

The Commission of Inquiry into Allegations of Police Inefficient in Khayelitsha and a Breakdown of Relations between the Community and the Police in Khayelitsha

Submission on the Issue of Relative Resourcing of Police Areas

Jean Redpath, Community Law Centre, University of the Western Cape

Summary

If policing burden were distributed equally, then police human resources should be distributed through a per capita method (i.e. population size determines relative resourcing). However policing burden is not distributed equally. Any method of determining resources which deviates from the per capita method, must be checked against per capita figures for obvious anomalies. The SAPS method fails this test. A method is suggested which sees a minimum number allocated to each station, and then the remaining resources distributed according to a method which uses per capita figures to distribute most resources, but takes some account of reported crime as well as the true serious violent crime rate, as indicated by the murder rate.

Introduction

The issue of allocation by the state of human resources to policing is one which impinges on various constitutional rights, such as the right to safety and security of the person, dignity, life, and equality before the law, inter-related with the right not to be unfairly discriminated against. At issue is whether the distribution of state resources on policing, which impinge on the protection or realisation of these rights, is unequal to the extent that it amounts to unfair discrimination. Variations in allocations per capita are prima facie an indication of unequal distribution of resources. Where the distribution of human resources in policing is not only unequal from area to area, but areas comprising predominantly poor and black people are particularly under-resourced, indirect discrimination on protected constitutional grounds exists. Such unequal resourcing is automatically unfair unless the state can show that the allocations are fair.

I have been asked to:

- review the relative resourcing of police stations in the Western Cape,
- comment on the method employed by the SAPS to determine relative resourcing, and
- propose a fair method for determining relative resourcing.

The data

The per capita calculations, using personnel figures provided by Lamoer and population data from Census 2011, show that Harare, which is among the poorest areas of the Western Cape and whose population is overwhelmingly black, has the lowest number of police personnel per 100 000 people of all police stations in the Western Cape (111 per 100 000). Indeed it has almost ten times fewer people per 100 000 than Camps Bay (959 per 100 000) (see table 9 annexed). Since an indirect inequality on protected grounds has been shown, the state must demonstrate that the inequality is

nevertheless fair. The indirect inequality demonstrated by the unequal allocations runs counter to the transformative project of the Constitution.

The SAPS method

SAPS has attempted to justify the allocations by demonstrating that the way in which resource requirements are calculated is rationally related to the burden of policing. The allocation of police resources is apparently based on a Theoretical Human Resource Requirement (THRR). This THRR is in turn calculated using a range of factors which must be attested to by each police area in an Information Management Sheet. All of the factors in the Information Management Sheet listed appear to relate to the burden of policing in one of the following ways: they affect the burden in terms of difficulty and extent of policing (e.g. number of square kilometres, presence of schools, daily influx of commuters, number of gangs), including the actual incidence of crime; they affect the burden of police interaction with the courts and with prisons (e.g. proximity of courts and prisons) or they affect the burden of internal police bureaucracy (e.g. accounting station, services offered, etc.).

One of the problems with this approach is that it is highly dependent on accurate information being supplied. Incorrect estimates can result in large distortions. Indeed SAPS itself alludes to misrepresentations apparently designed to influence resource allocation in submitted evidence. In further evidence submitted to the Commission, a number of errors in the relevant THRR information sheets were apparent, for example, incorrect unemployment rates. Furthermore the relative weight applied to the various factors appears to have been subjectively determined. It is indeed my submission that it is near impossible to take into account all relevant factors in a way which does not result in distortions.

Indeed those factors which speak to the incidence of crime are probably better indicated by an objective measure of the actual incidence of crime. (My previous submission suggested the likely extent of under-reporting in the three Khayelitsha areas resulting in reported crime being far lower than the actual incidence. The submission also described how the number of murders tracks the number of serious violent crimes closely, suggesting it is a suitable proxy for the variation in the true incidence of serious violent crime).

Ultimately, however, the best test of the SAPS THRR method is common-sense. Does the method accurately and fairly distribute resources on the basis of burden of policing? Township areas, known for their difficulty of policing, almost all demonstrate massive downward adjustment from the per capita amounts suggested. Indeed not only is it the case that the adjustment is downward, but it is such that township areas are among the least resourced per capita in the Western (see Table 9 annexed) despite being amongst the most difficult to police. Unless SAPS wishes to argue that the burden of policing is indeed lowest in Harare, Lwandle, Belhar and Nyanga, and thus the lowest resourcing per capita in these areas is fair, these results alone demonstrate the flaw in the SAPS approach and suggests flaws in either one or all the factors considered, their weighting, and the input data. It further suggests that SAPS is as a result of applying this formula discriminately unfairly against these areas in terms of police human resource allocation.

