**2017/2018 Individual Performance Scorecard**
**Executive Director: G Kaiser**
**1 July 2017-30 June 2018**

PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD

| 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** | | | | | | | | | **28%** | |
| **MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY** | | | | | | | | | **20%** | |
| **SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE** | | | | | | | | | **2%** | |
| **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% | EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR |
| 2 | Employee Engagement | Percentage feedback communication sent to the directorate | New | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 1% | EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR |
| 3 | | Results of engagement surveys | New | Positive survey outcome | N/A | N/A | N/A | Positive survey outcome | 1% | EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR |
| 4 | Leading change | Delivery against Leadership Competencies | New | Positive survey outcome | N/A | N/A | N/A | Positive survey outcome | 3% | EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR |
| 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% | EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR |
| | | | | **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 Sustainable Communities Activity Plan as well as the Green Economy Energy and Climate Change Activity Plan | Work group activity plan (and/or TOR) to be developed and submitted to oversight committee by end Sept 2017 To include: - Submission of Sustainable Communities Activity Plan - Submission of Green Economy Energy and Climate Change Activity Plan | N/A | N/A | Annual report to MAYCO on the implementation of Sustainable Communities Activity Plan as well as the Green Economy Energy and Climate Change Activity Plan | 5% | EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR |
| 7 | | Percentage of work group activity plan milestones delivered | Actual as at 30 June 2017 | 90% | N/A | N/A | N/A | 90% | 10% | EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR |
| 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% | EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR |
| | | | | **MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION** | | | | | **28%** | |
| | | | | **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% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| 10 | | Percentage adherence to EE target in all appointments (internal & external) | Actual as at 30 June 2017 | 85% | 85% | 85% | 85% | 85% | 2% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| 11 | 5.1 Operational Sustainability | Percentage of absenteeism | Actual as at 30 June 2017 | ≤5% | ≤5% | ≤5% | ≤5% | ≤5% | 2% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| 12 | | Percentage vacancy rate | Actual as at 30 June 2017 | ≤7% | ≤7% | ≤7% | ≤7% | ≤7% | 1% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| 13 | | Percentage of Probity functions recommendations implemented | Actual as at 30 June 2017 | 75% | 75% | 75% | 75% | 75% | 1% | All Depts in ISWWS |

**2017/2018 Individual Performance Scorecard**
**Executive Director: G Kaiser**
**1 July 2017-30 June 2018**

PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD

| 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 | | |
| | CORPORATE SCORECARD INDICATORS | | | | | | | | 21% | |
| 14 | 1.4. Resource efficiency and security | 1.H Percentage compliance with drinking water quality standards | Actual as at 30 June 2017 | 98% | 98% | 98% | 98% | 98% | 4% | Water & Sanitation |
| 15 | 3.1 Excellence in Basic Service delivery | 3.B Number of outstanding valid applications for water services expressed as a percentage of total number of billings for the service | Actual as at 30 June 2017 | < 0.7% | < 0.7% | < 0.7% | < 0.7% | < 0.7% | 2% | Water & Sanitation |
| 16 | 3.1 Excellence in Basic Service delivery | 3.C Number of outstanding valid applications for sewerage services expressed as a percentage of total number of billings for the service | Actual as at 30 June 2017 | < 0.7% | < 0.7% | < 0.7% | < 0.7% | < 0.7% | 2% | Water & Sanitation |
| 17 | 3.1 Excellence in Basic Service delivery | 3.E Number of outstanding valid applications for refuse collection service expressed as a percentage of total number of billings for the service | Actual as at 30 June 2017 | < 0.6% | < 0.6% | < 0.6% | < 0.6% | < 0.6% | 3% | Solid Waste Management |
| 18 | 3.2. Mainstreaming basic service delivery to informal settlements and backyard dwellers | 3.I Percentage of informal settlements receiving a door-to-door refuse collection service | Actual as at 30 June 2017 | 99% | 99% | 99% | 99% | 99% | 6% | Solid Waste Management |
| 19 | 3.2. Mainstreaming basic service delivery to informal settlements and backyard dwellers | 3.H Number of sanitation service points (toilets) provided to informal settlements | Actual as at 30 June 2017 | 2 800 | 100 | 500 | 1 600 | 2 800 | 2% | Informal Settlements & Backyarders |
| 20 | 3.2. Mainstreaming basic service delivery to informal settlements and backyard dwellers | 3.G Number of water services points (taps) provided to informal settlements | Actual as at 30 June 2017 | 600 | 50 | 120 | 300 | 600 | 2% | Informal Settlements & Backyarders |

