

2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard Executive Director: Kevin Jacoby 1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027														CM73609A	
	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	Annual Target	Q1 Target	Q2 Target	Q3 Target	Q4 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department		
					2024/2025	2025/2026	2026/2027	30-Sep-26	31-Dec-26	31-Mar-27	30-Jun-27				
MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION												18%			
MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY												10%			
SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE												55%			
DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS												15%			
												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.	0%	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		
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 performance = ≥ 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		
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 performance = 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		

9	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 actual performance. The indicator excludes: - All council and Mayco decisions for noting. - Decisions outside 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 it 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)
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%	99.04%	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%	100%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	3%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mthibi
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 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. 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.	3.2	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	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 in 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 there 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 in the 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 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%	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

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). <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = > 15% Not fully effective = > 10% - ≤ 15% Fully effective = ≤ 10% Significant performance = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9% Outstanding performance = < 5%	0%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	2%	Department: Supply Chain Management Source document: Demand Plan Overview Contact person: 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. <u>Performance rating:</u> 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: GAP report prepared by Zubair Contact person: Maureen Whare
MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY												10%	
12	12	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%	97.3%	90%	90%	43%	65%	79%	90%	5%	Directorate Finance Manager
13	13	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%	99%	95%	95%	25.53%	51.53%	75.20%	95%	5%	Directorate Finance Manager
SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE												55%	
14	14	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government Ease of Doing Business Index	1.C Percentage of revenue clearance certificates issued within 10 working days from time of completed application received (LED3.21)	The percentage of revenue clearance certificates issued by the municipality within 10 working days of a completed application. A revenue clearance certificate is issued by the relevant local municipality, and it reflects all of the debts collected on the property, including rates. The purpose of this document is to prove that all the outstanding debt on the property has been paid by the seller. A completed submission refers to the point in time when all necessary information has been supplied in relation to the certificate. The 10 days, in this instance, refers to 10 working days, not days of the week. <u>Performance rating</u> Unacceptable performance = < 90% Not fully effective = 90% - 92% Fully effective = 93% - 94% Significant performance = 94.1% and 97% Outstanding performance = > 97%	99.86%	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%	5%	Director: Revenue
15	15	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.B Opinion of Independent Rating Agency	Measure the opinion of the independent rating agency. A report that reflects credit worthiness of an institution to repay long-term and short-term liabilities. Credit ratings provide an analysis of the City's key financial data and are performed by an independent agency to assess the City's ability to meet short- and long-term financial obligations. Indicator standard/Norm/Benchmark: The highest rating possible for local government which is also subject to the Country's sovereign rating. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = N/A Not fully effective = N/A Fully effective = A1 (subject to the highest sector rating at the time) Significant performance = N/A Outstanding performance = AA3 (subject to the highest sector rating at the time)	High investment rating = Ba2/Aa2.za/P-1.za long and short-term national scale rating	High investment rating	High investment rating	High investment rating	High investment rating	High investment rating	High investment rating	5%	Director: Treasury