Proposed method

The question then arises as to what is a fair method of adjusting per capita figures to take into account the burden of policing. For sensible adjustments taking into account the burden of policing a disaggregation of the various broad components of the SAPS is necessary: Administration, Visible policing, Detective service, Crime intelligence, Protection and security.

Visible policing is not only about responding to crime, but about carrying out policing in a manner which prevents crime. Consequently it may be that visible policing patrols carried out in currently relatively crime-free areas will cease to be crime-free areas if such resourcing is removed. In other words it is not recommended that the incidence of crime replace total population as the determinant of allocation, not least also because varying rates of reporting mean the actual incidence of crime is difficult to determine from area to area. For the same reason reported crime should not determine allocations.

Consequently in relation to visible policing, in my view reference to the total population (the per capita measure) should remain the primary indicator of relative resourcing. This is particularly important as visible policing is the largest component of the SAPS. Some adjustment to take into account high day-time populations prevalent in city centre, may be required. These should be based on empirical evidence i.e. actual measures of daytime populations.

The burden of policing on detective services on the other hand can be directly measured by the incidence of crime reported at the police station, as a detective's burden is directly determined by the amount of crime reported. Assuming that the detective service conducts only reactive investigations (and that crime intelligence is thus responsible for pro-active investigations) the incidence of reported crime, in particular, serious reported crime, should in my view be the primary determinant of relative resourcing in relation to detective services.

The work of crime intelligence is directly related to the number of crimes actually occurring in the area (actual incidence of crime) as their objectives are to contribute to the neutralisation of crime by gathering, collating and analysing intelligence information which leads to actionable policing activity. The incidence of serious violent crime, as indicated by proxy through the number of murders, should in my view be the primary determinant of the relative resourcing of the crime intelligence component.

The primary indicator of the administrative burden should be the size of the population of the area served. (Adjustments to take into account the type of police station (cluster, accounting, satellite) would be justifiable, provided the determination of type is itself justifiable, are discussed below).

The protection and security services component of policing appears not to be relevant to policing at station level as this service apparently serves only dignitaries. (A separate issue for consideration is whether the amount spent on this component, and thus on dignitaries, is justified.) For the purposes of national figures and formula calculations, these are then omitted.

Proposed method on national figures

What does this method imply in practice on current figures? According to the SAPS Annual Report of 2013, the personnel available to SAPS is as follows (note 21% of these personnel are Public Service Act employees as opposed to SAPS Act employees):

Table 1: SAPS National personnel by function and rate per 100 000 population

SAPS Function	Number of personnel (national)	Personnel per 100 000 people (using 52 982 000 population)
Administration	36703	69.27
Visible policing	106527	201.06
Detective service	39425	74.41
Crime intelligence	8928	16.85
SUBTOTAL	191583	361.60
Protection and security	6363	12.01
TOTAL	197946	373.61

As described above, the primary determinant of visible policing and administrative function resources should be the population size. Thus the available administrative and visible policing personnel must be divided equally amongst the population. To do this the total number of relevant personnel in South Africa is divided by the total population of South Africa, and multiplied by 100 000, to arrive at the number per 100 000.

On current personnel and population figures as indicated in the table above, this implies that there should be 69 administrative personnel for every 100 000 population and 201 visible police personnel per 100 000 people. To calculate the number of visible policing personnel in a particular area, the population of that area must be divided by 100 000 and multiplied by 201, while for the number of administrative staff the population is divided by 100 000 and multiplied by 69.

The detective service component resourcing is by contrast primarily indicated by the number of crimes reported to the SAPS. The available detective resources must be divided equally amongst all reported serious crimes. The total number of detective personnel in South Africa is divided by total serious crimes in South Africa. To account for yearly anomalies, the last four years' crime figures should be used. On current national personnel and crime figures this equates to 0.01876 detectives per crime or 1.88 detectives for every 100 of the 20 most serious crimes reported in a year in an area on average over the last four years.

Table 2: SAPS National personnel by function and rate per 100 serious crimes

SAPS Function	Number of personnel (national)	Personnel per 100 serious crimes (20 most serious, average last 4 years 2101417 nationally)
Administration	36703	1.75
Visible policing	106527	5.07
Detective service	39425	1.88
Crime intelligence	8928	0.42
Protection and security	6363	0.30
TOTAL	197946	9.42

The primary indicator of the relative resourcing of the crime intelligence component, as discussed above, is the average number of murders over the last 4 years. The available crime intelligence resources must be divided equally amongst all murders recorded. On current figures this would imply 0.55 crime intelligence personnel for every murder recorded in an area on average over the last four years.

Protection and security personnel are not included in this national formula, as it is anticipated that these operate in discrete units and are not necessarily allocated to particular stations.

