PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD

2017/2018 Individual Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Craig Kesson
1 July 2017-30 June 2018

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Baseline as at 30 June 2017	Proposed Annual Target 2017/18	Quarter 1 30 Sep 2017 Target	Quarter 2 31 Dec 2017 Target	Quarter 3 31 Mar 2018 Target	Quarter 4 30 Jun 2018 Target	WEIGHTING	RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT
LEADERSHIP									**15%**	
TRANSVERSAL MANAGEMENT									**20%**	
MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION									**15%**	
MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY									**20%**	
SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE									**15%**	
SPECIAL PROJECTS									**15%**	
									100%	
			LEADERSHIP						**15%**	
1	Shared Values	Value scorecard (360 degree feedback)	New	Positive score outcome	N/A	N/A	N/A	Positive score outcome	5%	ED
2	Employee Engagement	Percentage feedback communication sent to the directorate	New	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	ED
3		Results of engagement surveys	New	Positive survey outcome	N/A	N/A	N/A	Positive survey outcome	1%	ED
4	Leading change	Delivery against Leadership Competencies	New	Positive survey outcome	N/A	N/A	N/A	Positive survey outcome	3%	ED
5	Customer centricity	Community satisfaction survey (Score 1 - 5) - city wide	Actual as at 30 June 2017	2.9	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.9	5%	ED
			TRANSVERSAL MANAGEMENT						**20%**	
6	Transversal Management	Work Group Activity plan developed and Annual Implementation report to Mayco	Actual as at 30 June 2017	Annual report to MAYCO on the implementation of Green Economy Energy and Climate Change Activity Plane	Green Economy Energy and Climate Change Activity Plan developed and submitted to oversight committee	N/A	N/A	Annual report to MAYCO on the implementation of Green Economy Energy and Climate Change Activity Plan	5%	Directorate of the Mayor
7		Percentage of work group activity plan milestones delivered	Actual as at 30 June 2017	90%	N/A	N/A	N/A	90%	10%	Directorate of the Mayor
8		Percentage implementation and incorporation of approved policies, by-laws and corporate SOPs	Actual as at 30 June 2017	100%	Approved policies, by-laws and corporate SOPs are assessed to determine if they are applicable to directorate business	Work plan developed for implementation and incorporation into departmental operations and business processes	100% adherence to identified quarterly work plan milestones	100% adherence to identified quarterly work plan milestones	5%	Directorate of the Mayor
			MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION						**15%**	
			MANAGEMENT INDICATORS						**7%**	
9	4.3 Building Integrated Communities	Percentage adherence to equal or more than 2% of complement for persons with disabilities (PWD)	Actual as at 30 June 2017	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%	Corporate Services
10		Percentage adherence to EE target in all appointments (internal & external)	Actual as at 30 June 2017	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	2%	Corporate Services
11	5.1 Operational Sustainability	Percentage of absenteeism	Actual as at 30 June 2017	≤5%	≤5%	≤5%	≤5%	≤5%	2%	Corporate Services
12		Percentage vacancy rate	Actual as at 30 June 2017	≤7%	≤7%	≤7%	≤7%	≤7%	1%	Corporate Services
13		Percentage of Probity functions recommendations implemented	Actual as at 30 June 2017	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	1%	Probity

