2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

CM73613A

	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											**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	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. <u>Performance rating:</u> **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.	1.79%	5%	5%	AT	AT	AT	5%	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: CMRS (Contract Register and Monitoring System) and Tender Tracking System Contact person: Maureen Whare 069 367 4023
2	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduction in the number of SCM deviations (%)	The objective is to achieve a 20% reduction on SCM deviations. The indicator only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R750 000 (inclusive of VAT). Sole/single service provider deviations, deviations relating to emergencies and unforeseen situations (at this time being – anti-corruption investigations and extortion management, with associated human life threats (threat to limb and life) will be excluded from the measurement as per section 36 of SCM regulations. Target = reduction of 20% Formula: (Number of SCM deviations for current year – Number of SCM deviations for prior year)/ Number of SCM deviations for prior year X 100" Exception protocols: A default performance rating of fully effective will be awarded if you have 2 or less deviations from a base of 2 or less <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = Any positive increase in the number of deviations, year-on-year **Not fully effective** = a reduction > 0% - < 19.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. **Fully effective** = a reduction of 20% - 21%, for the number of deviations (year-on-year), or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol) **Significant performance** = a reduction > 21% - < 99.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. **Outstanding performance** = a reduction of 100% for the number of deviations, year-on-year or no deviations for the current year.	100%	20%	20%	AT	AT	AT	20%	2%	Department: SCM Source document: SCM deviations schedule Formula: Number of SCM deviations reduced by the target percentage % year on year for the department/ directorate. Contact person: Gayle Postings Office of the City Manager: Specialist Advisor 021 400 1268
3	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Irregular, Fruitless and Wasteful, Unauthorised** Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating and Capital Expenditure	The indicator measures the extent to which the municipality has incurred irregular, fruitless and wasteful and unauthorised expenditure on its total budget (operating and capital budget). Fruitless and wasteful expenditure is expenditure that was made in vain and would have been avoided had reasonable care been exercised. Irregular expenditure is incurred by the municipality in contravention of a requirement of the law (specific legislation, per MFMA legislation). Unauthorized expenditure includes overspending of the total amount appropriated in the approved budget. The net amount after recoveries, write offs or condonement should be used in this calculation. The Q4 final figure is obtained from the Pre-audited AFS. Irregular expenditure will be included, if identified by other assurance providers, irrespective if it is self-disclosed or not. Formula: Per Directorate incidents value as a percentage of Directorate Opex and Capex ((1) Irregular + (2) Fruitless and Wasteful + (3) Unauthorised Expenditure) / (4) Total Operating and Capital Expenditure x 100 Note: New Executive Director or Executive Director taking up a post in another directorate as an Executive Director (in the year of review) will be measured on the UIFW Expenditure incidents for the current year, where the incident is in the term of appointment as Executive Director. This also applies if an existing ED moves to another directorate, the ED will be regarded as "New" I.e. previous UIFW expenditure incidents not in the term of employment of the ED will not be measured. <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

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	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											**10%**	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											**50%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**20%**	
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%	n/a	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	Department: Investor Relations Source document: Completed Audit Action plan Contact person: Lynn Joshua :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% - 99.99% 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. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = < 90% **Not fully effective** = 90% - 94.99% **Fully effective** = 95% - 96% **Significant performance** = 96.1% - 97.99% **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 98%	102.35%	95%	95%	Per the KOI schedule	Per the KOI schedule	Per the KOI schedule	95%	2%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	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											**10%**	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											**50%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**20%**	
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) <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = < 75% **Not fully effective** = 75% - 84.99% **Fully effective** = 85% - 90% **Significant performance** = > 90% - 94.99% **Outstanding performance**= ≥ 95%	97%	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.	3.1	N/A	3.0	AT	AT	AT	3.0	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 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 <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = < 80% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Not fully effective** = 80% - 84.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Fully effective =85% - 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: Adila Aboo - Manager: City Performance Management 021 400 9024

