing.

INDICATOR 2: By province, percentage of population:

Figure 13: Access to Basic Sanitation (percentage of population)



Please note: In the previous edition of this report, data for Limpopo was incorrect. This indicator is an example of service provisioning that still mirrors the legacy of apartheid's

FOOTNOTES:

193. Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, Draft White Paper on Water Services: Water is Life, Sanitation is Dignity, Draft for Public Comment, October 2002, available from: http://www.gov.za/sites/www.gov.za/files/draft_SA_water_services_wp6.1.pdf. Page iii.

discriminatory spatial planning. The stark difference in access in 2002 with the Eastern Cape only having 34.7% and Limpopo 27% access to basic sanitation and the Western Cape with 92.2% access in the same year speaks volumes. While the gap has narrowed, it is still marked. South Africans in different provinces still enjoy access to basic sanitation differently depending on where they live.

The indicator also signposts change in access over time with the Western Cape consistently exhibiting more than 90% access throughout the time series (2002-2016) with a short lived peak

in 2003 to more than 98%. Gauteng, which was consistently at or slightly below 90% throughout the period also had high levels of access. The greatest improvement over the period was shown by the Eastern Cape with an increase in access from just over 30% in 2002 to about 80% in 2016. Limpopo Province, which reached a high in 2016 of under 60% access, was the poorest performer over the entire period but also showed a consistent upward trend. The range of percentage access decreased from roughly 60 percentage points in 2002 to slightly over 30 percentage points in 2016.

ACCESS INDICATORS - (INDICATOR 3) ACCESS TO WATER

DATA SOURCE:
General Household Survey
2016 (StatsSA)


Data by sex available from
GHS 2009-2016

DESCRIPTION: Access to water leads to a significant improvement in human health. Properly provisioned water from a sustainable source also decreases potential strain on river and other water systems. It is significant to note that there are some concerns with the quality of access provided. In some instances,

infrastructure provided on paper is in reality *"broken or dysfunctional"*¹⁹⁴. Not only does non-functioning infrastructure negatively impact on human access, poorly constructed and badly maintained results in loss and waste of water, which impacts on sustainability and increases strain on already limited natural water resources.

INDICATOR 3a: By province,
percentage of population

Figure 14: Access to Water
(percentage of population)




The two highest performers, Gauteng and the Western Cape, were consistently between 95% and 100% throughout the considered period (2002-2016). The Eastern Cape was the poorest performer throughout the period, except in 2013 and 2016. The province also showed the largest increase in access, from about 35% in 2002 to a peak of 80% in 2013 and finally 75% in 2016. Except for the two highest performers, and the Northern Cape, the other provinces, with much fluctuation, showed a small increase in access or even a slight decrease, as was the case with Limpopo in the period from 2010 to 2016. The range was 45 percentage points in 2002, decreasing to less than 25 percentage points in 2016.

FOOTNOTES:

194. South African Human Rights Commission, Report on the Right to Access Sufficient Water and Decent Sanitation in South Africa, 2014: Water is Life. Sanitation is Dignity: Accountability to People who are Poor, 2014, available from: <http://www.sahrc.org.za/home/21/files/FINAL%204th%20Proof%204%20March%20-%20Water%20%20Sanitation%20low%20res%20%282%29.pdf>. Page 14.

INDICATOR 3b: By sex of head of household, number of households, national; [see supporting document]

Figure 15: Number of Households whose Main Source of Water was Supplied by the Local Municipality, by Sex (thousands)



Both categories showed an upward trend over the period under consideration (2009-2016). As with access to electricity, the number of male-headed households showed a decrease in 2011/2012 that was unmatched by female-led households. The difference between the two categories decreased slightly from about 3 million households in 2009 to about 2.5 million in 2016.

ACCESS INDICATORS - (INDICATOR 4) ACCESS TO WASTE REMOVAL SERVICES

DATA SOURCE:
General Household survey
2013-2016 (StatsSA)

DESCRIPTION: Access to waste removal reduces local air, land and water pollution as well as improving human health. Stats South Africa highlights the importance of refuse removal to "*maintain environmental hygiene of the households' neighborhoods*"¹⁹⁵. This indicator considers the removal of refuse (whether by municipality or private arrangement) at least once a week. It is important to note that urban and metropolitan areas have a far higher rate of refuse removal than rural areas. Ideally, the data


should be considered in terms of rural, urban and metropolitan, however before the **Statistics South Africa General Household Survey 2013** this additional data was not captured. Although refuse removal includes the "*proper disposal*" of waste, this indicator does not properly consider the management and proper disposal of waste after removal¹⁹⁶. In this sense, this indicator must be considered along with the adequacy indicator Waste Recycled.

FOOTNOTES:

195. Statistics South Africa, General Household Survey 2016, available from: <http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0318/P03182016.pdf>. Page 46.
196. Statistics South Africa, General Household Survey 2016, available from: <http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0318/P03182016.pdf>. Page 46.

INDICATOR 4a: By province, percentage of population

Figure 16: Access to Waste Removal Services (percentage of population)




The data is only available for years 2013--2016 so there were no clear increasing or decreasing trends, but the stratification of the provinces was evident.

This indicator shows clearly the limited changes to access to waste removal for many households. It is striking that in 2016 four provinces reported that less than 50% percent of their residents had access to waste removal. The closely matched highest performers were the Western Cape and Gauteng, at just under 95% access. Limpopo province was the poorest performer, at about 20%. This is almost 15 percentage points behind the next worst performers, the Eastern Cape and Mpumalanga, both at about 35% access. The range was about 80 percentage points over all four years, with minor fluctuations.

This suggests that responses to this discrepancy must not only take modern migration patterns into account but must question interventions to date that have clearly failed to address the patterns of privilege created largely by apartheid era spatial planning policy.

INDICATOR 4b: By province, geotype: **RURAL**, percentage of population

Figure 17: Rural Access to Waste Removal Services, by Province (percentage of population)




The period under consideration is 2013-2016. The North West was the only province to maintain >30% access, making it the best performer by far in 2013/2014. All the other provinces were below 10% access until 2014, when the Western Cape and Gauteng increased enough to exceed and match the North West, respectively. The only other province to rise above 10% access was the Northern Cape which, unlike the other provinces, continued its increasing trend to a maximum of about 23% in 2016.

One would expect that provinces with higher percentages of rural residents would have the lowest percentages of access to rural waste removal services given the well-documented challenges in the delivery of basic services.

INDICATOR 4c: By province, geotype: **URBAN**, percentage of population


Figure 18: Urban Access to Waste Removal Services, by Province (percentage of population)



The period under consideration is 2013-2016. The best performer was the Western Cape, which showed a slight decrease over 2013/14 and an increase over 2014-2016. The only other provinces to show a net increase were Mpumalanga and the Northern Cape. The other provinces showed either no change, a slight net decrease, or in the case of the Eastern Cape, Limpopo and KwaZulu Natal, net decreases of about 10, 12 and 8 percentage points respectively. The range increased from about 25 percentage points to approximately 35 percentage points. This trend is especially telling in that historically under-served provinces are also those exhibiting net decreases.

INDICATOR 4d: By province, geotype: **METROPOLITAN**, percentage of population

Figure 19: Metropolitan Area Access to Waste Removal Services (percentage of population)




The period under consideration is 2013-2016. The Western Cape, Kwa-Zulu Natal and Gauteng provinces were tied at around 90% access. The Eastern Cape was at about 60% access until 2014 when it increased to a high of 80% in 2016. The Free State showed a remarkable increase from 0% to 90% in 2014/15, which suggests that an area classified as urban in 2013 was reclassified as metropolitan in 2014. The range (considering only provinces which contain metropolitan areas) was about 30 percentage points at the beginning of the period, decreasing to about 10 percentage points in 2016.

ACCESS INDICATORS -
(INDICATOR 5) ACCESS TO THE
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT


DATA SOURCE: SANParks webpage (https://www.sanparks.org/about/) SANParks Annual Reports (2002-2016) (https://www.sanparks.org/about/annual/)	DESCRIPTION: Access to national parks ensures physical accessibility to healthy natural environment as well as increasing biodiversity and is measured by the number of national parks and the number of visitors. Unfortunately, this indicator does not properly consider location or the nature of the visitors. Therefore, although the indicator does provide useful data, its significance could be enhanced substantially by increasing the amount of data gathered by SANParks to allow for better disaggregation. This indicator is purely an access indicator of quantity and does not allow for a determination of quality of access.
--	---

INDICATOR 5a:
Figure 20: Number of
National Parks




The number of national parks increased by 3, from 16 to 19 over the period under consideration (2003-2017). New parks were commissioned in 2006, 2008 and 2010. The brief increase to 21 parks in 2016 suggests that two areas were reclassified in that year before being reverted again in 2017. Public education campaigns are an increasingly strong component of South African national parks and this indicator combined with the indicators below can assist with determining the number of people potentially reached by parks' conservation and environmental awareness message.

INDICATOR 5b:
Figure 21: Annual Number of
Visitors to National Parks



Over the period 2002-2017, the number of visitors showed a net increase of over 3.5 million (from 3 million in 2002 to over 6.5 million in 2017). There was a very large increase in numbers in 2007/8 of more than 1 million visitors.

INDICATOR 5c:
Figure 22: Annual Number of
 Black South African Visitors to
 National Parks¹⁹⁷



Data is reliably available for the period from 2006–2017, but excludes both the Table Mountain and West Coast National Parks.¹⁹⁸ In addition, there is some ambiguity with respect to the nationality of these visitors in years before 2010. After that year, the reports explicitly record the number of black South African visitors.

The total number of black South African visitors to the SANParks system showed an increase over the period under consideration. It rose from 400 thousand in 2010 to just over 600 thousand visitors in 2017. There was a year on year increase every year under consideration except between 2010 and 2012 where there was a plateau in the number of visitors at around the 400 thousand level.

South African National Parks (SANParks) was established in 1926 and is operated in terms of the National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act, 57 of 2003. The primary mandate of SANParks is to oversee the conservation of South Africa’s biodiversity, landscapes and associated heritage assets through a system of national parks.

In addition to fundamental nature conservation mandates, SANParks is also responsible for the conservation of South Africa’s cultural heritage. The entity also works to ensure that South Africans

“Participate and get involved in biodiversity initiatives, and that all its operations have a synergistic existence with neighbouring communities for their educational and socio-economic benefit”¹⁹⁹

This latter aspect is an important component in addressing social injustices of the past in which access to conservation facilities not only excluded the majority but where their establishment at times also resulted in the displacement of communities. Hallows (2011) states, for instance that prior to the democratic dispensation *“for many black people, the environment was associated with conservation and conservation with forced removals”*.

The Department of Environmental Affairs has introduced some measures to improve access to conservation areas for all South Africans. In a 2013 written reply to a Parliamentary question relating to such measures in two specific major parks, the Department outlined firstly that The Table Mountain National Park Wild Card initiative offers all city residents *“limited but affordable access”* while remaining open access areas remain free of charge.

According to the Department, the SANParks Responsible Tourism Strategy aims to provide equitable access through the implementation of subsidies. Subsidies and promotions are targeted at learners, senior citizens, members of previously disadvantaged groups and (for a week in September) all South African citizens. Although the overall figures pertaining to access to national parks reflect an increase- the current disaggregation of data is limited to racial demographics, vis. *“total number of black South African visitors to national parks”*.

FOOTNOTES:

197. New in this edition, this indicator is based on data recorded in the SANParks annual reports (2009–2017)

198. The visitor monitoring systems of those parks are incompatible with this measure

199. Department of Environmental Affairs Annual Report 2010/11, p.13. Available from: <https://www.environment.gov.za/documents/annualreports>

DATA SOURCE:
(2002–2008): Department of
Environmental Affairs website
(soer.deat.gov.za/1323.html)


(2008–2014): Department of
Energy Annual Commodity
Flow and Energy Balance
spreadsheets (www.energy.gov.
za/files/energyStats_frame.html)

DESCRIPTION: The Energy Sustainability indicator is concerned with sustainable energy generation practices. Sustainable energy generation practices contribute towards environmental sustainability and is especially important in a country with a carbon-intensive economy. The use of non-fossil fuels allows for sustainable energy generation. Further, the type of energy generation used, can reduce air, land and water pollution. **Sources of Energy and Gross Energy Consumption** are the most useful variables to measure this indicator. The source of energy is important as energy generation is widely considered to be one of the most significant contributors to environmental pollution. The combustion of carbon, in particular the use of 'dirty coal', for power generation leads to high and hazardous

amount of air pollution that directly impacts on human and natural health.


In the South African context, the emissions from power generation can largely be accounted for by the emissions from Eskom (see the variable **Emissions from Eskom** in the Adequacy indicator **Fine Particulate Matter**). Split into separate indicators for ease of use (and indicators in their own right), a comprehensive understanding of air quality would likely require the Adequacy indicator **Energy Sustainability** to be considered with **Emissions of Greenhouse Gas and Fine Particulate Matter** as well as the Quality indicator **Air Quality Impact on Health and Wellbeing**.

