2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 Target 30-Sep-24	Q2 Target 31-Dec-24	Q3 Target 31-Mar-25	Q4 Target 30-Jun-25	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											60%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											10%	
												100%	
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
1	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Increase in CPPPM maturity level (%) (average)	The CPPPM maturity level is based on the PPPM, Contract Management and Engineering Management (Only applicable to Engineering Directorates) maturity assessment. The maturity assessment will reflect the average maturity level of: - 1. Portfolio, Programme, Project - 2. Contract management and - 3. Engineering Management level. This will occur on an annual basis in order to assess the increase in the maturity level for the Directorate. 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 ED for Finance will be measured on a City-wide maturity level. All other EDs will be measured per the individual directorate. 1. A score of 2.89 and below based on the 2023/2024 baseline: <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.11 Not fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.1 Fully effective = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 Significant performance = increase of 0.21 - 0.3 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.31 2. A score of 2.9 and above based on the 2023/2024 baseline: <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.21 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 - 0.2 Fully effective = increase of 0.0 - 0.1 Significant performance = increase of 0.11- 0.2 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.21	2.98	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 Contact person: Ben Peters 021 400 9206

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 Target 30-Sep-24	Q2 Target 31-Dec-24	Q3 Target 31-Mar-25	Q4 Target 30-Jun-25	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
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). Formula: Total number of repeatable contracts tenders expanded and/ or amended multiple times ÷ Total number of repeatable contract active in the FY. Measured cumulatively. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = ≥ 3.1% Not fully effective = 2.6% – 3% Fully effective = 2% - 2.5% Significant performance = 0.1% - 1.99% Outstanding performance = 0%	0%	2%	2%	AT	AT	AT	2%	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: CMRS (Contract Register and Monitoring System) and Tender Tracking System Contact person: Maureen Whare 069 367 4023
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. July – December 2023 - The indicator only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R200 000 (inclusive of VAT). 01 January – 30 June 2024 - The indicator only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R750 000 (inclusive of VAT). Sole/single service provider deviations, anti-corruption 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. Target = reduction of 20% Formula: (No. of SCM deviations for current year – No of SCM deviations for prior year)/ Number of SCM deviations for prior year X 100" Exception protocols: A default performance rating of fully effective will be awarded if you have 2 or less deviations from a base of zero Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = Any positive increase in the number of deviations, year-on-year Not fully effective = a reduction > 0% - <19.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. Fully effective = a reduction of 20%, for the number of deviations (year-on-year), or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol) Significant performance = a reduction > 20% - <99.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. Outstanding performance = 0 deviations	Individual ED % as at 30 June 2023	200% increase	20%	AT	AT	AT	20%	2%	Department: SCM Source document: SCM deviations schedule Formula: Number of SCM deviations reduced by the target percentage % year on year for the department/ directorate. Contact person: Gayle Postings Office of the City Manager: Specialist Advisor 021 400 1268