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Baseline as at 30 June 2017	Proposed Annual Target 2017/18	Quarter 1 30 Sep 2017 Target	Quarter 2 31 Dec 2017 Target	Quarter 3 31 Mar 2018 Target	Quarter 4 30 Jun 2018 Target	WEIGHTING	RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT
		CORPORATE SCORECARD INDICATORS							**8%**	
14	3.1 Excellence in basic services	3.A Community satisfaction survey (Score 1-5) City Wide	Actual as at 30 June 2017	2.9	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.9	2%	Directorate of the Mayor
15	4.3 Building Integrated Communities	4.E Percentage of people from employment equity target groups employed in the three highest levels of management in compliance with the City's approved employment equity plan (EE)	Actual as at 30 June 2017	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	3%	Directorate of the Mayor
16	5.1 Operational Sustainability	5.B Opinion of the Auditor General	Actual as at 30 June 2017	Clean audit	Submission of Performance report for 2015/2016	Clean audit for 2016/17	N/A	N/A	3%	Directorate of the Mayor
		MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY							**20%**	
17	5.1 Operational Sustainability	Percentage of projects screened in SAP PPM	Actual as at 30 June 2017	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	4%	Organisational Planning and Policy
18		Percentage of 2017/18 PM comments completed in SAP PPM	Actual as at 30 June 2017	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	4%	Organisational Planning and Policy
19		Percentage spend of capital budget	Actual as at 30 June 2017	90%	20%	42%	65%	90%	5%	Directorate Finance Manager
20		Percentage spend on repairs and maintenance	Actual as at 30 June 2017	95%	22%	46%	70%	95%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager
21		Percentage of operating budget spent	Actual as at 30 June 2017	95%	18%	44%	72%	95%	3%	Directorate Finance Manager
22		Percentage of assets verified	Actual as at 30 June 2017	100%	N/A	N/A	60%	100%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager
		SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE							**15%**	
23	5.1 Operational Sustainability	Percentage of staff and councillors trained in values integration (100%)	New	100%	20%	50%	70%	100%	4%	Director: Org Effectiveness and Innovation
24		Percentage completion of development of a framework for evidence based analysis	New	100%	30%	50%	80%	100%	4%	Director: Organisational Policy and Planning
25		Innovation Project: Number of innovation forums held per year	New	8	2	4	6	8	4%	Director: Org Effectiveness and Innovation
26		Percentage of Probity activities completed (audit engagements, investigations, risk registers, completed lodged cases)	New	100%	25%	55%	75%	100%	3%	Portfolio Manager: Probity
		SPECIAL PROJECTS							**15%**	
27	5.1 Operational Sustainability	% Completion of ODTP 2	Actual as at 30 June 2016	100%		100%			15%	ED

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Baseline as at 30 June 2017	Proposed Annual Target	Quarter 1 30 Sep 2017	Quarter 2 31 Dec 2017	Quarter 3 31 Mar 2018	Quarter 4 30 Jun 2018	WEIGHTING	RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT
				2017/18	Target	Target	Target	Target		

Executive Director
Craig Kesson

30.06.2017

City Manager
Achmat Ebrahim

P. de Lille.

Executive Mayor
Patricia de Lille

2017/2018 Individual Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Craig Kesson
1 July 2017-30 June 2018

PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition/explanation	WEIGHTING	RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT
LEADERSHIP				**15%**	
TRANSVERSAL MANAGEMENT				**20%**	
MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION				**15%**	
MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY				**20%**	
SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE				**15%**	
SPECIAL PROJECTS				**15%**	
		LEADERSHIP		**15%**	
1	Shared Values	Value scorecard (360 degree feedback)	Shared values will be measured by means of a survey.	5%	Directorate of the Mayor
2	Employee Engagement	Percentage feedback communication sent to the directorate	Communicate the salient points from the directors' meetings to the directorate.	1%	Directorate of the Mayor
3		Results of engagement surveys	Results from an employee engagement survey.	1%	Directorate of the Mayor
4	Leading change	Delivery against Leadership Competencies	Leadership competencies will be measured by means of a survey.	3%	Directorate of the Mayor
5	Customer centricity	Community satisfaction survey (Score 1 - 5) - city wide	A statistically valid, scientifically defensible score from the annual survey of residents of perceptions of the overall performance of the services provided by the City of Cape Town. The measure is given against the non-symmetrical Likert scale ranging from : 1 being poor; 2 being fair; 3 being good; 4 being very good and 5 excellent. The objective is to improve the current customer satisfaction level.	5%	Directorate of the Mayor