**2017/2018 Individual Performance Scorecard**
**Executive Director: G Kaiser**
**1 July 2017-30 June 2018**

PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY** | | | | | **20%** | |
| 21 | 5.1 Operational Sustainability | Percentage of projects screened in SAP PPM | Actual as at 30 June 2017 | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 4% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| 22 | 5.1 Operational Sustainability | Percentage of 2017/18 PM comments completed in SAP PPM | Actual as at 30 June 2017 | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 95% | 4% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| 23 | 5.1 Operational Sustainability | Percentage spend of capital budget | Actual as at 30 June 2017 | 90% | ISWWS Projected Cash flow/Total Budget | ISWWS Projected Cash flow/Total Budget | ISWWS Projected Cash flow/Total Budget | 90% | 5% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| 24 | 5.1 Operational Sustainability | Percentage spend on repairs and maintenance | Actual as at 30 June 2017 | 95% | ISWWS Projected Cash flow/Total Budget | ISWWS Projected Cash flow/Total Budget | ISWWS Projected Cash flow/Total Budget | 95% | 2% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| 25 | 5.1 Operational Sustainability | Percentage of operating budget spent | Actual as at 30 June 2017 | 95% | ISWWS Projected Cash flow/Total Budget | ISWWS Projected Cash flow/Total Budget | ISWWS Projected Cash flow/Total Budget | 95% | 3% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| 26 | 5.1 Operational Sustainability | Percentage of assets verified | Actual as at 30 June 2017 | 100% | N/A | N/A | 60% | 100% | 2% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| | | | | **SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE** | | | | | **2%** | |
| 27 | 3.1 Excellence in basic service delivery | Percentage adherence to Citywide service requests | New | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 1% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| 28 | 1.3 Economic inclusion | Number of Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP) opportunities created | 100% | SWM = 10 000<br>IS = 4138<br>W&S = 2 100<br>Total = 16 238 | SWM =2 000<br>IS = 828<br>W&S =300<br>Total = 3 128 | SWM = 4 500<br>IS = 2 069<br>W&S =600<br>Total = 7 169 | SWM =5 000<br>IS = 3 104<br>W&S = 1 200<br>Total = 9 304 | SWM = 10 000<br>IS = 4138<br>W&S = 2 100<br>Total = 16 238 | 1% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| | | | | **SPECIAL PROJECTS** | | | | | **15%** | |
| 29 | 5.1 Operational Sustainability | % Completion of ODTP 2 | Actual as at 30 June 2016 | 100% | N/A | 100% | N/A | N/A | 15% | EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR |

**Executive Director**
Gisela Kaiser

**City Manager**
Achmat Ebrahim

30.06.2017

**Mayoral Committee Member**
Xanthea Limberg

**2017/2018 Individual Performance Scorecard**
**Executive Director: G Kaiser**
**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** | | | | **28%** | |
| **MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY** | | | | **20%** | |
| **SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE** | | | | **2%** | |
| **SPECIAL PROJECTS** | | | | **15%** | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | **LEADERSHIP** | **15%** | |
| 1 | Shared Values | Value scorecard (360 degree feedback) | Shared values will be measured by means of a survey. | 5% | ED |
| 2 | Employee Engagement | Percentage feedback communication sent to the directorate | Communicate the salient points from the directors' meetings to the directorate. E.g. Directorate of the Mayor: Update from the Office of the Executive Director | 1% | ED |
| 3 | | Results of engagement surveys | Results from an employee engagement survey. | 1% | ED |
| 4 | Leading change | Delivery against Leadership Competencies | Leadership competencies will be measured by means of a survey. | 3% | ED |
| 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.<br><br>The measure is given against the non-symmetrical Likert scale ranging from :<br>1 being poor; 2 being fair; 3 being good; 4 being very good and 5 excellent.<br><br>The objective is to improve the current customer satisfaction level. | 5% | ED |
| | | | **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<br>Annual Implementation report: Transversal report on the strategic outcomes of the city | 5% | ED |
| 7 | | Percentage of work group activity plan milestones delivered | Percentage of transversal work group activities delivered | 10% | ED |
| 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% | ED |
| | | | **MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION** | **28%** | |
| | | | **MANAGEMENT INDICATORS** | **7%** | |
| 9 | 4.3 Building Integrated Communities | Percentage adherence to the EE target (disabled) | This indicator measures:<br>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% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| 10 | | Percentage adherence to the EE target (directorate) | 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% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| 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.<br><br>B: ((number of working days for month) * number of staff members))*100%.<br><br>Formula:<br>C= (A1 + A2/B) * 100<br><br>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<br><br>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<br><br>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% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| 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. | 1% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| 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.<br><br>Probity includes Internal Audit, Ombudsman, Risk Management, Business Continuity, Combined Assurance, Ethics and Forensics functions. | 1% | All Depts in ISWWS |