INDICATOR 6a:
Figure 23: Energy consumption
by Source (TJ)



The period under consideration is 2002–2014. Coal was by far the most used source, and also showed the largest net increase over the period, from 3 million TJ in 2002 to 4 million in 2014. The next most used source was crude oil which showed no net increase over the entire period but showed large annual fluctuations of about 500 thousand TJ between 2002 and 2007. The fluctuations smoothed out after 2007 and crude oil usage remained at about 1 million TJ. Use of renewable energy sources (excluding hydro-electric power) was steady at around 400 thousand TJ until 2010, when it increased slightly to 600 thousand TJ and held steady until a precipitous drop to close to 0 TJ in 2013 and 2014. This stark change suggests a change in the data gathering methodology rather than a change in the physical reality. Use of nuclear, hydro-electric and gas sources was the lowest for most of the period: all less than 300 thousand TJ.

INDICATOR 6b:
Figure 24: Energy
 Consumption per Capita/MWh




The period under consideration is 2002-2014. Between the beginning and the end of the period, per capita energy consumption showed a net decrease from 4.6 MWh to 4.2 MWh. There were two years in which consumption peaked after 2002: 2007 at 4.9 MWh/capita and, after a period of decrease, 4.6 MWh/capita in 2011.

ADEQUACY INDICATORS - (INDICATOR 7) WASTE RECYCLED

DATA SOURCE:
 South African Waste
 Information Centre (SAWIC)
 website (<http://sawic.environment.gov.za>) interactive
 tonnage report generator


INDICATOR 7a:
Figure 25: Paper Waste
 Recycled (tonnes)

DESCRIPTION: The amount of waste generation directly impacts on environmental and human health and high levels of waste generation are unsustainable. Reducing quantity of waste is important, and the amount of waste recycled as a percentage of total waste reduces pollution and increases sustainability. This indicator is most effective when considered with the access indicator Access to Waste Removal Services.



The period under consideration is 2006-2017, with no data for 2009. Paper waste recycled was below 200 thousand tonnes until 2012/13 when a rapid increase began which peaked at 1.6 million tonnes in 2014, followed by a decrease to just over 200 thousand tonnes in 2016, and a slight increase the next year to about 400 thousand tonnes.

INDICATOR 7b:
Figure 26: Total Waste Recycled, by Province (tonnes)



The period under consideration is 2005–2017. Until 2012, the total waste recycled was below 200 thousand tonnes for all provinces. Thereafter, the Eastern Cape, Kwa-Zulu Natal, Gauteng showed an increase. By far the largest increase was the Eastern Cape, peaking at just under 25 million tonnes in the very next year and followed by a large decrease to less than 5 million tonnes in the two years after that. Gauteng showed a similar trend, albeit with a plateau of 5 million tonnes over 2013/14. Kwa-Zulu Natal showed a more

steady increase to a peak of 10 million tonnes in 2014 followed by a decrease to about 6 million tonnes in 2015. For the remainder of the period, all provinces remained below 5 million tonnes of waste recycled.

Note: Many of the dramatic changes in reported values for this indicator are likely to be due to changes in national and provincial reporting practices and waste categorisation, rather than large changes in actual materials recycled.

ADEQUACY INDICATORS - (INDICATOR 8) EMISSIONS OF GREENHOUSE GASES


DATA SOURCE:
Department of Environmental
Affairs GHG Inventory for
South Africa 2000–2010
(https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/docs/greenhousegas_inventorysouthafrica.pdf)

World Bank World
Development Indicators
(<http://wdi.worldbank.org/>)

CO₂ Emissions from Fuel
Combustion 2017(International
Energy Agency)


INDICATOR 8a:
Figure 27: Carbon Dioxide Emissions (thousands of metric tons CO₂ equivalent)

DESCRIPTION: Greenhouse gas emission impacts negatively on human and natural health, as well as contributing to climate change and is considered an international issue. The most significant variables in calculating this indicator include *CO₂ emissions per capita*, *CH₄ emissions*, *N₂O emissions*, *HFC emissions*, *PFC emissions*. This indicator should be considered with the Adequacy indicator **Fine Particulate Matter**, the Quality indicator **Air Quality Impact on Health and Wellbeing** and the variable **Emissions from Eskom** for a more complete assessment of air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions in South Africa.




The period under consideration is 2002–2016. From the beginning of the period to 2010, CO₂ emission showed a net increase of about 90 thousand tons, with some fluctuation and a noticeable spike in 2008. Emissions continued to rise to a peak of just under 440 thousand tonnes in 2014 before beginning a decrease to about 390 thousand tonnes in 2016.

INDICATOR 8b:
Figure 28: Methane Emissions
 (thousands of metric
 tons CO₂ equivalent)




Over the entire period, 2006-2012, methane emission showed a net decrease of about 2 thousand tons CO₂ equivalent, after an increasing trend which lasted until 2008 with a peak of just under 67.5 thousand tons CO₂ equivalent.

INDICATOR 8c:
Figure 29: Nitrous Oxide
 Emissions (thousands of metric
 tons CO₂ equivalent)




Over the entire period, 2006-2012, nitrous oxide emissions showed a net decrease of about 2 500 tons CO₂ equivalent.

INDICATOR 8d:
Figure 30: Hydrofluorocarbon
 Emissions (thousands of metric
 tons CO₂ equivalent)



Over the period 2005-2010, hydrofluorocarbon emissions increased steadily from about 100 to 800 tons CO₂ equivalent.


INDICATOR 8e:
Figure 31: Perfluorocarbon
 Emissions (thousands of metric
 tons CO₂ equivalent)



The period under consideration is 2002-2010. Perfluorocarbon emissions were steady at about 900 tons CO₂ equivalent until 2007 and then began a decrease to settle at 100 tons CO₂ equivalent in 2009/2010.

ADEQUACY INDICATORS -
(INDICATOR 9) FINE
PARTICULATE MATTER

<p>DATA SOURCE:</p> <p>World Bank Development Indicators (http://wdi.worldbank.org/)</p> <p>Eskom Annual Integrated Reports (http://www.eskom.co.za/OurCompany/MediaRoom/Pages/Publications.aspx)</p>	<p>DESCRIPTION: PM is a result of the effectiveness of governmental regulation and industry commitment to a clean and healthy environment. Although PM can be considered a greenhouse gas, it is left as a separate indicator due to its significant and lasting human and natural health impacts. PM is a clear indication of the levels of dangerous air pollution, typically caused by the combustion of carbon rich fossil fuels and other carbon emissions from industry and domestic energy consumption. This indicator considers background concentrations of Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) and (PM₁₀). PM_{2.5} should not exceed 10 µg/m³ annual mean and 25 µg/m³ 24-hour mean. PM10 should not exceed 20 µg/m³ annual mean and 50 µg/m³ 24-hour mean. Multiple studies by the World Health Organisation have determined that PM can “<i>cause or aggravate cardiovascular and lung diseases, heart attacks, and arrhythmias, affect the central nervous system, the reproductive system and cause cancer</i>”²⁰⁰. The variable Emissions from Eskom is included in this indicator, as Eskom is the primary energy producer and thus a primary emitter of air pollution; it is important to note that the “<i>energy sector was by far the largest contributor to the total GHG emissions... providing 85.0% in 2010</i>”^{201, 202}. In addition to this, not only is the energy sector the largest contributor to carbon dioxide emissions, its current growth is indicative of South Africa’s under-pricing of this fossil fuel and its coal-dominant electricity production.²⁰³</p>
--	--



FOOTNOTES:


200. European Environmental Agency, Exceedance of air quality limit values in urban areas (CSI 004, 2017, Available from: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/exceedance-of-air-quality-limit-3/assessment>)

201. Department of Environmental Affairs, Green House Gas Inventory for South Africa 2000 – 2010. Available from: https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/docs/greenhousegas_inventorysouthafrica.pdf.

202. Note, the variable Emissions from Eskom could also be used with the indicator Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

203. OECD Publishing, Environmental Performance Reviews:South Africa 2013 Available from: <https://www.oecd.org/southafrica/oecd-environmental-performance-reviews-south-africa-2013-9789264202887-en.htm>

INDICATOR 9b:
Figure 33: Emission from Eskom (relative particulate emissions in kg/MWh)



Period under consideration is 2002-2017, with no data for 2004. Between the beginning of the period and 2015, relative particulate emission increased from about 0.27 kg/MWh to 0.37 kg/MWh, with a significant peak of 0.39 kg/MWh in 2010 and trough over 2005-2008 having a minimum value of 0.2 kg/MWh. After 2015, relative particulate emissions began a decrease to about 0.30 kg/MWh in 2017.

ADEQUACY INDICATORS - (INDICATOR 10) WATER SUPPLY

DATA SOURCE:
 Knoema Data Atlas South Africa page (<https://knoema.com/atlas/South-Africa/topics/Environment>)
 World Bank World Development Indicators (<http://wdi.worldbank.org/tables>)
 Department of Water and Sanitation Weekly State of the Reservoirs (accessed on 09-03-2018) (<https://www.dwaf.gov.za/Hydrology/Weekly/Weekly.pdf>)
 National Integrated Water Information System (NIWIS) (<http://niwis.dws.gov.za/niwis2/>)


DESCRIPTION: The quantity and quality of water supply is important in determining environmental sustainability. As a water stressed state, the sustainability of water use is crucial and can be considered using the variables *Renewable Freshwater Resources per Capita*, and *Annual Freshwater Withdrawal as a Percentage of Total Internal Resources*. Ideally, the Strategic Water Source Areas (SWSA) should also be considered along with the Mean Annual Runoff, but unfortunately this information is not regularly updated or available in an adequate form for the methodology in use²⁰⁴. The variable Organic Water *Pollutant Emissions per day* shows the level of organic emissions that impact negatively on both human and natural health. Organic water pollutants may lead to harmful algal blooms which reduce the oxygen content of water, thereby destroying healthy natural ecosystems (in particular in

South Africa, riverine systems). The variable *Trophic Status of Dams* shows the quality and biological and ecological health of water in dams, and is a direct measure of the health of water sources. The extent to which dams are full can be seen in the variables *Drainage Region Summary - Percentage Full*, *Water Management Areas - Percentage Full* and *Provincial Summary - Percentage Full*. Also consider the Quality indicator *Quality of Drinking Water* and the Access indicator *Access to Water* for a more comprehensive understanding of water issues. This indicator is useful on its own, but should be considered with the Adequacy indicator *Acid Mine Drainage* and the Access indicator *Access to Water* for a more comprehensive overview of water use, health and sustainability in South Africa.

FOOTNOTES:


204. See <http://bgis.sanbi.org/NFEPA/SWSAmap.asp> for the Strategic Water Source Area, http://www.dwa.gov.za/iwqs/rhp/state_of_rivers/state_of_umngeni_02/umngeni.html, and https://web.archive.org/web/20151210011915/http://www.csir.co.za/impact/docs/Final_Freshwater_Atlas_Article.pdf (archived resource); <http://bgis.sanbi.org/Document/Download/2249> (2011 National Biodiversity Assessment (NBA)) for other useful information (that is unfortunately not updated regularly).

INDICATOR 10a:
Figure 34: Organic Water
 Pollutant Emission
 per day (kg)




Period under consideration is 2002–2007. Organic water pollutant emissions were steady at 220 thousand kg per day until 2004, when there was a decrease to 190 thousand kg over 2005/6 before an increase in 2006/7 to 230 thousand kg, for a net increase of about 10 thousand kg over the entire period.

INDICATOR 10b:
Figure 35: Trophic Status of
 Dams (2012/13)




Data only available for 2012–2013. 50 dams were categorised as oligotrophic in 2012, increasing to 60 in 2013. For all other categories there was no change over the period; 8 as mesotrophic, 5 as eutrophic and 7 as hypertrophic

INDICATOR 10c:
Figure 36: Renewable
 Freshwater Resources (cubic
 metres per capita)




Data available for 2007, 2012 and 2014. Per capita renewable freshwater resources decreased from 920 m³ in 2007, to 850 m³ in 2012 and 830 m³ in 2014.

INDICATOR 10d:
Figure 37: Drainage region/
 Water Management Areas -
 Percentage Full (National)



Period under consideration is 2015-2018. Over 2015-2016, water management areas totalled 74% and 52% full respectively, and over the 2017-2018 period these values were 74% decreasing to 63%.

INDICATOR 10e:
Figure 38: Provincial Summary-
 Dams Listed in State Reservoir
 Report (percent full)



The period under consideration is 2015-2018. Over 2015-16, all provinces showed a decrease in percentage fill of drainage regions, except the North West, which showed a very small increase. Gauteng saw the largest drop from 2015 to 2016, from having the highest percentage full at about 85% to one of the lowest at about 40%. In 2017 and 2018 most provinces showed a net increase or showed plateaux in their fill levels, with the stark exception of the Western Cape where percentage fill maintained a steady decreasing trend towards a low of less than 20%.

