

Q2 2020/2021 Individual Performance Scorecard
Acting Executive Director: Adv. Brent Gerber
1 July 2020 - 30 June 2021

CORE MANAGEMENT
COMPETENCIES ANNEXURE
B

Core Competency Requirements	Core Managerial Competencies	Competency Definitions	Weighting	Quarter 1 30 Sep 2020	Rating ED	Quarter 2 31 Dec 2020	Rating ED	Quarter 3 31 Mar 2021	Quarter 4 30 Jun 2021
	Moral Competence	Able to identify moral triggers, apply reasoning that promotes honesty and integrity and consistently display behaviour that reflects moral competence.	20%	5	5	5	5	5	5
	Planning and Organising	Able to plan, prioritise and organise information and resources effectively to ensure the quality of service delivery and built efficient contingency plans to manage risk.	20%	5	5	5	5	5	5
	Analysis and Innovation	Able to critically analyse information, challenges and trends to establish and implement fact-based solutions that are innovative to improve institutional processes in order to achieve key strategic objectives.	20%	5	5	5	5	5	5
	Knowledge and Information Management	Able to promote the generation and sharing of knowledge and information through various processes and media, in order to enhance the collective knowledge base of local government.	10%	5	5	5	5	5	5
	Communication	Able to share information, knowledge and ideas in a clear, focused and concise manner appropriate for the audience in order to effectively convey, persuade and influence stakeholders to achieve the desired outcome.	10%	5	5	5	5	5	5
	Results and Quality Focus	Able to maintain high quality standards, focus on achieving results and objectives while consistently striving to exceed expectations and encourage others to meet quality standards. Further, to actively monitor and measure results and quality against identified outcomes.	20%	5	5	5	5	5	5


Acting Executive Director

Adv. Brent Gerber

26/3/2021
Date

City Manager
Lungelo Mbandazayo

Date

No	COMBINED MEASURE			Target
3	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 AMENDMENT process (b) Reduction in SCM deviations (c) Average percentage reduction in the number and value of irregular expenditure identified <u>Performance rating:</u> 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%	Each ED is responsible for calculation as per the worksheet in the document. Individual evidence can be obtained from contact person as per worksheet.	80%

HOW TO CALCULATE COMBINED MEASURE			Contact person	Target
-----------------------------------	--	--	----------------	--------

Percentage compliance of contracts with MFMA section 116(3) AMENDMENT process	<u>(a) Percentage compliance of contracts with MFMA section 116(3) AMENDMENT process</u> The objective is to achieve a 100% compliance. Contract managers have to indicate on the Contract Monitoring System (CMS) whether an AMENDMENT in terms of section 116(3) has occurred. Section 116(3) states: Contracts procured through SCM process maybe amended only after reasons have been tabled in council and public participation process have been followed. Non-compliance to section 116(3) give rise to irregular expenditure. Irregular expenditure is defined as expenditure that is in contravention of, or not in accordance with, a requirement of the Local Government: Municipal Finance Management Act 56 of 2003, the Local Government: Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000, the Remuneration of Public Office Bearers Act 20 of 1998, or the municipality's supply chain management (SCM) policy Formula: Total number of contracts where 116(3) Amendments occurred and compliant with prescribed process ÷ Total number of contracts where 116(3) Amendments occurred <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance= below 60%. Rating = 50% Not fully effective= range between 60 % and 99%. Rating =70% Fully effective =100%. Rating 100%	Department: OPM - Contract Management Source document: CMS (Contract Management System) report to EMT Contact person: Maureen Whare 021 400 9206	100%
Percentage reduction in the number of SCM deviations	<u>(b) Percentage reduction in the number of SCM deviations</u> The objective is to achieve a 20% reduction on SCM deviations. The indicator only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R200 000. Sole/single service provider deviations and deviations relating to disasters such as fires and floods will be excluded from the measurement. The indicator will measure the percentage year on year reduction from the previous year's number of SCM deviations. Formula: (No. of SCM deviations for current year – No of SCM deviations for prior year)/ Number of SCM deviations for prior year X 100" <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance= below 60%. Rating = 50% Not fully effective= range between 60% and 89%. Rating =60% Fully effective= decrease deviations by 20%. Rating=90% Significant performance= zero deviations for current year. Rating=95% Outstanding performance= maintain zero deviations over two financial years. Rating=100%	Department: SCM Source document: Evidence: Formula: Number of SCM deviations reduced by the target percentage % year on year for the department/ directorate. Contact person: Darren Cupido (Acting) SCM: Demand & Risk Analyst 021 400 1111	20%

Average percentage reduction in the number and value of irregular expenditure identified for the Directorate (year-on-year)	(c) <u>Average percentage reduction in the number and value of irregular expenditure identified for the Directorate (year-on-year).</u> The objective is to achieve a 50% reduction on irregular expenditure. The indicator will measure the average percentage reduction in the number and value of irregular expenditure ie. contravention of legislation as defined in the irregular expenditure definition. Irregular expenditure is defined as expenditure that is in contravention of, or not in accordance with, a requirement of the Local Government: Municipal Finance Management Act 56 of 2003, the Local Government: Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000, the Remuneration of Public Office Bearers Act 20 of 1998, or the municipality's supply chain management (SCM) policy. Formula: $\frac{(\text{Non-compliance Instances for the current year} - \text{Non-compliance instances for prior year}) / \text{Non-compliance instance for prior year} \times 100 + (\text{Irregular expenditure amount for current year} - \text{Irregular expenditure amount for prior year}) / \text{Irregular expenditure amount for prior year} \times 100}{2}$ Refer to table below for calculation: <u>Performance rating:</u> Not fully effective=below 50% Fully effective=50%-99% Outstanding =100%	Department: City Manager Office Source document: Irregular Register and the AG's findings in the quarter that it is available. Contact person: Gayle Postings 021 400 1268	50%
---	--	---	-----

Average percentage reduction in the number and value of irregular expenditure identified	
VARIOUS SCENARIOS	
Formula:	Current year
Scenario 1	
Number of instances	5
Value	50000
AVERAGE	
Scenario 2	
Number of instances	5
Value	300000
AVERAGE	
Scenario 3	
Number of instances	7
Value	1000000
AVERAGE	

Scenario 4	
Number of instances	5
Value	0
AVERAGE	
Scenario 5	
Number of instances	7
Value	30000
AVERAGE	

Q1 Target	Q1 Actual	Quarter 2 Target	Q2 Actual	Quarter 3 Target	Q3 Actual	Quarter 4 Target	Q 4 Actual
80%	50%	80%	50%	80%	60%	80%	80%

Q1 Actual SCORE	Quarter 1 Score per Rating scale	Q2 Actual SCORE	Quarter 2 Score per Rating scale	Q3 Actual SCORE	Quarter 3 Score per Rating scale	Q4 Actual SCORE	Quarter 4 Score per Rating scale
-----------------------	--	-----------------------	--	-----------------------	--	-----------------------	--

100%	100%	100%	100%	55%	60%	100%	100%
AT	AT	AT	AT	AT	AT	-20%	90%

AT	AT	AT	AT	AT	AT	-36%	50%
	100%		100%		60%		240%
	50%		50%		60%		80%

Overall actual score evaluated against target of 80%

and value of irregular expenditure		
Prior year	Average Percentage	Performance rating
10	-50%	
100000	-50%	
	-50%	95%
8	-38%	
300000	0%	
	-19%	50%
5	29%	
300000	70%	
	49%	50%

8	-38%	
50000	-100%	
	-69%	99%
5	29%	
50000	-67%	
	-19%	50%