2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Robert McGaffin
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

CM73612A

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sep-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											50%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											20%	
												100%	
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											**20%**	
1	**1**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Repeatable Tenders that were Expanded/Amended multiple times (%)**	Measures the percentage of Expansions and Amendments on repeatable tenders. This indicator will only measure instances where there was more than one Expansion and/or Amendment on the same tender.This indicator thus measures instances where there was more than 5% of total repeatable tenders, expanded and/or amended, per the approved 2025/26 – 2027/28 Approved Demand Plan. However, the exclusion is not applicable if a tender extension is awarded within 45 calendar days of contract expiry of the current contracts arising from the tender. Thus, extensions are required to be awarded at least 45 days before expiry, ensuring proactive planning and due consideration of administrative effort for the timeous processing of the expansion. A Directorate will not be affected if 5% or less of the total repeatable tenders are expanded (as per above definition) in the financial year.Directorates will achieve Outstanding performance if all expansions of tenders are only single expansions, and all are approved 45 or more days prior to the expiry of the current contract. **Source:** Contract Register and Monitoring System and Tender Tracking System. Measurement will commence only when the second Expansions and/or Amendments are released in SAP MM and only applies to repeatable tenders that are active in the current FY (i.e. commenced before or in the financial year and expires in or after the FY).Formula: Total number of repeatable tenders expanded and/ or amended multiple times ÷ Total number of repeatable tenders active in the FY. Measured cumulatively. **Performance rating:** **Unacceptable performance =** >7% or if a tender extension is awarded within 45 calendar days of contract expiry **Not fully effective=** ≥ 5.1% – 7% **Fully effective =** 4.1% - 5% **Significant performance** = 2% - 4% **Outstanding performance** = <2% In exceptional circumstances, consideration will be given to exclude items from the calculation that are deemed outside of the control of the Departments, such as, but not limited to, unforeseen cancellations of replacement tenders close to the expiry of the preceding contract and legal proceedings that may lead to restrictions of services. These exclusions will be reviewed for consideration on a case-by-case basis on the grounds of a thorough motivation before quarterly reporting is finalised.	0%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2026	5%	AT	AT	AT	5%	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: CMRS (Contract Register and Monitoring System) and Tender Tracking System Contact person: Maureen Whare 069 367 4023
2	**2**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Reduction in the number of SCM deviations (%)**	The objective is to achieve a 20% reduction on SCM deviations. The indicator only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R750 000 (inclusive of VAT). Sole/single service provider deviations, deviations relating to emergencies and unforeseen situations (at this time being – anti-corruption investigations and extortion management, with associated human life threats (threat to limb and life) will be excluded from the measurement as per section 36 of SCM regulations. Target = reduction of 20% Formula: (Number of SCM deviations for current year – Number of SCM deviations for prior year)/ Number of SCM deviations for prior year X 100" Exception protocols: A default performance rating of fully effective will be awarded if you have 2 or less deviations from a base of 2 or less Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = Any positive increase in the number of deviations, year-on-year **Not fully effective** = a reduction > 0% - < 19.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. **Fully effective** = a reduction of 20% - 21%, for the number of deviations (year-on-year), or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol) **Significant performance** = a reduction > 21% - < 99.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. **Outstanding performance** = a reduction of 100% for the number of deviations, year-on-year or no deviations for the current year.	20%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2026	20%	AT	AT	AT	20%	2%	Department: SCM Source document: SCM deviations schedule Formula: Number of SCM deviations reduced by the target percentage % year on year for the department/ directorate. Contact person: Gayle Postings Office of the City Manager: Specialist Advisor 021 400 1268

