2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Nolwandle Gqiba
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 Target 30-Sep-24	Q2 Target 31-Dec-24	Q3 Target 31-Mar-25	Q4 Target 30-Jun-25	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											**20%**	
1	1	Transversal Management	Increase in CPPPM maturity level (average)	The CPPPM maturity level is based on the PPPM, Contract Management and Engineering Management (Only applicable to Engineering Directorates) maturity assessment. The maturity assessment will reflect the average maturity level of: - 1. Portfolio, Programme, Project - 2. Contract management and - 3. Engineering Management level. This will occur on an annual basis in order to assess the **increase** in the maturity level for the Directorate. The maturity level is measured on a scale of 1 - 5. The maturity levels: * Level 1 – Initial Process: No standard process or tracking system – informal process * Level 2 – Repeatable Process: Minimum standards for processes and procedures * Level 3 – Defined Process: Defined Process which allow for flexibility * Level 4 – Managed Process: Obtain and retain specific measurements and quality requirements * Level 5 – Optimised Process: Continuous process improvement and proactive technology and problem management for future improvements The ED for Finance will be measured on a City-wide maturity level. All other EDs will be measured per the individual directorate. **1. A score of 2.89 and below based on the 2023/2024 baseline:** <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.11 Not fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.1 Fully effective = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 Significant performance= increase of 0.21 - 0.3 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.31	3.25	3.48	3.58	AT	AT	AT	3.58	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: PPM assessment Contact person: Ben Peters 021 400 9206
2	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Repeatable Tenders that were Expanded/Amended multiple times (%)	Measures the percentage of Expansions and Amendments on repeatable tenders. This indicator will only measure instances where there was more than one Expansion and/or Amendment on the same tender. Expansions or Amendments are defined by the SCM section 116 (3) guide and can change at any time. **Source:** Contract Register and Monitoring System and Tender Tracking System. Measurement will commence only when the second Expansions and/or Amendments are released in SAP MM and only applies to repeatable tenders that are active in the current FY (i.e. commenced before or in the financial year and expires in or after the FY). Formula: Total number of repeatable contracts tenders expanded and/ or amended multiple times ÷ Total number of repeatable contract active in the FY. Measured cumulatively. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = ≥ 3.1% Not fully effective= 2.6% - 3% Fully effective = 2% - 2.5% Significant performance = range 0.1% - 1.99% Outstanding = 0%	0%	2%	2%	AT	AT	AT	20%	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: CMRS (Contract Register and Monitoring System) and Tender Tracking System Contact person: Maureen Whare 069 367 4023
3	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduction in the number of SCM deviations (%)	**The objective is to achieve a 20% reduction on SCM deviations.** July – December 2023 - The indicator **only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R200 000 (inclusive of VAT).** 01 January – 30 June 2024 - The indicator **only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R750 000 (inclusive of VAT).** Sole/single service provider deviations, anti-corruption deviations and deviations relating to emergencies will be excluded from the measurement as per section 36 of SCM regulations. The indicator will measure the percentage year on year reduction from the previous year's. Target = reduction of 20% Formula: (No. of SCM deviations for current year – No of SCM deviations for prior year)/ Number of SCM deviations for prior year X 100" **Exception protocols:** A default performance rating of fully effective will be awarded if you have 2 or less deviations from a base of 2 or less <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = Any positive increase in the number of deviations, year-on-year Not fully effective = a reduction of above > 0% - < 19.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. Fully effective = a reduction of 20%, for the number of deviations (year-on-year), or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol) Significant performance = a reduction > 20% - < 99.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. Outstanding performance = 0 deviations	1%	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