Table 3

SAPS Function	Number of personnel (national)	Number per murder (average last 4 years 16161)
Administration	36703	2.27
Visible policing	106527	6.59
Detective service	39425	2.44
Crime intelligence	8928	0.55
Protection and security	6363	0.39
TOTAL	197946	12.25

The national primary distribution formula, for each area for which an allocation is calculated, based on current available personnel is thus as follows:

$$(\text{pop} * 69.27 / 100\ 000) + (\text{pop} * 201.06 / 100\ 000) + (20\ \text{crimes} * 1.88/100) + (\text{murder} * 0.55)$$

On this national primary distribution formula, the Western Cape should receive 25 832 total personnel, compared to the per capita basis, which would result in 20 718 personnel (excluding protection and security). The difference reflects the additional burden of policing present in the Western Cape.

On this national primary distribution formula, Khayelitsha would receive 643 personnel, Lingeletu-West 275 and Harare 651, making a total of 1569 for the three areas together. This compares to the per capita basis, which would see 558, 233 and 624 employees respectively or 1415 for all three together.

The deviation is *upward* from the per capita calculation on national figures due to the burden of policing being higher than is suggested by population alone. Indeed almost all police stations save for seven in the Western Cape show an adjustment upward from the figures suggested by per capita figures, suggesting all but these seven have higher than average rates of crime.

Each year the calculation should be adjusted to take account of latest available population and crime figures. The formula calculation for each area is thus:

$$(\text{pop_area} * \text{admin_total}/\text{total_pop}) + (\text{pop_area} * \text{vispol_total}/\text{totalpol}) + (\text{area_20crimes} * \text{detectives_total}/\text{total_20crimes}) + (\text{murder_area} * \text{crime_int_total}/\text{murder_total})$$

Proposed method on provincial figures

It is interesting to note that the total number of police personnel in the Western Cape according to Lamoer figures (16 237) is very close to the total number of personnel which should be allocated to the Western Cape, purely on the basis of national per capita figures (20 407) (excluding protection and security) less the 21% Public Service Act employees (16 367). This suggests that:

1. The Lamoer figures refer to Police Act employees only; AND
2. Nationally, policing resources are in fact allocated to the provinces on a flat per capita basis, excluding protection services; OR
3. The THRR method simply reduces to the per capita method (excluding protection services) in the case of the Western Cape.

(A per capita calculation including the protection and security component would see 16 883 allocated to the Western Cape).

Given that it is the responsibility of the Provincial Commissioner to distribute the resources allocated to the province amongst the police stations in the province, and that the total resources allocated nationally are fewer than suggested by the national primary distribution formula explored above, there is a need to adjust the formula for application in the Western Cape.

Assuming that the personnel functions are similarly distributed as they are nationally, allocating protection and security on a per capita basis (which has the effect of treating them in the same way as visible policing) and assuming the Lamoer total number allocated to the Western Cape, the following arises:

Table 4: Western Cape personnel allocations by function

SAPS Function	Number of personnel (national)	National %	Implied Western Cape personnel based on 16 237 total allocation
Administration	36703	18.54%	3010
Visible policing	106527	53.82%	8739
Detective service	39425	19.92%	3234
Crime intelligence	8928	4.51%	732
SUBTOTAL	191583	96.79%	15715
Protection and security	6363	3.21%	521

TOTAL	197946	100%	16237
--------------	---------------	------	--------------

Table 5: Western Cape personnel by function and per 100 000

SAPS Function	Number of personnel (province)	Personnel per 100 000 people (using 5 729 594 population)
Administration	3010	52.53
Visible policing	8739	152.52
Detective service	3234	56.44
Crime intelligence	732	12.78
SUBTOTAL	15715	274.28
Protection and security	521	9.09
TOTAL	16237	283.39

Table 6: Western Cape personnel by function and per 100 serious crimes

Function	Number of personnel (province)	Personnel per 100 serious crimes (20 most serious, last year 474669)
Administration	3010	0.63
Visible policing	8739	1.84
Detective service	3234	0.68
Crime intelligence	732	0.15
Protection and security	521	0.11
TOTAL	16237	3.42

Table 7: Western Cape personnel by function and per murder

SAPS Function	Number of personnel (province)	Number per murder (last year 2580)
Administration	3010	1.17
Visible policing	8739	3.39
Detective service	3234	1.25
Crime intelligence	732	0.28
Protection and security	521	0.20
Total	16237	6.29

(Note that “last year” figures are used for convenience.)