3	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Irregular, Fruitless and Wasteful, Unauthorised** Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating and Capital Expenditure	The indicator measures the extent to which the municipality has incurred irregular, fruitless and wasteful and unauthorised expenditure on its total budget (operating and capital budget). Fruitless and wasteful expenditure is expenditure that was made in vain and would have been avoided had reasonable care been exercised. Irregular expenditure is incurred by the municipality in contravention of a requirement of the law (specific legislation, per MFMA legislation). Unauthorized expenditure includes overspending of the total amount appropriated in the approved budget.The net amount after recoveries, write offs or condonement should be used in this calculation. The Q4 final figure is obtained from the Pre-audited AFS.Irregular expenditure will be included, if identified by other assurance providers, irrespective if it is self-disclosed or not.Formula: Per Directorate incidents value as a percentage of Directorate Opex and Capex ((1) Irregular + (2) Fruitless and Wasteful + (3) Unauthorised Expenditure) / (4) Total Operating and Capital Expenditure x 100 Note: New Executive Director or Executive Director taking up a post in another directorate as an Executive Director (in the year of review) will be measured on the UIFW Expenditure incidents for the current year, where the incident is in the term of appointment as Executive Director.This also applies if an existing ED moves to another directorate, the ED will be regarded as "New" I.e. previous UIFW expenditure incidents not in the term of employment of the ED will not be measured. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performanc**e = ≥ 1.5% **Not fully effective** = > 0.75% - 1.49% **Fully effective** = 0.75% **Significant performance** = < 0.75% - > 0% **Outstanding performance** = 0%	>100%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2026	0,75%	AT	AT	AT	0,75%	2%	Department; City Manager Office Source document: Irregular Register and the AG's findings **in the quarter that it is available**. Contact person: Gayle Postings 021 400 1268
4	4	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**External audit (Auditor General) audit actions completed as per audit action plan (%)**	This indicator measures how many actions was completed in the financial cycle within in the unique deadline set, as per the audit action plan. The Audit Action Plan sets out the total number audit actions required to address the internal control deficiencies as identified by the Auditor-General in their management report. The unique deadline is set in consultation with the relevant ED. Completed would mean that the actions as stipulated in the audit action plan has been executed by the relevant delegated authority. Should there be no actions required for a Directorate the indicator will be 'Not Applicable'. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = N/A **Not fully effective** = < 99.99% **Fully effective** = N/A **Significant performanc**e = N/A **Outstanding performance** =100%	N/A	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2026	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	Department: Investor Relations Source document: Completed Audit Action plan Contact person: Lynn Joshua :021 400 5987
5	5	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Final council and Mayco decisions implemented within timeframes (%)**	This indicator measures all final Council and Mayco decisions allocated to the ED with implementation date for the quarter. Items marked as "implementation approved" that were due in the quarter (utilising the project end date as a filter) will be used to calculate the actual performance.The indicator excludes: •All council and Mayco decisions for noting. •Decisions outside of the control of the ED. •Decisions marked as "terminated" or "status completed". •Decisions actioned close to the end of the quarter which would be impossible to implement during that quarter due to time constraints – for example, if Council is on the last day of March, the decisions can only be work flowed to relevant EDs during April.•These exclusions must be supported by valid evidence and reflected on each quarterly report for the City Manager and/or panel's awareness. Implementation that runs over a period longer than a financial year will be measured according to milestones identified for implementation within the current financial year.Each ED must ensure that a date is allocated of when action will be completed and implemented. This must be captured in the CDIT system by the relevant implementer. If no timeframe was allocated, the timeframe is deemed to be one month for implementation. The project start date will be utilised to ensure projects with no end dates are included.Implementation is the date of completion of the actions or achievement of councils request or expectation ("implementation approved" date). **Performance rating**: **Unacceptable performance** = < 69% of ALL decisions **Not fully effective** = 69% - 99% of ALL decisions **Fully effective** = 100% of ALL decisions **Significant performance** = N/A **Outstanding performance** = N/A If "Not Applicable" weighting must be reallocated it within the category.	100%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2026	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Each ED is responsible for implementation, evidence and updates to the tracking system. Source document: SharePoint tracking Tracking System contact person: Rehana Razack (021 400 1246)
6	6	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**16.J Budget spent on implementation of Workplace Skills Plan (%)**	Measures the percentage of budget spent on the Workplace Skills Plan .The Workplace Skills Plan outlines the planned education, training and development interventions for the organisation. Its purpose is to formally plan and allocate budget for appropriate training interventions that will address the needs arising out of local government's skills sector plan, the IDP, the individual departmental staffing strategies, individual employees' personal development plans and the employment equity plan. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(f). Formula: % spent on the implementation of the WSP measured against the training budget. (A/B)*100 A: Actual spend per quarter on training budget B: Planned spend on training Budget for the year Q4 (as at end of June) reporting will be based on the latest period available at the time of reporting. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = < 90% **Not fully effective** = 90% - 94.99% **Fully effective** = 95% - 96% **Significant performance** = 96.1% - 97.99% **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 98%	100.82%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2026	95%	Per the KOI schedule	Per the KOI schedule	Per the KOI schedule	95%	2%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851
7	7	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Internal independent assurance provider's recommendations and action plans implemented (%)**	It is the monitoring and reporting of the implementation (expressed as a percentage) of corrective actions to address internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans, issued within the directorate of the responsible Executive Director. The internal independent assurance providers included in this KPI are **Internal Audit, Ombudsman, Integrated Risk Management** (limited to the Strategic Risks: Corporate, Transversals and Executive Risk Registers)**, Ethics and Forensics departments.** Each internal independent assurance provider as mentioned above has their own unique input to this KPI. This KPI will be "not applicable" to management when there are no recommendations, thus only those that could provide inputs will be included in the calculation. Future recommendations and action plans implemented (not recommended for implementation for the current financial year), will be taken into account for the measurement of this indicator, thereby creating an advantage for the ED. Formula: **Numerator:** Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans implemented (current and future implementations) **Denominator:** Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans made for the current period under review (recommendations and actions plans postponed as approved by the City Manager will be excluded) <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = < 75% **Not fully effective** = 75% - 84.99% **Fully effective** = 85% - 90% **Significant performance** = > 90% - 94.99% **Outstanding performance**= ≥ 95%	78%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2026	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	3%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mothibi

