FINAL 2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Jason McNeil
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

CM73615A

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Baseline 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											15%	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											55%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											10%	
												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%	5%	5%	AT	AT	AT	5%	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: CMRS (Contract Register and Monitoring System) and Tender Tracking System Contact person: Maureen Whare 069 367 4023

2	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduction in the number of SCM deviations (%)	The objective is to achieve a 20% reduction on SCM deviations. The indicator only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R750 000 (inclusive of VAT). Sole/single service provider deviations, deviations relating to emergencies and unforeseen situations (at this time being – anti-corruption investigations and extortion management, with associated human life threats (threat to limb and life) will be excluded from the measurement as per section 36 of SCM regulations. Target = reduction of 20% Formula: (Number of SCM deviations for current year – Number of SCM deviations for prior year)/ Number of SCM deviations for prior year X 100" Exception protocols: A default performance rating of fully effective will be awarded if you have 2 or less deviations from a base of 2 or less <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance:** Any positive increase in the number of deviations, year-on-year **Not fully effective:** a reduction > 0% - < 19.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. **Fully effective**: a reduction of 20% - 21%, for the number of deviations (year-on-year), or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol) **Significant performance:** a reduction > 21% - < 99.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. **Outstanding performance:** a reduction of 100% for the number of deviations, year-on-year or no deviations for the current year.	-25%	20%	20%	AT	AT	AT	20%	2%	Department: SCM Source document: SCM deviations schedule Formula: Number of SCM deviations reduced by the target percentage % year on year for the department/ directorate. Contact person: Gayle Postings Office of the City Manager: Specialist Advisor 021 400 1268

3	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Irregular, Fruitless and Wasteful, Unauthorised** Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating and Capital Expenditure	The indicator measures the extent to which the municipality has incurred irregular, fruitless and wasteful and unauthorised expenditure on its total budget (operating and capital budget). Fruitless and wasteful expenditure is expenditure that was made in vain and would have been avoided had reasonable care been exercised. Irregular expenditure is incurred by the municipality in contravention of a requirement of the law (specific legislation, per MFMA legislation). Unauthorized expenditure includes overspending of the total amount appropriated in the approved budget. The net amount after recoveries, write offs or condonement should be used in this calculation. The Q4 final figure is obtained from the Pre-audited AFS. Irregular expenditure will be included, if identified by other assurance providers, irrespective if it is self-disclosed or not. Formula: Per Directorate incidents value as a percentage of Directorate Opex and Capex ((1) Irregular + (2) Fruitless and Wasteful + (3) Unauthorised Expenditure) / (4) Total Operating and Capital Expenditure x 100 Note: New Executive Director or Executive Director taking up a post in another directorate as an Executive Director (in the year of review) will be measured on the UIFW Expenditure incidents for the current year, where the incident is in the term of appointment as Executive Director. This also applies if an existing ED moves to another directorate, the ED will be regarded as "New" I.e. previous UIFW expenditure incidents not in the term of employment of the ED will not be measured. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performanc**e: ≥ 1.5% **Not fully effective:** > 0.75% - 1.49% **Fully effective**: 0.75% **Significant performance:** < 0.75% - > 0% **Outstanding performance:** 0%	New	0.75%	0.75%	AT	AT	AT	0.75%	2%	Department: City Manager Office Source document: Irregular Register and the AG's findings **in the quarter that it is available**. Contact person: Gayle Postings 021 400 1268
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'. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = N/A **Not fully effective** = < 99.99% **Fully effective** = N/A **Significant performanc**e = N/A **Outstanding performance** =100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	Department: Investor Relations Source document: Completed Audit Action plan Contact person: Lynn Fortune:021 400 5987

5	5	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Final council and Mayco decisions implemented within timeframes (%)	This indicator measures all final Council and Mayco decisions allocated to the ED with implementation date for the quarter. Items marked as "implementation approved" that were due in the quarter (utilising the project end date as a filter) will be used to calculate the target. The indicator excludes: •All council and Mayco decisions for noting. •Decisions outside of the control of the ED. •Decisions marked as "terminated" or "status completed" •Decisions actioned close to the end of the quarter which would be impossible to implement during that quarter due to time constraints – for example, if Council is on the last day of March, the decisions can only be work flowed to relevant EDs during April. •These exclusions must be supported by valid evidence and reflected on each quarterly report for the City Manager and/or panel's awareness. Implementation that runs over a period longer than a financial year will be measured according to milestones identified for implementation within the current financial year. Each ED must ensure that a date is allocated of when action will be completed and implemented. This must be captured in the CDIT system by the relevant implementer. If no timeframe was allocated, the timeframe is deemed to be one month for implementation. The project start date will be utilised to ensure projects with no end dates are included. Implementation is the date of completion of the actions or achievement of councils request or expectation ("implementation approved" date). <u>Performance rating</u>: **Unacceptable performance:** < 69% of ALL decisions **Not fully effective**: 69% - 99% of ALL decisions **Fully effective:** 100% of ALL decisions **Significant performance:** N/A **Outstanding performance:**N/A If "Not Applicable" weighting must be reallocated it within the category.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Each ED is responsible for implementation, evidence and updates to the tracking system. Source document: SharePoint tracking Tracking System contact person: Rehana Razack (021 400 1246)