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	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											**10%**	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											**50%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**20%**	
10	**10**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Tenders in slippage at any given quarter end (%)	Measures tenders for MTREF in slippage at any given quarter end. This will drive the timeous implementation of the demand plan based on the agreed timeline. Abnormalities in the timeline will then impact each step of the process, such as where a tender only allows 30 days after award to Contract Required by Date (CRD), there will probably be a contract gap or a Value At Risk (VAR – Budget at risk of not being spent) on the Capital reporting. Slippage is defined as tenders on the demand plan which are behind schedule based on the agreed timelines for each tender. Slippage in the implementation of the demand plan, is a contributor to the cause of VAR. This will include the submission of draft specifications as per the minimum timeframe before the CRD. Measurement: The indicator is measured on a quarterly basis (non-cumulative), as such any recoveries are considered. The annual performance is based on the tenders in slippage as at the 4th quarter. ED's are able to recover if there are tenders in slippage throughout the year. There are processes in place to remedy tenders that are in amber or red. Formula: Total count of tenders in red or amber as a percentage of the total number of tenders required for the MTREF period (%) (non-cumulative). <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = > 15% **Not fully effective** = > 10% - ≤ 15% **Fully effective** = ≤ 10% **Significant performance** = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9% **Outstanding performance** = < 5%	6%	≤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. <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	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 **Performance rating:** 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

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	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											**10%**	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											**50%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**20%**	
	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%	99.67%	90%	90%	10%	20%	55%	90%	5%	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. 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%	95.39%	95%	95%	20%	50%	70%	95%	3%	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. Evidence: Grant Extracts.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 31 December (Q2) Not fully effective: 90% - <93% (Q4 or y/end) or <45% spent by 31 December (Q2) Fully effective: 93% - 95% (Q4 or y/end) and 45% spent by 31 December (Q2) Significant performance: >95% - 97% (Q4 or y/end) and 45% spent by 31 December (Q2) Outstanding performance: >97% (Q4 or y/end) and 45% spent by 31 December (Q2)	New	New	93%	N/A	45%	N/A	93%	2%	Grant Funding Department

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	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											**10%**	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											**50%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**20%**	
	SERVICE DELIVERY / GOOD GOVERNANCE											**50%**	
16	**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** = ≤ 3329 **Not fully effective** = 3330 - 3499 **Fully effective** = 3500 - 3675 **Significant performance** = 3676 - 3860 **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 3861	3 653	3 250	3 500	750	1 800	2 750	3 500	7%	Manager: EPIC Andrew Mortimer
17	**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 - 773 **Outstanding performance** = >773	854	700	700	175	350	425	700	7%	Deputy Chief: Traffic Services Pamela Mkosi
18	**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** = < 37 999 **Not fully effective** = 38 000 - 39 999 **Fully effective** = 40 000 - 42 000 **Significant performance** = 42 001 - 44 101 **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 44 102	58 392	35 000	40 000	10 000	20 000	30 000	40 000	7%	Director: Metro Police Barry Schuller
19	**4**	6. Strengthen partnerships for safer communities	6.A New auxilliary 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 - 166 **Outstanding performance** = > 166	146	150	150	0	0	0	150	6%	Deputy Chief: Law Enforcement Johannes Brand
20	**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%	100.00%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	6%	Manager: Support Services Anton Visser

