2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
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											50%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											20%	
												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 2. A score of below 3.1based on the previoys year's baseline Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = decrease of ≥ 0.21 **Not fully effective** = decrease of 0.1 - 0.2 or increase to 2.99 **Fully effective** = maintain 3.0 or increase to 3.0 from existing maturity level **Significant performance** = increase of 0.11 - 0.2 above a baseline score of 3.0 **Outstanding performance** = increase of ≥ 0.21 above a baseline score of 3.0	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 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 **Fully effective** = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 **Significant performance** = increase of 0.21 - 0.3 **Outstanding performance** = increase of ≥ 0.31	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 9207

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
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											**50%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**20%**	
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 expity, esuring 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 tenders 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% - 2.5% **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	-100%	20%	20%	AT	AT	AT	20%	2%	Department: SCM Source document: SCM deviations schedule Formula: Number of SCM deviations reduced by the target percentage % year on year for the department/ directorate. Contact person: Gayle Postings Office of the City Manager: Specialist Advisor 021 400 1268

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
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											50%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											20%	
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% **Fully effective** = 0.75% **Significant performance** = < 0.75% - > 0% **Outstanding performance** = 0%	New	New	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%	n/a	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	Department: Investor Relations Source document: Completed Audit Action plan Contact person: Lynn Fortune:021 400 5987

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
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											50%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											20%	
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%	91.79%	95%	95%	Planned Spend on SAP vs Budget	Planned Spend on SAP vs Budget	Planned Spend on SAP vs Budget	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%	95%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	2%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mothibi

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
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											**50%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**20%**	
11	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 **Not fully effective** = 80% - 84.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Fully effective** =85% - 99.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Significant performance** =100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Outstanding performance** =100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 and at least one replacement/ graduation to the CSC Exception rule: If an ED included less than 100% of the Output indicators (verbatim), however graduated at least one indicator, they will receive a default rating of Significant performance.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Department: Organisational Performance Management (OPM) Source document: C88 scorecard and Directorate SDBIP Contact person: Monique Fillies - Manager: City Performance Management 021 400 9024
12	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%	12%	≤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

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
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											**50%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**20%**	
13	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. 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	949	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 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. 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%	99.20%	90%	90%	10%	20%	55%	90%	5%	Directorate Finance Manager
15	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. 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%	96.34%	95%	95%	20%	50%	70%	95%	3%	Directorate Finance Manager

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
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											50%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											20%	
16	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. Performance rating: **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											50%	
17	1	5. Effective law enforcement to make communities safer	5.A Drone flights used for safety and security activities (number)	Mearures the drone flights used for approved safety and security activities through utilisation of partnerships and contracts, in which the drone technology offers enhanced situational awareness and evidence gathering in order to the benefit of community safety. Seasonal (weather) constraints as well as the unknown nature of S&S operations will dictate different quarterly utilisation statistics. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = ≤989 **Not fully effective** = 990 - 999 **Fully effective** = 1000 - 1100 **Significant performance** = 1101 - 1200 **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 1201	2 835	2 490	1 000	200	500	800	1 000	8%	Manager: EPIC Andrew Mortimer
18	2	5. Effective law enforcement to make communities safer	5.B Roadblocks focussed on drinking and driving offences (number)	Measures the number of roadblocks held with the focus on addressing drinking and driving offences of motorists. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance = ≤ 664** **Not fully effective = 665 - 699** **Fully effective = 700 - 735** **Significant performance = 736 - 772** **Outstanding performance = ≥ 773**	860	676	700	175	350	425	700	8%	Deputy Chief: Traffic Services Pamela Mkosi
19	3	5. Effective law enforcement to make communities safer	5.C Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) detected incidents relayed to responders	Measures the number of incidents detected on CCTV that were relayed to responders. CCTV incidents monitored by the two CCTV Centres require a response in order to deal with an incident. All incidents that require a response must be relayed to the relevant departments that can deal with the incident accordingly i.e Crime, Traffic, By Law, Fire, other. The number of incidents detected and relayed / passed on to responders for attention. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance = < 33 332** **Not fully effective = 33 332 - 34 999** **Fully effective = 35 000 - 36 750** **Significant performance = 36 751 - 38 588** **Outstanding performance = ≥ 38 589**	43 457	45000	35000	8750	17500	26250	35000	8%	Director: Metro Police Barry Schuller
20	4	6. Strengthen partnerships for safer communities	6.A New auxiliary law enforcement volunteers recruited (number)	Measures the number of new auxilliary law enforcement volunteers recruited. Volunteers includes law enforcement and support officers, in terms of the City's Auxilliary Law Enforcement Policy. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance = ≤140** **Not fully effective = 141 - 149** **Fully effective = 150 - 157** **Significant performance = 158 - 165** **Outstanding performance = > 165**	218	120	150	0	0	0	150	7%	Deputy Chief: Law Enforcement Johannes Brand