ADEQUACY INDICATORS -
(INDICATOR 11) ACID MINE
DRAINAGE (AMD)


DATA SOURCE:

Mine Water Management in the Witwatersrand Gold Fields with Special Emphasis on Acid Mine Drainage: Report to the Inter-ministerial Committee on Acid Mine Drainage (December 2010) (www.dwaf.gov.za/Documents/ACIDReport.pdf)

DESCRIPTION: AMD is a serious threat to human and natural health and sustainability, and as such is included separately from other indicators dealing with water. To determine AMD levels, variables such as the **Levels of pH, Electrical Conductivity, Total Dissolved Solids, Sulphate and Iron** in water must be considered. AMD has long term effects and although a report was commissioned by Parliament on the 9th of February, 2011 entitled **AMD**


Report on Mine Water Management in the Witwatersrand Gold Fields with Special Emphasis on Acid Mine Drainage, the issue still remains a serious threat to natural and human health. This indicator should be considered along with the Adequacy indicator **Water Supply**, the Quality indicator **Quality of Drinking Water** and the Access indicator **Access to Water** for a more comprehensive overview of the state of water in South Africa.

INDICATOR 11a:
Figure 39: Total Dissolved
Solids in Drainage Area,
2010 (mg/L)




Data available for 2010 only. The Western basin had the highest dissolved solids at 6.5 thousand mg/L, followed by the Central basin at 5 thousand mg/L and finally the Eastern basin at 2 thousand mg/L total dissolved solids.

INDICATOR 11b:
Figure 40: Total Sulphates in
Drainage Area, 2010 (mg/L)



Data available for 2010 only. The Western basin had the highest dissolved sulphates at 4 thousand mg/L, followed by the Central basin at 3.6 thousand mg/L and finally the Eastern basin at 1 thousand mg/L.

INDICATOR 11c:
Figure 41: Total Iron in
 Drainage Area, 2010 (mg/L)



The Western basin had the highest iron content at 1 thousand mg/L, followed by the Central basin with 100 mg/L and finally the Eastern basin with about 40 mg/L.

ADEQUACY INDICATORS - (INDICATOR 12) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION FROM THE GOVERNMENT

DATA SOURCE:

SANBI Red List (<http://redlist.sanbi.org/stats.php#Nationalstatistics>)

Ramsar Sites Information Service (rsis.ramsar.org)

South Africa's Fifth National Report to the Convention on Biological Diversity March 2014 (<https://www.cbd.int/doc/world/za/za-nr-05-en.pdf>)

South African MDG Report 2013 source: UNDP (http://www.za.undp.org/content/south_africa/en/home/library/mdg.html#)

National Biodiversity Assessment 2011 (bgis.sanbi.org)

SANParks Annual reports (2004-2017) (<https://www.sanparks.org/about/annual/>); (<http://soer.deat.gov.za/1218.html>)

Department of Environmental Affairs Environmental Indicators Database (<http://enviroindicator.environment.gov.za/>)

adapted from South African National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment 2004 Technical Report. Volume 4: Marine Component; Department of Water Affairs Annual Reports (2010/11-2014/15)

DESCRIPTION: This indicator shows commitment from government to protecting the health of the natural environment through the following variables:

Percentage of Biome Protected

Number of Ramsar Sites Protected: Ramsar sites are designated by the Ramsar Convention as sites of particular ecological importance and sensitivity. Some stakeholders are sceptical of the legal protections this affords. However, as it is internationally recognised, it was included in this list of indicators.

Number of Biosphere Reserves

Proportion of Terrestrial Areas Protected

Proportion of Marine Areas Protected

Percentage of River Ecosystem Types Protected / Degree of Protection

Wetlands Rehabilitation

Number of Hectares (ha) of Invasive Alien Plants Treated / Cleared


Area (ha) of Land Restored and Rehabilitated

Protection Levels of National Strategic Water Source Areas

Proportion of South African Coastline within Marine Bioregions


Number of Rivers Monitored by the River Health Programme

INDICATOR 12a:
Figure 42: Percentage of
 Biome Protected, by Type
 (2015, 2017)




Data available for 2015 and 2017. For both years, all the biome types had less than 18% protected, and the most protected was Forest biome at 17%. Savanna, Fynbos and Desert were all above 8% protected. The three least protected biomes were Nama Karoo, IOCB, and Grassland, which were all below 2% protection.

INDICATOR 12b:
Figure 43: Number of Ramsar
 Sites Protected




Between the beginning and end of the period (2002–2017), the number of Ramsar sites increased from 17 to 23, with two new sites being declared in 2007, and one each in 2010, 2011, 2015 and 2017.

INDICATOR 12c:
Figure 44: Number of
 Biosphere Reserves




Over 2002–2015, the number of biosphere reserves doubled from 4 in 2002 to 8 in 2015. New reserves were declared in 2007, 2009 and the last two in 2015.

INDICATOR 12d:
Figure 45: Proportion of
Terrestrial Areas Protected




Data available for 2010, 2012. The proportion of terrestrial areas protected increased slightly from 6.2 to 6.71%.

INDICATOR 12e:
Figure 46: Proportion of
Marine Areas Protected




Data available for 2010 and 2012. The proportion of marine areas protected increased from 6.54 to 7.34.

INDICATOR 12f:
Figure 47: Percentage of
River Ecosystem Types
Protected, by Degree of
Protection (2011)




Data for 2011 only. 50 % of river ecosystems were not protected at all, 29% poorly protected, 7% moderately protected and 14% were well protected.

INDICATOR 12g:
Figure 48: Wetlands
Rehabilitation (cubic metres)




Considering the beginning and end of the period, 2004-2016, wetlands rehabilitation showed a net increase of just over 5 thousand m³. It had a peak of 30 thousand m³ in 2009 and three peaks of about 15 thousand m³ in 2006, 2011 and 2015.

INDICATOR 12h:
Figure 49: Hectares of
Invasive Alien Plants
Treated/Cleared




Data available for 2004-2016. The follow-up clearing of invasive alien plants showed a net increase from about 125 thousand ha in 2004 to 200 thousand ha in 2016. The largest area cleared on follow up was in 2014 at over 250 thousand ha. Initial clearing was generally between 20 and 50 thousand ha throughout the period except in 2007 when it dropped close to 0.

INDICATOR 12i:
Figure 50: Proportion of South
African Coastline with Marine
Bioregions (2004)




Data available for 2004 only. For all bioregions except Delagoa the largest proportion falls into the not in MPA category. For the Natal, SW Cape and Delagoa bioregions, the next largest proportion is category 2, and Category 1 for Agulhas. Namaqua is the only bioregion to have a significant proportion that falls into category 4.

INDICATOR 12j:
Figure 51: Proportional Protection Levels of National strategic Water Source Areas (2013)



Data available for 2013 only. For all provinces, the largest proportion is the Not Protected category, followed by Protected-Formal A and then Protected-Formal B for the Western Cape.

INDICATOR 12k:
Figure 52: Number of Rivers Monitored by the River Health Programme




Data available for 2014-2015. There was no change over the one year period in number of rivers monitored in any province. The highest number of rivers were in the Western Cape with 40 rivers, followed by the Eastern Cape with 30.

QUALITY INDICATORS -
(INDICATOR 13) QUALITY OF
DRINKING WATER


<p>DATA SOURCE:</p> <p>Department of Water Affairs 2014 Briefing Summary notes (https://www.dwa.gov.za/Documents/Blue%20Drop%20Report%202014.pdf)</p> <p>GHS 2016 (StatsSA)</p>	<p>DESCRIPTION: Measured by the variables Blue Drop Score and Subjective Quality of Drinking Water, this indicator is determined as a result of municipalities' attempts and commitment to providing a healthy, well organised and maintained source of drinking water. Some stakeholders have expressed concern that the Blue Drop Score may not provide a reliable assessment of the actual quality of drinking water, but instead provide a more overall view of the management of drinking water. The Subjective Quality of Drinking Water is a subjective outcome of the water distribution and filtration process. Total percentage subjective rating of water quality supply is rated: not safe to drink; not clear; not in good taste; not free from bad smells. Clean drinking water is essential for a healthy human and natural environment. As has been previously explained, this indicator should be considered with the Access indicator Access to Water, and the Adequacy indicators Acid Mine Drainage and Water Supply.</p>
---	--

INDICATOR 13a:
Figure 53: Blue Drop Score
(out of 100)




Data available for 2009-2014, except 2013. Every province showed a net increase over the whole period, although 2012 was the year when most provinces showed peak water quality of nearly 100, in the case of Gauteng. 2010 was the best year for the Free State, with a score of 80. The most consistent quality was shown by the Western Cape, with an increase to, and maintenance of a score of about 90.

INDICATOR 13b:
Figure 54: Subjective Quality
of Drinking Water: **Not Free**
from Bad Smells
(percentage of households)




Data available for 2005-2016. Throughout the period, the two provinces with markedly good performance in this category were the Western Cape and Gauteng provinces which were never above 5% of households. Gauteng was consistently below about 2.5%. The greatest improvement was shown by the Eastern Cape, which showed a net decrease of about 11 percentage points, with some fluctuation in between. Kwa-Zulu Natal also showed a consistent improvement, dropping from about 12% to roughly 9% in 2016. The Northern Cape and Free State both recorded a net increase in complaints in this category over the period, increasing by about 2 and 10 percentage points respectively.

INDICATOR 13c:
Figure 55: Subjective Quality of Drinking Water: Not Good in Taste (percentage of households)




Data available for 2005-2016. The best performers in this category were the Western Cape and Gauteng provinces, both below 5% throughout the period. The worst performer in 2005, which also showed the largest net improvement, was the Eastern Cape, decreasing complaints by 9 percentage points from 25% to 16%, with a low of 15% in 2013. Kwa-Zulu Natal showed a consistent improvement for a net decrease of about 2 percentage points to drop below 10%. The Northern Cape, Free State, North West and Mpumalanga all showed a net increase over the period, with complaints in the Free State increasing by about 5 percentage points.

INDICATOR 13d:
Figure 56: Subjective Quality of Drinking Water: Unsafe (percentage of households)



Data available for 2005-2016. Staying consistently below 2.5%, the best performers were the Western Cape and Gauteng. The worst performer in 2005 was the Eastern Cape, which showed a net decrease of about 8 percentage points between 2005 and 2016. Limpopo province also saw a decrease in complaints in this category. Mpumalanga showed a net increase of just under 10 percentage points over the same period. The Northern Cape, Free State, and North West also showed a net increase in complaints over this period.

INDICATOR 13e:
Figure 57: Subjective Quality of Drinking Water: **Not Clear** (percentage of households)



Data available for 2005–2016. The best performers were Gauteng and the Western Cape, both consistently below 5% throughout. The Eastern Cape was the worst performer in 2005 but showed the largest net improvement, dropping by about 10 percentage points from its initial 22%. Kwa-Zulu Natal was another province to show improvement, with a net decrease of about 3 percent points. The Northern Cape, Free State, North West, and Mpumalanga all showed a net increase in percentage of households in this category. The largest increase was shown by the Free State, from about 6% in 2005 to 15% in 2016, with a peak of 20% in 2013.


QUALITY INDICATORS - (INDICATOR 14) ECOLOGICAL FOOTPRINT

DATA SOURCE:
 Department of Environmental
 Affairs Environmental Indicators
 Database ([http://enviroindicator.
 environment.gov.za/](http://enviroindicator.environment.gov.za/))

DESCRIPTION: A measurement of the amount
 of biological land required per capita. **Note:**
 some stakeholders consider this indicator to

no longer be current; however it is included as
 it may still provide useful information.

INDICATOR 14:
Figure 58: Ecological Footprint
 (hectares of biological
 productive land per capita)



Data available for 2003,2005,2007,2008 and 2013. For the years in which data is available, the national ecological footprint was steady at about 2 ha per capita until 2008, when it dropped to 1.5 ha per capita. By 2013, it had increased to about 3.5 ha per capita.

QUALITY INDICATORS -
(INDICATOR 15) BIODIVERSITY

DATA SOURCE:


Department of Environmental
Affairs Environmental Indicators
Database ([http://enviroindicator.
environment.gov.za/](http://enviroindicator.environment.gov.za/))

SANBI Red List statistics ([http://
redlist.sanbi.org/stats.php](http://redlist.sanbi.org/stats.php))

BIODIVERSITY: An indication of natural
ecosystem health, by considering the different
types of species and protections afforded
to said species. This indicator may also be
understood as a means of showing the
commitment and success of government


in ensuring a healthy natural environment.
Biodiversity can be measured by a combination
of the **Percentages of Threatened Amphibian,
Bird and Mammal Species**, as well as number
of **Endemic Threatened Taxa**.

