2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Nolwandle Gqiba
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sept-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											**20%**	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											**10%**	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											**40%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**30%**	
												100%	
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											**20%**	
1	**1**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Increase in P3M3 and EM maturity level (average)	The CPPPM maturity level is based on the PPPM and Engineering Management (Only applicable to Engineering Directorates) maturity assessment. The maturity assessment will reflect the average maturity level of: - 1. Portfolio, Programme, Project and - 2. Engineering Management level. This will occur on an annual basis in order to assess the increase in the maturity level for the Directorate. The maturity level is measured on a scale of 1 - 5. The maturity levels: * Level 1 – Initial Process: No standard process or tracking system – informal process * Level 2 – Repeatable Process: Minimum standards for processes and procedures * Level 3 – Defined Process: Defined Process which allow for flexibility * Level 4 – Managed Process: Obtain and retain specific measurements and quality requirements * Level 5 – Optimised Process: Continuous process improvement and proactive technology and problem management for future improvements All other EDs will be measured per the individual directorate. 1. A score of 3.1 and above based on the previous year's baseline: Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = decrease of ≥ 0.21 from existing maturity level **Not fully effective** = decrease of 0.1 - 0.2 from existing maturity level **Fully effective** = maintain 3.1 or existing maturity level (no movement) **Significant performance** = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 from existing maturity level **Outstanding performance** = increase of ≥ 0.21 from existing maturity level	New	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	AT	AT	AT	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: PPM assessment Contact person: Ben Peters 021 400 9206
2	**2**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Increase in Contract Management maturity level	The Contract Management maturity level is based on the Contract Management maturity assessment only. This will occur on an annual basis in order to assess the increase in the maturity level for the Directorate. The maturity level is measured on a scale of 1 - 5. The maturity levels: * Level 1 – Initial Process: No standard process or tracking system – informal process * Level 2 – Repeatable Process: Minimum standards for processes and procedures * Level 3 – Defined Process: Defined Process which allow for flexibility * Level 4 – Managed Process: Obtain and retain specific measurements and quality requirements * Level 5 – Optimised Process: Continuous process improvement and proactive technology and problem management for future improvements All other EDs will be measured per the individual directorate. 1. A score of 3.75 and above: Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = decrease of ≥ 0.11 **Not fully effective** = decrease of 0.1 – 0.2 **Fully effective** = maintain 3.75 or existing maturity level (no movement) **Significant performance** = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 **Outstanding performance** = increase of ≥ 0.21 2. A score of below 3.75: Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = decrease of ≥ 0.11 **Not fully effective** = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.1	New	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	AT	AT	AT	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	1%	Department: CPPPM Source document: PPM assessment Contact person: Ben Peters 021 400 9207

