2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard Template
Executive Director: Rob McGaffin
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	Annual Target	Q1 30 Sep 2024	Q 2 31 Dec 2024	Q 3 31 Mar 2025	Q4 30 Jun 2025	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
					2022/2023	2023/2024	2024/2025	Target	Target	Target	Target		
				MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION								**20%**	
1	1	Transversal Management	Increase in CPPM maturity level (Average)	The CPPPM maturity level is based on the PPPM, Contract Management and Engineering Management (Only applicable to Engineering Directorates) maturity assessment. The maturity assessment will reflect the average maturity level of: - 1. Portfolio, Programme, Project - 2. Contract management and - 3. Engineering Management level. This will occur on an annual basis in order to assess the increase in the maturity level for the Directorate. The maturity level is measured on a scale of 1 - 5. The maturity levels: * Level 1 – Initial Process: No standard process or tracking system – informal process * Level 2 – Repeatable Process: Minimum standards for processes and procedures * Level 3 – Defined Process: Defined Process which allow for flexibility * Level 4 – Managed Process: Obtain and retain specific measurements and quality requirements * Level 5 – Optimised Process: Continuous process improvement and proactive technology and problem management for future improvements The ED for Finance will be measured on a City-wide maturity level. All other EDs will be measured per the individual directorate. 1. A score of 2.89 and below based on the 2023/2024 baseline: Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.11 and above Not fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.1 Fully effective = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 Significant performance = increase of 0.21 - 0.3 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.31 and above 2. A score of 2.9 and above based on the 2023/2024 baseline: Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.21 and above Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 - 0.2 Fully effective = increase of 0.0 - 0.1 Significant performance = increase of 0.11 - 0.2 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥0.21	2.75%	2.94%	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	AT	AT	AT	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: PPM assessment Contact person: Ben Peters 021 400 9206
2	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Repeatable Tenders that were Expanded/Amended multiple times (%)	Measures the percentage of Expansions and Amendments on repeatable tenders. This indicator will only measure instances where there was more than one Expansion and/or Amendment on the same tender. Expansions or Amendments are defined by the SCM section 116 (3) guide and can change at any time. **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 contracts tenders expanded and/ or amended multiple times ÷ Total number of repeatable contract active in the FY. Measured cumulatively. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = ≥ 3.1% Not fully effective= range between 2.6% – 3% Fully effective = range between 2% - 2.5% Significant performance = range between 0.1% - 1.99% Outstanding performance = 0%	0%	2%	2%	AT	AT	AT	2%	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: CMRS (Contract Register and Monitoring System) and Tender Tracking System Contact person: Maureen Whare 069 367 4023
3	3	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. July – December 2023 - The indicator only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R200 000 (inclusive of VAT). 01 January – 30 June 2024 - The indicator only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R750 000 (inclusive of VAT). Sole/single service provider deviations, anti-corruption deviations and deviations relating to emergencies will be excluded from the measurement as per section 36 of SCM regulations. The indicator will measure the percentage year on year reduction from the previous year's. Target = reduction of 20% Formula: (No. of SCM deviations for current year – No of SCM deviations for prior year)/ Number of SCM deviations for prior year X 100" Exception protocols: A default performance rating of fully effective will be awarded if you have 2 or less deviations from a base of 2 or less Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = Any positive increase in the number of deviations, year-on-year Not fully effective = a reduction > 0% - < 19.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. Fully effective = a reduction of 20%, for the number of deviations (year-on-year), or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol) Significant performance = a reduction > 20% - < 99.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. Outstanding performance = 0 deviations	100% (0 SCM deviations)	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: Abu Bakr Moerat SCM: Head of Supplier Management and Administration 021 400 3007