8	8	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Community satisfaction survey (average)**	Measures the average score on the Community satisfaction survey. A statistically valid, scientifically defendable score from the annual survey of residents' perceptions of the overall performance of the City. The aim of the indicator is to improve the community's perception of the City.The measure is given against a non-symmetrical Likert scale, where 1 is poor, 2 is fair, 3 is good, 4 is very good, and 5 is excellent. The objective is to improve the current customer satisfaction average score per Directorate. **1. A score of 2.8 and below based on the previous year's survey outcome:** **Performance rating*:** Unacceptable performance = ≤ 2.7 Not fully effective = 2.8 Fully effective = 2.9 Significantly performance = 3.0 Outstanding performance = ≥ 3.1 **2. A score of 2.9 and above based on the previous year's survey outcome:** **Performance rating*:** Unacceptable performance = ≤2.8 Not fully effective = 2.9 Fully effective = 3.0 Significant performance = 3.1 Outstanding performance = ≥ 3.2 *No ranges due to nature of the KPI, which is based on outcome of a survey.	3.1%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2026	3.0.	AT	AT	AT	3.0.	1%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: Community Satisfaction survey score Contact person: Bridgette Morris 021 400 3812

9	**9**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Inclusion of C88 Output indicators (%)**	All Tier 1 and Tier 2 Circular 88 Output indicators should be included into the performance scorecards of the Executive Directors, where relevant. All indicators must be included verbatim into the Corporate (auditable) and Directorate SDBIP (cascading principle) and the measurement must be in compliance with the Technical Indicator Descriptions (TID) as issued by National Treasury. This indicator will be measured during the annual and mid-year review process. Measurement: Q1 and Q3 (after mid-year amendments). Weighting must be reallocated where 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 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 **Performance rating:** **Unacceptable performance** = < 80% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Not fully effective** = 80% - 84.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Fully effective** =85% - 90% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Significant performanc**e = >90% - 95% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Outstanding performance** = >95% - 100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2	100%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2026	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Department: Organisational Performance Management (OPM) Source document: C88 scorecard and Directorate SDBIP Contact person: Adila Aboo - Manager: City Performance Management 021 400 9024
10	**10**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Tenders in slippage at any given quarter end (%)**	Measures tenders for MTREF in slippage at any given quarter end. This will drive the timeous implementation of the demand plan based on the agreed timeline. Abnormalities in the timeline will then impact each step of the process, such as where a tender only allows 30 days after award to Contract Required by Date (CRD), there will probably be a contract gap or a Value At Risk (VAR – Budget at risk of not being spent) on the Capital reporting. Slippage is defined as tenders on the demand plan which are behind schedule based on the agreed timelines for each tender. Slippage in the implementation of the demand plan, is a contributor to the cause of VAR. This will include the submission of draft specifications as per the minimum timeframe before the CRD. Measurement: The indicator is measured on a quarterly basis (non-cumulative), as such any recoveries are considered. The annual performance is based on the tenders in slippage as at the 4th quarter. ED's are able to recover if there are tenders in slippage throughout the year. There are processes in place to remedy tenders that are in amber or red. Formula: Total count of tenders in red or amber as a percentage of the total number of tenders required for the MTREF period (%) (non-cumulative). Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = > 15% **Not fully effective** = > 10% - ≤ 15% **Fully effective** = ≤ 10% **Significant performance** = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9% **Outstanding performance** = < 5%	9%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2026	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	1%	Department: Supply Chain Management Source document: Demand Plan Overview Contact person: Bekumuzi Vumase and Razaan Arendse Manager Demand Management
11	**11**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Gaps in repeatable tender continuity (average number of days)**	This indicator is to ensure continued monthly service delivery implemented through repeatable tenders. A "gap" refers to the number of days between the expiring contract and the replacement contract commencing. Potential gaps should be mitigated via extension/expansion and/or deviation early enough so that it caters for any possible delay within a tender process. A gap less than one month will be included in the calculation. To drive the demand plan and improve Supply Chain Management (SCM) process and service delivery. The indicator is based on all repeatable tenders that currently has a gap at the time of reporting, i.e. the current contract had already expired and the new contract is not yet in place. Average number of days refer to calendar days (inclusive of weekends). Formula: Total number of gaps in days/ Total number of tenders with a gap of more than zero days = Average number of gaps (days) (Effectively the report should be 'blank'.) Using the gap report developed by Zubair which takes current status and projected time for completion into account. 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	0	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2026	0	0	0	0	0	1%	Department: CPPPM Source document: GAP report prepared by Zubair Contact person: Maureen Whare
12	**12**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Recurring Audit Findings and /or recurring root causes (number)**	The extent to which the Executive Director ensures that audit findings ((Communication of audit findings (COMAFs) and Service Delivery (lived- reality / resident experience) findings) are addressed at root-cause level. Remedial and corrective actions are translated into strengthened controls, standard practices and preventative mechanisms across the respective directorate for areas of improvement (e.g. transaction, discipline, functions, controls and oversight). The indicator will be measured year-on-year during the duration of the ED's term of office/employment contract. New EDs will not be penalised for recurring findings and/or root causes prior to their appointment.A COMAF is defined as: Any Auditor General of South Africa (AGSA) Communication of audit finding as per the scope of the regulatory audit.**Indicator objective:** to ensure that no recurring findings or root causes arises from the AGSA audits. To ensure that all audit findings and/or root causes identified by the AGSA that fall within the Executive Director's area of responsibility are effectively addressed and resolved, preventing recurrence, demonstrating improved governance, internal controls and strengthening accountability within the directorate. **A recurring finding is defined as:** Recurring findings refer to those findings which have persisted from one year of reporting to the next or a prior year, regardless of whether it relates to the same project/indicator or a different project/indicator or same department or different department within the directorate. **Source:** Management Audit Action Plans (MAAPs), Management Report and COMAFs **Formula:** Count of the number of recurring findings and /or recurring root causes **Performance rating:** **Unacceptable performance**: Recurring findings and recurring root causes **Not fully effective:** N/A **Fully effective**: Zero recurring findings and/or zero recurring root causes **Significant performance**: N/A **Outstanding performance**: N/A The weighting for the indicator will be reallocated, if the ED has no recurring findings and/or recurring root causes.	New	New	Zero recurring findings and recurring root causes	AT	AT	AT	Zero recurring findings and recurring root causes	2%	Office of the City Manager Contact person: Gayle Postings Specialist Advisor
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											**10%**	