INDICATOR 15a:
Figure 59: Percentage of
Threatened Amphibian
Species by Threat Category




Data available for 2007, 2011, 2018. For all years, the LC category dominated, with 80%, 95% and 90% of amphibian species falling into this category in 2007, 2011 and 2018 respectively. All other categories showed less than 10% of species in all three years.

INDICATOR 15b:
Figure 60: Percentage of
Threatened Bird Species, by
Threat Category




Data available for 2007, 2012, 2016, 2017. The LC category dominated in all four years, with about 75% in 2007 and about 68% in all the other years. The percentage of species in the NT category started at 30% and climbed by about 2 percentage points over the whole period. The percentage of species in the VU category showed not net change between 2007 and 2017. Besides the EN category, which climbed to about 15%, all the other categories were well below 5% for all years

INDICATOR 15c:
Figure 61: Percentage of
 Threatened Mammal Species
 by Threat Category



Data available for 2007, 2012, 2018. The most dominant category in 2007 was DD with about 51% of mammal species. It decreased to 30% in 2015, and 23% in 2018. All the other categories (except LC) showed a similar decrease, although their starting values were lower. The percentage of species in the LC category was the only one to show an increase over the period, climbing from about 15% to 60% between 2007 and 2018.

**INDICATOR 15d: Figure
 62:** Number of Endemic
 Threatened Taxa by
 province (2011-2017)



Data available for 2011-2017 with no data for 2016. The Western Cape had by far the largest number of endemic threatened taxa throughout the period, followed by the Northern Cape and Eastern Cape. Most of the other provinces had fewer than 100 endemic threatened taxa and showed little change between 2011 and 2017. The Eastern Cape was the only province to show a noticeable decrease in number of endemic threatened taxa. The Northern Cape and Western Cape both had an increase in the number of endemic threatened taxa

QUALITY INDICATORS -
(INDICATOR 16) RESPONSIBLE
ENVIRONMENTAL
MANAGEMENT (BUSINESS)


DATA SOURCE:
(National) Department
of Environmental Affairs
Environmental Indicators
Database (<http://enviroindicator.environment.gov.za/>)

2016, 2018 Regional Data
from South African Bureau of
Standards website.
(www.sabs.co.za)

DESCRIPTION: ISO14001 certification requires a business to have a framework for environmental management. ISO 14001 is thus an indication of private commitment to environmental protection, management and sustainability. It may also show the successes government and civil society have had in advocating for environmental protection, as


government and civil pressures may influence business attitudes towards certification. Some stakeholders were critical of the value of ISO 14001, believing it to be a framework without any substantial real-world application. They were therefore sceptical of its actual real-world impact on environmental health.

INDICATOR 16a:
Figure 63: Number of ISO
14001 Companies, National



Data available for 2010-2018. The net increase in total national number of ISO 14001 certified companies was 100, for a total of 350 in 2018. The highest number of certified companies was in 2016 when there were 430.

INDICATOR 16b:
Figure 64: Number of ISO
14001 certified companies, by
province



Data available for 2016, 2018. In 2016 and 2018, the only provinces with significantly more than 20 certified companies were the Western Cape, Gauteng and Kwa-Zulu Natal. Gauteng and Kwa-Zulu Natal were the leaders, both having more than 90 companies in both years. Most provinces experienced a decrease in the number of certified companies in 2018. The North-West, Gauteng, Mpumalanga and Limpopo all showed increases.


QUALITY INDICATORS -
(INDICATOR 17) AIR QUALITY
IMPACT ON HEALTH AND
WELLBEING

DATA SOURCE:
Mortality and causes of death in South Africa (2003-2015): Findings from Death Notification (StatsSA)

DESCRIPTION: An indication of the air pollution and its impact on human health. This is considered an outcome as it is a result of government regulation, health care services and commitment by private and government owned companies to reducing air pollution. This indicator can be measured by the **Number of Deaths from TB** (strongly linked to indoor air pollution) and the **Number of Deaths from other Respiratory Causes**. Although air


pollution is not the only cause of such deaths, stakeholders have argued that air pollution exacerbates such health issues and is thus a primary, on-going cause. This indicator is considered separately from the Quality indicator **Health** as it highlights the direct relationship between air pollution and human health, but should be considered along with the related Adequacy indicators **Fine Particle Matter and Emission of Greenhouse Gases**.

INDICATOR 17a:
Figure 65: Number of TB Deaths, by Province



Data available for 2003-2015. The largest number of TB deaths during the entire period were in Kwa-Zulu Natal, at 20 thousand in 2003, rising to a high of 25 thousand in 2006/7 before falling steadily to about 12 thousand in 2015. Most of the provinces followed this pattern, although much less defined and with highs occurring slightly earlier or later. The Northern Cape was almost unchanging during the whole period, as the best performer throughout with less than 2000 deaths in all years. The national range was about 19 thousand in 2003, and decreased to about 10 thousand in 2015.

INDICATOR 17b:
Figure 66: Number of TB Deaths by Sex, National




Data available for 2003-2015. Both categories showed an identical trend, showing a net decrease of roughly 11 thousand deaths between 2003 and 2015 and a peak in 2006-2008 followed by a steady decline. Throughout that period, the range between male and female mortality from TB was about 8 thousand, with more male deaths.

QUALITY INDICATORS -
(INDICATOR 18) HEALTH

DATA SOURCE:
Mid-Year Population Estimates
(2002-2017) (StatsSA)

DESCRIPTION: Infants are especially vulnerable to pollution related illness, thus an assessment of Infant mortality gives an indication of the general quality of the environment in terms of health and wellbeing. A healthy environment is not the sole determinant of infant mortality; however stakeholders have argued that toxic pollution, unclean drinking water and air pollution have a significant impact on infant mortality.

INDICATOR 18:
Figure 67: Infant Mortality
(deaths per 1000 births)




Data available for 2002-2017. Infant deaths per 1000 births declined steadily from 48 in 2002 to 34 in 2017.

QUALITY INDICATORS -
(INDICATOR 19) GENERAL
ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS
EXPERIENCED

DATA SOURCE:
General Household Survey
2016 (StatsSA)

DESCRIPTION: Measured by the percentage of households who experience specific kinds of environmental problems. Stakeholders were particularly concerned about the inability (mainly caused by a lack of education) of ordinary people to determine environmental rights violations and to understand their right to environment.

INDICATOR 19:
Figure 68: Percentage
of Households that
Experience Specific Kinds of
Environmental Problems,
National




Data available for 2003-2016. Throughout the period, waste related problems were the most commonly experienced, rising from 30% in 2003 to 40% in 2016, with fluctuations. Land related problems—such as soil erosion—also showed a net increase, with a consistent rise from 15% in 2003 to 30% in 2016. Air related problems showed a very slight net decrease of 2 percentage points, and water related problems fluctuated around 15% of households with no net change over the period as a whole.

DATA SOURCE:
General Household Survey
2009-2016 (StatsSA)


DESCRIPTION: Food security is an outcome of a healthy environment capable of supporting sustainable agricultural practices. The issue of environmental sustainability is bound to food security as without food, South Africa cannot be said to be sustainable.

INDICATOR 20a:
Figure 69: Food access
severely inadequate,
percentage of households, by
province):




Data available from 2009-2016. The North West showed a large increase starting in 2011 to become one of the three provinces with the highest severe food inadequacy in 2016 at about 12%. The others were the Northern Cape and Mpumalanga. Limpopo province showed a significant decrease to become the province with the lowest severe food inadequacy at about 3% in 2016. The largest improvement over the period under consideration was by the Free State with a net decrease of about 10 percentage points. The range in 2009 was about 11 percentage points, and in 2016 it was roughly the same.

INDICATOR 20b:
Figure 70: Food access
inadequate, percentage of
households, by province



Data available from 2009-2016. Most provinces showed a net increase in food inadequacy during this period, with the North West being the most prominent, with just over 15 percentage points gained, starting from 5% in 2009, making it the province with the highest food inadequacy over the entire period. Gauteng province showed no net change over the period, making it the province with the second lowest food inadequacy after Limpopo. Limpopo province was the only one to show a net decrease over the period as a whole, of about 1 percentage point.

INDICATOR 20c:
Figure 71: Food Access
Adequate (percentage of households)



Data available from 2009-2016. The two best performing provinces from about 2011 onward were Limpopo and Gauteng, with 91% and 83% adequate food access in 2016 respectively. Except for the North West, all the other provinces were fairly close together from 2010 to 2015 (within about 6 percentage points of each other) falling between 70% and 75% adequate food access. In 2016 the Northern Cape and Mpumalanga fell below this level. The Free State went from being the worst performer by far at 65% in 2009 to the middle of pack in 2016 at 75%. This was the opposite trend to the North West, which dropped out from the middle of the pack at 80% adequate access in 2009 to the worst performer in 2016 at 64%.

QUALITY INDICATORS - (INDICATOR 21) COMMUNITY EXPERIENCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

DATA SOURCE:
General Household Survey
2009-2016 (StatsSA)

DESCRIPTION: A relative, subjective measurement of the health and suitability of the environment as perceived by communities. Provides a potentially significant general overview of environmental problems faced, however it is important to remember that this assessment is not comprehensive and is based upon answers to a questionnaire with prepared, rigid answer options. The issue of understanding and recognition of the right to environment, and the articulation of environmental issues may also lead to unintentional bias. This indicator is split into the following variables:

Irregular or no waste removal

Littering

Water Pollution


Outdoor / Indoor air pollution

Land degradation / over utilisation of natural resources

Excessive noise / noise pollution


Other: Please note that the statistics used are drawn from the Stats SA General Household Report 2013 and this variable is presented without explanation. It likely refers to any other environmental issue that was not considered in the questionnaire.

INDICATOR 21a:
Figure 72: Community Experience of Irregular or No Waste Removal, by Sex (number of households, thousands)




Data available for 2009-2016. For both male and female-led households, there was a net increase in the number of households who experienced irregular or no waste removal between 2009 and 2015. The numbers rose steadily from 1.5 million and 1 million in 2009 to 3 million and 2.1 million for male and female-led households respectively, followed by a sharp decrease in 2016 to 2.3 million and 1.7 million households respectively

INDICATOR 21b:
Figure 73: Community Experience of Littering, by Sex (number of households, thousands)




Data available for 2009-2016. Male and female led households showed a similar trend throughout the period. The numbers increased slowly until a large decrease in 2015 for a net decrease in household experience of littering between 2009 and 2015 of roughly 300 thousand and 200 thousand for male and female led households respectively. There was a sharp increase in 2016 in the number of households experiencing this problem to 3.2 million and 2.4 million households respectively.

INDICATOR 21c:
Figure 74: Community Experience of Water Pollution, by Sex (number of households, thousands)




Data available for 2009-2016. The number of both male and female-led households showed a steady increase from 600 thousand and 1 million households in 2009 to 1 million and 1.3 million household in 2016 for female and male led households respectively.

INDICATOR 21d:
Figure 75: Community Experience of Outdoor/Indoor Air Pollution, by Sex (number of households, thousands)




Data available for 2009-2016. Both categories showed a net increase, of 400 thousand from initial values of 800 thousand and 1.5 million for female and male-led households respectively. The largest numbers of households experiencing this problem were recorded in 2015.

INDICATOR 21e:
Figure 76: Community Experience of Land Degradation/Over Utilisation of Resources, by Sex (number of households, thousands)



Data available for 2009-2016. The numbers of both male and female-led households showed the same pattern of a steady increase to reach a high in 2014, followed by a sharp drop in 2015 and a sharp rise in 2016, for a net increase between the beginning and end of the time period. The net increase for female led households was about 800 thousand households and for male led households it was about 900 thousand.


INDICATOR 21f:
Figure 77: Community Experience of Excessive Noise/Noise Pollution, by Sex (number of households, thousands)



Data available for 2009-2016. The numbers of both male and female led households showed a net increase between the beginning and end of the period, although the trend for female led households had a spike in 2012 which was not mirrored by that of male led households. The peak in 2015 was pronounced for both categories of household. The net overall increases in number of households experiencing this problem were 300 thousand and 200 thousand households for female and male-led households respectively.


INDICATOR 21g: Other problems²⁰⁵, number of households, by sex of head of household, national

Figure 78: Community Experience of Other Problems, by Sex (number of households, thousands)



Data available for 2009-2016. The numbers of both male and female-led households showed noticeable fluctuation, but also a net decrease in the number of households experiencing this problem between 2009 and 2016. Female-led households showed a net decrease from 70 thousand to 60 thousand households and male-led ones a net decline from 140 thousand to 90 thousand households, with numbers of both having peaks in 2011 and 2013.

