2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Nolwandle Gqiba
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

CM73611A

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											**20%**	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											**15%**	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											**45%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**20%**	
												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%	2%	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.	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

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. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performanc**e = ≥ 1.5% **Not fully effective** = > 0.75% - 1.49% **Fully effective** = 0.75% **Significant performance** = < 0.75% - > 0% **Outstanding performance** = 0%	New	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'. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = N/A **Not fully effective** = < 99.99% **Fully effective** = N/A **Significant performanc**e = N/A **Outstanding performance** =100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	Department: Investor Relations Source document: Completed Audit Action plan Contact person: Lynn Fortune:021 400 5987
5	5	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Final council and Mayco decisions implemented within timeframes (%)	This indicator measures all final Council and Mayco decisions allocated to the ED with implementation date for the quarter. Items marked as "implementation approved" that were due in the quarter (utilising the project end date as a filter) will be used to calculate the target. The indicator excludes: •All council and Mayco decisions for noting; • decisions outside of the control of the ED; • decisions marked as "terminated" or "status completed. • Decisions actioned close to the end of the quarter which would be impossible to implement during that quarter due to time constraints – for example, if Council is on the last day of March, the decisions can only be work flowed to relevant EDs during April. • These exclusions must be supported by valid evidence and reflected on each quarterly report for the City Manager and/or panel's awareness. Implementation that runs over a period longer than a financial year will be measured according to milestones identified for implementation within the current financial year. Each ED must ensure that a date is allocated of when action will be completed and implemented. This must be captured in the CDIT system by the relevant implementer. If no timeframe was allocated, the timeframe is deemed to be one month for implementation. The project start date will be utilised to ensure projects with no end dates are included. Implementation is the date of completion of the actions or achievement of councils request or expectation ("implementation approved" date). <u>Performance rating:</u> **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%	99.26%	95%	95%	15%	30%	70%	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%	92%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	3%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mothibi
8	8	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Community satisfaction survey (average)	Measures the average score on the Community satisfaction survey. A statistically valid, scientifically defendable score from the annual survey of residents' perceptions of the overall performance of the City. The aim of the indicator is to improve the community's perception of the City. The measure is given against a non-symmetrical Likert scale, where 1 is poor, 2 is fair, 3 is good, 4 is very good, and 5 is excellent. The objective is to improve the current customer satisfaction average score per Directorate. 1. A score of 2.8 and below based on the previous year's survey outcome: Performance rating*: Unacceptable performance = ≤ 2.7 Not fully effective = 2.8 Fully effective = 2.9 Significantly performance = 3.0 Outstanding performance = ≥ 3.1 2. A score of 2.9 and above based on the previous year's survey outcome: Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance =** ≤2.8 **Not fully effective =** 2.9 **Fully effective =** 3.0 **Significant performance =** 3.1 **Outstanding performance =** ≥ 3.2 *No ranges due to nature of the KPI, which is based on outcome of a survey.	2.8	N/A	2.9	AT	AT	AT	2.9	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 (%)	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: 1) The inclusion of C88 Output indicators in the Directorate SDBIP, and Formula: Inclusion in the directorate SDBIP - Total number of Tier 1& 2 Output indicators included in the directorate SDBIP divided by Tier 1 & 2 indicators required for inclusion as per C88 (auditable) * 100 Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 80% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Not fully effective** = 80% - 84.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Fully effective =**85% - 90% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Significant performance** = >90% - 95% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Outstanding performance** = >95% - 100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Department: Organisational Performance Management (OPM) Source document: C88 scorecard and Directorate SDBIP Contact person: Monique Fillies - Manager: City Performance Management 021 400 9024
10	10	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Tenders in slippage at any given quarter end (%)	Measures tenders for MTREF in slippage at any given quarter end. This will drive the timeous implementation of the demand plan based on the agreed timeline. Abnormalities in the timeline will then impact each step of the process, such as where a tender only allows 30 days after award to Contract Required by Date (CRD), there will probably be a contract gap or a Value At Risk (VAR – Budget at risk of not being spent) on the Capital reporting. Slippage is defined as tenders on the demand plan which are behind schedule based on the agreed timelines for each tender. Slippage in the implementation of the demand plan, is a contributor to the cause of VAR. This will include the submission of draft specifications as per the minimum timeframe before the CRD. Measurement: The indicator is measured on a quarterly basis (non-cumulative), as such any recoveries are considered. The annual performance is based on the tenders in slippage as at the 4th quarter. ED's are able to recover if there are tenders in slippage throughout the year. There are processes in place to remedy tenders that are in amber or red. Formula: Total count of tenders in red or amber as a percentage of the total number of tenders required for the MTREF period (%) (non-cumulative). Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = > 15% **Not fully effective** = > 10% - ≤ 15% **Fully effective** = ≤ 10% **Significant performance** = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9% **Outstanding performance** = < 5%	4%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	1%	Department: Supply Chain Management Source document: Demand Plan Overview Contact person: Bekumuzi Vumase and Razaan Arendse Manager Demand Management
11	11	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Gaps in repeatable tender continuity (average number of days)	This indicator is to ensure continued monthly service delivery implemented through repeatable tenders. A "gap" refers to the number of days between the expiring contract and the replacement contract commencing. Potential gaps should be mitigated via extension/expansion and/or deviation early enough so that it caters for any possible delay within a tender process. A gap less than one month will be included in the calculation. To drive the demand plan and improve Supply Chain Management (SCM) process and service delivery. The indicator is based on all repeatable tenders that currently has a gap at the time of reporting, i.e. the current contract had already expired and the new contract is not yet in place. Average number of days refer to calendar days (inclusive of weekends). Formula: Total number of gaps in days/ Total number of tenders with a gap of more than zero days = Average number of gaps (days) (Effectively the report should be 'blank'.) Using the gap report developed by Zubair which takes current status and projected time for completion into account. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = repeatable tenders with ≥ 150 days gap **Not fully effective** = repeatable tenders with ≥ 90 - < 150 days gap **Fully effective** = repeatable tenders with ≥ 30 - < 90 days gap **Significant performance** = repeatable tenders with gaps < 30 days gap **Outstanding performance** = zero repeatable tenders with gaps	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1%	Department: CPPPM Source document: GAP report prepared by Zubair Contact person: Maureen Whare