4	4	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduce and maintain nominal (number and value) irregular expenditure within the Directorate (year-on-year) (average %)	**The objective is to reduce past on irregular expenditure by 10% and limit irregular expenditure..** The indicator will measure the average percentage reduction in the number and value of irregular expenditure i.e. contravention of legislation as defined in the MFMA irregular expenditure definition and maintain lower levels of irregular expenditure. Irregular expenditure is defined as expenditure that is in contravention of, or not in accordance with, a requirement of the Local Government: Municipal Finance Management Act 56 of 2003, the Local Government: Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000, the Remuneration of Public Office Bearers Act 20 of 1998, or the municipality's supply chain management (SCM) policy. Indicator will measure Irregular expenditure that was incurred (transaction) during the time of employment of the Executive Director (in the position as Executive Director). This also applies if an Existing ED moves to another portfolio. i.e. previous irregular expenditure wont impact the new Executive Director. NOTES: a) Irregular expenditure will be included, if identified by other assurance provider, irrespective if it is self-disclosed or not. b) New Executive Directors will be impacted by existing contracts that incur irregular expenditure in the term of their office. If the existing contract had irregular expenditure in the period before ED's appointment, it will not be considered for the new EDs performance. **1) Formula: New Executive Director or Executive Director taking up a post in another directorate as an Executive Director (in the year of review)** Number of non-compliance incidents (irregular expenditure) for the current year, while employed as Executive Director and the amount of irregular expenditure, while employed as an Executive Director. (No baseline) This also applies if an existing ED moves to another directorate, the ED will be regarded as "New" I.e. previous irregular expenditure will not be carried over. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = where more than 2 incidents exist or the total amount is more than R2.5 million, starting from a	49.66%	50%	10%	AT	AT	AT	10%	2%	Department: City Manager Office Source document: Irregular Register and the AG's findings **in the quarter that it is available**. Contact person: Gayle Postings 021 400 1268
5	5	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	External audit (Auditor General) audit actions completed as per audit action plan (%)	This indicator measures how many actions was completed in the financial cycle within in the unique deadline set, as per the audit action plan. The Audit Action Plan sets out the total number audit actions required to address the internal control deficiencies as identified by the Auditor-General in their management report. The unique deadline is set in consultation with the relevant ED. Completed would mean that the actions as stipulated in the audit action plan has been executed by the relevant delegated authority. Should there be no actions required for a Directorate the indicator will not 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
6	6	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Final Council and Mayco decisions implemented within timeframes (%)	The indicator excludes all council and mayco decisions for noting. Decisions taken by Council and Mayco where there is no budget to implement actions or outside of the control of the ED. These exclusions must be supported by valid evidence. These decisions must be reflected on each quarterly report for the City Manager and/or panel's awareness. All final Council and Mayco decisions allocated to the ED with implementation date for the quarter must be implemented and reported on for the quarter to achieve the target. Implementation that runs over a period longer than a financial year will be measured according to milestones identified for implementation within the current financial year. Each ED must ensure that a date is allocated of when action will be completed and implemented. This must be captured in the CDIT system by the relevant implementer. If no timeframe was allocated the timeframe is deemed to be one month for implementation. Implementation is the date of completion of the actions or achievement of councils request or expectation. Weighting must be reallocated where there were **no council decisions** for the year. Performance rating: Outstanding performance= ≥95% of ALL decisions Significant performance= 85.1% - 94.99% of ALL decisions Fully effective= range between 80% -85% of ALL decisions Not fully effective = 69% - 79.99% of ALL decisions Unacceptable performance = < 69% of ALL decisions	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)

7	7	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.J Budget spent on implementation of Workplace Skills Plan (%)	Measures the percentage of budget spent on the Workplace Skills Plan .The Workplace Skills Plan outlines the planned education, training and development interventions for the organisation. Its purpose is to formally plan and allocate budget for appropriate training interventions that will address the needs arising out of local government's skills sector plan, the IDP, the individual departmental staffing strategies, individual employees' personal development plans and the employment equity plan. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(f). Formula: % spent on the implementation of the WSP measured against the training budget. (A/B)*100 A: Actual spend per quarter on training budget B: Planned spend on training Budget for the year <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = <90% Not fully effective = 90% - 94.99% Fully effective = 95% Significant performance=between range of 96.1% - 97.99% Outstanding performance= ≥ 98%	100%	90%	95%	10%	30%	60%	95%	1%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851
8	8	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Internal independent assurance provider's functions recommendations and action plans implemented (%)	It is the monitoring and reporting of the implementation (expressed as a percentage) of corrective actions to address internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans, issued within the directorate of the responsible Executive Director. The internal independent assurance providers included in this KPI are **Internal Audit, Ombudsman, Integrated Risk Management** (limited to the Corporate Risk Register), **Ethics and Forensics departments.** Each internal independent assurance provider as mentioned above has their own unique input to this KPI. This KPI will be "not applicable" to management when there are no recommendations, thus only those that could provide inputs will be included in the calculation. Future recommendations and action plans implemented (not recommended for implementation for the current financial year), will be taken into account for the measurement of this indicator, thereby creating an advantage for the ED. Formula: **Numerator:** Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans implemented (current and future implementations) **Denominator:** Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans made for the current period under review (recommendations and actions plans postponed as approved by the City Manager will be excluded) <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < 75% Not fully effective = 75% - 84.99% Fully effective = 85% - 90% Significant performance = 91% - 94% Outstanding performance= ≥ 95%	100%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	1%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mothibi