4	4	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduction in the number and value of irregular expenditure identified for the Directorate (year-on-year) (average %)	The objective is to reduce past on irregular expenditure by 10% and limit irregular expenditure.. The indicator will measure the average percentage reduction in the number and value of irregular expenditure i.e. contravention of legislation as defined in the MFMA irregular expenditure definition and maintain lower levels of irregular expenditure. Irregular expenditure is defined as expenditure that is in contravention of, or not in accordance with, a requirement of the Local Government: Municipal Finance Management Act 56 of 2003, the Local Government: Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000, the Remuneration of Public Office Bearers Act 20 of 1998, or the municipality's supply chain management (SCM) policy. Indicator will measure Irregular expenditure that was incurred (transaction) during the time of employment of the Executive Director (in the position as Executive Director). This also applies if an Existing ED moves to another portfolio. i.e. previous irregular expenditure wont impact the new Executive Director. NOTES: a. Irregular expenditure will be included, if identified by other assurance provider, irrespective if it is self-disclosed or not. b. New Executive Directors will be impacted by existing contracts that incur irregular expenditure in the term of their office. If the existing contract had irregular expenditure in the period before ED's appointment, it will not be considered for the new EDs performance. 1. New Executive Director or Executive Director taking up a post in another directorate as an Executive Director (in the year of review) Formula: Number of non-compliance incidents (irregular expenditure) for the current year, while employed as Executive Director and the amount of irregular expenditure, while employed as an Executive Director. (No baseline) This also applies if an existing ED moves to another directorate, the ED will be regarded as "New" I.e. previous irregular expenditure will not be carried over. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = where more than 2 incidents exist or the total amount is more than R2.5 million, starting from a baseline of zero. Not fully effective = N/A Fully effective = 2 or less incidents and the total amount is less than R2.5 million. Significant performance = N/A Outstanding performance = 0 incidents 2. Executive Director with baseline information Formula: 1) Non-compliance incidents incurred for the current year – Non-compliance incidents incurred for prior year / Non-compliance incidents incurred for prior year x 100% Target = reduction of 10% 2) Irregular expenditure amount incurred for the current year – Irregular expenditure amount incurred for the prior year)/ Irregular expenditure amount incurred for the prior year X 100" Target = reduction of 10% Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = Any positive increase in incidents or amount > R2.5 million, year-on-year Not fully effective = a reduction > 0% - < 9.9%, for incidents and amounts, year-on-year. Fully effective = a reduction of 10% or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol) Significant performance = a reduction > 10% - < 99.9%, for incidents and amount year-on-year. Outstanding performance = 0 incidents Exception protocols applicable to New Executive Directors and Executive Directors with baseline data: A default rating will apply (fully effective), if you have a zero baseline - provided that the default criteria is achieved, anything more will be unacceptable performance. A default criteria rating of fully effective will be awarded if you have 2 or less incidents and the total amount is less than R2.5 million.	99%	50%	50%	AT	AT	AT	50%	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

5	5	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	External audit (Auditor General) audit actions completed as per audit action plan (%)	This indicator measures how many actions was completed in the financial cycle within in the unique deadline set, as per the audit action plan. The Audit Action Plan sets out the total number audit actions required to address the internal control deficiencies as identified by the Auditor-General in their management report. The unique deadline is set in consultation with the relevant ED. Completed would mean that the actions as stipulated in the audit action plan has been executed by the relevant delegated authority. Should there be no actions required for a Directorate the indicator will be 'Not Applicable'. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = N/A Not fully effective = < 99.99% Fully effective = N/A Significant performance = N/A Outstanding =100%	N/A (0 audit actions received for attention)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	Department: Investor Relations Source document: Completed Audit Action plan Contact person: Lynn Fortune:021 400 5987