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition/explanation	WEIGHTING	RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT
		TRANSVERSAL MANAGEMENT		**20%**	
6	Transversal Management	Work Group Activity plan developed and Annual Implementation report to Mayco	Work group activity: Integrated activity plan informed by transversal strategies relevant to the work group eg. IHSF, EGS ect Annual Implementation report: Transversal report on the strategic outcomes of the city	5%	Directorate of the Mayor
7		Percentage of work group activity plan milestones delivered	Percentage of transversal work group activities delivered	10%	Directorate of the Mayor
8		Percentage implementation and incorporation of approved policies, by-laws and corporate SOPs	On approval, policies, by-laws and corporate SOPs are assessed to determine if they are applicable to directorate business, and implemented and incorporated into departmental operations and business processes	5%	Directorate of the Mayor
		MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION		**16%**	
		MANAGEMENT INDICATORS		**8%**	
9	4.3 Building Integrated Communities	Percentage adherence to equal or more than 2% of complement for persons with disabilities (PWD)	This indicator measures :The disability plan target: This measures the percentage of disabled staff employed at a point in time against the target of 2%. This category forms part of the `Percentage adherence to EE target', but is indicated separately for focused EE purpose. This indicator measures the percentage of people with disabilities employed at a point in time against the staff complement e.g staff complement of 100 target is 2% which equals to 2	1%	Corporate Services
10		Percentage adherence to EE target in all appointments (internal & external)	Formula: Number of EE appointments (external, internal and disabled appointments) / Total number of posts filled (external, internal and disabled) This indicator measures: 1. External appointments -The number of external appointments across all directorates over the preceding 12 month period. The following job categories are excluded from this measurement: Councillors, students, apprentices, contractors and non-employees. This will be calculated as a percentage based on the general EE target.2. Internal appointments -The number of internal appointments, promotions and advancements over the preceding 12 month period. This will be calculated as a percentage based on the general EE target.3. Disabled appointments -The number of people with disabilities employed at a point in time. This excludes foreigners, but includes SA White males with disabilities. Note: If no appointments were made in the period preceding 12 months, the target will be 0%.	2%	Corporate Services

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition/explanation	WEIGHTING	RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT
11	5.1 Operational Sustainability	Percentage of absenteeism	A: Actual number of days absent due to sick and unpaid/unauthorised leave in the directorate or department. B: ((number of working days for month) * number of staff members))*100%. Formula: C= (A1 + A2/B) * 100 A1: Sick Leave: Extract "All Absences" report from SAP Portal (Corporate Reporting / Human Resources / Time Management / All Absences) and enter the total number of absent days for sick leave. Enter the number of employees who took sick leave in the comments column A2: Unpaid/ Unauthorised leave: Extract "All Absences" report from SAP Portal (Corporate Reporting / Human Resources / All Absences) and enter the total number of absent days as per the "Unpaid" column of the report (authorised and unauthorised is separated). Enter the number of employees who took "unpaid" leave in the comments column B: Total number of staff X Total number of working days for the month The Target will be 5% or less for the rolling 12 month period.	2%	Corporate Services
12		Percentage vacancy rate	This is measured as a percentage of positions vacant against the total positions on structure. This indicator will be measured at a specific point in time to calculate the vacancy rate. The target is a vacancy rate of 7% or less.	2%	Corporate Services
13		Percentage of Probity functions recommendations implemented	The indicator will measure the percentage of recommendations implemented by the directorate the Executive Director is responsible for. Probity includes Internal Audit, Ombudsman, Risk Management, Business Continuity, Combined Assurance, Ethics and Forensics functions.	1%	Probity
		CORPORATE SCORECARD INDICATORS		**8%**	
14	3.1 Excellence in basic services	3.A Community satisfaction survey (Score 1-5) City Wide	A statistically valid, scientifically defensible score from the annual survey of residents of perceptions of the overall performance of the services provided by the City of Cape Town. The measure is given against the non-symmetrical Likert scale ranging from : 1 being poor; 2 being fair; 3 being good; 4 being very good and 5 excellent. The objective is to improve the current customer satisfaction level.	2%	Directorate of the Mayor