**2017/2018 Individual Performance Scorecard**
**Executive Director: G Kaiser**
**1 July 2017-30 June 2018**

PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD

| No. | Objective | Key Performance Indicator | Definition/explanation | WEIGHTING | RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **CORPORATE SCORECARD INDICATORS** | **21%** | |
| 14 | 1.4. Resource efficiency and security | 1.H Percentage compliance with drinking water quality standards | Measures the potable water sample pass rate according to the SANS 241 standard. | 4% | Water & Sanitation |
| 15 | 3.1 Excellence in Basic Service delivery | 3.B Number of outstanding valid applications for water services expressed as a percentage of total number of billings for the service | This indicator reflects the number of outstanding valid applications (down-payments received) for water services (where valid applications translate into an active account), expressed as a percentage of total number of active billings for the service. Billing equates to active contract accounts (water services) for domestic customers, as extracted from the City's SAP database.<br><br>Proxy measure for NKPI. | 2% | Water & Sanitation |
| 16 | 3.1 Excellence in Basic Service delivery | 3.C Number of outstanding valid applications for sewerage services expressed as a percentage of total number of billings for the service | This indicator reflects the number of outstanding valid applications (down-payments received) for sewerage services (where valid applications translate into an active account), expressed as a percentage of total number of active billings for the service. Billing equates to active contract accounts (sewerage services) for domestic customers, as extracted from the City's SAP database.<br><br>Proxy measure for NKPI. | 2% | Water & Sanitation |
| 17 | 3.1 Excellence in Basic Service delivery | 3.E Number of outstanding valid applications for refuse collection service expressed as a percentage of total number of billings for the service | This indicator reflects the number of outstanding valid applications (external service requests) for new refuse collection services at the end of a reporting period, expressed as a percentage of total number of active billings for formal residential refuse collection services as at the end of the same reporting period. Billing equates to active contract accounts (formal kerb-side refuse collection services) for domestic customers, as extracted from the City's SAP database.<br><br>Proxy measure for NKPI. | 3% | Solid Waste Management |
| 18 | 3.2. Mainstreaming basic service delivery to informal settlements and backyard dwellers | 3.I Percentage of informal settlements receiving a door-to-door refuse collection service | This indicator reflects the percentage of informal settlements receiving a weekly door-to-door refuse collection service for the period under review.<br><br>The collection of domestic refuse in informal settlements is done through contract services, employing local labour. Three-year contracts are awarded to a legitimate main contractor through the procurement tender process.<br><br>Proxy measure for NKPI. | 6% | Solid Waste Management |
| 19 | 3.2. Mainstreaming basic service delivery to informal settlements and backyard dwellers | 3.H Number of sanitation service points (toilets) provided to informal settlements | This indicator reflects the number of toilets provided in informal settlements during the period under review. Some toilets may however have been vandalised or removed after provision.<br><br>Proxy measure for NKPI. | 2% | Informal Settlements & Backyarders |
| 20 | 3.2. Mainstreaming basic service delivery to informal settlements and backyard dwellers | 3.G Number of water services points (taps) provided to informal settlements | The indicator reflects the number of taps provided in informal settlements during the period under review. Some taps may however have been vandalised or removed after provision.<br><br>Proxy measure for NKPI. | 2% | Informal Settlements & Backyarders |
| | | | **MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY** | **20%** | |
| 21 | 5.1 Operational Sustainability | 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.<br><br>Measurement:<br>Metrics extracted from SAP PPM from budget submissions.<br>Screening includes:<br>- Screening Questionnaire<br>- Implementation Complexity Questionnaire<br>- Strategic Themes Questionnaire<br>- GIS Location Mapping | 4% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| 22 | | 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.<br>Measurement:<br>Metrics extracted from SAP PPM on a monthly basis. | 4% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| 23 | | 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 |
| 24 | | Percentage spend on repairs and maintenance | Percentage reflecting year to date spend (including secondary cost) / total repairs and maintenance budget<br><br>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 |
| 25 | | Percentage of operating budget spent | Formula: Total actual to date as a percentage of the total budget including secondary expenditure. | 3% | Directorate Finance Manager |
| 26 | | 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.<br><br>Q1=N/A for ALL other department, except Corporate Finance (responsible)<br>Q1= 25% Corporate Finance<br>Q2= N/A for ALL other department, except Corporate Finance (responsible)<br>Q2= 50% Corporate Finance<br>Q3= 75% represent that 60% of the assets have been verified by the directorate/ department<br>Q4= 100% represents All assets have been verified. | 2% | Directorate Finance Manager |

**2017/2018 Individual Performance Scorecard**
**Executive Director: G Kaiser**
**1 July 2017-30 June 2018**

PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD

| No. | Objective | Key Performance Indicator | Definition/explanation | WEIGHTING | RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENT |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE** | **2%** | |
| 27 | 3.1 Excellence in basic service delivery | Percentage adherence to Citywide service requests | Measure the percentage adherence to Citywide service standard based on all external notifications. | 1% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| 28 | 1.3 Economic inclusion | Number of Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP) opportunities created | Refers to paid work created for an individual on an EPWP project for any period of time, within the employment conditions of the Code of Good Practice for the Expanded Public Works Programmes. | 1% | All Depts in ISWWS |
| | | | **SPECIAL PROJECTS** | **15%** | |
| 29 | 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:-<br><br>• Approval of new structure - evidence is structures signed by the CM – Director: HR to provide evidence.<br>• Populating of new structure with existing staff – evidence is placement letters – Director: HR to provide evidence<br>• Vacancies and new positions must be advertised – evidence is advertisement - Manager Strategic Staffing: Yolanda Scholtz to provide evidence.<br>• Restructuring completed for all levels (all staff moved to correct positions and mapping completed) | 15% | ED |

**Executive Director**
Gisela Kaiser

**City Manager**
Achmat Ebrahim

**Mayoral Committee Member**
Xanthea Limberg

**2017/2018 Individual Performance Scorecard**
**Executive Director: Gisela Kaiser**
**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**
Gisela Kaiser

**Date**

30 . 06 . 2017
**City Manager**
Achmat Ebrahim

**Date**

22/6/2017
**Mayoral Committee Member**
Xanthea Limberg

**Date**