12	12	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Recurring Audit Findings and /or recurring root causes (number)	The extent to which the Executive Director ensures that audit findings ((Communication of audit findings (COMAFs) and Service Delivery (lived- reality / resident experience) findings) are addressed at root-cause level. Remedial and corrective actions are translated into strengthened controls, standard practices and preventative mechanisms across the respective directorate for areas of improvement (e.g. transaction, discipline, functions, controls and oversight). The indicator will be measured year-on-year during the duration of the ED's term of office/employment contract. New EDs will not be penalised for recurring findings and/or root causes prior to their appointment. **A COMAF is defined as**: Any Auditor General of South Africa (AGSA) Communication of audit finding as per the scope of the regulatory audit. **Indicator objective**: to ensure that no recurring findings or root causes arises from the AGSA audits. To ensure that all audit findings and/or root causes identified by the AGSA that fall within the Executive Director's area of responsibility are effectively addressed and resolved, preventing recurrence, demonstrating improved governance, internal controls and strengthening accountability within the directorate. **A recurring finding is defined as**: Recurring findings refer to those findings which have persisted from one year of reporting to the next or a prior year, regardless of whether it relates to the same project/indicator or a different project/indicator or same department or different department within the directorate. **Source**: Management Audit Action Plans (MAAPs), Management Report and COMAFs **Formula**: Count of the number of recurring findings and /or recurring root causes <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance**: Recurring findings and recurring root causes **Not fully effective**: N/A **Fully effective:** Zero recurring findings and/or zero recurring root causes **Significant performance:** N/A **Outstanding performance:** N/A The weighting for the indicator will be reallocated, if the ED has no recurring findings and/or recurring root causes.	New	New	Zero recurring findings and recurring root causes	AT	AT	AT	Zero recurring findings and recurring root causes	2%	Office of the City Manager Contact person: Gayle Postings Specialist Advisor
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											**15%**	
13	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Total Capital Expenditure as a percentage of Total Capital Budget less contingencies (%)	This indicator measures the extent to which budgeted capital expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Capital expenditure is all costs incurred by the municipality for acquiring, upgrading, and renewing assets such as property, equipment, plants, buildings, intangible assets, investment property or any other assets meeting the definition of assets in terms of GRAP. Less soft-locked contractual contingencies on projects and insurance contingencies. **Q1 – Q3 reporting:** Formula: (1) YTD Actual Capital Expenditure / (2) Total Budgeted Capital Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. **Q4 reporting:** Formula: (1) Actual Capital Expenditure / (2) Total Budgeted Capital Expenditure **less contingencies**. The latest approved budget is applicable. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = < 85% or >100% (non-compliance) **Not fully effective** = ≥ 85% - 89.99% **Fully effective** = 90% - 93% **Significant performance** = > 93% - 96% **Outstanding performance** = > 96%	96%	90%	90%	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	90%	4%	Directorate Finance Manager (Karen Fourie)
14	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Total Operating Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating Expenditure budget	This indicator measures the extent to which operating expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Operating Expenditure (non-capital spending) is costs which the municipality incurs through its normal operations. The latest approved budget is applicable. Less soft-locked contractual grant construction contingency provisions projects provisions related to Human Settlements directorate. Q1 – Q4 reporting; Formula: Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. Q4 reporting for Human Settlements directorate: Formula: (1) Actual Operating Expenditure / (2) Budgeted Operating Expenditure, less contingencies in the contingency provisions. The latest approved budget is applicable. Formula: Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = < 90% or > 100% (non-compliance) **Not fully effective** = ≥ 90% - ≤ 94.99% **Fully effective** = 95% - 96% **Significant performance** = ≥ 96.1% - ≤ 97% **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 97.1% - 100%	99.1%	95%	95%	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	95%	9%	Directorate Finance Manager

