2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sep-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	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 P3M3 and EM maturity level (average)	The CPPPM maturity level is based on the PPPM and Engineering Management (Only applicable to Engineering Directorates) maturity assessment. The maturity assessment will reflect the average maturity level of: - 1. Portfolio, Programme, Project and - 2. 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 All EDs will be measured per the individual directorate. 1. A score of 3.1 and above based on the previous year's baseline: Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.21 from existing maturity level Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 - 0.2 from existing maturity level Fully effective = maintain 3.1 or existing maturity level (no movement) Significant performance = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 from existing maturity level Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.21 from existing maturity level 2. A score of below 3.1based on the previous year's baseline: Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.21 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 - 0.2 or increase to 2.99 Fully effective = maintain 3.0 or increase to 3.0 from existing maturity level Significant performance = increase of 0.11 - 0.2 above a baseline score of 3.0 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.21 above a baseline score of 3.0	New	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	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	1%	Department: CPPPM Source document: PPM assessment Contact person: Ben Peters 021 400 9206

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sep-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Increase in Contract Management maturity level	The Contract Management maturity level is based on the Contract Management maturity assessment only. 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 All other EDs will be measured per the individual directorate. 1. A score of 3.75 and above: <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.11 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 – 0.2 Fully effective = maintain 3.75 or existing maturity level (no movement) Significant performance = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.21 2. A score of below 3.75: <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	New	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	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	1%	Department: CPPPM Source document: PPM assessment Contact person: Ben Peters 021 400 9207
3	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. If a tender extension is awarded within 45 days of contract expiry of the current contracts arising from the tender, it will result in Unacceptable Performance. This would require all extensions to be awarded at least 45 days before expiry, ensuring proactive planning 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 tenders expanded and/ or amended multiple times ÷ Total number of repeatable tenders active in the FY. Measured cumulatively. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = ≥ 3.1% or if tender extension is awarded within 45 days of contract expiry of the current contracts arising from the tender Not fully effective= 2.1% – 3% Fully effective = 1.8% - 2.5% Significant performance = 0.1% - 1.79% Outstanding performance = 0%	2%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	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

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sep-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
4	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 R750 000 (inclusive of VAT). Sole/single service provider deviations, deviations relating to emergencies and unforeseen situations (at this time being – anti-corruption investigations and extortion management, with associated human life threats (threat to limb and life) will be excluded from the measurement as per section 36 of SCM regulations. Target = reduction of 20% Formula: (Number of SCM deviations for current year – Number 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 2 or less 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% - 21%, for the number of deviations (year-on-year), or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol) Significant performance = a reduction > 21% - < 99.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. Outstanding performance = a reduction of 100% for the number of deviations, year-on-year or no deviations for the current year	200% increase	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	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
5	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Irregular, Fruitless and Wasteful, Unauthorised** Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating and Capital Expenditure	The indicator measures the extent to which the municipality has incurred irregular, fruitless and wasteful and unauthorised expenditure on its total budget (operating and capital budget). Fruitless and wasteful expenditure is expenditure that was made in vain and would have been avoided had reasonable care been exercised. Irregular expenditure is incurred by the municipality in contravention of a requirement of the law (specific legislation, per MFMA legislation). Unauthorized expenditure includes overspending of the total amount appropriated in the approved budget. The net amount after recoveries, write offs or condonement should be used in this calculation. The Q4 final figure is obtained from the Pre-audited AFS. Irregular expenditure will be included, if identified by other assurance providers, irrespective if it is self-disclosed or not. Formula: Per Directorate incidents value as a percentage of Directorate Opex and Capex ((1) Irregular + (2) Fruitless and Wasteful + (3) Unauthorised Expenditure) / (4) Total Operating and Capital Expenditure x 100 Note: New Executive Director or Executive Director taking up a post in another directorate as an Executive Director (in the year of review) will be measured on the UIFW Expenditure incidents for the current year, where the incident is in the term of appointment as Executive Director. This also applies if an existing ED moves to another directorate, the ED will be regarded as "New" I.e. previous UIFW expenditure incidents not in the term of employment of the ED will not be measured. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = ≥ 1.5% Not fully effective = > 0.75% - 1.49% Fully effective = 0.75% Significant performance = < 0.75% - > 0% Outstanding performance = 0%	New	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	0.75%	AT	AT	AT	0.75%	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