16	16	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.C Audit Outcome (GG3.1)	The audit opinion is defined by the Auditor-General. It is given across a qualitative, ordinal scale including: Unqualified with no findings; Unqualified with findings; Qualified with findings; Adverse with findings; and Disclaimed with findings. For those who have not completed the process, Outstanding audits are recorded. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance (0) = Qualified audit opinion Not fully effective (0) = N/A Fully effective (0) = N/A Significant performance (4) = Unqualified audit opinion Outstanding performance (5) = Clean audit (unqualified with no findings) The weighting for the indicator will not be reallocated, the performance ratings for unacceptable, not fully effective and fully effective will be scored at zero.	Unqualified audit opinion (2023/2024)	Unqualified audit opinion	Unqualified audit opinion	Complete 100% of the audit actions within the unique deadline set as per the Audit Action Plan	Complete 100% of the audit actions within the unique deadline set as per the Audit Action Plan	Complete 100% of the audit actions within the unique deadline set as per the Audit Action Plan	Unqualified audit opinion	5%	Director: Treasury
17	17	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.E Cash/cost coverage ratio (NKPI)	Measures the cash/cost coverage ratio. The ratio indicates the ability to meet at least monthly fixed operating commitments from cash and short-term investment without collecting any additional revenue, during that month. (excluding unspent conditional grants). Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA regulation 10(g) <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < 1.1 Not fully effective = 1.1:1 - 1.13:1 Fully effective = 1.14:1 - 1.39:1 Significant performance = > 1.40 - 1.99:1 Outstanding performance = ≥ 2.0 Read together with 16.G over-performance in the same ratio. The 2 ratios are interrelated and compensate each other	1.73:1	1.70:1	1.14:1	1.47:1	1.47:1	1.47:1	1.14:1	5%	Director: Treasury
18	18	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.F Net debtors to annual income (NKPI)	Measures the Net Debtors to annual income. Net current debtors are a measurement of the net amounts due to the City that are realistically expected to be recovered. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(g) <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = N/A Not fully effective = > 20.34% Fully effective = between 19.36% - 20.34% Significant performance = 17.37% - 19.35% Outstanding performance = < 17.37% The outcome of this ratio is also dependent on the performance of the Rates collection ratio KPI (indicator 27)	15.16%	17%	20.34%	18.87%	18.87%	18.87%	20.34%	5%	Director: Treasury
19	19	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.G- Debt (total borrowing) to total operating revenue (NKPI)	The purpose of the ratio is to provide assurance that sufficient revenue will be generated to repay liabilities. Alternatively, it assesses the municipality's affordability of the total borrowings. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = > 30.90% Not fully effective = 29.74% - 30.90% Fully effective = 28.24% - 29.73% Significant performance = 27.38% - 28.23% Outstanding performance = < 27.38%	12.92%	18.52%	29.73%	23.38%	23.38%	23.38%	29.73%	5%	Director: Treasury
20	20	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Progress of budget cycle plan to ensure the submission of the Annual Budget to Council for adoption (Milestones)	Submission of affordable, sustainable and balanced Operating and Capital Budget (MTREF) aligned to the IDP to Council for consideration. Managing the drafting and coordination of Operating and Capital Budget for the City, ensuring alignment to the IDP <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = N/A Not fully effective = < 100% Fully effective = Submission of 2026/2027 Budget to Council for adoption by 30/06/2027 Significant performance = N/A Outstanding = Submission of 2027/2028 Budget, which is approved in the prescribed timelines despite exceptional challenging circumstances, demonstrated enhanced and improved insights for effective decision making and successfully managing complex processes	100% Budget approved at Council on 26/06/2025	Submission of 2026/2027 Final Budget to Council for adoption by 31/05/2026	Submission of 2026/2027 Final Budget to Council for adoption by 30/06/2027	Initial budget engagement to various forum (e.g. BSC)	Modelled determination of major budget assumptions eg. Tariff increases, growth parameters	Tabled Draft Budget at Council by 31/03/2027	Submission of 2026/2027 Final Budget to Council for adoption by 30/06/2027	5%	Director: Budgets
21	21	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Stock Availability rate (%)	Stock availability, measures the percentage of items that are in stock and ready to be delivered to customers or end users of stock. It is calculated as an average of the total number of items to customers divided by the total number of items offered and multiplying by 100 to get a percentage <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = N/A Not fully effective = < 92% Fully effective = 93% - 93.9% Significant performance = 94% - 94.9% Outstanding performance = ≥ 95%	97.23%	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%	5%	Director: SCM
22	22	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Municipal payments made to service providers who submitted complete forms within 30-days of invoice submission (%)	The percentage of municipal payments made to service providers within 30-days of complete invoice submission. The indicator measures the number of payments made on the basis of invoice submissions to the municipality within the accepted standard of 30 days or less. This measures 30 calendar days from the time of submission of an accurate invoice. Formula: ((1) Number of municipal payments within 30-days of complete invoice receipt made to service providers / (2) Total number of complete invoices received (30 days or older)) x 100 <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = N/A Not fully effective = < 97% Fully effective = 97% - 97.9% Significant performance = 98% - 98.9% Outstanding performance = ≥ 99%	99.90%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	5%	Director: Expenditure
23	23	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Adherence to the requirements of the Metro Trading Services Reform	The 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. The purpose of the indicator 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 to the Director: Grant Funding/CFO, for onward submission to NT aligned to the Trading Services Grant Incentive Scheme requirements, as amended from time to time Evidence Requirements: 1. Evidence of submission of the relevant requirements to National Treasury (per latest approved programme implementation plans). The frequency of reporting will take place annually. The Director: Grant Funding/CFO is responsible for adherence to NT requirements in terms of timeous submission by the stipulated deadlines. 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 is in accordance with the MTSR guidelines, which may change from time to time. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = Non-submission - N/A Not fully effective = Submission of 100% of the requirements, after the deadline Fully effective = Submission of 100% of the requirements on the deadline Significant performance = Submission of 100% of the requirements between 1 - 2 working days before the deadline Outstanding performance = Submission of 100% of the required evidence, of active engagement with National Treasury to ensure alignment of requirements with City direction. Disclaimer: The weighting for the indicator will not be reallocated, the performance ratings for unacceptable will be scored at zero.	New	Submission of 100% of the requirements on the deadline	Submission of 100% of the requirements on the deadline	N/A	N/A	N/A	Submission of 100% of the requirements on the deadline	5%	Director: Grant Funding