15	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	% of Capital Grant Funding Expenditure Spent	The purpose of the indicator is to ensure cashflow alignment, risk acceptance and strengthened governance requirements for Capital grant funded projects. **Disclaimer**: Achievement of at least 45% expenditure spent by 31 December is a non-negotiable requirement. This will include an internal November performance assessment benchmark to allow corrective action ahead of the National Treasury (NT) cut-off times. **Evidence:** Grant Performance Reports Issued by Grant Funding Department **Formula**: % of capital grant funding expenditure spent (excluding performance component of Urban Development Financing Grant (UDFG)) = Capital Grant expenditure spent/Total Capital grant allocation in budget •Q2 spent will be based on the latest available budget at 31 December. •FY spent will be based on the approved FY budget. •Grants received before Q2 will be included (grant dumps). •Grants received after Q2 will be excluded (grant dumps). **Grant dumps refer to grant allocations received that fall outside the approved DORA (Division of Revenue Act) allocation process:** • They are unplanned or irregular transfers of funds. • Unlike standard DORA allocations, which follow a structured approval and distribution framework, grant dumps are **not part of the formal budgetary or legislative process.** • They may arise from **ad hoc decisions, emergency funding, or discretionary transfers** that bypass the usual allocation mechanisms. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance**: <90% (Q4 or y/end) **or** <45% spent by 30 December (Q2) **Not fully effective**: 90% - <93% (Q4 or y/end) **or** <45% spent by 30 December (Q2) **Fully effective:** 93% - 95% (Q4 or y/end) **and** 45% spent by 30 December (Q2) **Significant performance**: >95% - 97% (Q4 or y/end) **and** 45% spent by 30 December (Q2) **Outstanding performance:** >97% (Q4 or y/end) **and** 45% spent by 30 December (Q2)	New	New	93%	N/A	45%	N/A	93%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											**45%**	
16	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Sector Prioritisation	Sector prioritisation refers to trade-offs between needed infrastructure projects, due to budgetary tensions. These trade-offs have a direct impact on service delivery and the City's future growth. To navigate these pressures responsibly, a consistent, transparent, and rigorous approach to sectoral prioritisation is essential to understand and capture the risks and consequences of decisions. This process is a critical decision-support mechanism that ensures resources are directed to projects that maintain essential City functions and supports the implementation of Council-approved strategies. All sector-based prioritisation (capital infrastructure projects) must be fully documented (codified), with all assumptions clearly stated to ensure transparency and to enable independent review. The methodology must support and enable long term strategic planning for a 10- and 15-year planning horizon. The methodology in line with CM directive must be – •practical to apply. •replicable across years and sectors; and •grounded in reliable data. It must also clearly define the criteria used to assess projects, together with the associated metrics and weightings where appropriate. Furthermore, all methodologies and prioritised project lists must be open to review by corporate assurance providers to ensure a defendable, evidence-based framework for Citywide investment decisions. The outcome of this process will be a complete and prioritised project pipeline identifying key strategic infrastructure projects to be incorporated into the 2050 Long Term Plan and the New Term of Office (NTO) Integrated Development Plan (IDP). The annual target is only applicable for the following directorates: Energy, W&S, HS, SPE, UM, UWM Evidence required based on milestones towards sector prioritisation: •26/27: Prioritisation methodology captured and approved by relevant Executive Director. PPM data. SMF. •27/28 and beyond: Methodology is applied to infrastructure projects to produce rational results. Performance Rating: **Unacceptable performance:** No prioritisation methodology (50%) **Not fully effective:** Prioritisation methodology captured but not approved by Executive Director (70%) **Fully effective:** Prioritisation methodology approved by ED is codified and is transparent, practical and replicable and presented by the Sector Lead to the ICWG (Infrastructure Coordination Working Group) (100%) **Significant performance:** Prioritisation methodology is data driven and applied to the 10-year project pipeline and produces rational results that will provide capital project options for the New Term of Office ID (120%) **Outstanding performance:** Prioritisation methodology is automated and applied to the 15-year project pipeline and results in a portfolio of prioritised projects required to meet demand up to and beyond 2040, which can be attached to the Long-Term Plan 2050 (150%)	New	New	100%	AT	AT	AT	100%	2%	Lucille Janssens (Strategic Planning, Policy and Strategy)