INDICATOR 21h:
Figure 79: Community Experience of Irregular or No Waste Removal, by Province (number of households, thousands)




Data available for 2009-2016. The two provinces with the least number of households with this problem were the Western Cape and the Northern Cape, which consistently had fewer than 100 thousand households experiencing this problem. The highest values were associated with Mpumalanga and Gauteng provinces which both showed a net increase over the period from less than to more than 600 thousand households. Kwa-Zulu Natal showed the same net increase as Gauteng, from about 500 thousand to 800 thousand households, but was not as consistently high as the other two for most of the period. By 2016, numbers of households in each province experiencing this problem were stratified into three clear groups: high (>600 thousand), moderate (~400 thousand) and low (<200 thousand).

FOOTNOTES:


205. The General Household survey does not explicitly provide any examples of problems that fall into this category. It is the collection of environmental problems that do not fit into the other categories, and could include a wide variety of complaints, possibly including animal and pest control problems.

INDICATOR 21i:
Figure 80: Community Experience of Littering, by Province (number of households, thousands)




Data available for 2009-2016. The Northern Cape, with consistently fewer than 100 thousand households reporting an experience of littering had the lowest values. All the provinces except two, Gauteng and Kwa-Zulu Natal showed no significant net change, remaining between 400 thousand and 600 thousand households. Gauteng showed an increase from 800 thousand households in 2009 to 1.4 million in 2016 and KwaZulu-Natal showed an increase from 800 thousand to 1.1 million.

INDICATOR 21j:
Figure 81: Community Experience of Water Pollution, by Province (number of households, thousands)




Data available for 2009-2016. The provinces with noticeably high values were Gauteng, Kwa-Zulu Natal and Eastern Cape provinces, in descending order, for most of the period. Of those three, only the Eastern Cape showed significant improvement after the initial increases. The Northern Cape, with consistently less than 100 thousand households experiencing water pollution, had the lowest values. The range in numbers among the remaining provinces besides these four was small throughout the period, and by 2016, they were all had between 100 thousand and 200 thousand households experiencing this problem.

INDICATOR 21k:
Figure 82: Community Experience of Outdoor/Indoor Air Pollution, by Province (number of households, thousands)




Data available for 2009-2016. Gauteng had significantly higher values than any other province, and showed a net increase from 600 thousand to 900 thousand households. The other provinces showed no major change until 2015 when they all showed a marked increase in number of households with this problem. The exceptions to this were the Western Cape and the Northern Cape which showed no net increase.

INDICATOR 21l:
Figure 83: Community Experience of Land Degradation/Over Utilisation of Natural Resources, by Province (number of households, thousands)




Data available for 2009-2016. Gauteng showed the largest values of all the provinces over the entire period, increasing past 1 million households before settling at 1 million from an initial value of about 700 thousand households in 2009. The other provinces showed very slight increases to highs in 2014 before decreasing noticeably both the numbers and the range between them in 2015. This pattern was reversed in 2016, with the range between among this middle group of provinces spreading from about 200 thousand to 600 thousand households. The North West province was the consistently the best performer throughout the period.

INDICATOR 21m:
Figure 84: Community Experience of Excessive Noise/Noise Pollution, by Province (number of households, thousands)



Data available for 2009-2016. Gauteng was the only province to have values above 600 thousand households over the entire period. All the other provinces were consistently below 400 thousand households except in 2015, when KwaZulu-Natal increased to about 500 thousand households experiencing this problem.

INDICATOR 21n:
Figure 85: Community Experience of Other Problems, by Province (number of households, thousands)



Data available for 2009-2016. Albeit with significant fluctuations, which were not matched by other provinces, Gauteng had the highest values over the whole period, with a net decrease of 20 thousand households between 2009 and 2016. KwaZulu-Natal and the Western Cape consistently had fewer than 40 thousand households in this category, with significant improvement by KwaZulu Natal to drop below 20 thousand households by 2014. The remaining provinces had consistently fewer than 20 thousand households in this category over the whole period.


QUALITY INDICATORS -
(INDICATOR 22) GOVERNMENTAL
FUNDING ALLOCATED TO
THE DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS (DEA)

DATA SOURCE:
Department of Environmental
Affairs Annual Reports
(<https://www.environment.gov.za/documents/reports>)

DESCRIPTION: As the most significant department involved directly in the environment, the budget of the DEA gives an indication of government's commitment to the environment. A breakdown of DEA spending into different areas shows governmental priorities and potential areas


of environmental concern. Variables include the amount of funds spent on **DEA legal, authorisation and compliance, Oceans and Coasts, Climate Change and Air Quality, Biodiversity and Conservation, Environmental Programmes, and Chemicals and Waste Management.**

INDICATOR 22a:
Figure 86: Oceans and Coasts
Programme (unadjusted ZAR)



Data available for 2005/6 to 2015/16. Appropriation and expenditure were exactly matched throughout the period and showed a slight net increase of about R100 million, with a very large peak in 2011/12 of almost R900 million and a dip in 2010/11 to just under R200 million from an initial value of about R280 million in 2005/6.

INDICATOR 22b:²⁰⁶
Figure 87: Climate Change
Programme (unadjusted ZAR)



Data available for 2009/10 to 2015/16. Appropriation and expenditure were exactly matched for the whole period except in the 2010/11 financial year when appropriation was higher by about R20 million. Between the beginning and the end of the period there was little net change in expenditure from the initial R250 million, notwithstanding the peak value of R500 million in 2010/11 and a significant dip to about R25 million in 2012/13²⁰⁷.

FOOTNOTES:


206. Until 2010/11 annual report, "Air Quality Management and Climate Change" was a sub-programme of the Environmental Quality and Protection programme. Thereafter, "Climate Change" was a separate programme.
207. These values as reflected in the actual 2012/13 report are not consistent with corresponding 'historical' values in the next year's (2013/14) report. The 2012/13 values as recorded in the 2012/13 report were used here.

INDICATOR 22c:
Figure 88: Biodiversity and Conservation Programme (unadjusted ZAR)




Data available for 2005/6 to 2015/16. Allocation and expenditure were exactly matched throughout the period and showed a steady increase from R300 million in the 2005/6 financial year to R700 million in 2015/16.

INDICATOR 22d:²⁰⁸
Figure 89: Environmental Programmes (unadjusted ZAR)



Data available for 2011/12-2015/16. Appropriation and expenditure were matched throughout the period except in the 2012/13 financial year when appropriation was roughly R200 million higher. Between the beginning and the end of the period, expenditure showed a net increase of R1.5 billion from the initial value of R2 billion. The increase over this period was relatively consistent.

INDICATOR 22e:²⁰⁹
Figure 90: Chemicals and Waste Management Programme (unadjusted ZAR)




Data available for 2012/13 to 2015/16. Appropriation was higher than expenditure in 2013/14 financial year by roughly R1 million. In all other years, appropriation was equal to expenditure. Overall, the two showed an increase from R58 million in 2012/13 to R80 million in 2015/16.

FOOTNOTES:

208. This programme either did not exist or was inconsistently named and accounted until the 2012/13 annual report
209. Until the 2013/14 annual report, the "Pollution and Waste Management" activity was a sub-programme of the Environmental Quality and Protection programme. Thereafter it became a separate programme called "Chemicals and Waste Management"

INDICATOR 22f:
Figure 91: Total Budget
 Allocation to the DEA
 (unadjusted ZAR)



Data available for 2007/8 to 2015/16. For the duration of the period between 2007/8 and 2015/16 financial years, the Department of environmental affairs has consistently spent within 90% of its allocated budget. Depicted in the figure is a net increase over the entire period of about R 3.25 billion from an initial allocation of R 2.75 billion in 2007/8. The overall pattern was a steady increase except for the 2010/11 financial year, which saw a sharp decline in the allocation to slightly under R 2.5 billion. Holistically, this pattern largely speaks well of the Department's financial management environment although the inevitable return of funds to the National Revenue Fund resulting from less than 100% expenditure requires further improvement.


QUALITY INDICATORS - (INDICATOR 23) ENVIRONMENTAL INFRINGEMENTS

DATA SOURCE:
 Department of Environmental
 Affairs National Environmental
 Compliance and Enforcement
 Reports (<https://www.environment.gov.za/otherdocuments/reports#legal>)

DESCRIPTION: This indicator potentially shows the government's commitment to enforcing state of environment rights in the real world. It may also be a reflection of the understanding of the right to environment amongst people in South Africa. However, it is important to remember that this is not a comprehensive

indicator, as access to the resources required to lodge complaints and pursue legal remedies is limited. This indicator considers the following variables; Number of Reported Environmental Incidents, Total Number of Arrests and Number of Inspections.

INDICATOR 23a:
Figure 92: Number of
 Reported Incidents




Data available for 2008-2013²¹⁰. The total number of reported incidents showed a net increase just over 4500 incidents to 6000 incidents reported in 2013. There were significantly fewer incidents than this reported in 2010 and 2011, with a trough at about 4000 incidents.

FOOTNOTES:

210. Reports for subsequent years refer only to "section 30" incidents, rather than total reported incidents

INDICATOR 23b:
Figure 93: Total Number
of Arrests



Data available for 2008–2017. There was a steady decrease from 2600 in 2008 to a low of 1400 arrests in 2012 followed by an increase to 1800 in 2013 then a decline to about 950 in 2016. Between the beginning and end of the period there was a net decrease in the number of arrests of about 1500.


INDICATOR 23c:
Figure 94: Number of
Inspections Conducted




Data available for 2010–2017. Between the beginning and end of the period, the number of inspections conducted showed a net increase of more than 400 inspections from an initial value of 2400 in 2010, with the lowest value overall being approximately 1700 inspections conducted in 2011.

Environmental Inspectors undertake a range of monitoring and investigative work. The indicators above and below reflect an improvement in the overall number of inspections but complementary to that are the often low arrest rates. This is especially evident in relation to the numbers of rhinoceros poached in 2011 and 2014 against the associated arrests for rhino-related crimes. Nationally in 2011, a total of 448 rhinos poached was met with 232 related arrests while in some provinces such as the Western Cape no arrests were made in spite of 6 poaching reports in the same year. In 2014 the total numbers of rhinos poached were at a staggering 1244 with 386 related arrests. In recent years the capacity of the inspectorate has received significant media coverage and political attention given the importance of the species. In 2014, the Integrated Strategic Management Approach was approved by Cabinet, enhancing current anti-poaching interventions in South Africa.

INDICATOR 23d:
Figure 95: Number of Rhinos Poached and related Arrests (2011)²¹¹



INDICATOR 23d:
Figure 96: Number of Rhinos Poached and related Arrests (2014)²¹²



FOOTNOTES:

211. Note: This figure is not a designated indicator but serves to provide an example of the work of environmental inspectors (Green Scorpions) across various national institutions

212. Source: 'Green Scorpions' National Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Report 2014/15 Available Online: https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/reports/201415_necer_report.pdf

CHAPTER SIX:

Conclusion: The status of the right to a healthy environment

This report has highlighted both positive and negative trends reflected in policy and (some) budget responses to promoting environmental protection, human wellbeing and sustainable development. South African legislation in relation to the management, governance and protection of the environment since 1994 has been extolled within the region and internationally. In keeping with national priorities for redress, equity and access, it is in the recognition of the nexus between social and ecological justice that the constitutional right guaranteed by Section 24 is considered particularly progressive in some respects. Households' levels of access to municipal waste collection, basic sanitation, electricity and clean water have increased in all provinces.

It is still apparent; however, that much must still change before the right to a clean, healthy and protected environment can begin to be a reality for all who live in South Africa. Gender, race and geographic disparities still exist. The allocation of national resources shows a clear under-prioritisation of environmental programmes. Municipalities are still not adequately supported to fulfil monitoring and delivery functions in spite of progressive, supportive policy and legislative frameworks.

A fundamental shift in the interpretation and delineation of the right itself is required. There needs to be a radical shift in the implementation of environmental policy and enforcement of legislation that seeks to protect precious resources and, by extension, ecosystem services and human wellbeing. Municipalities and provincial entities must be provided adequate technical capacity to fulfil core environmental management requirements. To do this not only must the South African government allocate sufficient funds but related strategic planning must be SMART and responsive to a dynamic delivery environment. It can no longer be business as usual across DEA departments and affiliated entities. This change is required particularly in those programmes mandated to ensure

waste management is effective, pollution is minimised and climate change innovation transcends mere promises in policies. Climate change innovation and adaptation must happen at a pace aligned with the international agreements that South Africa has ratified at the very least. All departments must take steps to ensure that environmental governance is integral to their operations as envisioned in policies such as the Department of Health's Environmental Health Policy. For this to happen, the Environmental Health Policy must become a costed, implemented plan, for instance.

Water scarcity is a significant threat with 98% of water resources in the country already allocated. The indicators discussed in this report highlight many sources of pressure and potential tipping points. Most pressing are increased GHG emissions, water contamination and land degradation. Minimal funding for environmental affairs results in constrained target-setting and will have negative impacts on personnel-heavy, socially-oriented programmes such as the WfW and WoW programmes. While these programmes are not intended to offer permanent employment nor particularly regular employment – their social impact is unrivalled particularly in province with high unemployment and rich biodiversity in need of protection.