6	6	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Final council and Mayco decisions implemented within timeframes (%)	The indicator excludes all council and Mayco decisions for noting. Decisions taken by council and Mayco where there is no budget to implement actions or outside of the control of the ED. These exclusions must be supported by valid evidence. These decisions must be reflected on each quarterly report for the City Manager and/or panel's awareness. All final Council and Mayco decisions allocated to the ED with implementation date for the quarter must be implemented and reported on for the quarter to achieve the target. Implementation that runs over a period longer than a financial year will be measured according to milestones identified for implementation within the current financial year. Each ED must ensure that a date is allocated of when action will be completed and implemented. This must be captured in the CDIT system by the relevant implementer. If no timeframe was allocated the timeframe is deemed to be one month for implementation. Implementation is the date of completion of the actions or achievement of councils request or expectation. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 69% of ALL decisions Not fully effective = range between 69% - 79.99% of ALL decisions Fully effective = range between 80% - 85% of ALL decisions Significant performance = range between 85.1% - 94.99% of ALL decisions Outstanding performance = ≥ 95% of ALL decisions If "Not Applicable"-weighting will be "zero" and must be reallocated it within the Transversal Category.	97,50%	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) **Weighting must be reallocated where there were no council decisions for the year.**
7	7	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 Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 90% Not fully effective = range between 90% - 94.99% Fully effective = range between 95% - 96% Significant performance = range between 96.1% - 97.99% Outstanding performance = ≥ 98%	95,22%	90%	90%	10%	30%	60%	95%	1%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851
8	8	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Internal independent assurance provider's functions 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 Corporate Risk Register), Ethics and Forensics departments. Each internal independent assurance provider as mentioned above has their own unique input to this KPI. This KPI will be "not applicable" to management when there are no recommendations, thus only those that could provide inputs will be included in the calculation. Future recommendations and action plans implemented (not recommended for implementation for the current financial year), will be taken into account for the measurement of this indicator, thereby creating an advantage for the ED. Formula: Numerator: Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans implemented (current and future implementations) Denominator: Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans made for the current period under review (recommendations and actions plans postponed as approved by the City Manager will be excluded) Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 75% Not fully effective = range between 75% - 84.99% Fully effective = range between 85% - 90% Significant performance = range between 91% to 94% Outstanding performance= ≥ 95%	100%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	1%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mothibi
9	9	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.A Community satisfaction city-wide survey(average)	Measures the average score on the Community satisfaction City-wide survey. A statistically valid, scientifically defensible 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. Refer to the 'Survey - Levels & Baselines' tab. 1. A score of 2.9 and below based on the 2023/2024 survey outcome: Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.11 Not fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.1 Fully effective = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 Significantly performance = increase of 0.21 - 0.3 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.31 2. A score of 3 and above based on the 2023/2024 survey outcome: Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.21 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 – 0.2 Fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) - increase of 0.1 Significant performance = increase of 0.11 - 0.2 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.21	2,8%	2,9	Actual averaged score for 2023/2024 per ED + 0.1	A/T	A/T	A/T	Actual averaged score for 2023/2024 per ED + 0.1	2%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: Community Satisfaction survey score Contact person: Brigette Morris 021 400 3812
