2023/2024 Executive Director Performance Scorecard template
Chief Financial Officer: Kevin Jacoby
1 July 2023 - 30 June 2024

	No	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	Annual Target	Q1 30 Sep 2023	Q 2 31 Dec 2023	Q 3 31 Mar 2024	Q4 30 Jun 2024	Weighting	Contact Department
					2021/2022	2022/2023	2023/2024	Target	Target	Target	Target		
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											60%	
	SPECIAL PROJECTS											10%	
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
1	1	Transversal Management	Increase in 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, Programme 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 Future Planning and Resilience 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 0.1 - 0.2 Significantly above expectation = range between 0.21 - 0.5 Outstanding performance = 0.51 and above	2.76	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	AT	AT	AT	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: PPM assessment
2	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Repeatable Tenders that were Expanded/Amended multiple times (%)	Measures the percentage of Expansions and Amendments on repeatable tenders. This indicator will only measure instances where there was more than one Expansion and/or Amendment on the same tender. Expansions or Amendments are defined by the SCM section 116 (3) guide and can change at any time. **Source:** Contract Register and Monitoring System and Tender Tracking System. Measurement will commence only when the second Expansions and/or Amendments are released in SAP MM and only applies to repeatable tenders that are active in the current FY (i.e. commenced before or in the financial year and expires in or after the FY).	0%	2%	2%	AT	AT	AT	2%	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: CMRS (Contract Register and Monitoring System) and Tender Tracking System

				Forumula: Total number of repeatable tenders expanded and/ or amended multiple times ÷ Total number of repeatable tenders active in the FY. Measured cumulatively. <u>Performance rating</u>: Not fully effective = 2.1% and above Fully effective = 2% Significant performance = range 0.1% - 1.9% Outstanding = 0%									
3	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduction in the number of SCM deviations (%)	**The objective is to achieve a 20% reduction on SCM deviations.** The indicator only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R200 000 (inclusive of VAT). Sole/single service provider deviations and deviations relating to emergencies will be excluded from the measurement as per section 36 of SCM regulations. 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 = any positive increase in deviations. Not fully effective = decrease deviations between 1% and 19% Fully effective = decrease deviations by 20% Exception: A default performance rating of fully effective will be awarded if you have 2 or less deviations starting from a base of zero Significant performance = decrease deviations between 21% and 99% Outstanding performance = 0 deviations	-87%	20%	20%	AT	AT	AT	20%	2%	Department: SCM Source document: SCM deviations schedule
4	4	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduction in the number and value of irregular expenditure identified for the Directorate (year-on-year) (average %)	**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 i.e. 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.	-67%	50%	50%	AT	AT	AT	50%	2%	Department: City Manager Office Source document: Irregular Register and the AG's findings **in the quarter that it is available**.

				Indicator will measure Irregular expenditure that arose only in the time of employment of the ED. Irregular expenditure will be measured based on the financial year in which it is disclosed. Irregular expenditure is based on self-disclosure or detected by an assurance provider (including AGSA) for the current financial year and the year preceding the current financial year where the ED was accountable for the directorate. Formula: (Non-compliance Instances for the current year – Non-compliance instances for prior year)/ Non-compliance instance for prior year X 100" + (Irregular expenditure amount for current year – Irregular expenditure amount for prior year)/ Irregular expenditure amount for prior year X 100" / 2 Refer to table below for guidance on calculation: <u>Performance rating</u>: Not fully effective = a reduction of above 0% and less than 50% Fully effective = a reduction between 50% and 99% Outstanding = 100% reduction or 0 instances									
5	5	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	External audit (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. <u>Performance rating:</u> Outstanding =100% No scores for fully effective and significant	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	Department: Investor Relations Source document: Completed Audit Action plan
6	6	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Final council decisions implemented within timeframes (%)	The indicator excludes all council decisions for noting. Decisions taken by council where there is no budget to implement actions or outside of the control of the ED. These exclusions must be supported by valid evidence. These decisions must be reflected on each quarterly report for the City Manager and/or panel's awareness. 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.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Each ED is responsible for implementation, evidence and updates to the tracking system.