17	2	7. Increased supply of affordable, well located homes	Percentage progress in digitising public housing documentation at 26 housing offices [SMF Priority]	The indicator measures the scanning of all the physical house file records at the housing offices to a digital platform like a SharePoint/system. The indicator is calculated by dividing the number of housing offices successfully (100%) scanned by the total number of housing offices. Performance Rating **Unacceptable performance =** < 80% **Not fully effective =** 80% - 84.99% **Fully effective =**85% - 90% **Significant performance =** >90% - 95% **Outstanding performance =** >95% - 100%	New	New	100%	AT	AT	AT	100%	6%	Director: Public Housing
18	3	7. Increased supply of affordable, well located homes	Lease Management: Tenancy record verification survey	The indicator measures the extent to which tenant and lease records are physically verified and validated against actual occupancy through a structured tenancy verification survey, including identification and resolution of discrepancies. Performance Rating **Unacceptable performanc**e = < 80% **Not fully effective** = 80% - 84.99% **Fully effective** =85% - 90% **Significant performance** = >90% - 95% **Outstanding performance** = >95% - 100%	New	New	100%	AT	AT	AT	100%	4%	Director: Public Housing
19	4	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. A land parcel is not necessarily restricted to a singular erf but a developable parcel of land. **Note**: Land release is achieved when the Council takes a resolution to in-principle release the land for affordable development. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 5 **Not fully effective** = 6 - 7 **Fully effective** = 8 **Significant performance** = 9 - 10 **Outstanding performance** = > 11	1	8	8	AT	AT	AT	8	5%	Director: Human Settlements Planning
20	5	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** = < 2 088 **Not fully effective** = 2 089 - 2 199 **Fully effective** = 2 200 - 2 310 **Significant performanc**e = 2 311 - 2 425 **Outstanding performance** = > 2 426	2 310	2 110	2 200	257	737	1 409	2 200	5%	Director: Housing Development
21	6	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** = < 3 038 **Not fully effective performance** = 3 039 - 3 199 **Fully effective** = 3 200 - 3 360 **Significant performance** = 3 361 - 3 528 **Outstanding performance** = >3 529	873	2 700	3 200	0	1 000	2 000	3 200	5%	Director: Housing Development