10	10	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Increase in City Pulse	The City Pulse survey measures the organisational culture and aims to improve employee experience at the City. The measure is given against a non-symmetrical Likert scale, measured biennial. The measurement for the 2024/25 will be based on the ED's lowest scoring pillar: Organisational Pillar in 2022/2023. Refer to the 'City Pulse baselines' tab. 1. A score of 3.4 and below based on the 2022/2023 baseline: Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.2 Not fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.19 Fully effective = increase of 0.1 - 0.19 Significantly performance = increase of 0.2 - 0.29 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.3 2. A score of 3.5 and above based on the 2022/2023 baseline: Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.2 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 - 0.19 Fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) - increase of 0.1 Significantly performance = increase of between 0.11 and 0.2 Outstanding performance = increase of > 0.2	3,3	N/A	Actual score of the lowest scoring pillar for 2022/2023 per ED + 0.1	AT	AT	AT	Actual score of the lowest scoring pillar for 2022/2023 per ED + 0.1	1%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: City Pulse 2021 Results and City Pulse 2019 results with the 3 questions identified in the attachment Contact person: Monica Pregnolato 021 400 9221

11	11	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Inclusion of C88 **output** indicators (%)(average)	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 review process and no mid-year adjustments will be taken into account. Measurement: Q1 Weighting must be reallocated where there the ED has no Output indicators. Note: Indicators that have barriers and challenges are excluded from the formula. The indicator will measure two aspects: 1) The inclusion of C88 Output indicators in the Directorate SDBIP, and 2) The inclusion of C88 Output indicators on the Corporate Scorecard (CSC) (graduating), whether replacing existing CSC indicators. 1) Formula: Inclusion in the directorate SDBIP - Total number of Tier 1& 2 Output indicators included in the directorate SDBIP divided by Tier 1 & 2 indicators required for inclusion as per C88 (auditable) * 100 2) Formula: Replacement and/ or inclusion of C88 Output indicators on the CSC - Total number of Tier 1& 2 indicators graduated on the CSC divided by Total number of Tier 1& 2 indicators graduated on the CSC * 100 Average: (Formula 1 + Formula 2) divided by 2 Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 80% inclusion of Tier 1&2 Not fully effective = 80% - 84.99% inclusion of Tier 1&2 Fully effective =85% - 89.99% inclusion of Tier 1&2 Significant performance = 90% - 99% inclusion of Tier 1&2 Outstanding performance =100% inclusion of Tier 1&2	New	100%	100%	A/T (YTD progress)	A/T (YTD progress)	A/T (YTD progress)	100%	1%	Department: Organisational Performance Management (OPM) Source document: C88 scorecard/ **Directorate** SDBIP Contact person: Monique Fillies - Manager: City Performance Management 021 400 9024
12	12	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Average of tenders in slippage at any given quarter end (%)	Measures the average of 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. Formula: Total count of tenders in red or amber as a percentage of the total number of tenders required for the MTREF period (average %). Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = > 15% Not fully effective = > 10% - ≤ 15% Fully effective = ≤ 10% Significant performance = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9% Outstanding performance = < 5%	New	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	1%	Department: Supply Chain Management Source document: Demand Plan Overview Contact person: Bekumuzi Vumase - Manager Demand Management
13	13	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. This indicator is based on all repeatable tenders that currently has a gap at the time of reporting i.e. the current contract had expired and the new contract is not yet in place. Average number of days refer to calendar days (inclusive of weekends). Formula: Total number of gaps in days/ Total number of tenders with a gap of more than zero days = Average number of gaps (days) (Effectively the report should be 'blank'.) Using the gap report developed by Zubair which takes current status and projected time for completion into account. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = repeatable tenders with ≥ 150 days gap Not fully effective = repeatable tenders with ≥ 90 - < 150 days gap Fully effective = repeatable tenders with ≥ 30 - < 90 days gap Significant performance = repeatable tenders with gaps < 30 days gap Outstanding performance = zero repeatable tenders with gaps	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: GAP report prepared by Zubair Contact person/s Gareth Morgan Ben Peters Zubair Adams
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											**10%**	
14	14	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 to acquire, upgrade, and renew physical assets such as property, plants, buildings, technology, or equipment. Less 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%	88%	90%	90%	18,15%	38,38%	67,65%	90%	6%	Directorate Finance Manager