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sep-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
6	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'. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = N/A Not fully effective = < 99.99% Fully effective = N/A Significant performance = N/A Outstanding performance =100%	100%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	Department: Investor Relations Source document: Completed Audit Action plan Contact person: Lynn Fortune:021 400 5987
7	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 councils request or expectation. <u>Performance rating:</u> 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.	100%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	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)
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 Q4 (as at end of June) reporting will be based on the latest period available at the time of reporting. <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%	97.76%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	95%	10%	30%	70%	95%	1%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sep-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
9	9	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 Strategic Risks: Corporate, Transversals and Executive Risk Registers), 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) Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 75% Not fully effective = 75% - 84.99% Fully effective = 85% - 90% Significant performance = > 90% - 94.99% Outstanding performance= ≥ 95%	97%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	2%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mothibi
10	10	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	Individual ED score as at 30 June 2024	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	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: Bridgette Morris 021 400 3812

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sep-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
11	11	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Inclusion of C88 **Output** indicators	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 and mid-year review process. Measurement: Q1 and Q3 (after mid-year amendments). 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 Outcome and 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 Outcome and Output indicators on the CSC Graduating criteria: Meet the strategic mandate of the City, with the Mayor's approval and Indicators should be auditable with systems and controls in place. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < 80% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Not fully effective = 80% - 84.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Fully effective =85% - 99.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Significant performance =100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Outstanding performance =100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 and at least one replacement/ graduation to the CSC Exception rule: If an ED included less than 100% of the Output indicators (verbatim), however graduated at least one indicator, they will receive a default rating of Significant performance.	100%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Department: Organisational Performance Management (OPM) Source document: C88 scorecard and Directorate SDBIP Contact person: Monique Fillies - Manager: City Performance Management 021 400 9024
12	12	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Tenders in slippage at any given quarter end (%)	Measures 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. Measurement: The indicator is measured on a quarterly basis (non-cumulative), as such any recoveries are considered. The annual performance is based on the tenders in slippage as at the 4th quarter. ED's are able to recover if there are tenders in slippage throughout the year. There are processes in place to remedy tenders that are in amber or red. Formula: Total count of tenders in red or amber as a percentage of the total number of tenders required for the MTREF period (%) (non-cumulative). <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = > 15% Not fully effective = > 10% - ≤ 15% Fully effective = ≤ 10% Significant performance = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9% Outstanding performance = < 5%	8%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	≤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

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sep-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
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 has 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	44	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	0	0	0	0	0	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: GAP report prepared by Zubair Contact person: Zubair Adams
				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 for acquiring, upgrading, and renewing assets such as property, equipment, plants, buildings, intangible assets, investment property or any other assets meeting the definition of assets in terms of GRAP. Less soft-locked 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%	94.2%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	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

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sep-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
15	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	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%	89.1%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	95%	24%	47%	68%	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 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 to100%. 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 = ≥ 98% - 99.9% Outstanding performance = ≥ 95% - 97.9%	94.2%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	2%	Energy