13	**13**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Total Capital Expenditure as a percentage of Total Capital Budget less contingencies (%)**	This indicator measures the extent to which budgeted capital expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Capital expenditure is all costs incurred by the municipality for acquiring, upgrading, and renewing assets such as property, equipment, plants, buildings, intangible assets, investment property or any other assets meeting the definition of assets in terms of GRAP. Less soft-locked contractual contingencies on projects and insurance contingencies. **Q1 – Q3 reporting:** Formula: (1) YTD Actual Capital Expenditure / (2) Total Budgeted Capital Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. **Q4 reporting:** Formula: (1) Actual Capital Expenditure / (2) Total Budgeted Capital Expenditure **less contingencies**. The latest approved budget is applicable. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = < 85% or >100% (non-compliance) **Not fully effective** = ≥ 85% - 89.99% **Fully effective** = 90% - 93% **Significant performance** = > 93% - 96% **Outstanding performance** = > 96%	92%	90%	90%	15.9%	37.1%	63.1%	90%	5%	Directorate Finance Manager
14	**14**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Total Operating Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating Expenditure budget**	This indicator measures the extent to which operating expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Operating Expenditure (non-capital spending) is costs which the municipality incurs through its normal operations. The latest approved budget is applicable. Less soft-locked contractual grant construction contingency provisions projects provisions related to Human Settlements directorate. **Q1 – Q4 reporting;** Formula: Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. **Q4 reporting for Human Settlements directorate:** Formula: (1) Actual Operating Expenditure / (2) Budgeted Operating Expenditure, less contingencies in the contingency provisions. The latest approved budget is applicable. Formula: Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = < 90% or > 100% (non-compliance) **Not fully effective** = ≥ 90% - ≤ 94.99% **Fully effective** = 95% - 96% **Significant performance** = ≥ 96.1% - ≤ 97% **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 97.1% - 100%	95%	95%	95%	22.8%	48.0%	72.3%	95%	3%	Directorate Finance Manager
15	**15**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**% of Capital Grant Funding Expenditure Spent**	The purpose of the indicator is to ensure cashflow alignment, risk acceptance and strengthened governance requirements for capital grant funded projects. Disclaimer: Achievement of at least 45% expenditure spent by 31 December is a non-negotiable requirement. This will include an internal November performance assessment benchmark to allow corrective action ahead of the National Treasury (NT) cut-off. Evidence: Grant Extracts.Grant Performance Reports Issued by Grant Funding Department Formula: % of capital grant funding expenditure spent (excluding performance component of Urban Development Financing Grant (UDFG)) =Capital Grant expenditure spent/Total Capital grant allocation in budget •Q2 spent will be based on the latest available budget at 31 December. •FY spent will be based on the approved FY budget. •Grants received before Q2 will be included (grant dumps). •Grants received after Q2 will be excluded (grant dumps). Grant dumps refer to grant allocations received that fall outside the approved DORA (Division of Revenue Act) allocation process:•They are unplanned or irregular transfers of funds.•Unlike standard DORA allocations, which follow a structured approval and distribution framework, grant dumps are not part of the formal budgetary or legislative process.•They may arise from ad hoc decisions, emergency funding, or discretionary transfers that bypass the usual allocation mechanisms. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance**: <90% (Q4 or y/end) or <45% spent by 31 December (Q2) **Not fully effective**: 90% - <93% (Q4 or y/end) or <45% spent by 31 December (Q2) **Fully effective**: 93% - 95% (Q4 or y/end) and 45% spent by 31 December (Q2) **Significant performance:** >95% - 97% (Q4 or y/end) and 45% spent by 31 December (Q2) **Outstanding performance**: >97% (Q4 or y/end) and 45% spent by 31 December (Q2)	New	New	93%	N/A	45%	N/A	93%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager
	SERVICE DELIVERY / GOOD GOVERNANCE											**50%**	
16	**16**	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. <u>Performance Rating</u> : **Unacceptable performance** = > 30 days **Not fully effective** = > 25 - 30 days **Fully effective**= 23 - 25 days **Significant performance** =20 - 22.99 days **Outstanding performance range** = < 20days	22,11	25	25	25	25	25	25	5%	Director : Development Management
17	**17**	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. <u>Performance Rating</u> : **Unacceptable performance** = > 40 days **Not fully effective** = > 35 - 40 days **Fully effective**= 33 - 35 days **Significant performance**= 28 days - 32.99 days **Outstanding performance** = < 28 days	35,28	35	35	35	35	35	35	5%	Director : Development Management