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition/explanation	WEIGHTING	RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT
15	4.3 Building Integrated Communities	4.E Percentage of people from employment equity target groups employed in the three highest levels of management in compliance with the City's approved employment equity plan (EE)	The indicator measures the percentage of people from employment equity target groups employed in the three highest levels of management in compliance with the City's approved employment equity plan. Each directorate contributes to the corporate achievement of targets and goals by implementing its own objectives of quantitative and qualitative goal setting. Level 1 – Executive Directors Level 2 – Portfolio managers and Directors Level 3 - Managers Proxy measure for NKPI.	3%	Directorate of the Mayor
16	5.1 Operational Sustainability	5.B Opinion of the Auditor General	The indicator measures good governance and accounting practices and will be evaluated and considered by the Auditor-General in determining his opinion. An unqualified audit opinion refers to the position where the auditor, having completed his audit, has no reservation as to the fairness of presentation of financial statements and their conformity with General Recognised Accounting Practice. This is referred to as 'clean audit'. Alternatively, in relation to a qualified audit opinion, the auditor would issue this opinion in whole, or in part, over the financial statement if these are not prepared in accordance with General Recognised Accounting Practice, or could not audit one or more areas of the financial statements. Future audit opinions will cover the audit of predetermined objectives.	3%	Directorate of the Mayor
		MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY		**20%**	
17		Percentage of projects screened in SAP PPM	Projects Screened in SAP PPM for the budget (95%) – per budget cycle for the current fiscal year and next fiscal year, measured at adjustment budget stage and at draft budget stages. Measurement: Metrics extracted from SAP PPM from budget submissions. Screening includes: - Screening Questionnaire - Implementation Complexity Questionnaire - Strategic Themes Questionnaire - GIS Location Mapping	4%	Organisational Planning and Policy
18		Percentage of 2017/18 PM comments completed in SAP PPM	Monthly PM Comments completion (95%) – aggregated quarterly and quarterly values averaged for the yearly statistic. Measurement: Metrics extracted from SAP PPM on a monthly basis.	4%	Organisational Planning and Policy
19		Percentage spend of capital budget	Percentage reflecting year to date spend / Total budget less any contingent liabilities relating to the capital budget. The total budget is the council approved adjusted budget at the time of the measurement. Contingent liabilities are only identified at the year end.	5%	Directorate Finance Manager

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition/explanation	WEIGHTING	RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT
20	5.1 Operational Sustainability	Percentage spend on repairs and maintenance	Percentage reflecting year to date spend (including secondary cost) / total repairs and maintenance budget Note that the in-year reporting during the financial year will be indicated as a trend (year to date spend). Maintenance is defined as the actions required for an asset to achieve its expected useful life. Planned Maintenance includes asset inspection and measures to prevent known failure modes and can be time or condition-based. Repairs are actions undertaken to restore an asset to its previous condition after failure or damage. Expenses on maintenance and repairs are considered operational expenditure. Primary repairs and maintenance cost refers to Repairs and Maintenance expenditure incurred for labour and materials paid to outside suppliers. Secondary repairs and maintenance cost refers to Repairs and Maintenance expenditure incurred for labour provided In-house / internally.	2%	Directorate Finance Manager
21		Percentage of operating budget spent	Formula: Total actual to date as a percentage of the total budget including secondary expenditure.	3%	Directorate Finance Manager
22		Percentage of assets verified	The indicator reflects the percentage of assets verified annually for audit assurance. Quarter one will be the review of the Asset Policy, In Quarter two, the timetable in terms of commencing and finishing times for the process is to be communicated, and will be completed. Both Quarters will only be performed by Corporate Finance. The asset register is an internal data source being the Quix system scanning all assets and uploading them against the SAP data files. Data is downloaded at specific times and is the bases for the assessment of progress. Q1=N/A for ALL other department, except Corporate Finance (responsible) Q1= 25% Corporate Finance Q2= N/A for ALL other department, except Corporate Finance (responsible) Q2= 50% Corporate Finance Q3= 75% represent that 60% of the assets have been verified by the directorate/ department Q4= 100% represents All assets have been verified.	2%	Directorate Finance Manager

