2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: *Kadri Nassiep*
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

CM73608A

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											15%	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											55%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											10%	
												100%	
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
1	1	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. This indicator thus measures instances where there was more than 5% of total repeatable tenders, expanded and/or amended, per the approved 2025/26 – 2027/28 Approved Demand Plan. However, the exclusion is not applicable if a tender extension is awarded within 45 calendar days of contract expiry of the current contracts arising from the tender. Thus, extensions are required to be awarded at least 45 days before expiry, ensuring proactive planning and due consideration of administrative effort for the timeous processing of the expansion. A Directorate will not be affected if 5% or less of the total repeatable tenders are expanded (as per above definition) in the financial year. Directorates will achieve Outstanding performance if all expansions of tenders are only single expansions, and all are approved 45 or more days prior to the expiry of the current contract. **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. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = >7% or if a tender extension is awarded within 45 calendar days of contract expiry Not fully effective= ≥ 5.1% – 7% Fully effective = 4.1% - 5% Significant performance = 2% - 4% Outstanding performance = <2% In exceptional circumstances, consideration will be given to exclude items from the calculation that are deemed outside of the control of the Departments, such as, but not limited to, unforeseen cancellations of replacement tenders close to the expiry of the preceding contract and legal proceedings that may lead to restrictions of services. These exclusions will be reviewed for consideration on a case-by-case basis on the grounds of a thorough motivation before quarterly reporting is finalised.	2.16%	5%	5%	AT	AT	AT	5%	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: CMRS (Contract Register and Monitoring System) and Tender Tracking System Contact person: Maureen Whare 069 367 4023

2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
2	2	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.	100%	20%	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
3	3	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 performanc**e = ≥ 1.5% **Not fully effective** = > 0.75% - 1.49% **Fully effective** = 0.75% **Significant performance** = < 0.75% - > 0% **Outstanding performance** = 0%	100%	0.75%	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

2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: *Kadri Nassiep*
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
4	4	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 performanc**e = N/A **Outstanding performance** =100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	Department: Investor Relations Source document: Completed Audit Action plan Contact person: Lynn Fortune:021 400 5987
5	5	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Final Council and Mayco decisions implemented within timeframes (%)	This indicator measures all final Council and Mayco decisions allocated to the ED with implementation date for the quarter. Items marked as "implementation approved" that were due in the quarter (utilising the project end date as a filter) will be used to calculate the target. The indicator excludes: •All council and Mayco decisions for noting; •decisions outside of the control of the ED; •decisions marked as "terminated" or "status completed. •Decisions actioned close to the end of the quarter which would be impossible to implement during that quarter due to time constraints – for example, if Council is on the last day of March, the decisions can only be work flowed to relevant EDs during April. •These exclusions must be supported by valid evidence and reflected on each quarterly report for the City Manager and/or panel's awareness. 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. The project start date will be utilised to ensure projects with no end dates are included. Implementation is the date of completion of the actions or achievement of councils request or expectation ("implementation approved" date). Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 69% of ALL decisions Not fully effective = 69% - 99% of ALL decisions Fully effective = 100% of ALL decisions Significant performance = N/A Outstanding performance = N/A If "Not Applicable" weighting must be reallocated within the category.	100%	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)

2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
6	6	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. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 90% **Not fully effective** = 90% - 94.99% **Fully effective** = 95% - 96% **Significant performance** = 96.1% - 97.99% **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 98%	95.49%	95%	95%	Per the KOI schedule	Per the KOI schedule	Per the KOI schedule	95%	2%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851
7	7	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Internal independent assurance provider's 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%	99.6%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	3%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mothibi