9	9	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.A Community satisfaction city-wide survey (average)	Measures the average score on the Community satisfaction City-wide survey. A statistically valid, scientifically defensible score from the annual survey of residents' perceptions of the overall performance of the City. The aim of the indicator is to improve the community's perception of the City. The measure is given against a non-symmetrical Likert scale, where 1 is poor, 2 is fair, 3 is good, 4 is very good, and 5 is excellent. The objective is to improve the current customer satisfaction average score per Directorate. **Refer to the 'Survey - Levels & Baselines' tab.** **1. A score of 2.9 and below based on the 2023/2024 survey outcome:** <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.11 Not fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.1 Fully effective = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 Significantly performance = increase of 0.21 - 0.3 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.31 **2. A score of 3 and above based on the 2023/2024 survey outcome:** <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.21 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 – 0.2 Fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) - increase of 0.1 Significant performance = increase of 0.11 - 0.2 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.21	2.8	2.9	3	AT	AT	AT	3	2%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: Community Satisfaction survey score Contact person: Brigette Morris 021 400 3812
10	10	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Increase in City Pulse	The City Pulse survey measures the organisational culture and aims to improve employee experience at the City. The measure is given against a non-symmetrical Likert scale, measured biennial. The measurement for the 2024/25 will be based on the ED's lowest scoring pillar: Organisational Pillar in 2022/2023. **Refer to the 'City Pulse baselines' tab.** **1. A score of 3.4 and below based on the 2022/2023 baseline:** <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.2 Not fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.19 Fully effective = increase of 0.1 - 0.19 Significantly performance = increase of 0.2 - 0.29 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.3 **2. A score of 3.5 and above based on the 2022/2023 baseline:** <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.2 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 - 0.19 Fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) - increase of 0.1 Significantly performance = increase between 0.11 - 0.2 Outstanding performance = increase of > 0.2	3.4	N/A	3.5	AT	AT	AT	3.5	1%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: City Pulse Contact person: Brigette Morris 021 400 3812
11	11	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Inclusion of C88 **Output** indicators (%) (average)	All Tier 1 and Tier 2 Circular 88 Output indicators should be included into the performance scorecards of the Executive Directors, where relevant. All indicators must be included verbatim into the Corporate (auditable) and Directorate SDBIP (cascading principle) and the measurement must be in compliance with the Technical Indicator Descriptions (TID) as issued by National Treasury. This indicator will be measured during the annual review process and no mid-year adjustments will be taken into account. Measurement: Q1 Weighting must be reallocated where there the ED has no Output indicators. Note: Indicators that have barriers and challenges are excluded from the formula. The indicator will measure two aspects: 1) The inclusion of C88 Output indicators in the **Directorate SDBIP**, and 2) The inclusion of C88 Output indicators on the **Corporate Scorecard (CSC)** (graduating), whether replacing existing CSC indicators. 1) Formula: **Inclusion in the Directorate SDBIP** - Total number of Tier 1& 2 Output indicators included in the Directorate SDBIP divided by Tier 1 & 2 indicators required for inclusion as per C88 (auditable) * 100 **2) Formula: Replacement and/ or inclusion of C88 Output indicators on the CSC** - Total number of Tier 1& 2 indicators graduated on the CSC divided by Total number of Tier 1& 2 indicators graduated on the CSC * 100 Average: (Formula 1 + Formula 2) divided by 2 <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < 80% inclusion of Tier 1&2 Not fully effective = 80% - 84.99% inclusion of Tier 1&2 Fully effective = 85% - 89.99% inclusion of Tier 1&2	New	100%	100%	AT	AT	AT	100%	1%	Department: Organisational Performance Management (OPM) Source document: C88 scorecard/ corporate SDBIP Contact person: Monique Fillies - Manager: City Performance Management 021 400 9024