15	15	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	FM1.12: Total Operating Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating Expenditure budget	This indicator measures the extent to which operating expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Operating Expenditure (non-capital spending) is costs which the municipality incurs through its normal operations. The latest approved budget is applicable. Formula: Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. <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%	91%	95%	95%	21,38%	47,46%	73,84%	95%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager
16	16	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Performance on cash backed expenditure over cash back budget items only (%)	In terms of the Directive 7 of 2023, directorates cannot offset primary operating budgeted expenditure that translates into a cash outflow against non-cash flow expenditures such as Impairments, Depreciation, Debt impairment, Write-offs, Post-retirement medical aid PRMA provision, Rehabilitation of landfill sites, Water Inventory, labour to operating, Interest and Prior year adjustments. This indicator measures the outcome of cash backed items only over the budget and if the outcome is higher than 100% then, it reflects reliance on non-cash items. The aim of the indicator is to achieve and outcome of less than or equal to 100% Source: Financial information. Formula: Operating expenditure (cash items only) / Operating budget (cash items only). Measured quarterly. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = > 100% Not fully effective = N/A Fully effective = ≤ 100% Significantly performance = N/A Outstanding performance = N/A	New	New	0%	N/A	N/A	0%	≤ 100%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE (CORPORATE SCORECARD AND FUNCTIONAL INDICATORS)											**60%**	
17	17	Obj 1. Increased jobs and investment in the Cape Town economy	1. A Average number of days taken to process building plan applications of less than 500 square meters (HS2.22)	The indicator measures the number of days a building plan application to the municipality takes to be processed, from the date of submission of all required information to the date of communication of the initial adjudication results of that application, on average, per application. Measures of the time taken to process appeals of the initial decision, sometimes expressed in relation to "amendment letters" or in terms of a "date of first refusal" are not included within the measurement. Each submission of a complete building plan application starts a new processing cycle for the purpose of the indicator. Performance Rating : Unacceptable performance = > 30 days Not fully effective > 26 - 29 days Fully effective= 25 days Significant performance <24 -20 days Outstanding performance range= < 19 days -15 days **Note** : SPE can only report on this indicator when the DAMS system can provide reliable data reports during the new Financial Year.	13,8	12	25	25	25	25	25	5%	Director : Development Management

18	18	Obj 1. Increased jobs and investment in the Cape Town economy	1. B Average number of days taken to process building applications of 500 square meters or more (LED3.13)	The indicator measures the number of days building plan applications of 500 square meters or more take to be processed, from the date of submission of all required information to the date of communication of the initial adjudication results of that application, on average, per application. Whether a large building plan application is for commercial or residential purposes does not have a bearing as the proxy of 500 square meters or more is used in this instance. Measures of the time taken to process appeals of the initial decision, sometimes expressed in relation to "amendment letters" or in terms of a "date of first refusal" are not included within the measurement. Each submission of a complete building plan application starts a new processing cycle for the purpose of the indicator. Performance Rating : Unacceptable performance = > 40 days Not fully effective > 36 - 40 days Fully effective= 35 days Significant performance= range from <34 - 30 days Outstanding performance= < 29 -20 days **Note :** SPE can only report on this indicator when the DAMS system can provide reliable data reports during the new Financial Year.	28,7	12	35	35	35	35	35	5%	Director: Development Management
19	19	Objective 9. Healthy and sustainable environment	9. A Percentage of biodiversity priority areas protected (ENV4.21)	Measures the proportion of land identified through municipal strategic environmental assessments and EMFs as biodiversity priority areas, which is protected through some mechanism. Mechanisms may include stewardship agreements, conventional protected areas, & biodiversity agreements, among others. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance<64% Not fully effective<65.40% Fully effective 65..40% Significant performance ≥65.41%- 65.99% Outstanding performance - ≥66% and above	65,14%	65.40%	65.40%	AT	AT	AT	65.40%	5%	Director: Environmental Management