2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: *Kadri Nassiep*
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
8	8	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Community satisfaction survey (average)	Measures the average score on the Community satisfaction survey. A statistically valid, scientifically defendable 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. 1. A score of 2.8 and below based on the previous year's survey outcome: Performance rating*: Unacceptable performance = ≤ 2.7 Not fully effective = 2.8 Fully effective = 2.9 Significantly performance = 3.0 Outstanding performance = ≥ 3.1 2. A score of 2.9 and above based on the previous year's survey outcome: Performance rating*: Unacceptable performance = ≤2.8 Not fully effective = 2.9 Fully effective = 3.0 Significant performance = 3.1 Outstanding performance = ≥ 3.2 *No ranges due to nature of the KPI, which is based on outcome of a survey.	3.0	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2026	EDs in the 2.8 and below range, the fully effective target will be 2.9. For EDs in the 2.9 and above range, the fully effective target will be 3.0.	AT	AT	AT	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	1%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: Community Satisfaction survey score Contact person: Bridgette Morris 021 400 3812
9	9	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Inclusion of C88 **Output** indicators (%)	Measure All Tier 1 and Tier 2 Circular 88 Output indicators that should be included into the Corporate scorecard, where relevant. This is a proxy indicator, which is used to reduce the number of KPIs in the performance scorecard of the Executive Directors (EDs). 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 the ED has no Output indicators. Note: Indicators that have barriers and challenges are excluded from the formula. The indicator will measure: 1) The inclusion of C88 Output indicators in the Directorate SDBIP, and 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 Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 80% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Not fully effective = 80% - 84.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Fully effective =85% - 90% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Significant performance = >90% - 95% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Outstanding performance = >95% - 100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2	100%	100%	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

2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: *Kadri Nassiep*
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
10	10	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). Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = > 15% **Not fully effective** = > 10% - ≤ 15% **Fully effective** = ≤ 10% **Significant performance** = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9% **Outstanding performance** = < 5%	6%	≤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
11	11	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	310	0	0	0	0	0	0	1%	Department: CPPPM Source document: GAP report prepared by Zubair Contact person: Maureen Whare

2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: *Kadri Nassiep*
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
12	12	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Recurring Audit Findings and /or recurring root causes (number)	The extent to which the Executive Director ensures that audit findings ((Communication of audit findings (COMAFs) and Service Delivery (lived- reality / resident experience) findings) are addressed at root-cause level. Remedial and corrective actions are translated into strengthened controls, standard practices and preventative mechanisms across the respective directorate for areas of improvement (e.g. transaction, discipline, functions, controls and oversight). The indicator will be measured year-on-year during the duration of the ED's term of office/employment contract. New EDs will not be penalised for recurring findings and/or root causes prior to their appointment. **A COMAF is defined as**: Any Auditor General of South Africa (AGSA) Communication of audit finding as per the scope of the regulatory audit. **Indicator objective**: to ensure that no recurring findings or root causes arises from the AGSA audits. To ensure that all audit findings and/or root causes identified by the AGSA that fall within the Executive Director's area of responsibility are effectively addressed and resolved, preventing recurrence, demonstrating improved governance, internal controls and strengthening accountability within the directorate. **A recurring finding is defined as:** Recurring findings refer to those findings which have persisted from one year of reporting to the next or a prior year, regardless of whether it relates to the same project/indicator or a different project/indicator or same department or different department within the directorate. **Source:** Management Audit Action Plans (MAAPs), Management Report and COMAFs **Formula:** Count of the number of recurring findings and /or recurring root causes Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: Recurring findings and recurring root causes Not fully effective: N/A Fully effective: Zero recurring findings and/or zero recurring root causes Significant performance: N/A Outstanding performance: N/A The weighting for the indicator will be reallocated, if the ED has no recurring findings and/or recurring root causes.	new	new	Zero recurring findings and recurring root causes	AT	AT	AT	Zero recurring findings and recurring root causes	2%	

2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: *Kadri Nassiep*
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
				MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY								**15%**	
13	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. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < 85% or >100% (non-compliance) Not fully effective = ≥ 85% - 89.99% Fully effective = 90% - 93% Significant performance = > 93% - 96% Outstanding performance = > 96%	91.0%	90%	90%	19%	39%	69%	90%	7%	Directorate Finance Manager
14	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. Less soft-locked contractual grant construction contingency provisions projects provisions related to Human Settlements directorate. Q1 – Q4 reporting; Formula: Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. Q4 reporting for Human Settlements directorate: Formula: (1) Actual Operating Expenditure / (2) Budgeted Operating Expenditure, less contingencies in the contingency provisions. The latest approved budget is applicable. Formula: Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. <u>Performance rating:</u> 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%	101.0%	95%	95%	23%	46%	67%	95%	6%	Directorate Finance Manager