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sep-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
				SERVICE DELIVERY / GOOD GOVERNANCE								60%	
17	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Adherence to the requirements of the Metro Trading Services reform (Applicable to W&S, EE and UWM)	National Treasury has initiated the trading services reform in metropolitan municipalities through performance-based financial incentive component of the Urban Development Finance Grant (UDFG), as set out in the Division of Revenue Bill, 2025. The financial incentive will be used to reward good accountability and performance. Frequency of reporting is annual. **The purpose of the indicator:** 1. Is to ensure the timeous submission of all trading services related deliverables (technical, non-financial, tariff and financial) as identified in the approved trading service reform roadmap. 2. To ensure 100% award of grant funding is achieved, through achieving 100 points during the assessment score. This assessment score is reviewed by an independent assessor as assigned by NT. **Evidence Requirements:** 1. Evidence of submission of necessary assessment documentation to National Treasury (per latest approved programme implementation plans). 2. Resultant score for the trading service awarded by the appointed independent assessors and officially communicated to the City. Non-submission of deliverables and poor implementation will result in non-compliance or poor performance, which will have a direct impact on grant funding allocated to the City of Cape Town, which negatively impacts various projects funded by the funding and the City's overall balance sheet. **Disclaimer:** The above definition and evidence are in accordance with the MTSR guidelines, which may change from time to time. **Measuring Framework:** **Energy:** Accountability Performance - 8 minimum access conditions & 5 indicators (10 points) Financial Performance - 6 indicators (30 points) Operational Performance - 7 indicators (60 points) **Total (18 indicators) (100 points)** **Formula:** Numerator: Assessment/ Resultant score divide by Denominator: 100 points The weighting for the indicator will not be reallocated. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = Assessment score of below < 50% **Not fully effective** = Assessment score of 50% - < 75% **Fully effective** = Assessment score of 75% - 90% **Significant performance** = Assessment score of > 90% - 99.9% **Outstanding performance** = Assessment score of 100% **Disclaimer:** The performance rating for non-adherence/ non-submission/ non-entry into the Trading Services Reform will be scored at zero.	New	New	100%	AT	AT	AT	100%	5%	Department: Grant Funding Source document: Submissions to NT and resultant score Contact person: Daniel Sullivan: 021 400 5097
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 = 1001 - 1499 Fully effective = 1500 - 1600 Significant performance = 1601 - 1775 Outstanding performance = ≥ 1776	1578	750	1500	375	750	1125	1500	5%	Energy
19	3	3. End Loadshedding in Cape Town over time	3.A Capacity of additional approved embedded generators on the municipal distribution network (EE4.12)	The capacity of the additional embedded generation installations in the municipal distribution network in megavolt-ampere. Also C88 EE4.12 Performance Rating: (Target = 20 MVA) Unacceptable Performance = < 15 MVA Not fully effective = 15 MVA - 19 MVA Fully effective = 20 MVA - 25 MVA Significant performance = 26 MVA - 30 MVA Outstanding performance = > 30 MVA	28.764 MVA	152 MVA	20 MVA	5 MVA	10 MVA	15 MVA	20 MVA	7%	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%	20%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	5%	Energy

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sep-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	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 94.99% Fully effective = 95% - 97% Significant performance= 97.1% - 98% Outstanding performance = > 98%	72.8%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	5%	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 = 1700 001 - 1 799 999 Fully effective = 1 800 000 - 1 890 000 Significant performance = 1 890 001 - 1 985 000 Outstanding performance = ≥ 1985 001	2042458kWh	2 042 458 kWh	1 800 000 kWh	AT	AT	AT	1 800 000 kWh	6%	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 - 5 hrs Fully effective = > 2.7 - 3 hrs Significant performance = 2 - 2.7 hrs Outstanding performance = < 2 hrs	2.2 hrs	< 3 hours	< 3 hours	< 3 hours	< 3 hours	< 3 hours	< 3 hours	6%	Energy

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sep-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
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 = > 2.19 occasions Not fully effective = 1.31 - 2.19 occasions Fully effective = 1.24 - 1.3 occasions Significant performance = 1.17 - 1.23 occasions Outstanding performance = < 1.17 occasions	0.4 occasions	<1.3 occasions	<1.3 occasions	<1.3 occasions	<1.3 occasions	<1.3 occasions	<1.3 occasions	6%	Energy
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 = 100%) Unacceptable performance = ≤ 90% Not fully effective = 90.1% - 99.9% Fully effective = 100% Significant performance = n/a Outstanding = n/a	94%	100%	100%	98%	98%	98%	100%	5%	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.) Performance rating: (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%	97.4%	95.0%	95%	23%	46%	70%	95%	5%	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. Performance Rating: (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%	10.2%	<12%	<12%	<12%	<12%	<12%	<12%	5%	Energy