				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 councils request or expectation. Weighting must be reallocated where there were no council decisions for the year. <u>Performance rating</u>: Below 70% not effective Fully effective = range between 79% and 70% of ALL decisions Significant performance = range between 99% and 80% of ALL decisions Outstanding performance = 100% Score of 5 and scoring will apply downwards where decisions were not implemented.									Source document: SharePoint tracking
7	7	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Final mayco decisions implemented within timeframes (%)	The indicator excludes all mayco decisions for noting. Decisions taken by mayco where there is no budget to implement actions or outside of the control of the ED. These exclusions must be supported by valid evidence. These decisions must be reflected on each quarterly report for the City Manager and/or panel's awareness. 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 of achievement of mayco's request or expectation.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Each ED is responsible for implementation, evidence and updates to the tracking system. Tracking System contact person:

				Weighting must be reallocated where there were no mayco decisions for the year. <u>Performance rating</u>: Below 70% not effective Fully effective = range between 79% and 70% of ALL decisions Significant performance = range between 99% and 80% of ALL decisions Outstanding performance = 100% Score of 5 and scoring will apply downwards where decisions were not implemented.									
8	8	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.J Budget spent on implementation of Workplace Skills Plan (%)	Measures the percentage of budget spent on the Workplace Skills Plan .The Workplace Skills Plan outlines the planned education, training and development interventions for the organisation. Its purpose is to formally plan and allocate budget for appropriate training interventions that will address the needs arising out of local government's skills sector plan, the IDP, the individual departmental staffing strategies, individual employees' personal development plans and the employment equity plan. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(f). Formula: % spent on the implementation of the WSP measured against the training budget. (A/B)*100 A: Actual spend per quarter on training budget B: Planned spend on training Budget for the year <u>Performance rating</u>: Fully effective = 90% - 95% Significant performance = between range of 96% and 98% Outstanding performance = 99% and above	100%	90%	90%	10%	30%	60%	90%	1%	Corporate Services Source documents: WSP report per quarter
9	9	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Internal independent assurance provider's functions 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 departments. 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. <u>Performance rating:</u> Fully effective = 85% - 90% Significant performance = between range of 91% and 94% Outstanding performance = 95% and above	94%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	1%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition

10	10	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.A Community satisfaction city-wide survey(score 1-5)	Measures the score on the Community satisfaction City-wide survey. A statistically valid, scientifically defensible score from the annual survey of residents' perceptions of the overall performance of the City's. The measure is given against a non-symmetrical Likert scale, where 1 is poor, 2 is fair, 3 is good, 4 is very good, and 5 is excellent. The objective is to improve the current customer satisfaction level. <u>Performance rating:</u> Fully effective = 2.8 - 2.9 Significant performance = between range of 3.0 and 3.1 Outstanding performance = 3.1 and above	2.7	2.8	2.9	AT	AT	AT	2.9	2%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: Community Satisfaction survey score
11	11	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Inclusion of C88 **output** indicators (%)	All Tier 1 and Tier 2 Circular 88 output indicators to be **included** into the performance scorecards of the Executive Directors, **where relevant**. All indicators must be included verbatim into the corporate and **Directorate** SDBIP and the measurement must be in compliance with the technical indicator descriptions (TID) as issued by National Treasury. (Targets is annual due to the fact that amendments can only be made in the mid-year scorecards) Formula: Percentage: Total number of Tier 1& 2 included in the directorate SDBIP divided by Tier 1 & 2 required for inclusion as per C88 <u>Performance rating</u>: Fully effective = 90% - 99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Significant performance = 100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2	New	New	100%	AT (YTD progress)	AT (YTD progress)	AT (YTD progress)	100%	1%	Department: Organisational Performance Management (OPM) Source document: C88 scorecard/ **Directorate** SDBIP
12	12	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Average of tenders in slippage at any given quarter end (%)	Measures the average of tenders for MTREF in slippage at any given quarter end. This will drive the timeous implementation of the demand plan based on the agreed timeline. Abnormalities in the timeline will then impact each step of the process, such as where a tender only allows 30 days after award to Contract Required by Date (CRD), there will probably be a contract gap or a Value At Risk (VAR – Budget at risk of not being spent) on the Capital reporting. (average %). Slippage is defined as tenders on the demand plan which are behind schedule based on the agreed timelines for each tender.	New	New	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	1%	Manager: Demand Management Source document: Demand Plan Overview