2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: *Kadri Nassiep*
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
15	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	% of Capital Grant Funding Expenditure Spent	The purpose of the indicator is to ensure cashflow alignment, risk acceptance and strengthened governance requirements for capital grant funded projects. Disclaimer: Achievement of at least 45% expenditure spent by 31 December is a non-negotiable requirement. This will include an internal November performance assessment benchmark to allow corrective action ahead of the National Treasury (NT) cut-off. Evidence: Grant Performance Reports Issued by Grant Funding Department Formula: % of capital grant funding expenditure spent (excluding performance component of Urban Development Financing Grant (UDFG) =Capital Grant expenditure spent/Total Capital grant allocation in budget • Q2 spent will be based on the latest available budget at 31 December. • FY spent will be based on the approved FY budget. • Grants received before Q2 will be included (grant dumps). • Grants received after Q2 will be excluded (grant dumps). Grant dumps refer to grant allocations received that fall outside the approved DORA (Division of Revenue Act) allocation process: • They are unplanned or irregular transfers of funds. • Unlike standard DORA allocations, which follow a structured approval and distribution framework, grant dumps are not part of the formal budgetary or legislative process. • They may arise from ad hoc decisions, emergency funding, or discretionary transfers that bypass the usual allocation mechanisms. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <90% (Q4 or y/end) or <45% spent by 31 December (Q2) Not fully effective: 90% - <93% (Q4 or y/end) or <45% spent by 31 December (Q2) Fully effective: 93% - 95% (Q4 or y/end) and 45% spent by 31 December (Q2) Significant performance: >95% - 97% (Q4 or y/end) and 45% spent by 31 December (Q2) Outstanding performance: >97% (Q4 or y/end) and 45% spent by 31 December (Q2)	New	new	93%	23%	45%	60%	93%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager

2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: *Kadri Nassiep*
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	SERVICE DELIVERY / GOOD GOVERNANCE											**55%**	
16	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Adherence to the requirements of the Metro Trading Services reform	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 full 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. This will have an 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. The resultant score as assessed by the National Treasury in accordance with the associated Guidance Note (addendum to guidance note 4: annexure: technical indicator description and minimum commitments definition sheets). Per the note, the calculation of this score will vary as the programme is rolled out with the first score being binary (full points, or no points and subsequent years being weighted according to performance, but with requirement to maintain the binary commitments or the weighted score will be zero). Energy & W&S: 2025/26: 100% - Council commitment for the 8 minimum conditions. 2026/27: 100% - Assessment based on achievement of 8 minimum conditions. Thereafter the 100% will equate to the assessment based on partial or full achievement of targets as per A3 PIAP. The weighting for the indicator will not be reallocated. Performance rating 2025- 2027- Energy & W&S (UWM: 2025 - 2028): Unacceptable performance = N/A Not fully effective = N/A Fully effective = N/A Significant performance = N/A Outstanding performance = 100% Performance rating 2027/28 onwards - Energy & W&S (UWM: 2028/29 onwards): 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 (including the non-achievement of binary indicators) will be scored at zero. Note: Performance for UWM will be assessed against the submission of required programme documentation to National Treasury and the resultant inclusion of UWM in the programme (full points)(applicable 2025/26).	New	100%	100%	AT	AT	AT	100%	5%	Department: Grant Funding Source document: Submissions to NT and resultant score Contact person: Daniel Sullivan: 021 400 5097