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 Target 30-Sep-24	Q2 Target 31-Dec-24	Q3 Target 31-Mar-25	Q4 Target 30-Jun-25	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
4	4	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduce and maintain nominal (number and value) irregular expenditure within the Directorate (year-on-year) (average %)	The objective is to reduce past irregular expenditure by 10% and limit 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 MFMA irregular expenditure definition and maintain lower levels of 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. Indicator will measure Irregular expenditure that was incurred (transaction) during the time of employment of the Executive Director (in the position as Executive Director). This also applies if an Existing ED moves to another portfolio. i.e. previous irregular expenditure wont impact the new Executive Director. NOTE: I a. Irregular expenditure will be included, if identified by other assurance provider, irrespective if it is self-disclosed or not. b. New Executive Directors will be impacted by existing contracts that incur irregular expenditure in the term of their office. If the existing contract had irregular expenditure in the period before ED's appointment, it will not be considered for the new EDs performance. 1. New Executive Director or Executive Director taking up a post in another directorate as an Executive Director (in the year of review) Formula: Number of non-compliance incidents (irregular expenditure) for the current year, while employed as Executive Director and the amount of irregular expenditure, while employed as an Executive Director. (No baseline) This also applies if an existing ED moves to another directorate, the ED will be regarded as "New" I.e. previous irregular expenditure will not be carried over. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = where more than 2 incidents exist or the total amount is more than R2.5 million, starting from a baseline of zero. Not fully effective = N/A Fully effective = 2 or less incidents and the total amount is less than R2.5 million. Significant performance = N/A Outstanding performance = 0 incidents 2. Executive Director with baseline information Formula: 1) Non-compliance incidents incurred for the current year – Non-compliance incidents incurred for prior year / Non-compliance incidents incurred for prior year x 100% Target = reduction of 10% 2) Irregular expenditure amount incurred for the current year – Irregular expenditure amount incurred for the prior year)/ Irregular expenditure amount incurred for the prior year X 100" Target = reduction of 10% Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = Any positive increase in incidents or amount > R2.5 million, year-on-year Not fully effective = a reduction of > 0% <9.9%, for incidents and amounts, year-on-year. Fully effective = a reduction of 10% or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol) Significant performance = a reduction >10% - < 99.9%, for incidents and amount year-on-year. Outstanding performance = 0 incidents Exception protocols applicable to New Executive Directors and Executive Directors with baseline data: A default rating will apply (fully effective), if you have a zero baseline - provided that the default criteria is achieved, anything more will be unacceptable performance. A default criteria rating of fully effective will be awarded if you have 2 or less incidents and the total amount is less than R2.5 million.	200%	10%	10%	AT	AT	AT	10%	2%	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

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 Target 30-Sep-24	Q2 Target 31-Dec-24	Q3 Target 31-Mar-25	Q4 Target 30-Jun-25	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
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. The unique deadline is set in consultation with the relevant ED. Completed would mean that the actions as stipulated in the audit action plan has been executed by the relevant delegated authority. Should there be no actions required for a Directorate the indicator will be 'Not applicable' Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = N/A Not fully effective = < 99.99% Fully effective = N/A Significant performance = N/A Outstanding = 100%	n/a	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	Department: Investor Relations Source document: Completed Audit Action plan Contact person: Lynn Fortune:021 400 5987
6	6	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Final Council and Mayco decisions implemented within timeframes (%)	The indicator excludes all Council and Mayco decisions for noting. Decisions taken by Council and 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 Council and 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 Council's request or expectation. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 69% of ALL decisions Not fully effective = 69% - 79.99% of ALL decisions Fully effective = 80% - 85% of ALL decisions Significant performance = 85.1% - 94.99% of ALL decisions Outstanding performance = ≥ 95% of ALL decisions If "Not Applicable"-weighting will be "zero" and must be reallocated it within the Transversal Category.	70%	100%	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)

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 Target 30-Sep-24	Q2 Target 31-Dec-24	Q3 Target 31-Mar-25	Q4 Target 30-Jun-25	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
7	7	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> Unacceptable performance = < 90% Not fully effective = 90% - 94.99% Fully effective = 95% - 96% Significant performance = 96.1% - 97.99% Outstanding performance = ≥ 98%	96.9%	90%	95%	10%	30%	60%	95%	1%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851
8	8	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Internal independent assurance provider's functions recommendations and action plans implemented (%)	It is the monitoring and reporting of the implementation (expressed as a percentage) of corrective actions to address internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans, 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 (limited to the Corporate Risk Register), 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. Future recommendations and action plans implemented (not recommended for implementation for the current financial year), will be taken into account for the measurement of this indicator, thereby creating an advantage for the ED. Formula: Numerator: Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans implemented (current and future implementations) Denominator: Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans made for the current period under review (recommendations and actions plans postponed as approved by the City Manager will be excluded) <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < 75% Not fully effective = 75% - 84.99% Fully effective = 85% - 90% Significant performance = 91% - 94% Outstanding performance = ≥95%	96%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	1%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mothibi