12	12	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Average of tenders in slippage at any given quarter end (%)	measures the average of tenders for which in slippage at any given quarter end. This will drive the timeous implementation of the demand plan based on the agreed timeline. Abnormalities in the timeline will then impact each step of the process, such as where a tender only allows 30 days after award to Contract Required by Date (CRD), there will probably be a contract gap or a Value At Risk (VAR – Budget at risk of not being spent) on the Capital reporting. Slippage is defined as tenders on the demand plan which are behind schedule based on the agreed timelines for each tender. Slippage in the implementation of the demand plan, is a contributor to the cause of VAR. This will include the submission of draft specifications as per the minimum timeframe before the CRD. Formula: Total count of tenders in red or amber as a percentage of the total number of tenders required for the MTREF period (average %). Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = > 15% Not fully effective = > 10% - ≤ 15% Fully effective = ≤ 10% Significant performance = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9% Outstanding performance = < 5%	New	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	1%	Department: Supply Chain Management Source document: Demand Plan Overview Contact person: Bekumuzi Vumase and Razaan Arendse Manager Demand Management
13	13	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Gaps in repeatable tender continuity (average number of days)	This indicator is to ensure continued monthly service delivery implemented through repeatable tenders. A "gap" refers to the number of days between the expiring contract and the replacement contract commencing. Potential gaps should be mitigated via extension/expansion and/or deviation early enough so that it caters for any possible delay within a tender process. A gap less than one month will be included in the calculation. To drive the demand plan and improve Supply Chain Management (SCM) process and service delivery.This indicator is based on all repeatable tenders that currently have a gap at the time of reporting, i.e the current contract had already expired and the new contract is not yet in place. Average number of days refer to calendar days (inclusive of weekends). Formula: Total number of gaps in days/ Total number of tenders with a gap of more than zero days = Average number of gaps (days) (Effectively the report should be 'blank'.) Using the gap report developed by Zubair which takes current status and projected time for completion into account. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = repeatable tenders with ≥ 150 days gap Not fully effective = repeatable tenders with ≥ 90 - < 150 days gap Fully effective = repeatable tenders with ≥ 30 - < 90 days gap Significant performance = repeatable tenders with gaps < 30 days gap Outstanding performance = zero repeatable tenders with gaps	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: GAP report prepared by Zubair Contact person: Zubair Adams
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											**10%**	
14	**1**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Total Capital Expenditure as a percentage of Total Capital Budget less contingencies (%)	This indicator measures the extent to which budgeted capital expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Capital expenditure is all costs incurred by the municipality to acquire, upgrade, and renew physical assets such as property, plants, buildings, technology, or equipment. Less contractual contingencies on projects and insurance contingencies. **Q1 – Q3 reporting:** Formula: (1) YTD Actual Capital Expenditure / (2) Total Budgeted Capital Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. **Q4 reporting:** Formula: (1) Actual Capital Expenditure / (2) Total Budgeted Capital Expenditure **less contingencies**. The latest approved budget is applicable. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 85% or >100% (non-compliance) Not fully effective = ≥ 85% - ≤ 89.99% Fully effective = 90% - 93% Significant performance = > 93% - 96% Outstanding performance = > 96%	99%	90%	90%	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	90%	6%	Directorate Finance Manager
15	**2**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	FM1.12: Total Operating Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating Expenditure budget	This indicator measures the extent to which operating expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Operating Expenditure (non-capital spending) is costs which the municipality incurs through its normal operations. The latest approved budget is applicable. Formula: Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 90.% or > 100% (non-compliance) Not fully effective = ≥ 90% - ≤ 94.99% Fully effective = 95% - 96% Significant performance= ≥ 96.1% - ≤ 97% Outstanding performance= ≥ 97.1% - 100%	96%	95%	95%	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	95%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager

16	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Performance on cash backed expenditure over cash back budget items (%)	In terms of the Directive 7 of 2023, directorates cannot offset primary operating budgeted expenditure that translates into a cash outflow against non-cash flow expenditures such as Impairments, Depreciation, Debt impairment, Write-offs, Post retirement medical aid (PRMA) provision, Rehabilitation of landfill sites, Water inventory, lanour to operating, interest and Prior year adjustments. This indicator measures the outcome of cash backed items only over thr budget and if the outcome is higher than 100% then, it reflects reliance on non-cash items. The aim of the indicator is to achieve an outcome of less than or equal to 100%. Source: Financial information. Formula: Operating expenditure (cash items only) / Operating budget (cash items only). Measured quarterly. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = > 100% Not fully effective = N/A Fully effective = ≤ 100% Significantly performance = N/A Outstanding performance = N/A	New	0%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											**60%**	
17	1	City Manager request	Approved Directorate Public Housing: Staff Housing allocation list (%).	Measures the Directorate's to sign-off the Public Housing: Staff Housing allocation list i.e. Management representation letter: confirming allocation, validity, accuracy and completeness of information. <u>Performance rating</u> Unacceptable performance = No Management respresentation letter Not fully effective = Unsigned Management representation letter Fully effective = 100% (signed off Management representation letter) Significant performance = Not applicable Outstanding performance = Not applicable	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	3%	Director Public Housing
18	2	City Manager request	Staff Housing fringe benefit loaded on SAP, for identified staff members (%)	Measures the percentage of staff members identified loaded onto SAP to ensure that the fringe benefit is loaded and taxed accordingly. <u>Performance rating</u> Unacceptable performance = No Management representation letter Not fully effective = Unsigned Management representation letter Fully effective = 100% (signed off Management representation letter) Significant performance = Not applicable Outstanding performance = Not applicable	68%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	3%	Director Public Housing
19	3	7. Increased supply of affordable, well located homes	7.A Well located land parcels released to the private sector for affordable housing (number) [CSC & Mayoral Priority Programme]	Measures the number of well-located land parcel released to the private sector. Land parcel refers to a single and finite immovable asset with a measurable extent. Land parcel is confirmed as released through final award notification, allowing the developer to commence with development. 'Well-located' refers to land that is in close proximity to economic opportunities, transport nodes, and social facility support. <u>Performance rating</u> Unacceptable performance = < 4 Not fully effective = ≤ 6 Fully effective = 7 Significant performance = ≥ range between 8 - 9 Outstanding performance = > range between 10 and above	1	5	7	AT	AT	AT	7	7%	Director Human Settlements Planning
20	4	7. Increased supply of affordable, well located homes	7.B Human Settlement Top structures (houses) provided (number) [C88, CSC] HS 1.11	Measures the number of Human Settlement top structures provided per housing programme. The Top structures are defined as any built structure providing shelter to a household in a human settlements development by means of any national housing programme, where the main source of funding is the Human Settlements Development Grant (HSDG) in terms of the Division of Revenue Act (DoRA) for such purpose. Definition of a human settlements opportunity per housing programme: A human settlements opportunity is incremental access to and/or delivery of one of the following housing products: (A) subsidy housing (BNG), which provides a minimum 40 m² house; (B) People's Housing Process (PHP) are beneficiaries who maximise their housing subsidy by building or organising the building of their homes themselves; (C) social housing is new rental units, delivered by the City's social housing partners; (D) rental housing, which is community residential units (CRUs), upgrading and redevelopment of existing rental units and hostels; and (E) GAP housing is a serviced site, or affordable unit for sale <u>Performance rating</u> Unacceptable performance = < below 1 700 Not fully effective = ≤ 1 700 - 1 859 Fully effective = 1 860 Significant performance = ≥ range between 1 861- 1 900 Outstanding performance = > range between 1 901 and above	1 811	1 300	1 860	0	350	850	1 860	10%	Director Housing Development
21	5	7. Increased supply of affordable, well located homes	7.C Formal housing service sites provided (number) [C88, CSC] HS 1.12	Measures the number of formula service sites provided. A serviced site is defined as any property providing municipal services (road, water and sewerage) on an individual basis to a household, including high-density residential sites, as well as other non-residential sites related to integrated human settlements developments. The main source of funding for serviced sites is the Urban Settlements Development Grant (USDG) and the Informal Settlement Upgrading Partnership Grant (ISUPG) in terms of the Division of Revenue Act (DoRA) for such purpose <u>Performance rating</u> Unacceptable performance = < below 2 000 Not fully effective performance = ≤ 2 000 - 2 399 Fully effective = 2 400 Significant performance = ≥ range between 2 401- 2 600 Outstanding performance = > range between 2 601 and above	2 640	2 700	2 400	200	450	850	2 400	7%	Director Housing Development