The provincial primary distribution formula then becomes:

$$(\text{pop} * 52.53 / 100\ 000) + (\text{pop} * 152.52 / 100\ 000) + (\text{total 20 crimes} * 0.68/100) + (\text{murder} * 0.28) + (\text{pop} * 9.09 / 100\ 000)$$

On this provincial primary distribution formula, Harare and Khayelitsha receive the third (444) and fourth (424) largest allocations in the province, and Lingelethu-West 178, making a total of 1046 for the three areas together. This compares to the provincial per capita basis, which would see 437, 182, and 489 employees respectively or 1108 for all three together.

Note that the formula for the three areas results in a *downward* adjustment compared to what is suggested on a per capita basis alone. (This is because the under-reporting of crime in these areas reduces the burden on the detective service.) The question is whether this is a fair reduction in resourcing. The formula suggests it is. However there is a need to check the formula allocations on a per capita basis (see Table 10 annexed).

Table 8: Per capita, formula, and actual allocations compared

	Provincial per capita	Provincial formula	Actual
Khayelitsha	437	424	294
Harare	489	444	192
Lingelethu West	182	178	177
TOTAL	1108	1046	663

Unlike the actual resource per capita figures, the formula allocation does not result in township areas occupying the bottom of the resource list on a per capita basis. Relatively underpopulated areas, such as Nuwerus, have the lowest per capita figures on formula allocations, while the township areas occupy the middle band of resourcing (see table 7). Most over-resourced (per capita) on the provincial primary distribution formula figures are, appropriately, those areas with high daytime populations, such as Cape Town, Sea Point, Woodstock, Claremont and Wynberg . However, a transparent, rational and fair basis now underpins the apparent per capita inequality .

Amendment to the primary formula

Nevertheless it may be judged that the formulas does not sufficiently take into account the extra burden on detectives whenever loss of life occurs, that is, when there is an incident of culpable homicide or murder, as these crimes consume more time and resources than do others arising through inquest proceedings and the like. The formula can be adjusted by double-weighting murder and culpable homicide reports in the detective component of the formula. The formula then becomes:

$$(\text{pop} * 52.53 / 100\ 000) + (\text{pop} * 152.52 / 100\ 000) + ((\text{total20crimes} + \text{murder} + \text{culphom}) * 0.68/100) + (\text{murder} * 0.28) + (\text{pop} * 9.09 / 100\ 000)$$

This has the effect of slightly raising (by between 1 and 4 persons) the number of personnel allocated to township areas, which tend to have a high proportion of all crimes being homicides, which in turn results in an improved per capita figure for township areas.

Adjustments to the primary distribution allocations

Rational adjustments to the primary distribution formula adopted might include those occasioned by the formula resulting in a number of personnel too small for a viable police station. This can be overcome by allocating to each station the minimum number of personnel necessary for a policing

station of that type (for example, a satellite station with limited opening hours requires at least 4 personnel).

Wherever the minimum number for the station type concerned is higher than the number suggested by the provincial primary distribution formula as initially applied, then the minimum number becomes the number allocated to that area. Whenever that substitution occurs, each such difference between the allocated number and the minimum number must be subtracted from the total number to be used in an amended formula. The primary distribution formula is then applied to the stations which have not had the minimum allocated, using the reduced totals.

For example, for the purposes of illustration assume that 12 is the minimum number of personnel for all police stations of all types. All police stations with primary distribution formula allocations below 12, of which there are 5, are allocated 12 personnel. From the total available personnel, 60 are removed from the total. For the formula calculations, the respective populations, crime numbers and murder numbers emanating from the already allocated areas must be subtracted from those totals, for calculating the factors which must be applied to the remaining 144 stations.

Other adjustments may require similar processes. However whatever adjustments occur, the final allocation must then be checked on a per capita basis to ensure that distortions resulting in unjustifiably unequal allocations have not occurred.

Conclusion

A fair method of downward adjustment of township areas resource allocations, compared to per capita allocations, exists. The method being applied by SAPS does not appear to be fair.

Jean Redpath 6 May 2014

Table 9: ACTUAL RESOURCES: Number of police personnel (Lamoer figures, 2013), per 100 000 people (Census 2011) Western Cape ranked from most resourced to least resourced on a per capita basis (average = 283 police per 100 000).