3	**3**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Repeatable Tenders that were Expanded/Amended multiple times (%)	Measures the percentage of Expansions and Amendments on repeatable tenders. This indicator will only measure instances where there was more than one Expansion and/or Amendment on the same tender. Expansions or Amendments are defined by the SCM section 116 (3) guide and can change at any time. If a tender extension is awarded within 45 days of contract expiry of the current contracts arising from the tender, it will result in Unacceptable Performance. This would require all extensions to be awarded at least 45 days before expiry, ensuring proactive planning. **Source:** Contract Register and Monitoring System and Tender Tracking System. Measurement will commence only when the second Expansions and/or Amendments are released in SAP MM and only applies to repeatable tenders that are active in the current FY (i.e. commenced before or in the financial year and expires in or after the FY). Formula: Total number of repeatable tenders expanded and/ or amended multiple times ÷ Total number of repeatable active in the FY. Measured cumulatively. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance =** ≥ 3.1% or if tender extension is awarded within 45 days of contract expiry of the current contracts arising from the tender. **Not fully effective=** 2.1% – 3% **Fully effective =** 1.8% - 2% **Significant performance =** 0.1% - 1.79% **Outstanding performance** = 0%	0%	2%	2%	AT	AT	AT	2%	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: CMRS (Contract Register and Monitoring System) and Tender Tracking System Contact person: Maureen Whare 069 367 4023
4	**4**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduction in the number of SCM deviations (%)	The objective is to achieve a 20% reduction on SCM deviations. The indicator only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R750 000 (inclusive of VAT). Sole/single service provider deviations, deviations relating to emergencies and unforeseen situations (at this time being – anti-corruption investigations and extortion management, with associated human life threats (threat to limb and life) will be excluded from the measurement as per section 36 of SCM regulations. Target = reduction of 20% Formula: (Number of SCM deviations for current year – Number of SCM deviations for prior year)/ Number of SCM deviations for prior year X 100" Exception protocols: A default performance rating of fully effective will be awarded if you have 2 or less deviations from a base of 2 or less Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = Any positive increase in the number of deviations, year-on-year **Not fully effective** = a reduction > 0% - < 19.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. **Fully effective** = a reduction of 20% - 21%, for the number of deviations (year-on-year), or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol) **Significant performance** = a reduction > 21% - < 99.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. **Outstanding performance** = a reduction of 100% for the number of deviations, year-on-year or no deviations for the current year.	0%	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
5	**5**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Irregular, Fruitless and Wasteful, Unauthorised** Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating and Capital Expenditure	The indicator measures the extent to which the municipality has incurred irregular, fruitless and wasteful and unauthorised expenditure on its total budget (operating and capital budget). Fruitless and wasteful expenditure is expenditure that was made in vain and would have been avoided had reasonable care been exercised. Irregular expenditure is incurred by the municipality in contravention of a requirement of the law (specific legislation, per MFMA legislation). Unauthorized expenditure includes overspending of the total amount appropriated in the approved budget. The net amount after recoveries, write offs or condonement should be used in this calculation. The Q4 final figure is obtained from the Pre-audited AFS. Irregular expenditure will be included, if identified by other assurance providers, irrespective if it is self-disclosed or not. Formula: Per Directorate incidents value as a percentage of Directorate Opex and Capex ((1) Irregular + (2) Fruitless and Wasteful + (3) Unauthorised Expenditure) / (4) Total Operating and Capital Expenditure x 100 Note: New Executive Director or Executive Director taking up a post in another directorate as an Executive Director (in the year of review) will be measured on the UIFW Expenditure incidents for the current year, where the incident is in the term of appointment as Executive Director. This also applies if an existing ED moves to another directorate, the ED will be regarded as "New" I.e. previous UIFW expenditure incidents not in the term of employment of the ED will not be measured. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performanc**e = ≥ 1.5% **Not fully effective** = > 0.75% - 1.49%	40794%	10%	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