20	20	Objective 9. Healthy and sustainable environment	9.B-Percentage of biodiversity priority area within the municipality(ENV4.11	Proportional share of land cover categories aggregated to relate to biological priority areas within the municipality, relative to the total municipal area. It indicates the presence of available habitats across a municipal area important for maintaining ecological processes, expressed in ha. A decline over time indicates a loss of land supporting biodiversity and local ecosystems. Biodiversity priority areas, or areas of high biodiversity importance, are defined by SANBI (2016) as "Natural or semi-natural areas in the landscape or seascape that are important for conserving a representative sample of ecosystems and species, for maintaining ecological processes, or for the provision of ecosystem services." Proxy measure for C88 ENV4.11. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance < 33% -34% Not fully effective < 34.18% Fully effective = 34.18% Significant performance ≥34.19% - 34.99% Outstanding performance ≥ 35% and above	33,36%	33,34%	34,18%	AT	AT	AT	34,18%	5%	Director: Environmental Management
21	21	Objective 10. Clean and healthy waterways and beaches	10. A Percentage of coastline with protection measures in place(ENV5.11)	Measures the percentage of coastline with protection measures in place within the municipal area. Protection measures refer to measures for protecting the coastal environment from activities that may detrimentally affect it and are inclusive of periodic maintenance. Protection measures are divided into four main categories: Hard (options influence coastal processes to stop or reduce the rate of coastal erosion.); Soft (aim to dissipate wave energy by mirroring natural forces and maintaining the natural topography of the coast); Combined (combining hard and soft solutions is sometimes necessary to improve the efficiency of the options and provide an environmentally and economically acceptable coastal protection system); and Innovative (exploited advancements in specific areas of engineering associated with erosion control namely geotextiles and beach drainage). Protection measures are therefore inclusive of managed retreat too. Proxy measure for C88 ENV5.11. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance < 6.2% Not fully effective < 6.21 % - 6.25% Fully effective= 6.27% Significant performance ≥ 6..28% - 6.29% Outstanding performance ≥ 6.3% and above	6,20%	6,27%	6,27%	6,08%	6,15%	6,20%	6,27%	5%	Director: Environmental Management
22	22	Objective 15. A more spatially integrated and inclusive city	15.A Local neighbourhood plans approved for mixed use development (number)(LSDFs)	Measures the number of local neighbourhood plans approved by Council. A local neighbourhood plan could be a spatial development framework or a precinct plan that identifies areas for, amongst others mixed use development, which would facilitate integration of land uses. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 2 LSDFs approved Not fully effective = 2 LSDFs approved Fully effective: 3 LSDF's approved Significantly performance = 4 - 5 LSDFs approved Outstanding performance = ≥ 6 LSDFs approved	4	3	3	AT	AT	AT	3	5%	Director: Urban Planning and Design
23	23	Clean and healthy waterways and beaches	Vlei remediation programme implementation (Milestones)	Vlei remediation programme implementation 'Waterway Rehabilitation project. . Waterway and Vlei rehabilitation projects will deliver multiple benefits by improving water quality and enhancing recreational facilities and providing new ecosystem services. This indicator will measure the number of rehabilitation plans approved. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance =Milestones not started Not fully effective = Miestones not achieved as planned Fully effective: All milestones achieved as planned Significantly performance = N/A Outstanding performance =N/A	Remediation plans for Zandvlei approved	Zeekoeivlei dredging project initiated	Zeekoevlei weir and fish ladder tender awarded	Zeekoevlei weir and fish ladder detailed design complete	Zeekoevlei weir and fish ladder tender advertised	Zandvlei Estuary Management Forum Established	Zeekoevlei weir and fish ladder tender awarded	6%	Director: Environmental Management
24	24	15. A more spatially integrated and inclusive City	Spatial Trends Annual Report (Milestones	In order to improve systems and processes to track changes in the built environment to determine if the spatial planning policy is implemented * Maintenance of the Spatial Trends Monitoring Framework (STMF) Performance rating : Unacceptable performance =Milestones not started Not fully effective = Miestones not achieved as planned Fully effective: All milestones achieved Significantly performance = N/A Outstanding performance =N/A	Completed	Annual Report to Infrastructure Group	Annual Report submitted to Infrastructure & Growth Working Group (IGWG)	2023 Spatial Trends Report presented to SPE PC.	AT	AT	Annual Report submitted to Infrastructure & Growth Working Group (IGWG)	5%	Director: Urban Planning and Design