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 Target 30-Sep-24	Q2 Target 31-Dec-24	Q3 Target 31-Mar-25	Q4 Target 30-Jun-25	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
9	9	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.A Community satisfaction city-wide survey(average)	Measures the average 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. The aim of the indicator is to improve the community's perception of the City. 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 average score per Directorate. Refer to the 'Survey - Levels & Baselines' tab. 1. A score of 2.9 and below based on the 2023/2024 survey outcome: Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.11 Not fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.1 Fully effective = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 Significantly performance = increase of 0.21 - 0.3 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.31 2. A score of 3 and above based on the 2023/2024 survey outcome: Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥0.21 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 – 0.2 Fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) - increase of 0.1 Significant performance = increase of 0.11 - 0.2 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥0.21	2.8	2.9	Actual averaged score for 2023/2024 per ED + 0.1	AT	AT	AT	Actual averaged score for 2023/2024 per ED + 0.1	2%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: Community Satisfaction survey score Contact person: Brigette Morris 021 400 3812

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 Target 30-Sep-24	Q2 Target 31-Dec-24	Q3 Target 31-Mar-25	Q4 Target 30-Jun-25	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
10	10	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Increase in City Pulse	The City Pulse survey measures the organisational culture and aims to improve employee experience at the City. The measure is given against a non-symmetrical Likert scale, measured biennial. The measurement for the 2024/25 will be based on the ED's lowest scoring pillar: Organisational Pillar in 2022/2023. Refer to the 'City Pulse baselines' tab. 1. A score of 3.4 and below based on the 2022/2023 baseline: <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.2 Not fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.19 Fully effective = increase of 0.1 - 0.19 Significantly performance = increase of 0.2 - 0.29 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.3 2. A score of 3.5 and above based on the 2022/2023 baseline: <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.2 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 - 0.19 Fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) - increase of 0.1 Significantly performance = increase between 0.11 - 0.2 Outstanding performance = increase of > 0.2	3.6	N/A	Actual score of the lowest scoring pillar for 2022/2023 per ED + 0.1	AT	AT	AT	Actual score of the lowest scoring pillar for 2022/2023 per ED + 0.1	1%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: City Pulse 2021 Results and City Pulse 2019 results with the 3 questions identified in the attachment Contact person: Monica Pregnolato 021 400 9221
11	11	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Inclusion of C88 output indicators (%) (average)	All Tier 1 and Tier 2 Circular 88 Output indicators should be included into the performance scorecards of the Executive Directors, where relevant. All indicators must be included verbatim into the corporate (auditable) and Directorate SDBIP (cascading principle) and the measurement must be in compliance with the Technical Indicator Descriptions (TID) as issued by National Treasury. This indicator will be measured during the annual review process and no mid-year adjustments will be taken into account. Measurement: Q1 Weighting must be reallocated where there the ED has no Output indicators. Note: Indicators that have barriers and challenges are excluded from the formula. The indicator will measure two aspects: 1) The inclusion of C88 Output indicators in the Directorate SDBIP, and 2) The inclusion of C88 Output indicators on the Corporate Scorecard (CSC) (graduating), whether replacing existing CSC indicators. 1) Formula: Inclusion in the directorate SDBIP - Total number of Tier 1& 2 Output indicators included in the directorate SDBIP divided by Tier 1 & 2 indicators required for inclusion as per C88 (auditable) * 100 2) Formula: Replacement and/ or inclusion of C88 Output indicators on the CSC - Total number of Tier 1& 2 indicators graduated on the CSC divided by Total number of Tier 1& 2 indicators graduated on the CSC * 100 Average: (Formula 1 + Formula 2) divided by 2 Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 80% inclusion of Tier 1&2 Not fully effective = 80% - 84.99% inclusion of Tier 1&2 Fully effective =85% - 89.99% inclusion of Tier 1&2 Significant performance = 90% - 99% inclusion of Tier 1&2 Outstanding performance =100% inclusion of Tier 1&2	n/a	100%	100%	AT	AT	AT	100%	1%	Department: Organisational Performance Management (OPM) Source document: C88 scorecard/ corporate SDBIP Contact person: Monique Fillies - Manager: City Performance Management 021 400 9024