18	18	Objective 9. Healthy and sustainable environment	**9. A Percentage of biodiversity priority areas protected (ENV4.21)**	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 =** < 62.00% **Not fully effective =** > 62.00% - 65.7% **Fully effective =** 65.8% - 69.09% **Significant performance =** 69.10% - 72.56% **Outstanding performance =** > 72.56%	68,13%	65,50%	65,8%	AT	AT	AT	65,8%	5%	Director: Environmental Management
19	19	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 =** < 31.74% **Not fully effective =** 31.74% - 33.33% **Fully effective =** 33.34% - 35% **Significant performance =** >35% - 36.75 % **Outstanding performance =** > 36.75 %	33,34%	34,18%	33,34%	AT	AT	AT	33,34%	4%	Director: Environmental Management
20	20	Objective 10. Clean and healthy waterways and beaches	**10. A Percentage of coastline with protection measures in place(ENV5.11)**	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. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance =** < 5.96% **Not fully effective** = 5.96 % - 6.26% **Fully effective**= 6.27% - 6.58 % **Significant performance =** ≥ 6..59% - 6.92% **Outstanding performance =** ≥ 6.93%	6,27%	6,27%	6,27%	6,27%	6,27%	6,27%	6,27%	5%	Director: Environmental Management
21	21	Objective 15. A more spatially integrated and inclusive city	**15.A Local neighbourhood development plans approved for mixed use development (number)**	Measures the number of local neighbourhood development plans approved by Council. A local neighbourhood development plan could be a spatial development framework, a precinct plan, site development plan, development application or overlay zone that identifies areas for, amongst others mixed use development. 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	3	3	3	AT	AT	AT	3	5%	Director: Urban Planning and Design
22	22	Objective 10. Clean and healthy waterways and beaches	**Vlei remediation programme implementation (Milestones)**	Vlei remediation programme implementation Mayor Priority Project . 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 and implemented. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = <346 666 m3 Zeekoeivlei dredging completed **Not fully effective** = 346 666 m3 - 363 999 m3 Zeekoeivlei dredging completed **Fully effective** = 364 000 Cubic metres (m3) achieved as planned **Significantly performance** = > 364 000m3 - 382 200 m3 Zeekoeivlei dredging completed **Outstanding performance** = > 382 200 m3 Zeekoeivlei dredging completed	Zeekoevleiweir and fishladder tender NOT awarded	Zeekoevlei dredging underway - estimated 40% completed	364 000 m^3 - Zeekoevlei dredging completed	236 600 m^3- Zeekoevlei dredging project completed	309 400 m^3 - Zeekoevlei dredging project completed	345 800 m^3 - Zeekoevlei dredging project completed	364 000 m^3 - Zeekoevlei dredging completed	6%	Director: Environmental Management
23	23	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Sector Prioritisation**	Sector prioritisation refers to trade-offs between needed infrastructure projects, due to budgetary tensions. These trade-offs have a direct impact on service delivery and the City's future growth. To navigate these pressures responsibly, a consistent, transparent,& rigorous approach to sectoral prioritisation is essential to understand and capture the risks and consequences of decisions.This process is a critical decision-support mechanism that ensures resources are directed to projects that maintain essential City functions& supports the implementation of Council-approved strategies. All sector-based prioritisation (capital infrastructure projects) must be fully documented (codified),with all assumptions clearly stated to ensure transparency and to enable independent review. The methodology must support and enable long term strategic planning for a 10-& 15-year planning horizon.The methodology in line with CM directive must be •practical to apply.•replicable across years and sectors;and •grounded in reliable data.It must also clearly define the criteria used to assess projects, together with the associated metrics and weightings where appropriate.Furthermore, all methodologies and prioritised project lists must be open to review by corporate assurance providers to ensure a defendable, evidence-based framework for Citywide investment decisions.The outcome of this process will be a complete and prioritised project pipeline identifying key strategic infrastructure projects to be incorporated into the 2050 Long Term Plan and the New Term of Office (NTO) Integrated Development Plan (IDP).The annual target is only applicable for the following directorates: Energy, W&S, HS, SPE, UM, UWM. Evidence required based on milestones towards sector prioritisation: •26/27: Prioritisation methodology captured and approved by relevant Executive Director. PPM data.SMF.•27/28 and beyond: Methodology is applied to infrastructure projects to produce rational results. Performance Rating: **Unacceptable performance**: No prioritisation methodology (50%) **Not fully effective**: Prioritisation methodology captured but not approved by Executive Director (70%) **Fully effective**: Prioritisation methodology approved by ED is codified and is transparent, practical and replicable and presented by the Sector Lead to the ICWG (Infrastructure Coordination Working Group) (100%) **Significant performance**:Prioritisation methodology is data driven and applied to the 10-year project pipeline and produces rational results that will provide capital project options for the New Term of Office ID (120%) **Outstanding performance**:Prioritisation methodology is automated and applied to the 15-year project pipeline and results in a portfolio of prioritised projects required to meet demand up to and beyond 2040, which can be attached to the Long-Term Plan 2050 (150%)	New	New	100%	AT	AT	AT	100%	2%	Lucille Janssens (Manager: Strategic Planning, Policy and Strategy)