Funding for Conservation and Biodiversity sees marginal, though more encouraging allocation trends as compared to also being systematic reductions noted in an earlier version of this report.

There is a definite need for the South African government to elevate funding levels for environmental affairs to match policy commitment and ever-increasing pressure from key drivers such as urbanization, increasing household demand for service and increasing, poorly regulated industrial growth. In addition to possible advocating for more funds via the DoRA, the DEA itself must seek to find innovative ways to increase revenue collection to invest back into conservation.

The Carbon Tax Bill currently in its proposal phase offers an important opportunity. This is an urgent consideration as South Africa is in fact set to increase its GHG emissions over the next two decades. The DEA and associated departments must actively seek ways to ensure that responses to a coal-hungry economy do not set the country back from COP21 and specifically the Paris Agreement at the expense of human wellbeing and at the highest possible cost to the environment on which we all depend for food, water, shelter, clean air and general wellbeing.

Ultimately it will be of little significance that South Africa is a leading voice in global climate and environment agreements if such pioneering work and legislation does not translate to responsive funding and prioritisation at all levels of government.

It is within the realm of South African courts to aid the process of more comprehensively defining the entitlements provided for by Section 24. To what standards are citizens (as rights holders) able to hold their government to account in fulfilling this right? To acknowledge its complexity and need for interdepartmental involvement is not an adequate response to South Africans who continue to live under conditions that adversely affect their physical health and overall wellbeing and whose environment is neither protected nor healthy.

Finally – it is also imperative for the South African government to ensure that the nexus between the rights of communities living in resource-rich areas such as Xolobeni in the Eastern Cape and the landscapes themselves are adequately protected from unsustainable, unjust exploitation.

CHAPTER SEVEN:

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Additional Protocol to the American Convention on Human Rights in the Area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights ("Protocol of San Salvador"). Available from: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3b90.html>

Adebayo, A., Musvoto G., Adebayo, P., *Towards the Creation of Healthier City Neighbourhoods for Marginalised Communities in South Africa: a Case Study of the South Durban Industrial Basin in the City of Durban*. Available from: <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs12132-012-9172-y#page-1>

African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, *Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa*. Available from:

American Association for the Advancement of Science, *Manual on Environmental Health Indicators and Benchmarks: Human Rights Perspectives (2007)*, A. Karim Ahmed, Anya Ferring and Lina Ibarra Ruiz. Available from: <http://www.aaas.org/sites/default/files/migrate/uploads/EnvironmentalHealth.pdf>.

Balmer, M., *Household coal use in an urban township in South Africa*. Journal of Energy in Southern Africa, Vol. 18, No. 3, August 2007: pp 27-32 Available from: http://www.erc.uct.ac.za/sites/default/files/image_tool/images/119/jesa/18-3jesa-balmer2.pdf

Burger, S. 14th November 2014. *South Africa Begins Waking up to the Economic Potential of Waste Recycling: Waste to Wealth*, Creamer Media Engineering News. Available Online: <http://www.engineeringnews.co.za/article/south-africa-begins-waking-up-to-the-economic-potential-of-waste-recycling-2014-11-13>

Company Secretary of Arcelormittal South Africa v Vaal Environmental Justice Alliance (69/2014). Available from: <http://www.saflii.org/za/cases/ZASCA/2014/184.pdf>

Constanza, R. 2000. Social Goals and Valuation of Ecosystem Services

Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996

Department of Environmental Affairs, State of the Environment Report (SOER). Chapter 3: What Is affecting our Environment?

Department of Environmental Affairs, 2nd South Africa Environment Outlook: A Report on the State of the Environment. 2016

Department of Environmental Affairs, *Acts and Regulations*, <https://www.environment.gov.za/legislation/actsregulations>

Department of Environmental Affairs, *Budget and Policy Speech 2016/17* Delivered by Minister Edna Molewa 3rd May 2016 Available Online: <http://www.gov.za/speeches/minister-edna-molewa-tables-department-environmental-affairs-20162017-budget-vote-policy>

Department of Environmental Affairs, *Environmental Sustainability Indicators Technical Report (2011)*. Available from: https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/docs/environmental_sustainability_indicators.pdf

Department of Environmental Affairs, *Green House Gas Inventory for South Africa 2000 – 2010*. Available from: https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/docs/greenhousegas_inventoriesouthafrica.pdf

Department of Environmental Affairs, *South Africa Country Report: Fourteenth session of the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development*, September 2005. Available from: <http://www.un.org/esa/agenda21/natlinfo/countr/safrica/industry.pdf>

Department of Environmental Affairs, *State of Environmental Systems Environmental Sustainability Indicator Report*. Available from https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/docs/envirosustainability_indicators_systems_state.pdf

Department of Environmental Affairs, *Strategic Plan (2011)*. Available from: <http://db3sqepoi5n3s.cloudfront.net/files/docs/110607stratplan.pdf>

- Department of Environmental Affairs, *The Environmental Sustainability Indicator Report State of Environmental Systems*. Available from: https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/docs/2009envirosustainability_indicators_introduction.pdf
- Department of the Presidency, *Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, Draft Outcome 10 MTSF 2014-2019*, available from: <http://www.dpme.gov.za/keyfocusareas/outcomesSite/MTSF%201/Outcome%2010%20Environment%20MTSF%20Chapter.pdf>
- Department of Water Affairs & Forestry, *South African Water Quality Guidelines, Volume 1: Domestic Water Use*, Second Edition, 1996. Available from: https://www.dwaf.gov.za/IWQS/wq_guide/domestic.pdf
- Department of Water Affairs, *Annual Report 2013/14*, available from: <https://www.dwa.gov.za/documents/AnnualReports/DWA%20ANNUAL%20REPORT%202013-14.pdf>
- Department of Water Affairs, *Draft White Paper on Water Services: Water is Life, Sanitation is Dignity, Draft for Public Comment*, October 2002, available from: http://www.gov.za/sites/www.gov.za/files/draft_SA_water_services_wp6.1.pdf
- Dickens C., Graham P., *The South African Scoring System (SASS) Version 5 Rapid Bioassessment Method for Rivers*, African Journal of Aquatic Science 2002, 27: 1-10. Available from: <https://www.dwa.gov.za/documents/AnnualReports/DWA%20ANNUAL%20REPORT%202013-14.pdf>
- Du Plessis, A (2009), *Fulfilment of South Africa's Constitutional Environmental Right in the Local Government Sphere*. The Netherlands: Wolf Legal Publishers.
- Environmental Law Association, Mosdell, S., *South Africa's Incoherent Sustainable Development Law – 'an opportune time for reform?* Available from: http://www.elasa.co.za/uploads/1/1/8/2/11823994/presentation_-_ms_susan_mosdell.pdf
- EThekweni Municipality, http://www.durban.gov.za/City_Government/Administration/Area_Based_Management/South_Durban_Basin/Pages/default.aspx
- European Environmental Agency, *Exceedance of air quality limit values in urban areas (CSI 004)*. Available from: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/exceedance-of-air-quality-limit-3/assessment>
- Forestry Laws Amendment Act (No. 35 of 2005)*. Available from: <https://www.dwaf.gov.za/Documents/Legislature/a35-05.pdf>
- Fakoya, M.B. 2014. Institutional Challenges to Municipal Waste Management Service Delivery in South Africa. *Journal of Human Ecology* 45 (2) 119-125.
- Fox, R., and Rowntree K. 2000. *The Geography of South Africa in a Changing World* Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK. 509 pp.
- Fuel Retailers Association of Southern Africa v Director-General: Environmental Management, Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Environment, Mpumalanga Province and Others 2007 (10) BCLR 1059 (CC)*. Available from: <http://www.saflii.org/za/cases/ZACC/2007/13.html>
- Glazeweski, J (2005) *Environmental Law in South Africa, 2nd edn*. Durban: LexisNexis Butterworths.
- Godfrey, L. and Oelofse, S. 2017. *Historical Review of Waste Management and Recycling in South Africa*. Resources 6 (57)
- Hanqin, X., *Transboundary Damage in International Law*. Available from: <http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/samples/cam033/2002067377.pdf>
- Hichange Investments (Pty) Ltd v Cape Products Company (Pty) Ltd t/a Pelts Products & Others (2004)*. Available from: <https://cer.org.za/virtual-library/judgments/high-courts/hichange-investments-pty-ltd-v-cape-produce-co-pty-ltd-ta-pelts-products-and-others-2004-e>
- HTF Developers (Pty) Ltd v Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism and Others (24371/05)*. Available from <http://www.saflii.org/za/cases/ZAGPHC/2006/132.html>

- Kotze, L.J., du Plessis, A; *SOME BRIEF OBSERVATIONS ON FIFTEEN YEARS OF ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS JURISPRUDENCE IN SOUTH AFRICA*, Available from: http://law.pace.edu/sites/default/files/IJIEA/jciKotze_South%20Africa%203-17_cropped.pdf
- African Union, *PROTOCOL TO THE AFRICAN CHARTER ON HUMAN AND PEOPLES' RIGHTS ON THE RIGHTS OF WOMEN IN AFRICA*, Available from: http://www.achpr.org/files/instruments/women-protocol/achpr_instr_proto_women_eng.pdf
- United Nations General Assembly, *Analytical study on the relationship between human rights and the environment: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (2011)*, Available from: http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/HRCouncil/RegularSession/Session19/A-HRC-19-34_en.pdf
- King, N., Rosmarin, T. and Friedmann, Y. 2005. *Background Research Paper produced for the South Africa Environment Outlook report on behalf of the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism*
- Kotze L.J., and du Plessis A. (2009), *Some Brief Observations on Fifteen Years of Environmental rights Jurisdiction in South Africa*. Available from:
- Local Government Municipal Systems Act (No. 32 of 2000)*. Available from: http://www.energy.gov.za/files/policies/act_municipalsystem_32of2000.pdf
- Marine Living Resources Act (No. 18 of 1998)*. Available from: https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/legislations/marine_livingresources_act18.pdf
- McNeill, J. 2018. BizTrends 2018: *Innovation critical to the Future of Waste Management in South Africa*: <http://www.bizcommunity.com/Article/196/721/171976.html>
- MEC: Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Environment and Another v HTF Developers (Pty) Limited (CCT 32/07)*. Available from: <http://www.saflii.org/za/cases/ZACC/2007/25.html>
- Minister of Public Works and Others vs. Kyalami Ridge Environmental Association and Others 2001 (7) BCLR 652 (CC)*. Available from: <http://www.saflii.org/za/cases/ZACC/2001/19.pdf>
- Mjoli, N. 2012. *Evaluation of Sanitation Upgrading Programmes - the Case of the Bucket Eradication Programme*: Report to the Water Research Commission
- Nahman, A., Wise R and de Lange, W. 2009. *Environmental and resource economics in South Africa: Status quo and lessons for developing countries*. South African Journal of Science 105(No. 9-10), September/October 2009.
- National Centre for Biotechnology Information, *Prevalence of asthma and respiratory symptoms in south-central Durban, South Africa, European Journal of Epidemiology*, 1999. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10555619>
- National Environment Management: Air Quality Act (No. 39 of 2004) and Amendments*. Available from: https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/legislations/nema_amendment_act39.pdf
- National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act (No. 57 of 2003)*. Available from: https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/legislations/nema_amendment_act57.pdf
- National Environmental Management: Waste Act (No. 59 of 2008)*. Available from: https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/legislations/nema_amendment_act59.pdf
- National Planning Commission, National Development Plan 2030: Our Future – Make it Work (Executive Summary)*, <http://www.education.gov.za/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=09T%2BvV0a5Sg%3D&tabid=628&mid=2062>
- National Treasury, Budget Review 2016, Available from: <http://www.treasury.gov.za/documents/national%20budget/2016/review/FullReview.pdf>
- National Treasury 2018. *Division of Revenue Bill 2018*
- National Treasury 2018. *Estimates of National Expenditure: Vote 27: Environmental Affairs*

National Treasury 2018. *Estimates of National Expenditure 2018*: Vote 36: Water and Sanitation

Nedbank. Undated. *COP21 and the Paris Agreement: An Analysis*. Available Online: <https://www.nedbank.co.za/content/dam/nedbank/site-assets/AboutUs/Sustainability/General/COP%2021%20Analysis%20March%202016%20Final.pdf>

North West Provincial Government, *The Environmental and Sustainable Development Indicators, North West Province*. Archived resource available from: <https://web.archive.org/web/20140910132032/http://www.nwpg.gov.za/soer/FullReport/indicators.htm>

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)* (3 January 1976). Available from: <http://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/cescr.aspx>

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, *The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948). Available from: http://www.ohchr.org/en/udhr/documents/udhr_translations/eng.pdf

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, *United Nations Report of the Independent Expert on the issue of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, John H. Knox*. Available from: http://www.ohchr.org/documents/hrbodies/hrcouncil/regularsession/session22/a-hrc-22-43_en.pdf

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *Key Environmental Indicators (2008)*. Available from: <http://www.oecd.org/env/indicators-modelling-outlooks/37551205.pdf>

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *The OECD Environmental Indicators: Development, Measurement and Use Reference Paper*. Available from: <http://www.oecd.org/environment/indicators-modelling-outlooks/24993546.pdf>

Palmer, J. and Neal, P. 1994. *The Handbook of Environmental Education*, New York, Routledge, 2780pp. New York. 278 pp.