				Slippage in the implementation of the demand plan, is a contributor to the cause of VAR. This will include the submission of draft specifications as per the minimum timeframe before the CRD. Formula: Total count of tenders in red or amber as a percentage of the total number of tenders required for the MTREF period (average %). <u>Performance rating</u>: Fully effective =≤ 9% - 10% Significant performance = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9% Outstanding performance = < 5%									
13	13	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Gaps in repeatable tender continuity (average number of days)	This indicator is to ensure continued monthly service delivery implemented through repeatable tenders. Potential gaps should be mitigated via extension/expansion and/or deviation early enough so that it caters for any possible delay within a tender process. A gap less than one month will be included in the calculation. To drive the demand plan and improve Supply Chain Management (SCM) process and service delivery. Formula: Total number of gaps in days/ Total number of tenders with a gap of more than zero days = Average number of gaps (days) <u>Performance rating</u>: Fully effective = repeatable tenders with gaps with > than 30 days ≤ 90 days gap Significant performance = repeatable tenders with gaps with ≤ than 30 days Outstanding performance = zero repeatable tenders with gaps	New	New	0	0	0	0	0	1%	Department: CPPPM Source document: GAP report
14	14	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Memorandum of Agreements (MOA) submitted to Legal for vetting prior to BAC (%)	Measures the percentage of MOAs submitted to Legal for vetting prior to BAC decision. (This is 100% within the control of the Directorate and contributes to the efficiency of the process by overlapping the vetting with the award and appeal period)	New	New	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	1%	Department: CPPPM Source document: Post award tracker

				Formula: Progressive per quarter using the Post Award Tracker based on all awards made by BAC in a financial year for that Directorate Performance rating: Fully effective = 95% - 96% Significant performance = 97% - 98% Outstanding performance = above 98%									
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
15	15	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Spend of capital budget (%) (NKPI)	Measures the extent to which capital expenditure has been spent based on the **original** budget during the financial year. Capital expenditure is all costs incurred by the municipality to acquire, upgrade, and renew physical assets such as property, plants, buildings, technology, or equipment. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(c). Proxy measure for C88 FM1.11 Performance rating: Fully effective = 90% - 93% Significant performance = range between 93% and 96% Outstanding performance = above 96%	98%	90%	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
16	16	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Operating budget spend (%)	This indicator measures the total actual expenditure to date as a percentage of the total budget including secondary expenditure. Performance rating: Fully effective = 95% - 96% Significant performance = range between 96% and 97% Outstanding performance = above 97%	97%	95%	95%	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	95%	4%	Directorate Finance Manager
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											60%	
17	17	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government Ease of Doing Business Index	1.C Property revenue clearance certificates issued within 10 working days (%)	Measures the percentage of revenue clearance certificates issued by the municipality within 10 working days of a compleeted submission. A revenue clearance certificate is issued by the relevant local municipality and reflects all of the debts collected on the property, including rates. the purpose of the document is to prove that all the outstanding debt on the property has been paid by the seller. A completed submission refers to the point in time when all necessary information has been supplied in relation to the certificate. The 10 days, in this instance, refers to 10 working days, not days of the week. Proxy measure for C88 LED3.21	99.06%	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%	5%	Director: Revenue

				<u>Performance rating</u>: Fully effective = 93% - ≤95% Significant performance = range between >95% and 98% Outstanding performance = above 98%									
18	18	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.B Opinion of independent rating agency	A report which reflects credit worthiness of an institution to repay long-term and short-term liabilities. Credit ratings provide an analysis of the City's key financial data and are performed by an independent agency to assess the City's 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. <u>Performance rating</u>: Fully effective = A1 (3) (subject to the highest sector rating at the time) Outstanding performance = AA3 (5) (subject to the highest sector rating at the time)	Aa3.za/P-1.za long and short-term national scale rating	High investment rating	High investment rating	High investment rating	High investment rating	High investment rating	High investment rating	5%	Director: Treasury
19	19	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.C Opinion of the Auditor-General	This indicator measures good governance and accounting practices and will be evaluated and considered by the Auditor General (AG) in determining their opinion. The AG has various approved opinions and the City will be measured against these opinions based on the outcome of the audit. <u>Performance rating</u>: Not fully effective = Qualified with findings, Adverse with findings and Disclaimed with findings = (0) Significant performance = Unqualified audit opinion (4) Outstanding performance = Clean audit (5)	Clean Audit	Unqualified audit opinion	Unqualified audit opinion	Annual Financial Statements and Consolidated Financial Statements submitted	Unqualified audit opinion	Resolved 60% of audit management issues	Unqualified audit opinion	5%	Director: Treasury