24	24	Obj 1. Increased jobs and investment in the Cape Town economy	**CBD / 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** = Milestones not achieved as planned **Fully effective** = Foreshore Precinct First draft Development Framework complete **Significant performance** = Buitengracht Public realm upgrade Scoping complete **Outstanding performance** =Buitengracht Block 27 land use application ready for decision making	N/A	Buitengracht B25/26/27 rezoning preparation commenced	Foreshore Precinct First draft Development Framework complete	Buitengracht Block 25 26 27 - land use application submitted	Buitengracht Block 25 26 27 - land use application submitted	Precinct Programme Tranche 1 tabled at EMT	Foreshore Precinct First draft Development Framework complete	3%	Manager: Urban Regeneration - Programme Coordinator & Partnerships
25	25	Obj 1. Increased jobs and investment in the Cape Town economy	**Local Planning Support: Sector Support Toolkit: 6 new Prototypical Plans**	Sector support for the micro-developers. As part of the LPS, Affordable rental flats (ARFs) Prototypical plans will be developed according to urban design guidelines. **Performance rating :** **Unacceptable performance** =Milestones not started **Not fully effective** = Miestones not achieved as planned **Fully effective =** 6 new Prototypical Plans **Significantly performance** = 6 prototypical widely accessible to sector professionals (available in LPS website for download) **Outstanding performance** = Sector utilisation of prototypical plans (measured by downloads from website)	New	New	6 new Prototypical Plans	Content Audit & Catalogue of Prototypical Units	Template Development	Technical Drafting, Catalogue & Supplementary Documentation Preparation	6 new Prototypical Plans	4%	Director : Urban Planning and design
26	26	Obj 1. Increased jobs and investment in the Cape Town economy	**Maintain an overall collection rate greater than 95% for City Improvement Districts (CIDs).**	The CID Collection Rate measures the percentage of billed City Improvement District (CID) additional rates that are successfully collected within a 12 month period. It reflects the effectiveness of the City's revenue and debt management processes as they relate to CIDs. Although CIDs are funded based on their approved budgets rather than on actual collections, maintaining a high collection rate is essential to ensure that CIDs do not place additional strain on the City's overall rates income. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance =** < 50% **Not fully effective** = ≥50 - 94.99% **Fully effective** = 95% - 96.99% **Significant performance** = 97 - 100% **Outstanding**= >100%	New	New	> 95%	> 95%	> 95%	> 95%	> 95%	6%	Manager: Urban Regeneration - CIDS
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**20%**	
27	27	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government CM request	**Operational** Staff housing population verified, per directorate (%)	Measures the percentage of Staff Housing population verified by confirming occupancy, operational need, and conditions as per the approved allocation list, as compiled by the Directorate coordinators to ensure validity, accuracy and completeness by conducting an annual site visit to confirm staff occupancy for operational purposes. The approved list must include the following: • Property occupancy–Staff member occupying property by conducting a site visit. • Operational need - staff member and staff number confirmed on SAP. • Lease agreement in place (number and tenure). • Rental value • Fringe benefit registration, confirmed with Payroll. • Visual Assessments undertaken at the beginning of the lease period. Closed out status- where all the above conditions are met. Exclusions Housing under litigation. Affected Directorates: • Water and Sanitation • Spatial Planning and Environment • Energy • Urban Mobility • Safety and Security • Community Services and Health. **Formula:** Numerator: All staff housing verified (with a closed-out status) Denominator: All staff housing Performance Rating: **Unacceptable performance=** < 50% **Not fully effective=** 50 - 89% **Fully effective=** 100% **Significant performance=** N/A **Outstanding=** N/A	New	New	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Director: Environmental Management
28	28	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government CM request	**Non-Operational** Staff housing population disposal plan developed, per directorate (%)	Measures the percentage completion of a disposal plan for NonOperational Staff Housing. Including confirming occupancy, operational status, and conditions (through visual assessments) as per the approved asset list, as compiled by the Directorate coordinators to ensure validity, accuracy and completeness. Each Directorate thus needs to determine the details of the disposal plan, given the many factors such as location, condition of the building and CoCT longer term plans.The Disposal plan must include the following: • Plan for disposal/re-use • Property Valuations • Property occupancy – Staff member occupying property by conducting a site visit. • Status Verification: Operational need determined. • Lease agreement in place (number and tenure). • Rental value. • Visual Assessments undertaken. Closed out status- where all the above conditions are met. Exclusions Housing under litigation (eviction and legal proceedings). Affected Directorates:• Water and Sanitation • Spatial Planning and Environment • Energy • Urban Mobility • Safety and Security • Community Services and Health.**Formula: N**umerator: All staff housing verified (with a closed-out status) Denominator: All staff housing Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance =** < 50% **Not fully effective** = 50 - 89% **Fully effective =** 90% - 95% **Significant performance =** > 95% - 99.99% **Outstanding=** 100%	New	New	100%	AT	AT	AT	100%	1%	Director: Environmental Management