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	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											**10%**	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											**50%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**20%**	
21	**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** = ≤ 64 **Not fully effective** = 65 - 69 **Fully effective** = 70 - 77 **Significant performance** = 78 - 83 **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 84	107	65	70	0	0	0	70	7%	Manager: Disaster Risk Management Johan Minnie
22	**7**	Increased Jobs and Investment in the Cape Town economy	Number of new major events	Attracting and hosting new major events that will attract visitors to the City. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = ≤ 0 **Not fully effective** = 1 **Fully effective** = 2 - 4 **Significant performance** = 5 - 7 **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 8	5	1	2	0	1	2	2	5%	Manager: Events Leonora Desouza-Zilwa
23	**8**	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%	95%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	5%	Manager: EPIC Andrew Mortimer
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**20%**	
23	**1**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government CM request	**Operational** Staff housing population verified, per directorate (%)	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. • Visual Assessments undertaken at the beginning of the lease period. Closed out status- where all the above conditions are met. Exclusions Housing under litigation. Affected Directorates: • Water and Sanitation • Spatial Planning and Environment • Energy • Urban Mobility • Safety and Security • Community Services and Health. **Milestones:** Q1 – 60% Site Visits Completed Q2 – 75% SAP Confirmation Q3 – 90% Lease Agreement Confirmed Q4 – 100% Fringe Benefits Confirmed Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 50% **Not fully effective** = 50 - 99% **Fully effective** = 100% **Significant performance** = N/A **Outstanding** = N/A	100%	100%	100%	60%	75%	90%	100%	1%	Corporate Services Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	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											**10%**	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											**50%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**20%**	
24	**2**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government CM request	**Non-Operational** Staff housing population disposal plan developed, per directorate (%)	Measures the percentage completion of a disposal plan for Non-Operational Staff Housing. Including confirming occupancy, operational status, and conditions (through visual assessments) as per the approved asset list, as compiled by the Directorate coordinators to ensure validity, accuracy and completeness. Each Directorate thus needs to determine the details of the disposal plan, given the many factors such as location, condition of the building and CoCT longer term plans. The Disposal plan must include the following: • Plan for disposal/re-use • Property Valuations • Property occupancy – Staff member occupying property by conducting a site visit. • Status Verification: Operational need determined. • Lease agreement in place (number and tenure). • Rental value. • Visual Assessments undertaken. Closed out status- where all the above conditions are met. **Exclusions** Housing under litigation (eviction and legal proceedings). **Affected Directorates:** • Water and Sanitation • Spatial Planning and Environment • Energy • Urban Mobility • Safety and Security • Community Services and Health. **Performance Rating**: Unacceptable performance: < 50% Not fully effective: 50 - 99% Fully effective: 100% Significant performance: N/A Outstanding: N/A	New	New	100%	60%	75%	90%	100%	1%	Corporate Services Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851
25	**3**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government CM request	Revenue generated from traffic fines (Business Improvement initiatives)	Measures the total revenue received from traffic fines during the reporting period, as recorded in SAP. This project contributes to the indicator through improved traffic fine payment recovery. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance:** N/A **Not fully effective** = <R361 610 781 **Fully effective** = R361 610 781 (19% (Baseline + 1.0%) **Significant performance** = R372 896 026 (19.5% (Baseline + 1.5%) **Outstanding** = R384 181 271 (20%(Baseline + 2.0%)	New	New	R361 610 781	AT	AT	AT	R361 610 781	1%	Future Planning and Resilience Manager Christopher Bosman
26	**4**	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** = ≤ 1044 **Not fully effective** = 1045 - 1099 **Fully effective** = 1100 - 1155 **Significant performance** = >1156 - 1214 **Outstanding** = ≥ 1215	3 165	1 000	1 100	275	550	827	1 100	4%	Deputy Chief: Law Enforcement Johannes Brand
27	**5**	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%	99.38%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	4%	Commissioner: Operational Coordination

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Vincent Botto
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	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											**10%**	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											**50%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**20%**	
28	**6**	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 - 607 **Outstanding** = > 607	582	500	550	135	280	415	550	5%	Manager: Disaster Risk Management Johan Minnie
29	**7**	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	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	4%	Commissioner: Operational Coordination

Executive Director

Vincent Botto

Digitally signed by Vincent Botto
Date: 2026.07.09 06:54:47 +02'00'

Date

City Manager
Lungelo Mbandazayo

Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo
Date: 2026.07.31 07:46:51 +02'00'

Date