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 Target 30-Sep-24	Q2 Target 31-Dec-24	Q3 Target 31-Mar-25	Q4 Target 30-Jun-25	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
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. Slippage is defined as tenders on the demand plan which are behind schedule based on the agreed timelines for each tender. 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 %). Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = > 15% Not fully effective = > 10% - ≤ 15% Fully effective = ≤ 10% Significant performance = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9% Outstanding performance = < 5%	New	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	1%	Department: Supply Chain Management Source document: Demand Plan Overview Contact person: Bekumuzi Vumase and Razaan Arendse Manager Demand Management
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. A "gap" refers to the number of days between the expiring contract and the replacement contract commencing. 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. The indicator is based on all repeatable tenders that currently have a gap at the time of reporting , i.e. the current contract had already expired and the new contract is not yet in place Average number of days refer to calendar days (inclusive of weekends). Formula: Total number of gaps in days/ Total number of tenders with a gap of more than zero days = Average number of gaps (days) (Effectively the report should be 'blank'.) Using the gap report developed by Zubair which takes current status and projected time for completion into account. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = repeatable tenders with ≥ 150 days gap Not fully effective = repeatable tenders with ≥ 90 - < 150 days gap Fully effective = repeatable tenders with ≥ 30 - < 90 days gap Significant performance = repeatable tenders with gaps < 30 days gap Outstanding performance = zero repeatable tenders with gaps	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: GAP report prepared by Zubair Contact person: Zubair Adams