29	29	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government CM request	Business Improvement initiatives **BDM Application: Reduce Time with City** **Building Plans >500m2 and >10000m2** **Days to scrutinise, circulate for internal comments and provide outcome. (Submission to 1st decision)**	To measure the organisation's ability to translate identified improvement opportunities into implemented actions that enhance performance, Control effectiveness, and service delivery outcomes.Consideration should be given to including an indicator that demonstrates a measurable outcome that links directly to the impact of management actions. EDs have the flexibility to choose an indicator that is most relevant to their portfolio; however, it must be meaningful, quantifiable, and clearly attributable to deliberate efforts to enhance operational effectiveness. Examples may include metrics such as cost per unit delivered, turnaround time reductions for a process, or productivity improvements. The chosen indicator should show a clear trend over time and be supported by reliable data. Data source(s) for consideration Approved Business Improvement Plans / Registers • Management reports • Project status reports • Improvement tracking tools or systems Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = > 67 days **Not fully effective** = 61 - 66 days **Fully effective** = 60 days- 50 days **Significant performance** = 40-49 days **Outstanding performance** = 30 - 39 days	New	New	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	60 days	1%	Director: Development Management & Director: Organisational Effectiveness & Innovation
30	30	Obj1. 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 DMOP intervention is a longterm programme with 7 themes and 42 workstreams to date to bring about enhanced improvement in the development industry and customer engagement and experience with the department. **The priority projects are :** 1.Quality of application assessments 2. Measurement of the commenting protocol project Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** =Milestones not started **Not fully effective** = Milestones not achieved as planned **Fully effective** = 2 prioritiy projects finalised as per project plan **Significantly performance** = Commenting departments within SPE to achieve the target of ≥86- 90% for commenting on building development management applications within 7 calendar days, from the date it has been circulated on DAMS. **Outstanding performance** = Commenting departments within SPE to achieve the target of ≥90.1- 91.5 % for commenting on building development management applications within 7 calendar days, from the date it has been circulated on DAMS.	Priority Projects finalised (where planned to be completed by the end of the financial year)	Priority Projects finalised (where planned to be completed by the end of the financial year)	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 yea	3%	Director : Development Management
31	31	CM-DS	**Foreshore Freeway Development Framework (milestones)**	The objective is to progress towards land release for development.Finalising conceptual proposals and technical infrastructure solutions along with high level pre-feasibility assessment towards a comprehensive redevelopment vision with accompanying sequenced roll-out plan that will address current constraints and unlock future economic development opportunity in a phased manner for this key subprecinct part of the Cape Town CBD. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = Milestones not started **Not fully effective** = Milestones not achieved as planned **Fully effective =** Phase 1 land use application preparation commenced **Significant performance** = Phase 1 land use application pre-submission meeting complete **Outstanding performance** =Phase 1 land use application submitted	Final Drafts of the 2 development options submitted for decision	Stakeholder engagement associated with the preferred scenario identified in phase 1	Phase 1 land use application preparation commenced	N/A	Phase 1 draft Development Framework preparation underway	Phase 1 draft Development Framework preparation complete	Phase 1 land use application preparation commenced	4%	Manager: Urban Regeneration - Programme Coordinator & Partnerships
32	32	CM-DS	**Number of Integrated precinct management plans developed and approved:** **for ORIO Precincts identified below:** **Nolungile Station** **Nyanga Transport Interchange** **Vuyani/ Spine Road** **for Prioritised CBD's identified below:** **Wynberg CBD** **Mitchells Plain CBD**	Precinct Management includes the coordination between departments to address cleanliness/ safety and conditional assessment of buildings and public space. It will develop strategic partnerships to bring about sustained economic development and urban regeneration. Quarterly Performance Survey for Prioritized Precincts is Measuring against an agreed Precinct Performance Metric, made up of **1. Cleanliness which cannot be limited to UWM as this is a transversal action touching on**: Vandalism, Graffiti , Illegal advertising, Staining, Weeds or overgrown vacant plots, verges, , Dumping – garden, construction and demolition waste . **2. Conditional assessment of Precincts**: **a.** Public Space, Buildings and associated Infrastructure (City owned assets) **b.** Private buildings and associated infrastructure (including problem buildings) **c.** Other Government buildings and associated infrastructure (ie: PRASA, Transnet, etc) **d.** Issues include: **i.** The physical condition of the building, space and associated infrastructure (landscaping maintenance, graffiti, building maintenance etc) **ii.** Whether effective management is in place (public building lease agreement, trader management, legal or illegal occupation) The Prioritised Areas: CT CBD, Wynberg/ Claremont, Bellville, Mitchells Plain Town Centre, Nyanga Transport Interchange Precinct(Orio) and Nolungile Station Precinct (Orio). Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = 0 Precinct Mgt Plans developed **Not fully effective** = 1- 3 Precinct Mgt Plans developed **Fully effective =** 4 - 5 Precinct Management Plans developed **Significantly performance** = Determine a baseline by performing a quarterly precinct survey on cleanliness and conditional assessment of buildings and spaces of all identified areas **Outstanding performance** = Implementation of the Plan across a defined number of precincts	New	4	5	1	3	4	5	4%	Manager: Urban Regeneration - MURP
33	33	2. Improved access to quality and reliable basic services Less Formal Township Establishment Act (LFTEA) areas	**Development of Strategic Local Planning Framework (LPF) for Joe Slovo area**	This indicator focuses on the planning, coordination, and implementation progress of community development efforts in Joe Slovo, culminating in a strategic urban local planning framework for the area. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = Milestones not started **Not fully effective** = Milestones not achieved as planned **Fully effective =** All quarterly milestones achieved in line with approved plans and timelines **Significant performance =** Sub-council approval of the Local Planning Framework **Outstanding performance** : Implementation milestones of Framework started	New	New	Submit LPF to ED for approval	Project initiation and procurement	Project implementation and stakeholder engagement	Drafting of framework	Submit LPF to ED for approval	3%	Manager: Urban Regeneration - MURP