	Place	Police personnel per 100 000	Actual number of personnel
1	TABLE BAY HARBOUR	2636.38	63
2	CAPE TOWN CENTRAL	1544.88	541
3	REDELINGHUYS	1156.31	28
4	SUURBRAAK	1086.63	32
5	ELANDS BAY	1011.35	26
6	CAMPS BAY	959.51	53
7	WYNBERG	852.57	215
8	DORING BAY	847.11	28
9	MOSEL BAY	836.85	88
10	LEEU GAMKA	797.83	43
11	STRUISBAAI	731.35	33
12	MOWBRAY	693.92	69
13	GRAAFWATER	688.2	34
14	LAINGSBURG	655.17	53

15	NUWERUS	650.88	33
16	DE RUST	625.98	37
17	EENDEKUIL	617.32	35
18	MCGREGOR	604.96	35
19	SEA POINT	592.56	147
20	CLAREMONT	592.22	183
21	WOODSTOCK	569.85	157
22	CALITZDORP	564.02	43
23	PRINCE ALBERT	528.94	53
24	PAARL	526.71	271
25	STANFORD	525.93	32
26	RONDEBOSCH	521.71	77
27	LADISMITH	517.43	90
28	PHILADELPHIA	506.09	37
29	NAPIER	501.58	34
30	BARRYDALE	496.45	37
31	MURRAYSBURG	484.69	36
32	LAMBERTSBAAI	480.36	34
33	RAWSONVILLE	474.29	62
34	VANRHYNSDORP	469.58	36
35	CALEDON	467.99	128
36	DA GAMASKOP	466.64	121
37	UNIONDALE	466.28	65
38	GEORGE	456.94	282
39	BELLVILLE	450.07	297
40	PLETTENBERG BAY	438.26	118
41	RIVIERSONDEREND	432.61	34
42	KLEINMOND	428.08	39
43	LANGEBAAN	427.72	35
44	VREDENDAL	427.35	110
45	GENADENDAL	421.73	45
46	BEAUFORT WEST	416.7	167
47	HOPEFIELD	416.02	37
48	MAITLAND	414.76	81
49	TULBAGH	410.48	77
50	STELLENBOSCH	408.65	218
51	STILL BAY	402.98	33
52	TOUWS RIVER	399.43	35
53	ALBERTINIA	396.27	33
54	OUDTSHOORN	392.59	293
55	PORTERVILLE	388.21	61
56	GANS BAY	387.95	59

57	HEIDELBERG(C)	385.13	60
58	BREDASDORP	380.17	86
59	SWELLENDAM	372.53	90
60	ROBERTSON	372.41	133
61	SARON	368.81	37
62	CERES	363.34	153
63	ST HELENA BAY	362.23	41
64	BONNIEVALE	351.01	49
65	CLANWILLIAM	346.5	55
66	MITCHELLS PLAIN	344.97	674
67	VREDENBURG	339.8	140
68	PINELANDS	338.77	70
69	BELLVILLE SOUTH	337.94	99
70	SIMON'S TOWN	337.35	44
71	GOODWOOD	332.41	146
72	MELKBOSSTRAND	331.08	41
73	ASHTON	326.99	61
74	WORCESTER	319.61	365
75	KLAWER	317.16	35
76	HERMANUS	311.42	149
77	RIVERSDALE	311.22	63
78	STRAND	300.39	155
79	FISH HOEK	295.75	60
80	DYSSELSDORP	294.34	44
81	ELSIES RIVER	292.72	204
82	RIEBEEK WEST	291.45	47
83	LANGA	290.64	138
84	PAROW	290.03	175
85	SOMERSET WEST	288.98	165
86	PHILIPPI	287.56	155
87	MBEKWENI	286.05	115
88	CONVILLE	285.99	135
89	CITRUSDAL	279.01	54
90	KLAPMUTS	278.01	38
91	LINGELETHU-WEST	274.97	177
92	PACALTSDORP	270.35	69
93	ATHLONE	270.11	171
94	MOORREESBURG	270.1	63
95	LUTZVILLE	269.42	39
96	MONTAGU	269.14	63
97	WOLSELEY	264.12	44
98	KWANOKUTHULA	262.65	55

99	LAAIPLEK	261.53	36
100	KNYSNA	261.26	179
101	ATLANTIS	259.95	207
102	GORDONS BAY	259.48	43
103	KIRSTENHOF	257.7	78
104	WELLINGTON	257.39	138
105	BOTHASIG	254.86	68
106	KUILSRIVIER	254.33	183
107	RAVENSMEAD	254	156
108	THEMBALETHU	252.89	111
109	VILLIERSDORP	250.92	58
110	PIKETBERG	248.58	59
111	PHILIPPI EAST	246.02	138
112	LANSDOWNE	245.43	119
113	MILNERTON	242.77	209
114	KWANONQABA	242.1	83
115	BISHOP LAVIS	241.39	256
116	BRACKENFELL	240.83	122
117	GROOT-DRAKENSTEIN	238.12	41
118	GRABOUW	237.11	100
119	KENSINGTON	234.31	60
120	MANENBERG	228.65	195
121	STEENBERG	215.47	133
122	DIEPRIVIER	214.47	83
123	DARLING	214.13	33
124	GROOT BRAKRIVIER	211	45
125	SALDANHA	210.58	61
126	MALMESBURY	205.56	123
127	HOUT BAY	204.29	68
128	FRANSCHHOEK	204.13	46
129	DURBANVILLE	201.8	146
130	PRINCE ALFRED HAMLET	197.43	75
131	MACASSAR	196.97	69
132	PAARL EAST	194.77	163
133	MUIZENBERG	193.25	114
134	KHAYELITSHA	190.46	294
135	TABLE VIEW	190.21	140
136	GRASSY PARK	178.27	158
137	DE DOORNS	173.78	61
138	GUGULETHU	172.55	214
139	KLEINVLEI	171.86	166
140	STRANDFONTEIN	162.79	46