25	25	16. A capable and collaborative City government	Percentage Integrated precinct management methodology developed in consultation with other directorates	Precinct management detailed study with other directorates which can eventually be pipelined into one comprehensive precinct basket of projects for the city Engagement with Directorates on precinct methodology SOPs so that there is a standardised methodology and resource approach to it. 25% target is defined as Precinct Management SOP Developed and approved by SPE PC. 50% target is defined as Precinct Management Plan developed in terms of SOP in Bellville CBD 75% target is defined as Precinct Management Plan developed in terms of SOP for Mitchells Plain Town Centre 100% target is defined as Precinct Management Plan developed in terms of SOP for Wynberg and Cape Town CBD Performance rating : Unacceptable performance < 50 % achieved Not fully effective < 75% achieved Fully effective:= 100% achieved Significantly performance N/A Outstanding performance =N/A	New	0%	100%	25%	50%	75%	100%	5%	Manager : MURP

26	26	1.Increased jobs and investment within the Cape Town economy	Gateway Catalytic Precinct: *(Milestones)	The focus is on progressing precinct planning and project packaging for the prioritised catalytic precinct; and to measures progress on implementation of the catalytic precinct, specifically progress towards enabling land release for development Performance rating : Unacceptable performance =Milestones not started Not fully effective = Miestones not achieved as planned Fully effective: All milestones achieved Significantly performance = N/A Outstanding performance =N/A	New	Block 28 & 31 land use applications decisions received, and Block 30 draft land use application ready for submission, in support of the Mayor's Priority Programme for Accelarted Land Release	Block 30 land use application with decision maker	Strand Street Quarry EIA/ HIA commenced and land use application preparation underway	N/A	Block 30 land use application submitted to the decision maker	N/A	7%	Director: Urban Catalytic Investment
27	27	1.Increased jobs and investment within the Cape Town economy	Claremont CBD Catalytic Precinct (milestones)	The focus is on progressing precinct planning and project packaging for the prioritised catalytic precincts; and the development of a conceptual vision and supporting due diligence . This indicator measures progress on implementing the catalytic precinct, specifically the project packaging and enablement of the first phase of the Palmyra sub-precinct. Performance rating : Unacceptable performance =Milestones not started Not fully effective = Miestones not achieved Fully effective: All milestones achieved as planned Significantly performance = N/A Outstanding performance =N/A	New	New	Claremont CBD Palmyra Sub-precinct plan and supporting technical, legal and environmental due dilligence complete	N/A	Claremont CBD Palmyra Sub-precinct plan and supporting technical, legal and envoronmental due dilligence commenced	N/A	Claremont CBD Palmyra Sub-precinct plan and supporting technical, legal and environmental due dilligence complete	7%	Director: Urban Catalytic Investment
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**10%**	
28	28	CM request CM memo	Staff housing population verified, per directorate (%) • Water and Sanitation; • Spatial Planning and Environment; • Energy; • Urban Mobility; • Safety and Security; and • Community Services and Health.	Measures the percentage of Staff Housing population verified by confirming occupancy, operational need, and conditions as per the approved allocation list, as compiled by the Directorate coordinators to ensure validity, accuracy and completeness by conducting an annual site visits to confirm staff occupancy for operational purposes. The approved list must include the following: • Property occupancy – Staff member occupying property by conducting a site visit. • Operational need - staff member and staff number confirmed on SAP. • Lease agreement in place (number and tenure). • Rental value. • Fringe benefit registration, confirmed with Payroll. Closed out status- where all the above conditions are met. Formula: Numerator: All staff housing verified (with a closed out status) Denominator: All staff housing Performance rating: Unacceptable performance < 50% Not fully effective ≥50 - 99% Fully effective = 100% Significant performance = N/A Outstanding=N/A	96,28%	100%	100% (100 staff houses verified out of 100)	60%	75%	90%	100% (100 staff houses verified out of 100)	2%	Spatial Planning and Environment
29	29	1. Increased Jobs and Investment in the Cape Town economy Mayoral Priority Programme	Ease of doing business Index Development Management Optimisation Programme	The objective is to improve the ease of doing business index relating to each EDs business processes. It is therefore proposed that each ED first commence with a diagnostic assessment of the targeted process(es)within their functional areas. The assessment should indicate the root cause and proposed recommendation that will improve the timing of ease of doing business index, and will drive down costs associated with delays. The priority projects are : 1. Enforcement Business Improvement Project 2. Communication Plan 3. ED reporting on Circulation Performance Project 4. COCT Commenting Protocol Project Performance rating: Unacceptable performance =Milestones not started Not fully effective = Miestones not achieved as planned Fully effective: All milestones achieved Significantly performance = All milestones achieved and output indicators implemented Outstanding performance = All milestones achieved and improvement in outcome indicator	New	Close out report on full implementation submitted to City Manager	Priority Projects finalised (where planned to be completed by the end of the financial year)	Priority Projects initiated in terms of work plan	Priority Projects Progress Report	Draft Priority Project Reports	Priority Projects finalised (where planned to be completed by the end of the financial year)	2%	Director: Development Management