34	34	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government Unlawful Land Occupation (ULO)	**Unlawful Land Occupation plan**	The following process milestones is followed to measure the impact and progress for eviction: 1. Proactive identification of areas at risk 2. Identification of custodian department/ land owner 3. Informing and ongoing reviews at the WAR room and Safety and security land invasion meetings 4. Line department has recogised the ULO and initiated the internal eviction process with the City's legal services (includes submission of Legal requests form and documentation) 5. A legal team is appointed 6. A notice to vacate is served 7. The City's eviction application drafted and reviewed 8. The City's eviction application finalised by City's Advocate and lauching of application to follow 9. Ongoing monitoring of ULO sites (drones, patrols etc) The Directorate has 4 Protected areas which are at different stages of the above eviction process namely Slangetjiebos, Rivergate, Wolfgat and Potsdam Sustainability campus Performance Rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 2 or equal achieved **Not fully effective** =< 3 or equal average achieved **Fully effective =** average of 4 - 5 achieved **Significantly performance** = average of 6- 6.6 achieved **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 6.7 -7 average achieved	7 milestones achieved	4	5	5	5	5	5	3%	Director: Environmental Management

Robert McGaffin

Digitally signed by Robert McGaffin
Date: 2026.07.10 15:47:34 +02'00'

Executive Director **Date**

Robert McGaffin

Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo
Date: 2026.07.31 07:47:40 +02'00'

City Manager **Date**

Lungelo Mbandazayo