2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
17	2		Sector Prioritisation	Sector prioritisation refers to trade-offs between needed infrastructure projects, due to budgetary tensions. These trade-offs have a direct impact on service delivery and the City's future growth. To navigate these pressures responsibly, a consistent, transparent, and rigorous approach to sectoral prioritisation is essential to understand and capture the risks and consequences of decisions. This process is a critical decision-support mechanism that ensures resources are directed to projects that maintain essential City functions and supports the implementation of Council-approved strategies. All sector-based prioritisation (capital infrastructure projects) must be fully documented (codified), with all assumptions clearly stated to ensure transparency and to enable independent review. The methodology must support and enable long term strategic planning for a 10- and 15-year planning horizon. The methodology in line with CM directive must be – •practical to apply. •replicable across years and sectors; and •grounded in reliable data. It must also clearly define the criteria used to assess projects, together with the associated metrics and weightings where appropriate. Furthermore, all methodologies and prioritised project lists must be open to review by corporate assurance providers to ensure a defendable, evidence-based framework for Citywide investment decisions. The outcome of this process will be a complete and prioritised project pipeline identifying key strategic infrastructure projects to be incorporated into the 2050 Long Term Plan and the New Term of Office (NTO) Integrated Development Plan (IDP). The annual target is only applicable for the following directorates: Energy, W&S, HS, SPE, UM, UWM Evidence required based on milestones towards sector prioritisation: •26/27: Prioritisation methodology captured and approved by relevant Executive Director. PPM data. SMF. •27/28 and beyond: Methodology is applied to infrastructure projects to produce rational results. Performance Rating: Unacceptable performance: No prioritisation methodology (50%) Not fully effective: Prioritisation methodology captured but not approved by Executive Director (70%) Fully effective: Prioritisation methodology approved by ED is codified and is transparent, practical and replicable and presented by the Sector Lead to the ICWG (Infrastructure Coordination Working Group) (100%) Significant performance: Prioritisation methodology is data driven and applied to the 10-year project pipeline and produces rational results that will provide capital project options for the New Term of Office ID (120%) Outstanding performance: Prioritisation methodology is ~~automated and~~ applied to the 15-year project pipeline and results in a portfolio of prioritised projects required to meet demand up to and beyond 2040, which can be attached to the Long-Term Plan 2050 (150%)	New	New	100%	AT	AT	AT	100%	2%	Lucille Janssens (Strategic Planning, Policy and Strategy)
18	3	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	758	1500	1500	375	750	1125	1500	5%	Energy
19	4	3. End Loadshedding in Cape Town over time	3.A Installed capacity of approved embedded generators on the municipal distribution network	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	251.52MVA	20 MVA	20 MVA	5 MVA	10 MVA	15 MVA	20 MVA	5%	Energy

2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: *Kadri Nassiep*
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
20	5	3. End Loadshedding in Cape Town over time	3.B Load-shedding level variance (%)	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%	24%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	5%	Energy
21	6	Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	4.G Percentage of 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 = 80%) Unacceptable performance = < 76% Not fully effective = 76% to 79.9% Fully effective = 80% - 84% Significant performance= 84.1% - 89% Outstanding performance = > 89%	71.9%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	3%	Energy
22	7	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 kWh Unacceptable performance = < 1100 000 Not fully effective = 1100 001 - 1 199 999 Fully effective = 1 200 000 - 1 260 000 Significant performance = 1 260 001 - 1 323 000 Outstanding performance = > 1323 00	1 845 775	1 800 000	1 200 000	AT	AT	AT	1 200 000	5%	Energy

2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: ***Kadri Nassiep***
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
23	8	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 = < 180 min) Unacceptable performance = > 300 min Not fully effective = > 180 – 300 min Fully effective = > 162 - 180 min Significant performance = 120 - 161 min Outstanding performance = < 120min	138 minutes	<180 minutes	<180 minutes	<180 minutes	<180 minutes	<180 minutes	<180 minutes	5%	Energy
24	9	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	0.5 occasions	<1.3 occasions	<1.3 occasions	<1.3 occasions	<1.3 occasions	<1.3 occasions	<1.3 occasions	6%	Energy
25	10	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 = 98%) Unacceptable performance = <93% Not fully effective = 93% - 98% Fully effective = 98% - 99% Significant performance = 100% Outstanding = n/a	95%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	5%	Energy

2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: *Kadri Nassiep*
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
26	11	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%	94%	95%	95%	22%	45%	69%	95%	5%	Energy
27	12	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%	11.26%	<12%	<12%	<12%	<12%	<12%	<12%	4%	Energy

2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: *Kadri Nassiep*
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											10%	
28	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government CM request	Operational 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. • Visual assessments undertaken at the beginning of the lease period Closed out status- where all the above conditions are met Exclusions: Housing under litigation Milestones: Q1 – 60% Site Visits Completed Q2 – 75% SAP Confirmation Q3 – 90% Lease Agreement Confirmed Q4 – 100% Fringe Benefits Confirmed Formula: Numerator: All staff housing verified (with a closed out status) Denominator: All staff housing Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 50% Not fully effective = 50 - 99% Fully effective = 100% Significant performance = N/A Outstanding = N/A	100%	New	100%	60%	75%	90%	100%	1%	Energy