30	30	SMF	Foreshore Freeway Development Framework (Milestones)	The Foreshore Freeway Development Project is currently at feasibility stage. This entails the assessment of feasible conceptual transport and land use options in order to determine a preferred option to undertake public engagement and to obtain statutory approvals for development of available land parcels in the next phase of the project. Performance Rating: Unacceptable performance =Milestones not started Not fully effective = Miestones not achieved Fully effective: All milestones achieved Significantly performance = All milestones achieved and optional analysis concluded Outstanding performance = All milestones achieved and planning towards implementation concluded	Draft scoping / contextual synthesis report with project plan completed for internal circulation	Pre-application meeting held with Development Management	Options Analysis completed for Foreshore	N/A	Stakeholder engagement associated with the preferred scenario identified in phase 1	1st draft Development framework presented to the PMT	Options Analysis completed for Foreshore	2%	Director: Urban Planning and design
31	31	Focused service delivery approach in informal settlements , including but not limited to townships established in terms of LFTEA (Less Formal Township Establishment Act)	Development of a policy and drafting of a comprehensive Building By-law to replace the NBR in Cape Town (Milestones)	The focus of the workstream will relate to the Building Policy and By-Law. This also encompass the rescindment of the National Building regulations (NBR) by National Government to replace it . Performance Rating: Unacceptable performance =Milestones not started Not fully effective = Miestones not achieved as planned Fully effective: All milestones achieved Significantly performance = First Draft concluded with peer review Outstanding performance = First Draft ready for SPE PC	Ongoing Development of the Building Policy	Prepare the 1st Draft of the Building By-Law	Prepare the 1st Draft of the Building By-Law	Review of the concept note and ongoing development of the policy and drafting of the building by-law	Conclude engagements with various stakeholders and interested parties on what should be considered in the policy and draft bylaw	First Draft of the Policy to inform the drafting of the building by-law	Prepare the 1st Draft of the Building By-Law	2%	Director: Development Management
32	32	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government Unlawful Land Occupation (ULO)	Quarterly/ situation update of ULO for Protected Areas and areas under management submitted to Safety & Security and ongoing reviews in the ULO Command Centre.	This is the proactive identification of areas at risk in protecting our nature reserves and any other property from Unlawful Land Occupation by making sure that there is adequate surveillance and systems in place to deal with this threat. Performance Rating: Unacceptable performance =Milestones not started Not fully effective = Miestones not achieved as planned Fully effective: All milestones achieved Significantly performance = N/A Outstanding performance = N/A	Achieved with ongoing monitoring and reporting	Quarterly situation update of ULO for Protected Areas and areas under management submitted to Safety & Security and ongoing reviews of these risks in the ULO Command Centre.	Quarterly situation update of ULO for Protected Areas and areas under management submitted to Safety & Security and ongoing reviews of these risks in the ULO Command Centre.	Quarterly situation update of ULO for Protected Areas and areas under management submitted to Safety & Security and ongoing reviews of these risks in the ULO Command Centre.	Quarterly situation update of ULO for Protected Areas and areas under management submitted to Safety & Security and ongoing reviews of these risks in the ULO Command Centre.	Quarterly situation update of ULO for Protected Areas and areas under management submitted to Safety & Security and ongoing reviews of these risks in the ULO Command Centre.	Quarterly situation update of ULO for Protected Areas and areas under management submitted to Safety & Security and ongoing reviews of these risks in the ULO Command Centre.	2%	Director: Environmental Management

Executive Director: Spatial Planning & Environment

Rob McGaffin

Robert McGaffin

Digitally signed by Robert McGaffin
Date: 2024.07.24 14:40:25 +02'00'

City Manager

Lungelo Mbandazayo

Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo
Date: 2024.07.30 18:25:57 +02'00'