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 Target 30-Sep-24	Q2 Target 31-Dec-24	Q3 Target 31-Mar-25	Q4 Target 30-Jun-25	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
14	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Total Capital Expenditure as a percentage of Total Capital Budget less contingencies (%)	This indicator measures the extent to which budgeted capital expenditure has been spent 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. Less contractual contingencies on projects and insurance contingencies. Q1 – Q3 reporting: Formula: (1) YTD Actual Capital Expenditure / (2) Total Budgeted Capital Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. Q4 reporting: Formula: (1) Actual Capital Expenditure / (2) Total Budgeted Capital Expenditure less contingencies. The latest approved budget is applicable. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 85% or >100% (non-compliance) Not fully effective = ≥ 85% - ≤ 89.99% Fully effective = 90% - 93% Significant performance = > 93% - 96% Outstanding performance = > 96%	96.8%	90%	90%	16%	39%	62%	90%	6%	Directorate Finance Manager
15	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	FM1.12: Total Operating Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating Expenditure budget	This indicator measures the extent to which operating expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Operating Expenditure (non-capital spending) is costs which the municipality incurs through its normal operations. The latest approved budget is applicable. Formula: Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 90.% or > 100% (non-compliance) Not fully effective = ≥ 90% - ≤ 94.99% Fully effective = 95% - 96% Significant performance = ≥ 96.1% - ≤ 97% Outstanding performance = ≥ 97.1% - 100%	96.7%	95%	95%	25%	50%	75%	95%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager
16	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Performance on cash backed expenditure over cash back budget items only (%)	In terms of the Directive 7 of 2023, directorates cannot offset primary operating budgeted expenditure that translates into a cash outflow against non-cash flow expenditures such as Impairments, Depreciation, Debt impairment, Write-offs, Post retirement medical aid (PRMA) provision, Rehabilitation of landfill sites, water inventory, labour to operating, interest and and Prior year adjustments. This indicator measures the outcome of cash backed items only over the budget and if the outcome is higher than 100%, then it reflects reliance on non-cash items. The aim of the indicator is to achieve an outcome of less than or equal to 100% Source: Financial information. Formula: Operating expenditure (cash items only) / Operating budget (cash items only). Measured quarterly. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = >100% Not fully effective = N/A Fully effective = ≤ 100% Significantly performance = N/A Outstanding performance = N/A	New	0%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 Target 30-Sep-24	Q2 Target 31-Dec-24	Q3 Target 31-Mar-25	Q4 Target 30-Jun-25	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
				SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE								60%	
17	1	3. End load shedding in Cape Town over time. Mayoral Priority Programme	Number of programmes reaching preferred bidder status	The outcome of a tender process for the Embedded IPP Programme will result in a Preferred Bidder status for a bidder or bidders. Indicator measures that this programme has reached this stage of progression. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = no tender process initiated Not fully effective = not all Embedded IPP1 PPAs signed by end June 2025 Fully effective = All Embedded IPP1 PPAs signed and 1 program at preferred bidder status or cancelled (Despatchable), 1 programme (Traders tender) launched by 30 June 2025 Significant performance = PPAs of All Embedded IPP1 process signed by end May 2025 and 1 program at preferred bidder status or cancelled (Despatchable) 1 programme (Traders tender) launched by 30 June 2025 Outstanding performance = PPAs of All Embedded IPP1 process signed by end April 2025 and 1 program at preferred bidder status or cancelled (Despatchable) 1 programme (Traders tender) launched by 30 June 2025	New	PPA's signed for Embedded IPP Programme	2	A/T	A/T	A/T	2	3%	Energy
18	2	1. Improved access to quality an reliable services	2.D Subsidised electricity connections installed (number) (NKPI)	Measures the number of subsidised electricity connections installed per annum in informal settlements, public rental stock backyard dwellings (pilot) and low-cost housing. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(a) Performance Rating:- (Target=1500) Unacceptable Performance = < 1000 Not fully effective = 1000 - 1499 Fully effective = 1500 -1600 Significant performance = 1601 - 1775 Outstanding performance = ≥ 1 776	2440	1500	1500	375	750	1125	1500	7%	Energy
19	3	3. End Loadshedding in Cape Town over time	3.A Installed Capacity of approved embedded generators on the municipal distribution network (EE4.12)	The total capacity of the embedded generation installations in the municipal distribution network in megavolt-ampere. Also C88 EE4.12 Performance Rating: (Target = 140MVA) Unacceptable Performance = < 135 MVA Not fully effective = 135 MVA - 139.9 MVA Fully effective = 140 MVA - 147 MVA Significant performance = range between 147.1 MVA - 154.5 MVA Outstanding performance = >155 MVA.	27.682MVA	10.0MVA	10MVA	132.5MVA	135MVA	137.5MVA	10MVA	8%	Energy
20	4	3. End Loadshedding in Cape Town over time	3.B Load-shedding level variance (%) Other Mayoral request	Load shedding level variance measures the amount of additional energy generated by the City and its contracted suppliers during load-shedding as a percentage of the total demand reduction required by Eskom to keep the network stable. Performance Rating: (Target =16%) Unacceptable Performance = < 12% Not fully effective = 12 -15.99% Fully effective = 16% - 17% Significant performance = 17.1% - 20% Outstanding performance = > 20%	14%	16%	40%	16%	16%	16%	40%	3%	Energy