22	7	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** = < 14ha **Not fully effective performance** = 15ha - 15.99ha **Fully effective** = 16ha - 16.99ha **Significant performance** = 17ha - 17.99ha **Outstanding performance** = > 18ha	69	16	16	AT	AT	AT	16	7%	Director: Human Settlements Planning
23	8	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** = < 2 278 **Not fully effective performance** = 2 399 - 2 279 **Fully effective** = 2 400 - 2 520 **Significant performance** = 2 521 - 2 647 **Outstanding performance** = > 2 648	2 264	2 675	2 400	350	600	1 200	2 400	6%	Director: Housing Development
24	9	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 =** < 2 278 **Not fully effective performance =** 2 399 - 2 279 **Fully effective =** 2 400 - 2 520 **Significant performance =** 2 521 - 2 647 **Outstanding performance =** > 2 648	354	2 000	2 400	100	800	1 200	2 400	5%	Director: Informal Settlements
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**20%**	
25	1	1. Increased Jobs and Investment in the Cape Town economy 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. Technical work is required to inform policy choices. This indicator measures the progress of the technical work to inform the Affordable Housing Policy. Performance rating **Unacceptable performance =** Progress report on technical work not submitted **Not fully effective =** Progress report on technical work submitted **Fully effective =** Technical work completed. **Significant performance =** Workshop held with City leadership, on the technical work to inform final policy decisions for the draft Affordable Housing Policy. **Outstanding performance =** Policy is approved by PC for public participation.	Initiation of technical work to inform policy complete	Progress report on technical work submitted	Technical work completed.	AT	AT	AT	Technical work completed.	2%	Director: Human Settlements Planning
26	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	A 15-year Informal Settlements Pipeline Dashboard City Manager Delivery System (CM-DS) Initiatives	This indicator will measure the development of a 15-year Informal Settlements Project Pipeline and Dashboard. The 15 year project pipeline will classify informal settlements according to the following three pipelines: 1) IS requiring access to emergency basic services ; 2) IS to be upgraded ; 3) IS where urban management interventions are required. Projects will be prioritised according to classification and timeline for pipeline 2. A draft Dashboard will be developed, highlighting the classification and progression of informal settlements in the pipeline. Performance Rating: **Unacceptable performance =** 15 year pipeline not operational **Not fully effective =** 15 year pipeline operational, but not linked with the Stage Gate process **Fully effective =** 15 year upgrading pipeline operational and linked with the Stage Gate process **Significant performance =** Review of 15 year pipeline commenced based on LUM 2050 **Outstanding performance =** Review of 15 year pipeline finalised based on LUM 2050	New	Draft Dashboard completed, showing the draft pipeline prioritised projects	15 year pipeline operational, and linked with Stage Gate process.	AT	AT	AT	15 year pipeline operational, and linked with Stage Gate process.	2%	Director: Informal Settlements
27	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	The development of a transversal Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) of service standards for the City's various informal settlement development pathways. City Manager Delivery System (CM-DS) Initiatives	This indicator will measure the submission for approval of a transversal SOP outlining the service standards for the City's various informal settlement development pathways. Its purpose is to: • Define the roles and responsibilities of the Human Settlements, Water & Sanitation, Urban Management, Energy, Urban Waste Management, Spatial Planning & Environment and Urban Mobility Directorates within the organisation. • Ensure that service standards for each development pathway (upgrading typology) are understood and confirmed across the organisation. Performance rating **Unacceptable performance** = Draft SOP only. **Not fully effective** = Review of SOP completed and supported by the Human Settlements Directorate for onward submission. **Fully effective** = Submission of the SOP to City Manager for Approval **Significant performance** = Approved SOP **Outstanding performance** = Roll-out of training of operational staff in applicable departments on the new SOP	New	Review of SOP completed and supported by the Human Settlements Directorate for onward submission.	Submission of the SOP to City Manager for Approval.	AT	AT	AT	Submission of the SOP to City Manager for Approval.	2%	Director: Informal Settlements