Rennkamp B., Energy Research Centre, University of Cape Town Research Report Series: Sustainable development planning in South Africa: a case of over-strategizing? Available from: http://www.erc.uct.ac.za/sites/default/files/image_tool/images/119/Papers-2013/13-Rennkamp-Sustainable-Development_Planning.pdf

Shell and BP South African Petroleum Refineries. Available from: <http://www.sapref.com/FAQ>

South African Air Quality Information Systems, The South African National Atmospheric Emissions Inventory System. Available from: <http://www.saaqis.org.za/Emissions4.aspx>

South African Human Rights Commission, Report on Economic and Social Rights 2012-2013 Section 184(3) Report. Available from: [http://www.sahrc.org.za/home/21/files/Final%20S184\(3\)%20Report%202012-2013.pdf](http://www.sahrc.org.za/home/21/files/Final%20S184(3)%20Report%202012-2013.pdf)

South African Human Rights Commission, Report on the Right to Access Sufficient Water and Decent Sanitation in South Africa, 2014: Water is Life. Sanitation is Dignity: Accountability to People who are Poor, 2014, available from: <http://www.sahrc.org.za/home/21/files/FINAL%204th%20Proof%204%20March%20-%20Water%20%20Sanitation%20low%20res%20%282%29.pdf>

South African Journal of Child Health, Ambient pollution and respiratory outcomes among schoolchildren in Durban, South Africa. Available from: <http://www.sajch.org.za/index.php/SAJCH/article/view/598/474>

Statistics South Africa, Selected Development Indicators, 2013. Available from: <http://beta2.statssa.gov.za/publications/P03182/P031822013.pdf>

The Mining and Petroleum Resources Development Act (No. 28 of 2002). Available from: <http://www.dmr.gov.za/publications/finish/109-mineral-and-petroleum-resources-development-act-2002/225-mineraland-petroleum-resources-development-actmprda/0.html>

The National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act (No. 10 of 2004). Available from: https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/legislations/nema_amendment_act10.pdf

The State versus Blue Platinum Ventures PTY LTD and Matome Samuel Maponya. Available from: http://cer.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/S-v-BLue-Platinum-Ventures-16-Pty-Ltd-and-others-_sentencing.pdf

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), The National Coordinating Committee for the Millennium Development Goals, Millennium Development Goals Country Report 2013. Available from: http://www.za.undp.org/content/dam/south_africa/docs/Reports/The_Report/MDG_October-2013.pdf

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), The Sustainable Development Goals. Available from: <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/corporate/sustainable-development-goals-booklet.html>

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), undated. Working for Water: A South African Sustainability Case Study

United Nations Environment Programme, UNEP Yearbook: Emerging Issues in Our Global Environment (Chapter 4) Key Environmental Indicators: Tracking progress towards environmental sustainability (2012). Available from: <https://www.unenvironment.org/resources/year-books>

United Nations Environment Programme, Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Effective 8 September 2003. Available from: <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/mdg/Resources/Attach/Indicators/OfficialList.pdf>

United Nations Environment Programme, Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (1992). http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/RIO_E.PDF

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Draft decision -/CP.17, Establishment of an Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action, Available from https://unfccc.int/files/meetings/durban_nov_2011/decisions/application/pdf/cop17_durbanplatform.pdf.

United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), Analytical Study on the Relationship between Human Rights and the Environment: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, A/HRC/19/34 (16 December 2011). Available from: <http://undocs.org/en/A/HRC/19/34>

United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development, Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future. Available from: <http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf>

United Nations, The Millennium Development Goals. Available from <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/report-2013/mdg-report-2013-english.pdf>

United Nations, World Summit on Sustainable Development: Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development. Available from: <http://www.un-documents.net/jburgdec.htm>

United States National Library of Medicine National Institutes of Health, Prevalence of asthma and respiratory symptoms in south-central Durban, South Africa, European Journal of Epidemiology, 1999. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10555619>

Van der Linde, M. and Feris, L. (Eds) 2010. Compendium of South African Environmental Legislation (2nd Edition). Pretoria University Law Press (PULP).

World Health Organization, WHO Air quality guidelines for particulate matter, ozone, nitrogen dioxide and sulfur dioxide, Global update 2005: Summary of risk assessment. Available from: http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2006/WHO_SDE_PHE_OEH_06.02_eng.pdf

World Resource Institute, Environmental Indicators: A Systematic Approach to Measuring and Reporting on Environmental Policy Performance in the Context of Sustainable Development by the World Resources Institute. Available from: http://pdf.wri.org/environmentalindicators_bw.pdf

Zipplies, R (Ed). 2008. Bending the Curve: Your Guide to Tackling Climate Change in South Africa. Africa Geographic.

ANNEXURES:

ANNEXURE 1: DETAILS OF MAIN PROGRAMMES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

PROGRAMME	PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES/PURPOSE
1: Administration	"provide leadership, strategic, centralised administration, executive support, corporate services and facilitate effective cooperative governance, international relations and environmental education and awareness."
2: Legal Authorisations Compliance and Enforcement	promote the development and implementation of an enabling legal regime and licensing/ authorisation system to ensure enforcement and compliance with environmental law.
3: Oceans and Coasts	"promote, manage and provide strategic leadership on oceans and coastal conservation. The programme is made-up of five sub programmes which are as follows: (1) Oceans and Coasts Management (2) Integrated Coastal Management (3) Oceans and Coastal Research (4) Oceans Conservation (5) Specialist Monitoring Services."
4: Climate Change and Air Quality Management	"improve air and atmospheric quality, lead and support, inform, monitor and report efficient and effective international, national and significant provincial and local responses to climate change. The programme is made-up of seven sub programmes which are as follows: (1) Climate Change Management (2) Climate Change Mitigation (3) Climate Change Adaptation (4) Air Quality Management (5) South African Weather Service (6) International Climate Change Relations and Negotiations (7) Climate Change Monitoring and Evaluation."
5: Biodiversity and Conservation	"ensure the regulation and management of all biodiversity, heritage and conservation matters in a manner that facilitates sustainable economic growth and development. The programme is made-up of eight sub programmes which are as follows: (1) Biodiversity and Conservation Management (2) Biodiversity Planning and Management (3) Protected Areas Systems Management (4) iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority (5) South African National Parks (6) South African National Biodiversity Institute (7) Biodiversity Monitoring and Evaluation (8) Biodiversity Economy and Sustainable Use."
6: Environmental Programmes	"facilitate the implementation of expanded public works and green economy projects in the environmental sector. The programme is made-up of eight sub programmes: (1) Environmental Protection and Infrastructure Programme (2) Working for Water and Working on Fire (3) Green Fund (4) Environmental Programmes Management (5) Information Management and Sector Coordination."
7: Chemical and Waste Management	"and ensure that chemicals and waste management policies and legislation are implemented and enforced in compliance with chemicals and waste management authorisations, directives and agreements. The programme is made-up of five sub programmes which are as follows: (1) Chemicals and Waste Management (2) Hazardous Waste Management and Licensing (3) General Waste and Municipal Support (4) Chemicals and Waste Policy, Evaluation and Monitoring (5) Chemicals Management."

ANNEXURES:

ANNEXURE 2:
ENVIRONMENTAL
INFRASTRUCTURE GRANT
BY BUDGET VOTE (SOURCE:
NATIONAL TREASURY)

ENERGY (VOTE 26)	Integrated National Electrification Programme (Municipal) Grant	To implement the Integrated National Electrification Programme by providing capital subsidies to municipalities to address the electrification backlog of occupied residential dwellings, and the installation of bulk infrastructure.
	Water Services Infrastructure Grant	To facilitate the planning and implementation of various water and sanitation projects to accelerate backlog reduction and improve the sustainability of services in prioritised district municipalities, especially in rural municipalities; provide interim, intermediate water and sanitation services that ensure provision of services to identified and prioritised communities, including through spring protection, drilling, testing and equipping of boreholes and on-site solutions; to support drought relief projects in affected municipalities.
WATER AND SANITATION (VOTE 36)	Regional Bulk Infrastructure Grant	To develop new, refurbish, upgrade and replace ageing infrastructure that connects water resources to infrastructure serving extensive areas across municipal boundaries or large regional bulk infrastructure serving numerous communities over a large area within a municipality; to develop new, refurbish, upgrade and replace ageing waste water infrastructure of regional significance; to pilot regional Water Conservation and Water Demand Management projects or facilitate and contribute to the implementation of local Water Conservation and Water Demand Management projects that will directly impact on bulk infrastructure requirements.

ANNEXURE 3:
CPI TABLE

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Index	67.8	70.7	74.2	78.4	82.9	88	92	97.8	103	105.7

ANNEXURES:

ANNEXURE 4: INDICATOR DETAILS AND ANALYSIS

ACCESS

1. ACCESS TO MAINS ELECTRICITY:

People with access to mains electricity tend to burn far less fossil fuels. As such, access to mains electricity can significantly reduce local air pollution. Access to mains electricity also reduces the amount of deforestation and damage to flora, as energy generation without electricity tends to involve the burning of combustible material, including wood and grass. In addition, the use of mains electricity also reduces the amount of air pollution (especially indoor air pollution), and can significantly improve human health. The extent to which access to mains electricity reduces pollution is highly dependent on the source of the energy.

2. ACCESS TO BASIC SANITATION:

Access to sanitation significantly improves local environmental quality and human health. Sanitation is defined as the "*collection, removal, disposal or treatment of human excreta and domestic wastewater, and the collection, treatment and disposal of industrial wastewater where this is done by or on behalf of a water services authority*."²¹³ The proper treatment and disposal of faecal waste made possible by access to basic sanitation, reduces water and land pollution and significantly reduces the risk of cholera and other diseases. Therefore, access to basic sanitation is vital for an environment that is healthy and promotes human and natural wellbeing.

3. ACCESS TO WATER:

Access to water leads to a significant improvement in human health. Properly provisioned water from a sustainable source also decreases potential strain on river and other water systems. It is significant to note that there are some concerns with the quality of access provided. In some instances, infrastructure provided on paper is in reality "*broken or dysfunctional*."²¹⁴ Not only does non-functioning infrastructure negatively impact on human access, poorly constructed and badly maintained results in loss and waste of water, which impacts on sustainability and increases strain on already limited natural water resources.

4. ACCESS TO WASTE REMOVAL SERVICES:

Access to waste removal reduces local air, land and water pollution as well as improving human health. Statistics South Africa highlights the importance of refuse removal to "*maintain environmental hygiene of the households' neighborhoods*."²¹⁵ This indicator considers the removal of refuse (whether by municipality or private arrangement) at least once a week. It is important to note that urban and metropolitan areas have a far higher rate of refuse removal than rural areas. Ideally, the data should be considered in terms of rural, urban and metropolitan, however before the Statistics South Africa General Household Survey 2013 this additional data was not captured. Although refuse removal includes the "*proper disposal*" of waste, this indicator does not properly consider the management and proper disposal of waste after removal.²¹⁶ In this sense, this indicator must be considered along with the adequacy indicator Waste Recycled.

5. ACCESS TO NATURAL ENVIRONMENT: Access to national parks ensures physical accessibility to healthy natural environment as well as increasing biodiversity and is measured by the number of national parks and the number of visitors. Unfortunately, this indicator does not fully consider location or the nature of the visitors.

FOOTNOTES:

213. Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, Draft White Paper on Water Services: Water is Life, Sanitation is Dignity, Draft for Public Comment, October 2002, available from: http://www.gov.za/sites/www.gov.za/files/draft_SA_water_services_wp6.1.pdf. Page iii.
214. South African Human Rights Commission, Report on the Right to Access Sufficient Water and Decent Sanitation in South Africa, 2014: Water is Life. Sanitation is Dignity: Accountability to People who are Poor, 2014, available from: <http://www.sahrc.org.za/home/21/files/FINAL%204th%20Proof%204%20March%20-%20Water%20%20Sanitation%20low%20res%20%282%29.pdf>. Page 14.
215. Statistics South Africa, General Household Survey 2016, available from: <http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0318/P03182016.pdf>. Page 46.
216. Statistics South Africa, General Household Survey 2016, available from: <http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0318/P03182016.pdf>. Page 46.

Therefore, although the indicator does provide useful data, its significance could be enhanced substantially by increasing the amount of data gathered by SANParks to allow for better disaggregation. This indicator is purely an access indicator of quantity and does not allow for a determination of quality of access.

