2020/2021 Individual Performance Scorecard
CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: KEVIN JACOBY
1 July 2020 - 30 June 2021

PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline as at 30 June 2019	Annual Target	Quarter 1 30 Sep 2020	Quarter 2 31 Dec 2020	Quarter 3 31 Mar 2021	Quarter 4 30 Jun 2021	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
					2019/20 (June 2020)	Target	Target	Target	Target		
MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION										**20%**	
MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY										**10%**	
SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE										**60%**	
SPECIAL PROJECTS										**10%**	
										100%	
MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION										**20%**	
1	Organisational culture	An increase in City Pulse score for the 3 lowest scoring attributes	City Pulse 2021 survey results to reflect an increase of 0.1 points for the 3 lowest scoring questions in the City Pulse 2019 survey, where the score achieved was ≥ 3.1 and an increase of 0.2 for scores of <3.1 of which one must be within the People Dimension. Performance rating: Fully effective: - minimum increased score of 0.1 achieved for 2 of 3 attributes where scored ≥ 3.1 or - the minimum increased score of 0.2 achieved for 2 of 3 attributes where scored <3.1 Significantly above expectation: - minimum increased score of 0.1 achieved for 3 of 3 attributes where scored ≥ 3.1 or - the minimum increased score of 0.2 achieved for 3 of 3 attributes where scored <3.1 Outstanding performance: - exceed 0.1 in all 3 attributes where scored ≥ 3.1 or - exceed 0.2 in all 3 attributes where scored <3.1 (Baseline+Targets as per City Pulse worksheet)	3.20	Increase of 0.2 on the 3 lowest scoring attributes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Increase of 0.1 on the 3 lowest scoring attributes	2%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: To be provided by each ED as this will vary based on the type of intervention Contact person: Monica Pregnolato 021 400 9221
2	Transversal Management	Increase in the PPM maturity level based on the PPM Operating Model	The original PPM maturity level is based on the PPM Operating Model maturity assessment that was tabled at EMT during June 2018. The maturity assessment will reflect the maturity at Portfolio and Project level and will occur on an annual basis in order to assess the increase in the maturity level. The maturity level is measured on a scale of 1 - 5. The maturity levels: * Level 1 – Initial Process: No standard process or tracking system – informal process * Level 2 – Repeatable Process: Minimum standards for processes and procedures * Level 3 – Defined Process: Defined Process which allow for flexibility * Level 4 – Managed Process: Obtain and retain specific measurements and quality requirements * Level 5 – Optimised Process: Continuous process improvement and proactive technology and problem management for future improvements The EDs for Finance and Corporate Services will be measured on a City-wide maturity level. All other EDs will be measured per the individual directorate. Performance rating: Fully effective = achieve increase of 0.05 Significantly above expectation= range between 0.06 to 0.08 Outstanding performance= achieve increase 0.09	2.6	2.31	AT	AT	AT	2.47	2%	Department: CPPM Source document: PPM assessment Contact person: Ben Peters 021 400 9206
3	5.1. Operational sustainability	Effective and efficient management of contracts and achievement of reduced irregular expenditure	The measurement will be a combination of the: Average score of the following measures: (a) Compliance with Section 116(3) of the MFMA (b) Reduction in SCM deviations (c) Average percentage reduction in the number and value of irregular expenditure identified Performance rating: Unacceptable performance= an average below 60% across all 3 factors Not fully effective= an average range between 60 to 79% across all 3 factors Fully effective = an average achievement of 80% across all 3 factors Significantly above expectation= an average range between 81% to 99% across all 3 factors Outstanding performance= 100% Refer to CM and Irregular expenditure worksheet	new	new	80%	80%	80%	80%	8%	Each ED is responsible for calculation as per the worksheet in the document. Individual evidence can be obtained from contact person as per worksheet. **Refer to CM and Irregular Exp worksheet in the document**

2020/2021 Individual Performance Scorecard
CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: KEVIN JACOBY
1 July 2020 - 30 June 2021

PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline as at 30 June 2019	Annual Target 2019/20 (June 2020)	Quarter 1 30 Sep 2020 Target	Quarter 2 31 Dec 2020 Target	Quarter 3 31 Mar 2021 Target	Quarter 4 30 Jun 2021 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
4	5.1. Operational sustainability	Percentage of external (Auditor-General) audit actions completed as per audit action plan	This indicator measures how many actions was completed in the financial cycle within in the unique deadline set, as per the audit action plan. The Audit Action Plan sets out the total number audit actions required to address the internal control deficiencies as identified by the Auditor-General in their management report. Completed would mean that the actions as stipulated in the audit action plan has been executed by the relevant ED and/or Director. Should there be no actions required for an Executive Director and/or Director the indicator will not be applicable. Performance rating: Fully effective =100%	New	New	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	Department: Investor Relations Source document: Completed Audit Action plan Contact person: Lynn Fortune:021 400 5987
5		Percentage adherence to the EE target of overall representation by employees from the designated groups. (see EE act definition)	This indicator measures the overall representation of designated groups across all occupational levels at City, directorate and departmental level as at the end of the preceding month. Performance rating: Fully effective =90% Significant performance=between range of 91% to 94%. Outstanding performance=95% and above	91.75%	85%	90%	90%	90%	90%	2%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: EE Stats Report Contact person: Sabelo Hlanganisa/Elize Madella 021 444 1338
6		Percentage of final council decisions implemented within timeframes	The indicator excludes all council decisions for noting. All final Council decisions allocated to the ED with implementation date for the quarter must be implemented and reported on for the quarter to achieve the target. Implementation that runs over a period longer than a financial year will be measured according to milestones identified for implementation within the current financial year. Each ED must ensure that a date is allocated of when action will be completed and implemented. This must be captured in the CDIT system by the relevant implementer. If no timeframe was allocated the timeframe is deemed to be one month for implementation. Implementation is the date of completion of the actions or achievement of Council's request or expectation. Performance rating: Outstanding performance= 100% Score of 5 and scoring will apply downwards where decisions were not implemented. Significant performance= range between 99% - 80% of ALL decisions Fully effective= range between 79% -70% of ALL decisions Below 70% not effective	New	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Each ED is responsible for implementation, evidence and updates to the tracking system. Source document: Sharepoint tracking Tracking System contact person: Rehana Razack (021 400 1246)
7		Percentage of final mayco decisions implemented within timeframes	The indicator excludes all mayco decisions for noting. All final Mayco decisions allocated to the ED with implementation date for the quarter must be implemented and reported on for the quarter to achieve the target. Implementation that runs over a period longer than a financial year will be measured according to milestones identified for implementation within the current financial year. Each ED must ensure that a date is allocated of when action will be completed and implemented. This must be captured in the CDIT system by the relevant implementer. If no timeframe was allocated the timeframe is deemed to be one month for implementation. Implementation is the date of completion of the actions or achievement of Mayco's request or expectation. Performance rating: Outstanding performance= 100% Score of 5 and scoring will apply downwards where decisions were not implemented. Significant performance= range between 99% - 80% of ALL decisions Fully effective= range between 79% -70% of ALL decisions Below 70% not effective	New	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Each ED is responsible for implementation, evidence and updates to the tracking system. Source document: Sharepoint tracking Tracking System contact person: Rehana Razack (021 400 1246)

2020/2021 Individual Performance Scorecard
CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: KEVIN JACOBY
1 July 2020 - 30 June 2021

PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline as at 30 June 2019	Annual Target 2019/20 (June 2020)	Quarter 1 30 Sep 2020 Target	Quarter 2 31 Dec 2020 Target	Quarter 3 31 Mar 2021 Target	Quarter 4 30 Jun 2021 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
8	5.1. Operational sustainability	Percentage of internal independent assurance provider's recommendations implemented	It is the monitoring and reporting of the implementation (expressed as a percentage) of corrective actions to address internal independent assurance providers' recommendations, issued within the directorate of the responsible Executive Director. The internal independent assurance providers included in this KPI are Internal Audit, Ombudsman, Integrated Risk Management, Ethics and Forensics functions. Each internal independent assurance provider as mentioned above has their own unique input to this KPI. This KPI will be "not applicable" to management when there are no recommendations, thus only those that could provide inputs will be included in the calculation. Performance rating: Fully effective =85% Significant performance=between range of 86% to 90%. Outstanding performance=91% and above	97%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	2%	Department: Probity Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Denise Flack 021 400 9279
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY									**10%**	
9	5.1 Operational Sustainability	5.C Percentage spend of capital budget (NKPI)	Percentage reflecting year-to-date spend in relation to the total budget, less any contingent liabilities relating to the capital budget. The total budget is the Council-approved adjusted budget at the time of the measurement. Contingent liabilities are only identified at year-end. Performance rating: Fully effective =90% Significant performance= range between 91% to 94%. Outstanding performance=95% and above	98%	90%	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	90%	6%	Directorate Finance Manager
10	5.1 Operational Sustainability	Percentage of operating budget spent	This indicator measures the total actual expenditure to date as a percentage of the total budget including secondary expenditure. Performance rating: Fully effective =90% Significant performance= range between 91% to 94%. Outstanding performance=95% and above	96%	90%	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	90%	4%	Directorate Finance Manager
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE									**60%**	
11	1.1 Positioning Cape Town as a forward looking Globaly Competetive City	1.B Percentage of rates clearance certificates issued within 10 working days	This indicator measures the percentage of rates clearance certificates issued within 10 working days, only once the correct payments and required documentation have been received and verified as correct. Performance rating: Fully effective= target achieved Significant performance=range between 1% to 5% above target achieved Outstanding performance= range between 6%-10% above target achieved	94.61% = 12 months accumulative 95.54% = quarterly average as at 30 June 2019	92%	90%	90%	90%	90%	6%	Director: Revenue
12	5.1 Operational Sustainability	5.A Opinion of independent rating agency	A report which reflects credit worthiness of an institution to repay long-term and short-term liabilities. Credit rating is an analysis of the City's key financial data performed by an independent agency to assess its ability to meet short- and long-term financial obligations. Indicator standard/Norm/Benchmark The highest rating possible for local government which is also subject to the Country's sovereign rating. Performance rating: Fully effective =100%	Baa3 confirmed rating with a stable outlook	High investment rating	High investment rating	High investment rating	High investment rating	High investment rating	6%	Director: Treasury