6	**6**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	External audit (Auditor General) audit actions completed as per audit action plan (%)	This indicator measures how many actions was completed in the financial cycle within in the unique deadline set, as per the audit action plan. The Audit Action Plan sets out the total number audit actions required to address the internal control deficiencies as identified by the Auditor-General in their management report. The unique deadline is set in consultation with the relevant ED. Completed would mean that the actions as stipulated in the audit action plan has been executed by the relevant delegated authority. Should there be no actions required for a Directorate the indicator will be 'Not Applicable'. 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
7	**7**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Final council and Mayco decisions implemented within timeframes (%)	The indicator excludes all council and Mayco decisions for noting. Decisions taken by council and Mayco where there is no budget to implement actions or outside of the control of the ED. These exclusions must be supported by valid evidence. These decisions must be reflected on each quarterly report for the City Manager and/or panel's awareness. All final Council and Mayco decisions allocated to the ED with implementation date for the quarter must be implemented and reported on for the quarter to achieve the target. Implementation that runs over a period longer than a financial year will be measured according to milestones identified for implementation within the current financial year. Each ED must ensure that a date is allocated of when action will be completed and implemented. This must be captured in the CDIT system by the relevant implementer. If no timeframe was allocated the timeframe is deemed to be one month for implementation. Implementation is the date of completion of the actions or achievement of councils request or expectation. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 69% of ALL decisions **Not fully effective** = 69% - 79.99% of ALL decisions **Fully effective** = 80% - 85% of ALL decisions **Significant performance** = 85.1% - 94.99% of ALL decisions **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 95% of ALL decisions If "Not Applicable"-weighting will be "zero" and must be reallocated it within the Transversal Category.	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)
8	**8**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.J Budget spent on implementation of Workplace Skills Plan (%)	Measures the percentage of budget spent on the Workplace Skills Plan .The Workplace Skills Plan outlines the planned education, training and development interventions for the organisation. Its purpose is to formally plan and allocate budget for appropriate training interventions that will address the needs arising out of local government's skills sector plan, the IDP, the individual departmental staffing strategies, individual employees' personal development plans and the employment equity plan. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(f). Formula: % spent on the implementation of the WSP measured against the training budget. (A/B)*100 A: Actual spend per quarter on training budget B: Planned spend on training Budget for the year Q4 (as at end of June) reporting will be based on the latest period available at the time of reporting. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 90% **Not fully effective** = 90% - 94.99% **Fully effective** = 95% - 96% **Significant performance** = 96.1% - 97.99% **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 98%	99.92%	95%	95%	15%	30%	70%	95%	2%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851

9	**9**	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%	90%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	2%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mothibi
10	**10**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Inclusion of C88 **Output** indicators	All Tier 1 and Tier 2 Circular 88 Output indicators should be included into the performance scorecards of the Executive Directors, where relevant. All indicators must be included verbatim into the **Corporate (auditable) and Directorate SDBIP (cascading principle)** and the measurement must be in compliance with the Technical Indicator Descriptions (TID) as issued by National Treasury. This indicator will be measured during the annual and mid-year review process. Measurement: Q1 and Q3 (after mid-year amendments). Weighting must be reallocated where there the ED has no Output indicators. Note: Indicators that have barriers and challenges are excluded from the formula. The indicator will measure two aspects: 1) The inclusion of C88 Output indicators in the Directorate SDBIP, and 2) The inclusion of C88 Outcome and Output indicators on the Corporate Scorecard (CSC) (graduating), whether replacing existing CSC indicators. 1) Formula: **Inclusion in the directorate SDBIP -** Total number of Tier 1& 2 Output indicators included in the directorate SDBIP divided by Tier 1 & 2 indicators required for inclusion as per C88 (auditable) * 100 2) Formula: **Replacement and/ or inclusion of C88 Outcome and Output indicators on the CSC** **Graduating criteria:** Meet the strategic mandate of the City, with the Mayor's approval and Indicators should be auditable with systems and controls in place. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 80% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2	80%	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
11	**11**	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%	14%	≤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

12	**12**	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: Zubair Adams
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											**10%**	
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%	98%	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
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. 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%	97%	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
15	**3**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Performance on cash backed expenditure over cash back budget items only (%)	In terms of the Directive 7 of 2023, directorates cannot offset primary operating budgeted expenditure that translates into a cash outflow against non-cash flow expenditures such as Impairments, Depreciation, Debt impairment, Write-offs, Post-retirement medical aid (PRMA) provision, Rehabilitation of landfill sites, Water Inventory, labour to operating, Interest and Prior year adjustments. This indicator measures the outcome of cash backed items only over the budget and if the outcome is higher than 100% then, it reflects reliance on non-cash items. The aim of the indicator is to achieve an outcome of less than or equal to100%. Source: Financial information. Formula: Operating expenditure (cash items only) / Operating budget (cash items only). Measured quarterly. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = > 100% **Not fully effective** = N/A **Fully effective** = 100% **Significantly performance =** ≥ 98% - 99.9% **Outstanding performance =** ≥ 95% - 97.9%	0%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager

	SERVICE DELIVERY / GOOD GOVERNANCE											**40%**	
16	**1**	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. **Note**: Land release is achieved when the Council takes a resolution to in-principle release the land for affordable development. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = ≤ 7 **Not fully effective** = 8 - 9 **Fully effective** = 10 **Significant performance** = 11 - 12 **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 13	5	7	10	AT	AT	AT	10	**8%**	Director: Human Settlements Planning
17	**2**	7. Increased supply of affordable, well located homes	7.B Human Settlement Top structures (houses) provided (number) [C88, CSC & Mayoral Priority Programme]	Measures the number of Human Settlement top structures provided per housing programme. 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 Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 2 004 **Not fully effective** = 2 004 - 2 109 **Fully effective** = 2 110 - 2 215 **Significant performanc**e = 2 216 - 2 326 **Outstanding performance** = > 2 326	1 854	1 860	2 110	250	750	1 100	2 110	**7%**	Director: Housing Development
18	**3**	7. Increased supply of affordable, well located homes	7.C Formal housing serviced sites provided (number) [CSC & Mayoral Priority Programme]	Measures the number of formal 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 Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 2 564 **Not fully effective performance** = 2 564 - 2 699 **Fully effective** = 2 700 - 2 835 **Significant performance** = 2 836 - 2 977 **Outstanding performance** = > 2 977	1 627	2 400	2 700	200	650	1 200	2 700	**5%**	Director: Housing Development
19	**4**	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. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 43ha **Not fully effective performance** = 43ha - 46ha **Fully effective** = 47ha - 49ha **Significant performance** = 50ha - 52ha **Outstanding performance** = > 52ha	165.85	39	47	AT	AT	AT	47	**7%**	Director: Human Settlements Planning
20	**5**	7. Increased supply of affordable, well located homes	7.E Number of title deeds registered to beneficiaries (HS1.22)	The number of title deeds registered to beneficiaries within a municipality during the period under assessment. A title deed is a document that proves legal ownership of a property in South Africa. This refers to title deeds registered to beneficiaries of human settlements programmes within the municipal area. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 2 237 **Not fully effective performance** = 2 237 - 2 349 **Fully effective** = 2 350 - 2 467 **Significant performance** = 2 468 - 2 591 **Outstanding performance** = > 2 591	4 815	2 200	2 350	300	800	1 400	2 350	**8%**	Director: Housing Development
21	**6**	8. Safer, better-quality homes in informal settlements and backyards over time	8.A Informal settlement sites serviced (number) [CSC & Mayoral Priority Programme]	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 Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 1 899 **Not fully effective performance** = 1 899 - 1 999 **Fully effective** = 2 000 - 2 100 **Significant performance** = 2 101- 2 206 **Outstanding performance** = > 2 206	1 124	1 400	2 000	50	200	700	2 000	**5%**	Director: Informal Settlements