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sep-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
				DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS								10%	
28	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government CM request	Staff housing population verified, per directorate (%) Energy	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 = < 50% Not fully effective = 50 - 89% Fully effective = 90% - 95% Significant performance = > 95% - 99.99% Outstanding = 100%	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. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = 60% - 64.99% Not fully effective = 65% -69.99% Fully effective = 70% - 74.99% Significantly performance = 75% - 79.99% Outstanding performance = ≥ 80%	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	70%	1%	Energy

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sep-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	City Manager Delivery System (CM-DS) Initiatives Proposed updated micro structure for the Energy Directorate and related Change Management Plan	The City Manager Delivery System (CM-DS) (dashboard) is used for tracking and monitoring progress on key priority areas as highlighted by the CM. There are six (6) programmes that has not shown progress and needed CM intervention, which was selected from the IDP. These include: Energy Utility Reform. As per the Energy Strategy, the changing energy landscape in South Africa requires the Energy Directorate to review its existing business functions and adapt these and the organisational structure to ensure ongoing financial and operational sustainability. Evidence requirements: Q1 - Screenshots of model Q2 - Screenshots of model Q3 - Report Q4 - Report to CM with org structure and change management plan attached Performance Rating: Unacceptable performance = Two current director posts not in place ito proposed updated micro structure by 30 June 2026 Not fully Effective = Two current director posts not in place ito proposed updated micro structure 31 March 2026 Fully Effective = Proposal for updated micro structure and draft change management plan for implementation for Directorate by 30 June 2026. Significant performance = Completing the proposal for updated micro structure and draft change management plan for implementation by 31 March 2026 Outstanding performance = Completing the proposal for updated micro structure and draft change management plan for implementation by 31 December 2025	New	New	Proposal for updated micro structure and draft change management plan for implementation for Directorate	30 Sept 2025 (25%) – As-is enterprise architectural model of utility business layer	31 Dec 2025 (40%) - Draft future-state enterprise architectural business layer	31 March 2026 (70%) - Perform gap analysis of as-is and future-state models	30 June 2026 (100%) – Proposal for updated micro structure and draft change management plan for implementation for Directorate	3%	
4	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	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. Performance rating: Update the EDs performance rating in line with relevant rate as per the MTREF Electricity: (ED Energy) Unacceptable performance = < 97.9 Not fully effective = 97.9% - 98.4% Fully effective = 98.5% -99.1% Significant performance = 99.2% to 99.9% Outstanding performance = ≥ 99.9 %	97.8%	97.9%	98.5%	98.5%	98.5%	98.5%	98.5%	1%	Energy
5	2. Improved access to quality and reliable basic services 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%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2%	Energy
6	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government Unlawful Land Occupation (ULO)	Unlawful Land Occupation Plan Implementation: Prevention of unlawful land occupation	Unlawful Land Occupation: Reporting Unlawful land Occupation to the Anti- land Invasion/ Displaced People Unit within 24 hours from HV, MV servitudes and substations To report during working hours, complaints received regarding unlawful land occupation in the HV, MV servitudes and substations to the Anti-Land Invasion/Displaced People Units within 24 hours of being informed Performance Rating Unacceptable performance = < 90% Not fully effective = 85% - 90% Fully effective = 100% Significant performance = 30% of incidents reported within 18 hours Outstanding = 60% of incidents reported within 18 hours or no incidents of unlawful land occupation	New	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Energy

Executive Director
Kadri Nassiep

Date 22/07/25

City Manager
Lungelo Mbandazayo

Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo
Date: 2025.07.31 09:36:56 +02'00'

Date