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 Target 30-Sep-24	Q2 Target 31-Dec-24	Q3 Target 31-Mar-25	Q4 Target 30-Jun-25	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
21	5	Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	4.G Percentage valid customer applications for new electricity connections processed in terms of municipal service standards (Also C88 EE1.13)	This indicator measures the number of valid customer applications for new electricity connections processed within the municipal standard timeframes in relation to the total number of customer applications for new electricity connections. A 'valid customer application' for a new electricity connection refers to an application for which a quote has been supplied and payment made by the applicant, at which point the application becomes 'valid', regardless of whether it is commercial or residential. An electricity connection processed refers to the sequence of procedures between where a service notification is created and payment is received from the applicant, until the supply is finalised. The indicator measures the percentage of all valid applications where the time taken between the point of payment and the finalisation of supply fall within municipal standard timeframes , as differentiated per the relevant facilities and categories of applicant Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(a) Performance rating: (Target = 95%) Unacceptable performance = <80% Not fully effective = 80% to 84.99% Fully effective = 85% - 90% Significant performance= 90.1% - 95 %. Outstanding performance = 95.1% - 100%	67.27%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	4%	Energy
22	6	14 A Resilient City	Annual Measured and Verified Electricity savings from energy efficiency projects in Municipal Operations (kWh)	The measured and verified savings for LED lighting retrofits in selected municipal facilities. SmartFacility metered historic and post energy efficiency project energy use is used for baseline and reporting period savings input data to calculations. The SANS 50010:2011 Measurement and Verification of Energy Savings is used to calculate the outcome. Performance rating: (Target=1 800 000) Unacceptable performance = < 1700 000 Not fully effective = 1710 001 - 1 799 999 Fully effective = 1 800 000 - 1 890 000 Significant performance = 1 890 001 - 1 985 000 Outstanding performance = ≥ 1985 001	1 704 112 kWh	1 800 000 kWh	1 800 000 kWh	A/T	A/T	A/T	1 800 000 kWh	7%	Energy
23	7	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	EE3.5 Average System Interruption Duration Index (ASIDI)	ASIDI of a network is calculated using a load based approach rather than a customer affected approach, and is recommended in utilities where updated customer-network links are not available. ASIDI indicates the average system interruption duration in minutes per KVA served over a defined period. Performance Rating: (Target = <3hrs) Unacceptable performance = > 5hrs Not fully effective = 3.2 - 4.9 hrs Fully effective = 2.9 - 3.1 hrs Significant performance = 2.8 - 1.9 hrs Outstanding performance = <1.8 hours	2.2 hrs	< 3 hrs	< 3 hrs	< 3 hrs	< 3 hrs	< 3 hrs	< 3 hrs	7%	Energy
24	8	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	EE3.6 Average System Interruption Frequency Index (ASIFI)	ASIFI of a network is calculated using a load based approach rather than a customer affected approach, and is recommended in utilities where updated customer-network links are not available. ASIFI indicates the average system interruptions over a defined period. Performance Rating: (Target = <1.3 occasions) Unacceptable performance = > 2 occasions Not fully effective = 1.4 - 2 occasions Fully effective = 1.3 -1.2 occasions Significant performance = 1.1 - 0.5 occasions Outstanding performance = ≤ 0.4 occasions	0.6 occasions	< 1.3 occasions	< 1.3 occasions	< 1.3 occasions	< 1.3 occasions	< 1.3 occasions	< 1.3 occasions	7%	Energy