	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**30%**	
22	**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]	The indicator refers to the number of deeds of sale signed with qualifying beneficiaries of saleable rental stock. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance =** < 713 **Not fully effective performance =** 713 - 749 **Fully effective =** 750 - 787 **Significant performance =** 788 - 827 **Outstanding performance =** > 827	685	750	750	AT	AT	AT	750	**5%**	Director: Human Settlements Planning
23	**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	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. The number of **historical** title deeds registered to beneficiaries within a municipality during the period under assessment. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance =** < 569 **Not fully effective performance =** 569 - 599 **Fully effective** = 600 - 630 **Significant performance =** 631 - 662 **Outstanding performance =** > 662	669	600	600	AT	AT	AT	600	**5%**	Director: Human Settlements Planning
24	**3**	8. Safer, better-quality homes in informal settlements and backyards over time	Implementation of ULO - Review of the ULO Framework	The indicator measures the review of the Unlawful Land Occupation (ULO) Framework of **2021/2022**. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance =** Concept Note only **Not fully effective =** Draft reviewed ULO framework (consultation with relevant Stakeholders and PCC) **Fully effective =** Review of ULO framework complete and supported by Human Settlements for onward submission **Significant performance =** Approval of ULO framework **Outstanding performance =** ULO Framework informs the functioning of the Informal Settlements Coordinating Structure (ISCS) and the City Manager Delivery System (CM-DS) Initiatives	New	New	Review of framework complete and supported by Human Settlements for onward submission	AT	AT	AT	Review of framework complete and supported by Human Settlements for onward submission	**5%**	Director: Informal Settlements
25	**4**	7. Increased supply of affordable, well located homes Mayoral Priority Programme	Affordable Housing Policy Ease of doing business (EoDB) index	The Affordable Housing Policy as an enabler for private sector participation in the Affordable Housing Market in Cape Town. This indicator measures the submission for approval of the Affordable Housing Policy to the Human Settlements Portfolio Committee, Mayco and Council. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = Initiation of technical work to inform policy **Not fully effective** = Completion of technical work **Fully effective** = Submission of policy for approval to PC **Significant performance** = Submission of policy for approval to Mayco **Outstanding performance** = Submission of policy for approval to Council	New	Completion of the Draft Affordable Housing Policy	Submission of Affordable Housing Policy for approval	AT	AT	AT	Submission of Affordable Housing Policy for approval	**5%**	Director: Human Settlements Planning
26	**5**	8. Safer, better-quality homes in informal settlements and backyards over time	A 25-year Informal Settlements Pipeline Dashboard City Manager Delivery System (CM-DS) Initiatives	This indicator will measure the development of a 25-year Informal Settlements (IS) Project Pipeline Dashboard to include the following information: name, location, number of households, current basic services available, the proposed human settlement programme to be implemented and estimated timelines for project implementation. Its purpose is to thoroughly plan and allocate budget for the appropriate upgrading programmes that will address the housing needs and provision of basic services to residents residing in areas of informality. Performance Rating: **Unacceptable performance** = No 25-year Informal Settlements Pipeline Dashboard **Not fully effective** = Draft 25-year Informal Settlements Pipeline Dashboard **Fully effective** = Workshop of the draft 25-year Informal Settlements Pipeline Dashboard **Significant performance** = Final draft of the 25-year Informal Settlements Pipeline Dashboard **Outstanding performance** = Publication of the final 25-year Informal Settlements Pipeline Dashboard for relevant Stakeholder to access	New	New	Workshop of the draft 25-year Informal Settlements Pipeline Dashboard	AT	AT	AT	Workshop of the draft 25-year Informal Settlements Pipeline Dashboard	**5%**	Director: Informal Settlements

27	6	8. Safer, better-quality homes in informal settlements and backyards over time	The development of a guideline of service standards for various Informal Settlement Upgrading programmes/ Typologies City Manager Delivery System (CM-DS) Initiatives	This indicator will measure the submission for approval of a guideline outlining the service standards for the various Informal Settlement Upgrading Programmes/Typologies. Its purpose is to: •Define the roles and responsibilities of the Human Settlements, Water & Sanitation, Urban Management, Energy, Spatial Planning & Environment and Urban Mobility directorates within the organisation •Roles and responsibilities for transitioning between upgrade typologies are understood •Service standards for each upgrading typology are confirmed and widely understood across the organisation Performance Rating: **Unacceptable performance** = Concept Note only **Not fully effective** = Draft guideline only **Fully effective** = Review of guideline completed and supported by Human Settlements for onward submission **Significant performance** = Submission to the City Manager for Approval **Outstanding performance** = Publication of the final guideline for the relevant Stakeholders to access	New	New	Review of guideline completed and supported by Human Settlements for onward submission	Annual Target	Annual Target	Annual Target	Review of guideline completed and supported by Human Settlements for onward submission	**5%**	Director: Informal Settlements

Nolwand le Gqiba Digitally signed by Nolwandle Gqiba Date: 2025.07.24 13:28:33 +02'00'

Executive Director **Date**

Nolwanlde Gqiba

Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo Date: 2025.07.31 09:39:05 +02'00'

City Manager **Date**

Lungelo Mbandazayo