141	MFULENI	160.63	186
142	KRAAIFONTEIN	160.05	265
143	CLOETESVILLE	152.37	78
144	DELFT	149.58	230
145	OCEAN VIEW	146.07	59
146	NYANGA	143.82	291
147	BELHAR	131.96	75
148	LWANDLE	128.94	84
149	HARARE	111.32	192

Table 10: FORMULA RESOURCES Number of police personnel (provincial primary distribution formula), per 100 000 people (Census 2011) Western Cape ranked from most resourced to least resourced per capita (average = 283 police per 100 000).

Rank	Place	Formula number per 100 000	Formula Number	Actual Number
1	TABLE BAY HARBOUR	666	16	63
2	CAPE TOWN CENTRAL	580	203	541
3	SEA POINT	348	86	147
4	WOODSTOCK	347	96	157
5	CLAREMONT	339	105	183
6	WYNBERG	337	85	215
7	STELLENBOSCH	334	178	218
8	MITCHELLS PLAIN	326	638	674
9	KLEINMOND	324	30	39
10	MOSSSEL BAY	323	34	88
11	BELLVILLE	323	213	297
12	PHILIPPI	321	173	155
13	CAMPS BAY	318	18	53
14	MOWBRAY	317	32	69
15	RONDEBOSCH	308	45	77
16	ATHLONE	306	194	171
17	PAROW	305	184	175
18	MAITLAND	304	59	81
19	KIRSTENHOF	302	92	78
20	ELSIES RIVER	302	211	204
21	STRAND	301	155	155
22	MILNERTON	299	257	209
23	MANENBERG	298	254	195
24	BEAUFORT WEST	297	119	167
25	PAARL	297	153	271
26	GEORGE	296	183	282
27	GORDONS BAY	295	49	43
28	PLETTENBERG BAY	294	79	118

29	HOUT BAY	294	98	68
30	GOODWOOD	293	129	146
31	SWELLENDAM	291	70	90
32	PINELANDS	291	60	70
33	WORCESTER	290	331	365
34	GUGULETHU	289	358	214
35	BISHOP LAVIS	288	305	256
36	DIEPRIVIER	288	111	83
37	CONVILLE	288	136	135
38	ALBERTINIA	287	24	33
39	RAVENSMEAD	287	176	156
40	KUILSRIVIER	286	206	183
41	SOMERSET WEST	285	163	165
42	KLEINVLEI	285	275	166
43	FISH HOEK	284	58	60
44	GRASSY PARK	284	252	158
45	LANGEBAAN	284	23	35
46	DA GAMASKOP	284	74	121
47	KNYSNA	283	194	179
48	TOUWS RIVER	282	25	35
49	LAINGSBURG	282	23	53
50	RAWSONVILLE	282	37	62
51	NYANGA	281	569	291
52	KLAPMUTS	281	38	38
53	STEENBERG	281	173	133
54	VREDENBURG	280	116	140
55	BELLVILLE SOUTH	279	82	99
56	MFULENI	277	321	186
57	KWANONQABA	277	95	83
58	TABLE VIEW	277	204	140
59	KRAAIFONTEIN	276	458	265
60	LINGELETHU-WEST	276	178	177
61	LADISMITH	276	48	90
62	BRACKENFELL	276	140	122
63	GANS BAY	276	42	59
64	CERES	276	116	153
65	RIVIERSONDEREND	275	22	34
66	KHAYELITSHA	274	424	294
67	UNIONDALE	274	38	65
68	LANGA	274	130	138
69	PHILIPPI EAST	274	154	138
70	MUIZENBERG	274	162	114
71	STANFORD	274	17	32
72	BELHAR	274	156	75