22	6	7. Increased supply of affordable, well located homes	7.D Hectares of land acquired for human settlements in the municipal area (HS1.13)	Hectares of land acquired for human settlements development within the municipal area. Therefore, this refers to land acquired in an agreement between at least two parties for which purchase and sales agreement or donation agreements, expropriation notices, or development rights agreements have been concluded. The land is understood to have been acquired with the intention of advancing human settlements development within the municipal area, subject to the subsequent completion of any outstanding planning and approval processes. <u>Performance rating</u> Unacceptable performance = < below 30 HA Not fully effective performance = ≤ 30 HA - 38 HA Fully effective = 39 HA Significant performance = ≥ range between 40 HA - 50 HA Outstanding performance = > range between 51 A and above	0	140	39	AT	AT	AT	39	8%	Director Human Settlements Planning
23	7	7. Increased supply of affordable, well located homes	7.E Transfer of ownership to new beneficiaries (number) (HS1.22)	Measures the registration of title in the name of the new beneficiary, confirmed by the issuing of a title deed <u>Performance rating</u> Unacceptable performance = < below 2 000 Not fully effective performance = ≤ 2 000 - 2 199 Fully effective = 2 200 Significant performance = ≥ range between 2 201 - 3 000 Outstanding performance = > 3 001 and above	2 372	3 250	2 200	600	1 400	2 100	2 200	15%	Director Housing Development
24	8	8. Safer, better-quality homes in informal settlements and backyards over time	8.A Informal settlements sites serviced (number) [C88, CSC] HS 1.12	Measures incremental access to better services as part of an informal settlement upgrading programme: Incremental upgrade of informal areas, which provides a serviced site with or without tenure in accordance with the informal settlement upgrading programme as part of the National Housing Code. A 'serviced site' is defined as a site to which the following services were provided: •Road; •Water; and •Sewerage <u>Performance rating</u> Unacceptable performance = < below 1 000 Not fully effective performance = ≤ 1 000 - 1 399 Fully effective = 1 400 Significant performance = ≥ range between 1 401 - 1 450 Outstanding performance = > range between 1 451 and above	1 002	1 220	1 400	0	440	990	1 400	7%	Director Informal Settlements
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**10%**	
25	1	7. Increased supply of affordable, well located homes	Number of deeds of sale agreements signed with identified beneficiaries within City owned rental stock [SMF Priority] HS.1.22	The indicator refers to the number of deeds of sale signed with identified beneficaries based on certain criteari; Deeds of sale agreements: Legal document stating the terms and conditions regardin g the sale of rental unit to beneficiary Identified beneficiary: Lawful tenant with an existing leqase agreement with the City of Cape Town; Qualifying criteria: Current lawful tenant with a lease agreement and with no other property ownership <u>Performance rating</u> Unacceptable performance = < below 600 Not fully effective performance = ≤ 600 - 749 Fully effective = 750 Significant performance = ≥ range between 751 - 900 above target achieved Outstanding performance = > 901 and above	575	500	750	AT	AT	AT	750	5%	Director Human Settlements Planning
26	2	Focussed service delivery approach in informal settlements including but not limited to LFTEA (Less Formal Township Establishment Act)	Number of title deeds registered to beneficiaries (C88) HS 1.22	Indicator focusses on adoption of an approach that will ensure that service delivery challenges are addressed in a structured way to demonstrate progressive transformation of living conditions in the focus areas into liveable neighbourhoods. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < below 500 Not fully effective performance = ≤ 500 - 599 Fully effective = 600 Significant performance = ≥ range between 601- 700 Outstanding performance = > range between 701 and above	1075	600	600	AT	AT	AT	600	2%	Director Human Settlements Planning

27	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government Unlawful Land Occupation (ULO)	Implementation of ULO - Number of Managed Settlements Piloted	The indicator measures the number of managed settlements piloted which have finalised conceptual lay-out plans and engineering viability studies <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance < 0 Not fully effective ≤ 1 Fully effective = 2 Significant performance ≥ range between 3 - 4 Outstanding performance > range between 5 and above	2	2	2	AT	AT	AT	2	2%	Director Informal Settlements
28	4	1. Increased Jobs and Investment in the Cape Town economy Mayoral Priority Programme	Approve the Affordable Housing Poliicy Ease of doing business (EoDB) index	Approval of the Affordable Housing Policy as an enabler for private sector participation in the Affordable Housing Market in Cape Town <u>Performance rating (guide):</u> Unacceptable performance = Policy not finalised Not fully effective = Policy not approved Fully effective = Policy approved Significant performance = N/A Outstanding performance = N/A	New	New	Approved Affordable Housing Policy	AT	AT	AT	Approved Affordable Housing Policy	1%	Director Human Settlements Planning

Nolwandle Gqiba
Executive Director: Human Settlements

Nolwandle Gqiba

Digitally signed by Nolwandle Gqiba
Date: 2024.07.25 11:39:10 +02'00'

Lungelo Mbandazayo
City Manager

Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo
Date: 2024.07.30 18:23:53 +02'00'