2020/2021 Individual Performance Scorecard
CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: KEVIN JACOBY
1 July 2020 - 30 June 2021

PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline as at 30 June 2019	Annual Target 2019/20 (June 2020)	Quarter 1 30 Sep 2020 Target	Quarter 2 31 Dec 2020 Target	Quarter 3 31 Mar 2021 Target	Quarter 4 30 Jun 2021 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
13	5.1 Operational Sustainability	5.B Opinion of the Auditor-General	The indicator measures good governance and accounting practices and will be evaluated and considered by the Auditor-General in determining his opinion. An unqualified audit opinion is where the auditor, having completed the audit, has no reservation as to the fairness of presentation of financial statements and their conformity with general recognised accounting practice. This is referred to as a 'clean audit'. Alternatively, the auditor would issue a qualified audit opinion either in whole or in part over the financial statements if these have not been prepared in accordance with general recognised accounting practice, or the auditor could not audit one or more areas of the financial statements. Future audit opinions will cover the audit of predetermined objectives. Performance rating: Fully effective =100%	Unqualified with findings	Clean Audit	N/A	N/A	N/A	Clean Audit	6%	Department: Finance Source document:Evidence: Final Audit Report Contact person: David Valentine Director: Treasury 021 400 3800
14		5.E Cash/cost coverage ratio (excluding unspent conditional grants) (NKPI)	The ratio indicates the ability to meet at least its monthly fixed operating commitments from cash and short-term investment without collecting any additional revenue, during that month. Proxy measure for NKPI Performance rating: Fully effective = 1.81:1 Significant performance = range between 1.82 – 2.5:1 Outstanding performance = above 2.5	3.85:1	21:36	1,8:1	2,2:1	1.81:1	1.81:1	6%	Director: Treasury
15		5.F Net Debtors to annual income (NKPI)	Net current debtors are a measurement of the net amounts due to the City for which the anticipation of the recovery is realistic. Proxy measure for NKPI Performance rating: Fully effective = 21.5% Significant performance = range between 19.44% - 21.4% Outstanding performance = below 19.44%	19.94%	22.80%	17.12%	16.98%	22.15%	21.50%	6%	Director: Treasury
16		5.G Debt (total borrowings) to total operating revenue (NKPI)	The purpose of the ratio is to provide assurance that sufficient revenue will be generated to repay liabilities. Proxy measure for NKPI Performance rating: Fully effective = 25.02% Significant performance = range between 22.85% - 25.02% Outstanding performance = below 22.85%	22.85%	26.11%	25,75%	25,75%	25.02%	25.02%	6%	Director: Treasury
17		Progress against major milestones of budget cycle plan to ensure the submission of the 2021/2022 Budget to Council for adoption	Submission of affordable, sustainable and balanced Operating and Capital Budget (MTREF) aligned to the IDP to Council for consideration. Managing the drafting and coordination of Operating and Capital Budget for the City, ensuring alignment to the IDP. Performance rating: Fully effective =100%	Budget approved at Council on 29 May 2019 (Item SPC 06/05/19)	Submission of 2021/2022 Budget to Council for adoption by 31/05/2021	Initial budget engagement to relevant for a (e.g. BSC)	Modelled determination of major budget assumptions eg. Tariff increases, growth parameters	Tabled budget at Council by 31/03/2021	Submission of 2021/2022 Budget to Council for adoption by 31/05/2021	8%	Director: Budgets
18		Number of reports submitted indicating regular monitoring, assessment and reporting of relevant in-year financial results	Regular monitoring, assessment and reporting of all relevant financial data sets, advice on corrective action and proposals in respect of variances between budget and progressive actuals. Compliance to relevant legislative frameworks w.r.t. other tiers of government. Under-spending or -recovery of budgetary provisions impacts negatively on municipalities' ability to deliver on its projects and services. Continuous and pro-active steps in monitoring progressive results could address this aspect timeously. In this regard internal procedures managed by the Budget Department (eg. FMR and PCER) is key to highlight variances and propose and implement remedial action towards optimum budget implementation and realisation. Ultimate format and mechanism must be in accordance with municipal budget-related legislation and directives. Performance rating: Fully effective =100%	3 FMR's submitted for Q4 Annual total = 12	Annual Total of 12 reports	3 reports	3 reports	3 reports	3 for 4th quarter, making an Annual Total of 12 reports	8%	Director: Budgets