73	KENSINGTON	274	70	60
74	MACASSAR	274	96	69
75	CALITZDORP	274	21	43
76	OUDTSHOORN	273	204	293
77	LEEU GAMKA	273	15	43
78	CLANWILLIAM	273	43	55
79	LANSDOWNE	273	132	119
80	RIEBEEK WEST	273	44	47
81	ATLANTIS	273	217	207
82	DELFT	273	419	230
83	ELANDS BAY	272	7	26
84	CITRUSDAL	272	53	54
85	KLAWER	272	30	35
86	WELLINGTON	272	146	138
87	TULBAGH	272	51	77
88	STRUISBAAI	271	12	33
89	GENADENDAL	271	29	45
90	ROBERTSON	270	97	133
91	CALEDON	270	74	128
92	GRABOUW	269	113	100
93	DURBANVILLE	269	194	146
94	VILLIERSDORP	268	62	58
95	BREDASDORP	268	61	86
96	PHILADELPHIA	266	19	37
97	VREDENDAL	266	68	110
98	LAMBERTSBAAI	265	19	34
99	SARON	265	27	37
100	PRINCE ALBERT	264	26	53
101	HERMANUS	264	126	149
102	SALDANHA	264	76	61
103	PORTERVILLE	264	41	61
104	WOLSELEY	264	44	44
105	LUTZVILLE	264	38	39
106	MALMESBURY	263	158	123
107	SUURBRAAK	263	8	32
108	PAARL EAST	263	220	163
109	PACALTS DORP	263	67	69
110	BOTHASIG	263	70	68
111	REDELINGHUYSDORP	263	6	28
112	ST HELENA BAY	263	30	41
113	STRANDFONTEIN	263	74	46
114	DE RUST	262	15	37
115	THEMBALETHU	262	115	111
116	BARRYDALE	262	20	37

117	ASHTON	262	49	61
118	MBEKWENI	261	105	115
119	DE DOORNS	261	92	61
120	MOORREESBURG	261	61	63
121	VANRHYNSDORP	260	20	36
122	LAAIPLEK	259	36	36
123	KWANOKUTHULA	258	54	55
124	HARARE	258	444	192
125	BONNIEVALE	258	36	49
126	FRANSCHHOEK	257	58	46
127	SIMON'S TOWN	256	33	44
128	OCEAN VIEW	256	103	59
129	NAPIER	256	17	34
130	RIVERSDALE	255	52	63
131	MONTAGU	255	60	63
132	HEIDELBERG(C)	255	40	60
133	MURRAYSBURG	255	19	36
134	LWANDLE	254	166	84
135	GROOT-DRAKENSTEIN	254	44	41
136	GRAAFWATER	254	13	34
137	DARLING	252	39	33
138	MELKBOSSTRAND	251	31	41
139	PRINCE ALFRED HAMLET	250	95	75
140	PIKETBERG	250	59	59
141	STILL BAY	249	20	33
142	MCGREGOR	249	14	35
143	CLOETESVILLE	247	127	78
144	GROOT BRAKRIVIER	246	53	45
145	HOPEFIELD	246	22	37
146	DYSSELSDORP	244	37	44
147	DORING BAY	237	8	28
148	EENDEKUIL	233	13	35
149	NUWERUS	214	11	33

Table 11: Actual personnel compared to personnel suggested by provincial primary distribution formula, ranked from the largest difference between formula and actual

Rank	Name	Actual personnel	Formula personnel	Difference
1	NYANGA	291	568	277
2	HARARE	192	444	252
3	KRAAIFONTEIN	265	457	192
4	DELFT	230	419	189
5	GUGULETHU	214	357	143

6	MFULENI	186	320	134
7	KHAYELITSHA	294	423	129
8	KLEINVLEI	166	275	109
9	GRASSY PARK	158	252	94
10	LWANDLE	84	165	81
11	BELHAR	75	156	81
12	TABLE VIEW	140	203	63
13	MANENBERG	195	254	59
14	PAARL EAST	163	220	57
15	BISHOP LAVIS	256	305	49
16	CLOETESVILLE	78	127	49
17	DURBANVILLE	146	194	48
18	MILNERTON	209	257	48
19	MUIZENBERG	114	162	48
20	OCEAN VIEW	59	103	44
21	STEENBERG	133	173	40
22	MALMESBURY	123	158	35
23	DE DOORNS	61	92	31
24	HOUT BAY	68	98	30
25	DIEPRIVIER	83	111	28
26	STRANDFONTEIN	46	74	28
27	MACASSAR	69	96	27
28	KUILSRIVIER	183	206	23
29	ATHLONE	171	193	22
30	PRINCE ALFRED HAMLET	75	95	20
31	RAVENSMEAD	156	176	20
32	PHILIPPI	155	173	18
33	BRACKENFELL	122	140	18
34	PHILIPPI EAST	138	154	16
35	SALDANHA	61	76	15
36	KNYSNA	179	194	15
37	KIRSTENHOF	78	91	13
38	LANSDOWNE	119	132	13
39	GRABOUW	100	113	13
40	FRANSCHHOEK	46	58	12
41	KWANONQABA	83	95	12
42	ATLANTIS	207	217	10
43	KENSINGTON	60	70	10
44	PAROW	175	184	9
45	WELLINGTON	138	146	8
46	GROOT BRAKRIVIER	45	53	8
47	ELSIES RIVER	204	211	7
48	DARLING	33	39	6
49	GORDONS BAY	43	49	6