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 Target 30-Sep-24	Q2 Target 31-Dec-24	Q3 Target 31-Mar-25	Q4 Target 30-Jun-25	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
25	9	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	EE3.11 Percentage of unplanned outages that are restored to supply within industry standard timeframes	The proportion of unplanned electricity outages where at least 98% of the customers affected by the outage have their electricity supply restored within 24 hours of the incident. The industry standard NRS 047 specifies the restoration of electricity supply to differing proportions of affected customers within the standards of 1,5; 3,5; 7,5; 24 and 168 hours or less. This indicator tracks the 24-hour standard whereby at least 98% of customers affected by an unplanned outage have had their electricity restored. An unplanned outage is defined as a network event that occurs when a piece of equipment is taken out of service immediately, either automatically or as soon as switching operations can be performed, as a direct result of emergency conditions or a major natural event, such as risk to life or equipment Performance rating:(Target = nil) Unacceptable performance = < 85% Not fully effective = 85.1% - 89.9% Fully effective = 90% - 93.99% Significant performance = 94.0% - 97.99% Outstanding = ≥98%	100%	98%	nil target	nil target	nil target	nil target	nil target	2%	Energy
26	10	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Spend on Repairs and Maintenance (%)	Percentage reflecting year to date spend (including secondary cost) / total repairs and maintenance budget (Note that the in-year reporting during the financial year will be indicated as a trend (year to date spend). Maintenance is defined as the actions required for an asset to achieve its expected useful life. Planned Maintenance includes asset inspection and measures to prevent known failure modes and can be time or condition-based. Repairs are actions undertaken to restore an asset to its previous condition after failure or damage. Expenses on maintenance and repairs are considered operational expenditure. Primary repairs and maintenance cost refers to Repairs and Maintenance expenditure incurred for labour and materials paid to outside suppliers. Secondary repairs and maintenance cost refers to Repairs and Maintenance expenditure incurred for labour provided In-house / internally.) <u>Performance rating:</u> (Target = 95%) Unacceptable performance = < 90% Not fully effective = 90% to 94.9% Fully effective =95% - 96.99% Significant performance= 97% - 98.99% Outstanding performance = ≥99%	101%	95%	95%	25%	50%	75%	95%	7%	Energy
27	11	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	EE4.4 Percentage total electricity losses	Electricity losses have two components: technical and non-technical. Technical losses occur naturally and consist mainly of power dissipation in electricity system components such as transmission and distribution lines, transformers, and measurement systems. Non-technical losses are caused by actions external to the power system and consist primarily of electricity theft, faulty or inaccurate meters, and errors in accounting and record-keeping. Losses is a measure of unaccounted for energy. Thus, non-payment is not included as losses. <u>Performance Rating:</u> (Target = <12%) Unacceptable performance = > 13.5% Not fully effective = 12.1% - 13.5% Fully effective = 11.5% - 12% Significant performance = 10% - 11.4% Outstanding performance = < 10%	11%	<12 %	<12 %	<12 %	<12 %	<12 %	<12 %	5%	Energy

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 Target 30-Sep-24	Q2 Target 31-Dec-24	Q3 Target 31-Mar-25	Q4 Target 30-Jun-25	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
				DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS								10%	
28	1	CM request CM memo	Staff housing population verified, per directorate (%)	Measures the percentage of Staff Housing population verified by confirming occupancy, operational need, and conditions as per the approved allocation list, as compiled by the Directorate coordinators to ensure validity, accuracy and completeness by conducting an annual site visits to confirm staff occupancy for operational purposes The approved list must include the following: • Property occupancy – Staff member occupying property by conducting a site visit • Operational need - staff member and staff number confirmed on SAP. • Lease agreement in place (number and tenure) • Rental value. • Fringe benefit registration, confirmed with Payroll. Closed out status- where all the above conditions are met Formula: Numerator: All staff housing verified (with a closed out status) Denominator: All staff housing Performance Rating: Unacceptable performance = below 50% Not fully effective = 50 - 89% Fully effective = 100% Significant performance = N/A Outstanding =N/A	50%	100%	100%	60%	75%	90%	100%	2%	Energy
29	2	1. Increased Jobs and Investment in the Cape Town economy Mayoral Priority Programme	Ease of doing business index Developing action plan to improve EoDB index implementation-Electricity Connection	The objective is to improve the ease of doing business index relating to each EDs business processes. The outcome consists of various data elements that is required and will measure the average percentage achievement per ED. The Getting Electricity indicator assesses the City's effectiveness in delivering electricity connections to businesses in Cape Town. It examines the duration from successful payment to connection, taking into account processing time and overall complexity, and the consideration of application costs. Measures the number of valid customer applications for a new electricity connection processed within municipal standard timeframes. Refers specifically to the time taken from the acceptance of quotation until supply is finalised. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = 60% -.64.99% Not fully effective = 65% - 69.99% Fully effective = 70% - 74.99% Significantly performance = 75% - 79.99% Outstanding performance = ≥80%	New	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	2%	Energy
30	3	3.1 Excellence in Basic Service delivery	Collection Rate Ratio	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. <u>Performance rating:</u> (Target = 97.9%) Unaccpetable performance = < 95% Not fully effective = 95.1% - 97.8% Fully effective = 97.9% - 98.8% Significant performance = 98.9% - 99.4% Outstanding performance = ≥99.5 %	99%	98%	97.90%	97.90%	97.90%	97.90%	97.90%	1%	Energy