2020/2021 Individual Performance Scorecard
CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER: KEVIN JACOBY
1 July 2020 - 30 June 2021

PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline as at 30 June 2019	Annual Target 2019/20 (June 2020)	Quarter 1 30 Sep 2020 Target	Quarter 2 31 Dec 2020 Target	Quarter 3 31 Mar 2021 Target	Quarter 4 30 Jun 2021 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
19	5.1 Operational Sustainability	Legal Compliance wrt the implementation of an annual Supplementary Valuation Roll.	Quarter 1: At least one batch of real-time valuations transmitted to Revenue via the GRM/LUM/ISO interface. Quarter 2: At least one batch of real-time valuations transmitted to Revenue via the GRM/LUM/ISO interface. Quarter 3: At least one batch of real-time valuations transmitted to Revenue via the GRM/LUM/ISO interface. Quarter 4: SV02 to GV2018 certified by the MV. The approval of the SV is an annual process within the three year GV cycle. Performance rating: Fully effective= target achieved Significant performance=range between 1% to 5% above target achieved Outstanding performance= range between 6%-10% above target achieved	New	Supplementary Valuation Roll SV01 to GV2018 certified by the Municipal Valuer on 28 June 2020	One batch of real-time valuations processed in Q1	One batch of real-time valuations processed in Q2	One batch of real-time valuations processed in Q3	Supplementary Valuation Roll SV02 to GV2018 certified by the Municipal Valuer by 30 June 2021	8%	Director: Valuations
			SPECIAL PROJECTS							**10%**	
20	3.1 Excellence in Basic Service delivery	Revenue collected as a percentage of billed amount - Rates (CFO)	To measure the receipts as a percentage of billing covering the immediate 12 months period. Formula: Revenue collected over Billed amount. Performance rating: Rates Fully effective= 96% Significant performance=range between 97% to 98% Outstanding performance= 99% and above	96%	85%	86%	86%	86%	86%	2%	Director: Revenue
21	5.1 Operational Sustainability	Management and resolution of GV 2018 Objections received	Quarter 1: 60% of GV2018 valuation based objections resolved and captured on GRM Quarter 2: 60% of GV2018 valuation based objections resolved and captured on GRM Quarter 3: 60% of GV2018 valuation based objections resolved and captured on GRM Quarter 4: 60% of GV2018 valuation based objections resolved and captured on GRM Performance rating: Fully effective= target achieved Significant performance=range between 1% to 5% above target achieved Outstanding performance= range between 6%-10% above target achieved	New	Management of the GV2018 objections to ensure 99% of valuation based objections are resolved by 30 June 2021	60% of GV2018 valuation based objections resolved	70% of GV2018 valuation based objections resolved	80% of GV2018 valuation based objections resolved	Management of the GV2018 objections to ensure 99% of valuation based objections are resolved by 30 June 2021	4%	Director: Valuations
22	5.1 Operational Sustainability	Percentage funding alignment of City Conditional grant funding to Division of Revenue Act and Provincial Gazette prescripts and framework allocations	Percentage, per each conditional grant as defined in both the Divisions of Revenue Act and Gazette, of funding allocation alignment to City budgets. Performance rating: Fully effective= target achieved Significant performance=range between 1% to 5% above target achieved Outstanding performance= range between 6%-10% above target achieved	New	100%	20%	45%	70%	100%	4%	Director: Grant Funding

Digitally signed by Kevin Jacoby
Date: 2021.03.26 13:30:56 +02'00'

Executive Director

Kevin Jacoby

Date

Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo
Date: 2021.04.06 21:51:40 +02'00'

City Manager

Lungelo Mbandazayo

Date