ADEQUACY

1. ENERGY SUSTAINABILITY:

An indicator of sustainable energy generation practices. Sustainable energy generation practices contribute towards environmental sustainability. The use of non-fossil fuels allow for sustainable energy generation. Further, the type of energy generation used, can reduce air, land and water pollution. **Sources of Energy and Gross Energy Consumption** are the most useful variables to measure this indicator. The source of energy is important as energy generation is widely considered to be one of the most significant contributors to environmental pollution. The combustion of carbon, in particular the use of 'dirty coal', for power generation leads to high and hazardous amount of air pollution that directly impacts on human and natural health. In the South African context, the emissions from power generation can largely be accounted for by the emissions from Eskom (see the variable Emissions from Eskom in the Adequacy indicator **Fine Particulate Matter**). Split into separate indicators for ease of use (and indicators in their own right), a comprehensive understanding of air quality would likely require the Adequacy indicators **Energy Sustainability** to be considered with **Emissions of Greenhouse Gas and Fine Particulate Matter** as well as the Quality indicator **Air Quality Impact on Health and Wellbeing**.

2. WASTE RECYCLED:

The amount of waste generation directly impacts on environmental and human health and high levels of waste generation are unsustainable. Reducing quantity of waste is important, and the amount of waste recycled as a percentage of total waste reduces pollution and increases sustainability. This indicator is most effective when considered with the access indicator **Access to Waste Removal Services**.

3. EMISSIONS OF GREENHOUSE GAS:

Greenhouse gas emission impacts negatively on human and natural health, as well as contributing to climate change and is considered an international issue. The most significant variables in calculating this indicator include **CO₂ emissions per capita**, **CH₄ emissions**, **N₂O emissions**, **HFC emissions**, **PFC emissions**. This indicator should be considered with the Adequacy indicator **Fine Particulate Matter**, the Quality indicator **Air Quality Impact on Health and Wellbeing** and the variable **Emissions from Eskom** for a more complete assessment of air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions in South Africa.

4. FINE PARTICULATE MATTER (PM):

PM is a result of the effectiveness of governmental regulation and industry commitment to a clean and healthy environment. Although PM can be considered a greenhouse gas, it is left as a separate indicator due to its significant and lasting human and natural health impacts. PM is a clear indication of the levels of dangerous air pollution, typically caused by the combustion of carbon rich fossil fuels and other carbon emissions from industry and domestic energy consumption. This indicator considers background concentrations of Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) and (PM₁₀). PM_{2.5} should not exceed 10 µg/m³ annual mean and 25 µg/m³ 24-hour mean. PM₁₀ should not exceed 20 µg/m³ annual mean and 50 µg/m³ 24-hour mean. Multiple studies by the World Health Organisation have determined that PM can *"cause or aggravate cardiovascular and lung diseases, heart attacks, and arrhythmias, affect the central nervous system, the reproductive system and cause cancer"*.²¹⁷ The variable Emissions from Eskom is included in this indicator, as Eskom is the primary energy producer and thus a primary emitter of air pollution; it is important to note that the *"energy sector was by far the largest contributor to the total GHG emissions... providing 85.0% in 2010"*.^{218/219}

FOOTNOTES:

-
217. European Environmental Agency, Exceedance of air quality limit values in urban areas (CSI 004, 2017, Available from: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/indicators/exceedance-of-air-quality-limit-3/assessment>.
218. Department of Environmental Affairs, Green House Gas Inventory for South Africa 2000 – 2010. Available from: https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/docs/greenhousegas_inventorysouthafrica.pdf.
219. Note, the variable Emissions from Eskom could also be used with the indicator Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

In addition to this, not only is the energy sector the largest contributor to carbon dioxide emissions, its current growth is indicative of South Africa's under-pricing of this fossil fuel and its coal-dominant electricity production.²²⁰

5. WATER SUPPLY:

The quantity and quality of water supply is important in determining environmental sustainability. As a water stressed state, the sustainability of water use is crucial and can be considered using the variables **Renewable Freshwater Resources per Capita**, and **Annual Freshwater Withdrawal as a Percentage of Total Internal Resources**. Ideally, the Strategic Water Source Areas (SWSA) should also be considered along with the Mean Annual Runoff, but unfortunately this information is not regularly updated or available in an adequate form for the methodology in use.²²¹ The variable **Organic Water Pollutant Emissions per day** shows the level of organic emissions that impact negatively on both human and natural health. Organic water pollutants may lead to harmful algal blooms which reduce the oxygen content of water, thereby destroying healthy natural ecosystems (in particular in South Africa, riverine systems). The variable Trophic Status of Dams shows the quality and biological and ecological health of water in dams, and is a direct measure of the health of water sources. The extent to which dams are full can be seen in the variables **Drainage Region Summary - Percentage Full, Water Management Areas - Percentage Full and Provincial Summary - Percentage Full**. Also consider the Quality indicator **Quality of Drinking Water** and the Access indicator **Access to Water** for a more comprehensive understanding of water issues. This indicator is useful on its own, but should be considered with the Adequacy indicator **Acid Mine Drainage** and the Access indicator **Access to Water** for a more comprehensive overview of water use, health and sustainability in South Africa.

6. ACID MINE DRAINAGE (AMD):

AMD is a serious threat to human and natural health and sustainability, and as such is included separately from other indicators dealing with water. To determine AMD levels, variables such as the Levels of pH, **Electrical Conductivity**, **Total Dissolved Solids**, **Sulphate and Iron** in water must be considered. AMD has long term effects and although a report was commissioned by Parliament on the 9th of February, 2011 entitled **AMD Report on Mine Water Management in the Witwatersrand Gold Fields with Special Emphasis on Acid Mine Drainage**, the issue still remains a serious threat to natural and human health. This indicator should be considered along with the Adequacy indicator **Water Supply**, the Quality indicator **Quality of Drinking Water** and the Access indicator **Access to Water** for a more comprehensive overview of the state of water in South Africa.

7. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BY GOVERNMENT:

This indicator shows commitment from government to protecting the health of the natural environment through the following variables:

Percentage of Biome Protected

Number of Ramsar Sites Protected: Ramsar sites are designated by the Ramsar Convention as sites of particular ecological importance and sensitivity. Some stakeholders are sceptical of the legal protections this affords. However, as it is internationally recognised, it was included in this list of indicators.

Number of Biosphere Reserves

Proportion of Terrestrial Areas Protected

Proportion of Marine Areas Protected

FOOTNOTES:

220. OECD Publishing, Environmental Performance Reviews: South Africa 2013 Available from: <https://www.oecd.org/southafrica/oecd-environmental-performance-reviews-south-africa-2013-9789264202887-en.htm>.
221. <http://bgis.sanbi.org/NFEPA/SWSAmap.asp> for the Strategic Water Source Area, http://www.dwa.gov.za/iwqs/rhp/state_of_rivers/state_of_umngeni_02/umngeni.html, and https://web.archive.org/web/20151210011915/http://www.csir.co.za/impact/docs/Final_Freshwater_Atlas_Article.pdf (archived resource); <http://bgis.sanbi.org/Document/Download/2249> (2011 National Biodiversity Assessment (NBA)) for other useful information (that is unfortunately not updated regularly.)

Percentage of River Ecosystem Types Protected / Degree of Protection

Wetlands Rehabilitation

Number of Hectares (ha) of Invasive Alien Plants Treated / Cleared

Area (ha) of Land Restored and Rehabilitated

Protection Levels of National Strategic Water Source Areas

Proportion of South African Coastline within Marine Bioregions

Number of Rivers Monitored by the River Health Programme

QUALITY

1. QUALITY OF DRINKING WATER:

Measured by the variables Blue Drop Score and Subjective Quality of Drinking Water, this indicator is determined as a result of municipalities' attempts and commitment to providing a healthy, well organised and maintained source of drinking water. Some stakeholders have expressed concern that the Blue Drop Score may not provide a reliable assessment of the actual quality of drinking water, but instead provide a more overall view of the management of drinking water. The **Subjective Quality of Drinking Water** is a subjective outcome of the water distribution and filtration process. Total percentage subjective rating of water quality supply is rated: not safe to drink; not clear; not in good taste; not free from bad smells. Clean drinking water is essential for a healthy human and natural environment. As has been previously explained, this indicator should be considered with the Access indicator **Access to Water**, and the Adequacy indicators **Acid Mine Drainage and Water Supply**.

2. ECOLOGICAL FOOTPRINT:

A measurement of the amount of biological land required per capita. Note: some stakeholders consider this indicator to no longer be current; however it is included as it may still provide useful information.

3. BIODIVERSITY:

An indication of natural ecosystem health, by considering the different types of species and protections afforded to said species. This indicator may also be understood as a means of showing the commitment and success of government in ensuring a healthy natural environment. Biodiversity can be measured by a combination of the **Percentages of Threatened Amphibian, Bird and Mammal Species**, as well as number of **Endemically Threatened Taxa**.

4. RESPONSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT (BUSINESS):

ISO14001 certification requires a business to have a framework for environmental management. ISO 14001 is thus an indication of private commitment to environmental protection, management and sustainability. It may also show the successes government and civil society have had in advocating for environmental protection, as government and civil pressures may influence business attitudes towards certification. Some stakeholders were critical of the value of ISO 14001, believing it to be a framework without any substantial real-world application. They were therefore sceptical of its actual real-world impact on environmental health.

5. AIR QUALITY IMPACT ON HEALTH AND WELLBEING:

An indication of the air pollution and its impact on human health. This is considered an outcome as it is a result of government regulation, health care services and commitment by private and government owned companies to reducing air pollution. This indicator can be measured by the **Number of Deaths from TB** (strongly linked to indoor air pollution) and the **Number of Deaths from other Respiratory Causes**. Although air pollution is not the only cause of such deaths, stakeholders

have argued that air pollution exacerbates such health issues and is thus a primary, on-going cause. This indicator is considered separately from the Quality indicator Health as it highlights the direct relationship between air pollution and human health, but should be considered along with the related Adequacy indicators **Fine Particle Matter** and **Emission of Greenhouse Gases**.

6. HEALTH:

Infants are especially vulnerable to pollution related illness, thus an assessment of Infant mortality gives an indication of the general quality of the environment in terms of health and wellbeing. A healthy environment is not the sole determinant of infant mortality; however stakeholders have argued that toxic pollution, unclear drinking water and air pollution have a significant impact on infant mortality.

7. GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED:

Measured by the percentage of households who experience specific kinds of environmental problems. Stakeholders were particularly concerned about the inability (mainly caused by a lack of education) of ordinary people to determine environmental rights violations and to understand their right to environment.

8. FOOD SECURITY:

Food security is an outcome of a healthy environment capable of supporting sustainable agricultural practices. The issue of environmental sustainability is bound to food security as without food, South Africa cannot be said to be sustainable.

9. COMMUNITY EXPERIENCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS:

A relative, subjective measurement of the health and suitability of the environment as perceived by communities. Provides a potentially significant general overview of environmental problems faced, however it is important to remember that this assessment is not comprehensive and is based upon answers to a questionnaire with prepared, rigid answer options. The issue of understanding and recognition of the right to environment, and the articulation of environmental issues may also lead to unintentional bias. **This indicator is split into the following variables:**

Irregular or no waste removal

Littering

Water Pollution

Outdoor / Indoor air pollution

Land degradation / over utilisation of natural resources

Excessive noise / noise pollution

Other: Please note that the statistics used are drawn from the Stats SA General Household Report 2013 and this variable is presented without explanation. It likely refers to any other environmental issue that was not considered in the questionnaire.

GOVERNMENTAL FUNDING ALLOCATED TO DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS (DEA):

As the most significant department involved directly in the environment, the budget of the DEA gives an indication of government's commitment to the environment. A breakdown of DEA spending into different areas shows governmental priorities and potential areas of environmental concern. Variables include the amount of funds spent on **DEA legal, authorisation and compliance, Oceans and Coasts, Climate Change and Air Quality, Biodiversity and Conservation, Environmental Programmes, and Chemicals and Waste Management**.

ENVIRONMENTAL INFRINGEMENTS:

This indicator potentially shows the government's commitment to enforcing state of environment rights in the real world. It may also be a reflection of the understanding of the right to environment amongst people in South Africa. However, it is important to remember that this is not a comprehensive indicator, as access to the resources required to lodge complaints and pursue legal remedies is limited. This indicator considers the following variables; **Number of Reported Environmental Incidents, Total Number of Arrests and Number of Inspections Conducted**. With the provisos already mentioned, these variables combined indicate the state of environmental right enforcement in South Africa.



*Building up knowledge
to break down Poverty*

Studies in Poverty and Inequality Institute (SPII)

31 Quinn Street, Newtown
Johannesburg
South Africa
2000

Phone: + 27 11 833 0161
Fax: + 27 11 832 3085
www.spii.org.za

For a complete list of SPII's partners, please visit www.spii.org.za