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 Target 30-Sep-24	Q2 Target 31-Dec-24	Q3 Target 31-Mar-25	Q4 Target 30-Jun-25	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
31	4	SMF	Draft Framework developed for the Energy Strategy Implementation Plan	Energy Strategy: The development of a new, long-term energy strategy for the City with a wide-reaching scope to ensure a cost effective and cohesive approach to overcoming the challenges and taking hold of the opportunities of the energy transition currently underway. This includes a focus on energy security; power utility reform; investment in the distribution grid of the future; using energy efficiently; and alleviating energy poverty. Importantly, all these focus areas work together to create a strong foundation for economic growth to create jobs and alleviate poverty in the City. Performance Rating: Unacceptable performance = Draft Framework for the Energy Strategy Implementation Plan developed by 31 Dec 2025 Not fully Effective = Draft Framework for the Energy Strategy Implementation Plan developed by 30 Sept 2025 Fully Effective = Finalisation of the Framework of the Energy Strategy Implementation Plan by 31 December 2024. Significant performance = Completing the Performance Management Plan and signed off Implementation Plan by March 2025 Outstanding performance = Completing the Performance Management Plan and signed off Implementation Plan by December 2024	NEW	Draft Framework developed for the Energy Strategy Implementation Plan	Draft Framework developed for the Energy Strategy Implementation Plan	A/T	A/T	A/T	Draft Framework developed for the Energy Strategy Implementation Plan	1%	Energy
32	5	Less Formal Township Establishment Act (LFTEA) areas	Less Formal Township Establishment Act (LFTEA) areas: Percentage of total residential electricity provision allocated as Free Basic Electricity (FBE)	This indicator measures the reliance of municipal residents on FBE for access to electricity by measuring how much of electricity provided by the municipality in MWh is subsidised through FBE. In other words, this indicator measures the extent of free electricity provided by the municipality to its residents as a percentage of the overall total. This is inclusive of indigent households. FBE is an amount of electricity determined by municipal policy provided on a monthly basis for free with the aim of assisting poor households to meet basic needs. Depending on the municipal policy, FBE may or may not be targeted exclusively at poor households Performance Rating: (Target = 2.5%) Unacceptable performance = < 2% Not fully effective = 2% - 2.4% Fully effective = 2.5% - 2.6% Significant performance = 2.7% - 3.1% Outstanding performance = ≥ 3.2%	3.2%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2%	Energy
33	6	Unlawful Land Occupation (ULO)	Unlawful Land Occupation Plan Implementation: Prevention of unlawful land occupation	Unlawful Land Occupation: Legal action initiated to remove illegal structures from HV and MV servitudes Initiating legal action to obtain authority to go to court to obtain demolition/eviction orders. This measures any legal requests submitted to Legal services and meet legal requirements. Legal Services to provide a confirmation that the matter is acknowledged Performance Rating Unacceptable performance= < 85% Not fully effective = 85% - 90% Fully effective = 100% Significant performance = 50% of legal action initiated assessed and acted upon Outstanding = 75 % of legal action initiated assessed and acted upon	New	New	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	Energy

Executive Director:
Kadri Nassiep

Date: 24 July 2024

City Manager:
Lungelo Mbandazayo

Date:

Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo
Date: 2024.07.30 18:19:17 +02'00'