24	24	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Successful transactions submitted into the Land Use Management System (LUM) interface (%)	The indicator is aimed at the setting of a standard of 98% successful (less than 2% failed) LUM interface transactions to ensure that ratepayers will have the benefit of their property valuation decisions to be implemented in good time and without errors ensuring customer relations excellence. Q1: Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1 Q2: Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1 and Q2 Q3: Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1, Q2 and Q3 Q4: Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4 <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = Errors ≥ 2.5% Not fully effective = Errors ≥ 2% and < 2.5% Fully effective = Errors < 2% and ≥ 1.6% Significant performance = Errors < 1.6% and ≥ 1% Outstanding performance = Errors < 1%	0.36% 122 out of 34 324 transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4	Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4	Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4	Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1	Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1 and Q2	Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1, Q2 and Q3	Less than 2% transactional errors for LUM interface transactions in Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4	5%	Director: Valuations
DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS												15%	
25	25	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Legal Compliance wrt the implementation of an annual Supplementary Valuation Roll (Milestones)	The determination of supplementary valuation roll is prescribed by the Municipal Property Rates Act (MPRA) in terms of format and certification time frames. The approval of the SV is an annual process within the GV cycle <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = N/A Not fully effective = Supplementary Valuation Roll SV01 to GV2025 not certified by the Municipal Valuer Fully effective = Supplementary Valuation Roll SV01 to GV2025 certified by the Municipal Valuer by 30 June 2027 Significant performance = More than 1 batch of real-time valuations completed and inserted in SV01 to GV2025 by 30 June 2027 Outstanding performance = More than 2 batches (additional 1 to the above) of real-time valuations completed and inserted in SV01 to GV2025, which must be certified by 30 June 2027	100% Supplementary Valuation Roll SV02 to GV2022 certified by the Municipal Valuer on 30 June 2025	Supplementary Valuation Roll SV03 to GV2022 certified by the Municipal Valuer by 30 June 2026	Supplementary Valuation Roll SV01 to GV2025 certified by the Municipal Valuer on or before 30 June 2027	N/A	One batch of real-time valuations submitted for inclusion in SV01 of GV2025	A project plan completed for the finalisation and certification of SV01 of GV2025	Supplementary Valuation Roll SV01 to GV2025 certified by the Municipal Valuer on or before 30 June 2027	5%	Director: Valuations
26	26	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government LITEA	Review of a set number of properties, to identify unregulated development, using aerial photography and change detection methodology	Review of 150 000 rateable properties to identify unregulated development using aerial image change detection. This will include all identifiable structures in formal areas as well as in less formal incremental housing areas, where backyard informality is being converted to formal development, with or without building consent. Considering standard procedures and data collection with current staff resources allows for data collection of just on 2000 properties per month, this will expand the reach of the department and allow for the review of a number of additional properties within the standard international best practices timeframes. <u>Performance Rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < 140 000 Not fully effective = 140 001 - 149 999 Fully effective = 150 000 - 160 000 Significant performance = 160 001 - 169 999 Outstanding performance = > 170 000	85.1% 152 584 out of 179 246 rateable properties zoned as single residential incremental housing, reviewed to include unregulated building developments in the valuation process, with a focus on those that result in a usage and rating category changes	150,000	150,000	2,000	50,000	100,000	150,000	5%	Director: Valuations
27	27	3.1 Excellence in Basic Service delivery	Revenue collected as a percentage of billed amount - Rates (%)	To measure the receipts as a percentage of billing covering the immediate 12 months period for all directorate responsible for services. Formula: Revenue collected over billed amount. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < 90% Not fully effective = 90% - 94.99% Fully effective = 95% Significant performance = 95.01.% - 95.5% Outstanding performance = ≥ 95.5%	97.59%	93%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	5%	Director: Revenue
Chief Financial Officer Kevin Jacoby													
City Manager Lungelo Mbandazayo													