28	4	2. Improved access to quality and reliable basic services Less Formal Township Establishment Act (LFTEA) areas	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	117	600	600	150	200	400	600	5%	Director: Human Settlements Planning
29	5	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government Unlawful Land Occupation (ULO)	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 tabled at PCC **Not fully effective =** First draft of the ULO Framework circulated for review to relevant line departments **Fully effective =** Final Draft of the ULO Framework complete **Significant performance =** ULO Framework submitted to the City Manager for approval. **Outstanding performance =** Approved ULO Framework	New	First draft circulated for review to relevant line departments	Final Draft of the ULO Framework	AT	AT	AT	Final Draft of the ULO Framework	2%	Director: Informal Settlements
30	6	7. Increased supply of affordable, well located homes	Asset Improvement Plan: Review Completion	Measures the extent to which the review of the 2020 Asset Management Improvement Plan (AIP) is completed, approved, and ready for implementation, including verification of asset condition data. Performance Rating **Unacceptable performance =** Review of the Asset Improvement Plan not initiated **Not fully effective =** Review of the Asset Improvement Plan initiated **Fully effective =** First draft of the reviewed Asset Improvement Plan complete **Significant performance =** Review of the Asset Improvement Plan complete **Outstanding performance =** Approved Asset Improvement Plan	New	New	First Draft Asset Improvement Plan Complete	AT	AT	AT	First Draft Asset Improvement Plan Complete	2%	Director: Public Housing
31	7	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Number of stakeholder management engagements	The total number of structured and officially coordinated engagements conducted with identified stakeholders to support programme implementation, coordination, and public awareness. These engagements include both sector partner interactions and consumer education initiatives. The purpose of these engagements are to strengthen collaboration with sector stakeholders and enhance community awareness and understanding of Human Settlements programmes, services, and processes. **- Sector Partners**: Government departments (national, provincial, and local), Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and Other relevant sector stakeholders. **- Consumer Education/Community Engagements**: Sub-council roadshows, Awareness campaigns and outreach sessions, Community meetings or imbizos and Information-sharing workshops Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance =** < 36 **Not fully effective =** 37 - 39 **Fully effective =** 40 - 42 **Significant performance =** 43 - 45 **Outstanding performance =** > 46	New	New	40	15	33	38	40	3%	Manager: Communication and Customer Services
32	8	7. Increased supply of affordable, well located homes	Number of township establishments completed	The total number of Human Settlements township establishments that have been fully completed within the reporting period, where all statutory, administrative and regulatory processes required to legally establish a township have been finalised and approved by the relevant authority. The purpose of this indicator is to measure progress in formalising land for human settlements development, enabling the provision of secure tenure, infrastructure development and planned urban growth. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance =** < 0 **Not fully effective =** 1 **Fully effective =** 2 (no ranges) **Significant performance =** 3 **Outstanding performance =** > 4	New	New	2	AT	AT	AT	2	1%	Director: Housing Development Director: Informal Settlements

33	9	8. Safer, better-quality homes in informal settlements and backyards over time	Number of Enumeration Surveys completed in Informal Settlements	The number of designated informal settlements within the municipal area enumerated. Enumeration includes the collection of household level data of informal settlement residents, as well as the levels and status of services in the settlement. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance =** < 1 **Not fully effective =** 2 **Fully effective =** 3 (no ranges) **Significant performance =** 4 **Outstanding performance =** > 5	New	New	3	AT	AT	AT	3	1%	Director: Informal Settlements

Nolwandle Gqiba Digitally signed by Nolwandle Gqiba
Date: 2026.07.10 13:53:41 +02'00'

Executive Director

Nolwandle Gqiba

Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo
Date: 2026.07.31 07:47:56 +02'00'

City Manager

Lungelo Mbandazayo