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition/explanation	WEIGHTING	RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT
		SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE		**15%**	
23	5.1 Operational Sustainability	Percentage of staff and councillors trained in values integration (100%)	Percentage of staff and councillors who have attended values integration sessions which include inter alia workshops and programmes as well as industrial theatre interventions.	4%	Director: Org Effectiveness and Innovation
24		Percentage completion of development of a framework for evidence based analysis	The indicator reflects the percentage progress towards the completion of a framework for evidence based analysis aligned to City processes and will be used as an input into City processes. This will include a review of City evidence needs, the data, analysis, tools and repositories available; a gap analysis and the development of a framework for evidence-based analysis; integrated and transversal information to inform strategic decision-making and planning. Q1= 30% - review of evidence needs and data Q2= 50% - review of analysis, tools and repositories Q3= 80% - gap analysis, draft framework for evidence based analysis prepared Q4= 100% - framework for evidence based analysis completed	4%	Director: Organisational Policy and Planning
25		Innovation Project: Number of innovation forums held per year	This indicator measures the number of innovation forums held per year. This will be evidence by 4 x Innovation Forum outcomes reports.	4%	Director: Org Effectiveness and Innovation
26		Percentage of Probity activities completed (audit engagements, investigations, risk registers, completed lodged cases)	This indicator measures the percentage per quarter of the completed number of audit engagements, investigations, risk registers, completed lodged cases / (divided by) annual target of the completed number of audit engagements, investigations, risk registers, completed lodged cases for the year (173+80+210+500=963). Forensics Ethics and Integrity: 173 Internal Audit: 80 Integrated Risk Management: 210 Ombudsman: 500 - authorised forensic and ethics cases investigated and reported on by Forensic, Ethics and Integrity (Cumulative) - actual final reports issued as completed (on a cumulative basis) as per the approved risk based Internal Audit plan. - risk registers completed (signed off) on level 1, 2 and 3 of the organization structure for which Integrated Risk Management did workshops. - cases lodged with the Ombudsman completed This will be an annual target which will be monitored on a quarterly basis; Q1- 25% Q2 - 55% Q3 - 75% Q4 - 100%	3%	Probity

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition/explanation	WEIGHTING	RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT
	SPECIAL PROJECTS			**15%**	
27	5.1 Operational Sustainability	% completion of ODTP 2	Conclusion of ODTP Phase 2 meaning that ED's would have implemented or in the process of finalising the following:- • Approval of new structure - evidence is structures signed by the CM – Director: HR to provide evidence. • Populating of new structure with existing staff – evidence is placement letters – Director: HR to provide evidence • Vacancies and new positions must be advertised – evidence is advertisement - Manager Strategic Staffing: Yolanda Scholtz to provide evidence. • Restructuring completed for all levels (all staff moved to correct positions and mapping completed)	15%	ED

Executive Director
Craig Kesson

City Manager
Achmat Ebrahim

30.06.2012

P. de Lille

Executive Mayor
Patricia de Lille

2017/2018 Individual Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Craig Kesson
1 July 2017-30 June 2018

CORE MANAGEMENT COMPETENCIES
ANNEXURE C

Core Competency Requirements	Core Managerial Competencies	Competency Definitions	Weighting	Quarter 1 30 Sep 2017	Quarter 2 31 Dec 2017	Quarter 3 31 Mar 2018	Quarter 4 30 Jun 2018	Rating ED	Rating Panel
	Moral Competence	Able to identify moral triggers, apply reasoning that promotes honesty and integrity and consistently display behaviour that reflects moral competence.	20%						
	Planning and Organising	Able to plan, prioritise and organise information and resources effectively to ensure the quality of service delivery and built efficient contingency plans to manage risk.	20%						
	Analysis and Innovation	Able to critically analyse information, challenges and trends to establish and implement fact-based solutions that are innovative to improve institutional processes in order to achieve key strategic objectives.	10%						
	Knowledge and Information Management	Able to promote the generation and sharing of knowledge and information through various processes and media, in order to enhance the collective knowledge base of local government.	20%						
	Communication	Able to share information, knowledge and ideas in a clear, focused and concise manner appropriate for the audience in order to effectively convey, persuade and influence stakeholders to achieve the desired outcome.	10%						
	Results and Quality Focus	Able to maintain high quality standards, focus on achieving results and objectives while consistently striving to exceed expectations and encourage others to meet quality standards. Further, to actively monitor and measure results and quality against identified outcomes.	20%						

Executive Director
Craig Kesson

31/05/17
Date

City Manager
Achmat Ebrahim

30.06.2017
Date

P. de Lille.
Executive Mayor
Patricia de Lille

Date