20	20	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.E Cash/cost coverage ratio (NKPI)	The ratio indicates the ability to meet at least its monthly fixed operating commitments from cash and short-term investments, without collecting any additional revenue, during that month (excluding unspent conditional grants). Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(g) Performance rating: NT Benchmark - 1 to 3 times Fully effective = below target achieved of 1.70:1 Significant performance = target achieved of 1.70:1 Outstanding performance = above target of 1.70:1 Read together with 16.G over-performance in the same ratio. The 2 ratios are interrelated and compensate each other	1.84:1	1.70:1	1.70:1	1.65:1	1.8:1	1.8:1	1.70:1	5%	Director: Treasury
21	21	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.F Net debtors to annual income (NKPI)	Net current debtors are a measurement of the net amounts due to the City that are realistically expected to be recovered. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(g) Performance rating: Fully effective = range between 1% and 5% above target achieved Significant performance = target achieved 20.98% Outstanding performance = below target of 20.98% achieved The outcome of this ratio is also dependent on the performance of the Rates collection ratio KPI (indicator 31)	16.61%	20.67%	20.98%	18.25%	18.52%	18.79%	20.98%	5%	Director: Treasury
22	22	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.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 per MSA Regulation 10(g) Performance rating: Fully effective = range between 1% andd 5% above target achieved Significant performance = target achieved 41.56% Outstanding performance = below target 41.56% achieved	19.78%	30.52%	41.56%	23.50%	23.50%	23.50%	41.56%	5%	Director: Treasury

23	23	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Progress against major milestones of budget cycle plan to ensure the submission of the 2023/2024 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: Outstanding = 100% No score for fully effective and significant	100% Budget submitted to Council (item SPC 31/05/22) on 31 May 2022	100% Budget submitted to Council (item SPC 31/05/22) on 31 May 2023	Submission of 2024/2025 Budget to Council for adoption by 31/05/2024	Initial budget engagement to various forum (e.g. BSC)	Modelled determination of major budget assumptions eg. Tariff increases, growth parameters	Tabled budget at Council by 31/03/2024	Submission of 2024/2025 Budget to Council for adoption by 31/05/2024	5%	Director: Budgets
24	24	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Approved reports 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. The FMR reports are approved by CFO, Executive Mayor and Quality certified by the City Manager. Performance rating: Fully effective = 6 reports Significant performance = 8 reports Outstanding = 12 reports	3 Financial Monitoring Reports submitted for Q4 (April, May and June 2022) = total of 12	3 Financial Monitoring Reports submitted for Q4 (April, May and June 2023 = total of 12	3 for 4th quarter, making an Annual Total of 12 reports	3 reports	3 reports	3 reports	3 for 4th quarter, making an Annual Total of 12 reports	5%	Director: Budgets
25	25	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Improved Stock Availability rate (%)	To measure and maintain the stock levels in the system at optimal levels to enable service delivery Performance rating: Fully effective = 92% Significant performance = > 92% - < 95% Outstanding performance = ≥ 95%	2.72	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	5%	Director: SCM