2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: *Kadri Nassiep*
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
29	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government CM request	Non-Operational Staff housing population disposal plan developed per directorate (%)	Measures the percentage completion of a disposal plan for Non-Operational Staff Housing. Including confirming occupancy, operational status, and conditions (through visual assessments) as per the approved asset list, as compiled by the Directorate coordinators to ensure validity, accuracy and completeness. Each Directorate thus needs to determine the details of the disposal plan, given the many factors such as location, condition of the building and CoCT longer term plans. Closed out status- where all the above conditions are met The Disposal plan must include the following: • Plan for disposal/re-use • Property Valuations • Property occupancy – Staff member occupying property by conducting a site visit. • Status Verification: Operational need determined. • Lease agreement in place (number and tenure). • Rental value. • Visual Assessments undertaken. Closed out status- where all the above conditions are met Exclusions Housing under litigation (eviction and legal proceedings) 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%	New	new	100%	60%	75%	90%	100%	1%	Energy

2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: *Kadri Nassiep*
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
30	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Business Improvement Initiatives: Contract Finalisation during the Post-Award Activation Phase (average number of days)	To measure the organisation’s ability to translate identified improvement opportunities into implemented actions that enhance performance, control effectiveness, and service delivery outcomes. To measure the organisation’s ability to translate identified improvement opportunities into implemented actions that enhance performance, control effectiveness, and service delivery outcomes.This indicator measures the efficiency of the post-award contract activation process to ensure contracts are finalised and activated timeously, thereby supporting uninterrupted service delivery and mitigating the risk of contract gaps. The indicator measures the average numbers of calendar days taken by the Line department to finalise contracts and obtain all required contract signatures, including the resolution of any anomolies identified by the Contract Management Unit (CMU) prior to contract activation in Contract Register and Monitoring System Average number of days is calculated using calendar days (inclusive of weekends). Exceptions and exclusions - Builders Holiday period; Vendor (JV and Consortium) creation by Supply Chain Management Formula: Total number of "Contract Signature plus MOA Finalise" in days/ Total number of tenders (based on 9 month rolling average) = Average number of contract finalisation (days) Using the Post Award Tracker report developed by C3PM (Zubair) which takes current status and the 9 month rolling average for completion into account. Progress will be monitored and reported quarterly using the approved 9-month rolling average methodology as reflected in the Post Award Tracker report. Performance Rating Unacceptable Performance: > 45.0 days Not Fully Effective: ≥ 43.0 days to 45.0 days Fully Effective: ≥ 40.0 days to 42.0 days Significant Performance: ≥ 38.0 days to 39.0 days Outstanding Performance: < 38.0 days	new	new	40 calendar days	≤ 41.5 days	≤ 41 days	≤ 40.5 days	40 calendar days	1%	Energy Source: approved 9-month rolling average methodology as reflected in the Post Award Tracker report.
31	4	1. Increased Jobs and Investment in the Cape Town economy Mayoral Priority Programme	Ease of doing business index Improve times for new Electricity Connections	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 in terms of time taken for new electricity connections 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. (time taken in current quarter -time taken in previous quarter) /time taken in previous quarter Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = ≤ 17.99% Not fully effective = 18% - 19.99% Fully effective = 20% - 22.99% Significantly performance = 23% - 25.99% Outstanding performance = ≥ 26%	72.2%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%	1%	Energy

2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Kadri Nassiep
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
32	5	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. <u>Performance rating: Update the EDs performance rating in line with relevant rate as per the MTREF</u> Electricity: (ED Energy) Unacceptable performance = < 97.9 Not fully effective = 97.9% - 98.4% Fully effective = 98.5% -98.8% Significant performance = > 98.8% to 99.4% Outstanding performance = > 99.4 %	98.6%	98.5%	98.5%	98.5%	98.5%	98.5%	98.5%	2%	Energy
33	6	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%	3.20%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2%	Energy
34	7	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government Unlawful Land Occupation (ULO)	Unlawful Land Occupation plan was already approved and therefore the focus must be on the implementation	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	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	Energy

Executive Director Kadri Nassiep Digitally signed by Kadri Nassiep Date: 2026.07.10 16:36:11 +02'00' Date

City Manager
Lungelo Mbandazayo Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo Date: 2026.07.31 07:42:36 +02'00' Date