50	VILLIERSDORP	58	62	4
51	THEMBALETHU	111	115	4
52	GROOT-DRAKENSTEIN	41	44	3
53	BOTHASIG	68	70	2
54	CONVILLE	135	136	1
55	LINGELETHU-WEST	177	177	0
56	STRAND	155	155	0
57	PIKETBERG	59	59	0
58	KLAPMUTS	38	38	0
59	WOLSELEY	44	44	0
60	LAAIPEK	36	36	0
61	LUTZVILLE	39	38	-1
62	KWANOKUTHULA	55	54	-1
63	CITRUSDAL	54	53	-1
64	PACALTS DORP	69	67	-2
65	MOORREESBURG	63	61	-2
66	SOMERSET WEST	165	163	-2
67	FISH HOEK	60	58	-2
68	RIEBEEK WEST	47	44	-3
69	MONTAGU	63	60	-3
70	KLAWER	35	30	-5
71	DYSSELS DORP	44	37	-7
72	LANGA	138	130	-8
73	ALBERTINIA	33	24	-9
74	KLEINMOND	39	30	-9
75	MELKBOSSTRAND	41	31	-10
76	PINELANDS	70	60	-10
77	MBEKWENI	115	105	-10
78	TOUWS RIVER	35	25	-10
79	SARON	37	27	-10
80	SIMON'S TOWN	44	33	-11
81	ST HELENA BAY	41	30	-11
82	RIVERSDALE	63	52	-11
83	CLANWILLIAM	55	43	-12
84	LANGEBAAN	35	23	-12
85	ASHTON	61	49	-12
86	RIVIERSONDEREND	34	22	-12
87	STILL BAY	33	20	-13
88	BONNIEVALE	49	36	-13
89	HOPEFIELD	37	22	-15
90	LAMBERTSBAAI	34	19	-15
91	STANFORD	32	17	-15
92	GENADENDAL	45	29	-16
93	VANRHYNSDORP	36	20	-16

94	NAPIER	34	17	-17
95	GANS BAY	59	42	-17
96	MURRAYSBURG	36	19	-17
97	BELLVILLE SOUTH	99	82	-17
98	GOODWOOD	146	129	-17
99	BARRYDALE	37	19	-18
100	PHILADELPHIA	37	19	-18
101	ELANDS BAY	26	7	-19
102	PORTERVILLE	61	41	-20
103	SWELLENDAM	90	70	-20
104	DORING BAY	28	8	-20
105	HEIDELBERG(C)	60	40	-20
106	MCGREGOR	35	14	-21
107	STRUISBAAI	33	12	-21
108	GRAAFWATER	34	13	-21
109	DE RUST	37	15	-22
110	NUWERUS	33	11	-22
111	REDELINGHUYS	28	6	-22
112	MAITLAND	81	59	-22
113	EENDEKUIL	35	13	-22
114	CALITZDORP	43	21	-22
115	HERMANUS	149	126	-23
116	SUURBRAAK	32	8	-24
117	VREDENBURG	140	115	-25
118	RAWSONVILLE	62	37	-25
119	BREDASDORP	86	61	-25
120	TULBAGH	77	51	-26
121	PRINCE ALBERT	53	26	-27
122	UNIONDALE	65	38	-27
123	LEEU GAMKA	43	15	-28
124	LAINGSBURG	53	23	-30
125	RONDEBOSCH	77	45	-32
126	WORCESTER	365	331	-34
127	CAMPS BAY	53	18	-35
128	ROBERTSON	133	96	-37
129	CERES	153	116	-37
130	MITCHELLS PLAIN	674	637	-37
131	MOWBRAY	69	32	-37
132	PLETTENBERG BAY	118	79	-39
133	STELLENBOSCH	218	178	-40
134	VREDENDAL	110	68	-42
135	LADISMITH	90	48	-42
136	TABLE BAY HARBOUR	63	16	-47
137	DA GAMASKOP	121	73	-48

138	BEAUFORT WEST	167	119	-48
139	MOSSEL BAY	88	34	-54
140	CALEDON	128	74	-54
141	SEA POINT	147	86	-61
142	WOODSTOCK	157	95	-62
143	CLAREMONT	183	105	-78
144	BELLVILLE	297	213	-84
145	OUDTSHOORN	293	204	-89
146	GEORGE	282	183	-99
147	PAARL	271	152	-119
148	WYNBERG	215	85	-130
149	CAPE TOWN CENTRAL	541	203	-338