26	26	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Municipal payments made to service providers who submitted complete forms within 30-days of invoice submission (%)	The percentage of municipal payments made to service providers within 30-days of complete invoice submission. The indicator measures the number of payments made on the basis of invoice submissions to the municipality within the accepted standard of 30 days or less. This measures 30 calendar days from the time of submission of an accurate invoice. Formula:((1) Number of municipal payments within 30-days of complete invoice receipt made to service providers / (2) Total number of complete invoices received (30 days or older)) x 100 <u>Performance rating</u>: Fully effective = 97% Significant performance = 98% Outstanding performance = 99% and above	99%	99.3%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	5%	Director:: Expenditure
27	27	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	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. <u>Performance rating</u>: Outstanding = 100% No scores for fully effective and significant	100%	100%	100%	20%	45%	70%	100%	5%	Director: Grant Funding
28	28	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Successful transactions submitted into the LUM interface (%)	The indicator is aimed at the setting of a standard of 98% successful (less than 2% failed) LUM interface transactions to ensure that ratepayers will have the benefit of their property valuation decisions to be implemented in good time and without errors ensuring customer relations excellence. Q1: Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1. Q2: Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1 and Q2. Q3: Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1, Q2 and Q3. Q4: Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4. <u>Performance rating</u>: Outstanding = > 2% No scores for fully effective and significant	0.95% 360 out of 37 964 of transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4	Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4	Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4	Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1	Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1and Q2	Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1, Q and Q3	Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4	5%	Director: Valuations

		SPECIAL PROJECTS										10%	
29	29	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Legal Compliance wrt the implementation of an annual Supplementary Valuation Roll (Milestones)	Quarter1: N/A Quarter 2: One batch of real-time valuations submitted by 31 December 2023, for inclusion SV01 of GV2022 Quarter 3: A project plan completed by 31 March 2024 for the finalisation and certification of SV01 of GV2022 Quarter 4: Supplementary Valuation Roll SV01 to GV2022 certified by the Municipal Valuer by 30 June 2024 The approval of the SV is an annual process within the GV cycle Performance rating: Outstanding performance = 100% No scores for fully effective and significant performance	100% Supplementary Valuation Roll SV04 to GV2018 certified by the Municipal Valuer on 30 June 2022	Supplementary Valuation Roll SV05 to GV2018 certified by the Municipal Valuer by 30 June 2023	Supplementary Valuation Roll SV01 to GV2022 certified by the Municipal Valuer by 30 June 2024	70%	70%	70%	70%	3%	Director: Valuations
30	30	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government LFTEA	Review of developments in areas not established through formal building development processes to recognise rateable properties (%)	Percentage of rateable properties zoned as single residential incremental housing, reviewed to include unregulated building developments in the valuation process, with a focus on those that result in a usage and rating category changes Q1: 10% Q2: 25% Q3: 50% Q4: 75% Performance Rating: Fully effective = 75% Significant performance = range between 76% and 80% Outstanding performance = 81% and above	100% of Rateable properties in the LFTEA area of Imazama Yethu, Hout Bay, included in valuation process	100% of Rateable properties in one further LFTEA included in valuation process	75% of all Rateable properties zoned as single residential incremental housing, reviewed to include unregulated building developments in the valuation process, with a focus on those that result in a usage and rating category changes	10% of all Rateable properties zoned as single residential incremental housing, reviewed to include unregulated building developments in the valuation process, with a focus on those that result in a usage and rating category changes	25% of all Rateable properties zoned as single residential incremental housing, reviewed to include unregulated building developments in the valuation process, with a focus on those that result in a usage and rating category changes	50% of all Rateable properties zoned as single residential incremental housing, reviewed to include unregulated building developments in the valuation process, with a focus on those that result in a usage and rating category changes	75% of all Rateable properties zoned as single residential incremental housing, reviewed to include unregulated building developments in the valuation process, with a focus on those that result in a usage and rating category changes	4%	Director: Valuations

31	31	3.1 Excellence in Basic Service delivery	Revenue collected of billed amount - Rates (%)	To measure the receipts as a percentage of billing covering the immediate 12 months period for all directorate responsible for services. Formula: Revenue collected over Billed amount. Performance rating: Fully effective = range between 95% and 95.99% Significant performance = range between 96% and 96.99% Outstanding performance = 97% and above	98.95%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	3%	Director: Revenue

Chief Financial Officer

Kevin Jacoby

Digitally signed by Kevin Jacoby
Date: 2023.07.25 08:55:54 +02'00'

City Manager

Lungelo Mbandazayo

Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo
Date: 2023.07.31 15:51:30 +02'00'