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
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											50%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											20%	
21	5	6. Strengthen partnerships for safer communities	6.B Client satisfaction survey for neighbourhood watch support programme (%)	Measures the percentage client satisfaction achieved, by means of a survey after every community engagement, in respect of the main deliverables of the neighbourhood watch support programme i.e. (a) Crime prevention training, (b) Patrol and crime prevention equipment issued, (c) Guidance provided in respect of Department of Community Safety (DoCS) accreditation, and (d) Guidance provided in respect of crime prevention initiatives. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance = ≤ 84.99%** **Not fully effective = 85 - 95.99%** **Fully effective = 96 - 96.99%** **Significant performance = 97- 99.99%** **Outstanding performance = 100%**	96.55%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	7%	Manager: Support Services Anton Visser
22	6	14. A Resilient City	14.B New Disaster Risk Management volunteers recruited (number)	Measures the number of disaster risk management volunteer members recruited from the community and appointed after appropriate training, officialy appointed as volunteers. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance = ≤ 59** **Not fully effective = 60 - 64** **Fully effective = 65 - 70** **Significant performance = 71 - 76** **Outstanding performance = ≥ 77**	124	60	65	0	0	0	65	7%	Manager: Disaster Risk Management Johan Minnie
23	7	6. Strengthen partnerships for safer communities	% of resolved service requests registered on the integrated Emergency Policing Incident Command (EPIC) system in the CBD	Measures the response rate of service requests registered on the integrated EPIC system, which manages the redeployment of operation departments (Traffic Services, Law Enforcement and Metro Police) in the CBD combatting crime on a 24 hour basis. Formula: Numerator: The number of resolved service requests registered on the integrated EPIC system. Denominator: The number of service requests registered on the integrated EPIC system Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance = ≤ 69%** **Not fully effective = 70 - 79.99%** **Fully effective = 80 - 85%** **Significant performance = 85.1% - 90%** **Outstanding performance = ≥ 91%**	97%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	5%	Manager: EPIC Andrew Mortimer
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											20%	
22	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government CM request	**Staff housing population verified, per directorate (%)** • Water and Sanitation; • Spatial Planning and Environment; • Energy; • Urban Mobility; • Safety and Security; and • Community Services and Health.	Measures the percentage of Staff Housing population verified by confirming occupancy, operational need, and conditions as per the approved allocation list, as compiled by the Directorate coordinators to ensure validity, accuracy and completeness by conducting an annual site visits to confirm staff occupancy for operational purposes. The approved list must include the following: • Property occupancy – Staff member occupying property by conducting a site visit. • Operational need - staff member and staff number confirmed on SAP. • Lease agreement in place (number and tenure). • Rental value. • Fringe benefit registration, confirmed with Payroll. Closed out status- where all the above conditions are met. Formula: Numerator: All staff housing verified (with a closed out status) Denominator: All staff housing Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance = < 50%** **Not fully effective = 50 - 89%** **Fully effective = 90% - 95%** **Significant performance = > 95% - 99.99%** **Outstanding = 100%**	100%	100%	100%	60%	75%	90%	100%	4%	HR Business Partner Althea Daniels

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
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											50%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											20%	
23	2	SMF/COVID-19	Number of law enforcement interventions in the CBD for reducing crime	This indicator measures the number of law enforcement interventions in the Cape Town Central Business District. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance = ≤ 950** **Not fully effective = 951 - 999** **Fully effective = 1000 - 1050** **Significant performance = >1051 - 1103** **Outstanding = ≥ 1104**	2 078	840	1 000	250	500	750	1 000	4%	Deputy Chief: Law Enforcement Johannes Brand
24	3	Unlawful Land Occupation (ULO)	Dispatch responsiveness to land invasions within 10 minutes (percentage)	On receipt of a service request, relating to land invasion, the Anti-Land Invasion Unit, will promptly dispatch its members within 10 minutes of receiving such request. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance = < 80%** **Not fully effective = 80% - 89%** **Fully effective = 90 - 93%** **Significant performance = 94 - 97%** **Outstanding = ≥ 98%**	92.33%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	4%	Commissioner: Operational Coordination Petrus Robberts
25	4	Less Formal Township Establishment Act (LFTEA) areas	14.A Public safety awareness and preparedness sessions held in communities (number)	Measures the number of public and safety awareness sessions with communities based on various risk profiles, community-based risk assessments and social media contact. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance = ≤ 449** **Not fully effective = 450 - 549** **Fully effective = 550 - 577** **Significant performance = 578 - 606** **Outstanding = ≥ 607**	616	500	550	125	250	375	550	4%	Manager: Disaster Risk Management Johan Minnie
26	5	City Manager Delivery System (CM-DS) Initiatives	Incident-free Safety and Security escort service assignments	The indicator measures the completion of both pre-booked or emergency escort services provided by the Safety and Security policing agencies where no incidents were encountered and reported during the course of the escort. Formula: Incident-free escort service rate = Number of incident-free escort service assignments / Total number of escort service assignments provided x 100 (measurement is cumulative) Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance = <86%** **Not fully effective = 86% - 89%** **Fully effective = 90% - 93%** **Significant performance = >93% - 96%** **Outstanding = >96%**	New	New	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	4%	Commissioner: Operational Coordination Petrus Robberts

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	Annual Target	Q1 Target	Q2 Target	Q3 Target	Q4 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
					2023/2024	2024/2025	2025/2026	30-Sept-25	31-Dec-25	31-Mar-26	30-Jun-26		
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											50%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											20%	

Executive Director Digitally signed by Vincent Botto Date: 2025.07.16 11:12:01 +02'00' **Date**

City Manager
Lungelo Mbandazayo
Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo Date: 2025.07.31 09:41:46 +02'00' **Date**