6	6	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.J Budget spent on implementation of Workplace Skills Plan (%)	Measures the percentage of budget spent on the Workplace Skills Plan .The Workplace Skills Plan outlines the planned education, training and development interventions for the organisation. Its purpose is to formally plan and allocate budget for appropriate training interventions that will address the needs arising out of local government's skills sector plan, the IDP, the individual departmental staffing strategies, individual employees' personal development plans and the employment equity plan. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(f). Formula: % spent on the implementation of the WSP measured against the training budget. (A/B)*100 A: Actual spend per quarter on training budget B: Planned spend on training Budget for the year Q4 (as at end of June) reporting will be based on the latest period available at the time of reporting. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 90% **Not fully effective** = 90% - 94.99% **Fully effective** = 95% - 96% **Significant performance** = 96.1% - 97.99% **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 98%	83.46%	95%	95%	10%	30%	70%	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) Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 75% **Not fully effective** = 75% - 84.99% **Fully effective** = 85% - 90% **Significant performance** = > 90% - 94.99% **Outstanding performance**= ≥ 95%	87%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	3%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mothibi

8	8	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Community satisfaction survey (average)	Measures the average score on the Community satisfaction survey. A statistically valid, scientifically defendable score from the annual survey of residents' perceptions of the overall performance of the City. The aim of the indicator is to improve the community's perception of the City. The measure is given against a non-symmetrical Likert scale, where 1 is poor, 2 is fair, 3 is good, 4 is very good, and 5 is excellent. The objective is to improve the current customer satisfaction average score per Directorate. 1. A score of 2.8 and below based on the previous year's survey outcome: <u>Performance rating</u>*: **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: <u>Performance rating</u>*: **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.	3.0	N/A	3.0	AT	AT	AT	3.0	1%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: Community Satisfaction survey score Contact person: Bridgette Morris 021 400 3812

9	9	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Inclusion of C88 **Output** indicators (%)	All Tier 1 and Tier 2 Circular 88 Output indicators should be included into the performance scorecards of the Executive Directors, where relevant. All indicators must be included verbatim into the **Corporate (auditable) and Directorate SDBIP (cascading principle)** and the measurement must be in compliance with the Technical Indicator Descriptions (TID) as issued by National Treasury. This indicator will be measured during the annual and mid-year review process. Measurement: Q1 and Q3 (after mid-year amendments). Weighting must be reallocated where there the ED has no Output indicators. Note: Indicators that have barriers and challenges are excluded from the formula. The indicator will measure two aspects: 1) The inclusion of C88 Output indicators in the Directorate SDBIP, and 1) Formula: **Inclusion in the directorate SDBIP -** Total number of Tier 1& 2 Output indicators included in the directorate SDBIP divided by Tier 1 & 2 indicators required for inclusion as per C88 (auditable) * 100 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 performance:** >90% - 95% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Outstanding performance:** >95% - 100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Department: Organisational Performance Management (OPM) Source document: C88 scorecard and Directorate SDBIP Contact person: Monique Fillies - 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). <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = > 15% **Not fully effective** = > 10% - ≤ 15% **Fully effective** = ≤ 10% **Significant performance** = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9% **Outstanding performance** = < 5%	2%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	1%	Department: Supply Chain Management Source document: Demand Plan Overview Contact person: Bekumuzi Vumase and Razaan Arendse Manager Demand Management
11	11	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Gaps in repeatable tender continuity (average number of days)	This indicator is to ensure continued monthly service delivery implemented through repeatable tenders. A "gap" refers to the number of days between the expiring contract and the replacement contract commencing. Potential gaps should be mitigated via extension/expansion and/or deviation early enough so that it caters for any possible delay within a tender process. A gap less than one month will be included in the calculation. To drive the demand plan and improve Supply Chain Management (SCM) process and service delivery. The indicator is based on all repeatable tenders that currently has a gap at the time of reporting, i.e. the current contract had already expired and the new contract is not yet in place. Average number of days refer to calendar days (inclusive of weekends). Formula: Total number of gaps in days/ Total number of tenders with a gap of more than zero days = Average number of gaps (days) (Effectively the report should be 'blank'.) Using the gap report developed by Zubair which takes current status and projected time for completion into account. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = repeatable tenders with ≥ 150 days gap **Not fully effective** = repeatable tenders with ≥ 90 - < 150 days gap **Fully effective** = repeatable tenders with ≥ 30 - < 90 days gap **Significant performance** = repeatable tenders with gaps < 30 days gap **Outstanding performance** = zero repeatable tenders with gaps	1040	0	0	0	0	0	0	1%	Department: CPPPM Source document: GAP report prepared by Zubair Contact person: Maureen Whare

12	12	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Recurring Audit Findings and /or recurring root causes (number)	The extent to which the Executive Director ensures that audit findings ((Communication of audit findings (COMAFs) and Service Delivery (lived- reality / resident experience) findings) are addressed at root-cause level. Remedial and corrective actions are translated into strengthened controls, standard practices and preventative mechanisms across the respective directorate for areas of improvement (e.g. transaction, discipline, functions, controls and oversight). The indicator will be measured year-on-year during the duration of the ED's term of office/employment contract. New EDs will not be penalised for recurring findings and/or root causes prior to their appointment. A COMAF is defined as: Any Auditor General of South Africa (AGSA) Communication of audit finding as per the scope of the regulatory audit. Indicator objective: to ensure that no recurring findings or root causes arises from the AGSA audits. To ensure that all audit findings and/or root causes identified by the AGSA that fall within the Executive Director's area of responsibility are effectively addressed and resolved, preventing recurrence, demonstrating improved governance, internal controls and strengthening accountability within the directorate. A recurring finding is defined as: Recurring findings refer to those findings which have persisted from one year of reporting to the next or a prior year, regardless of whether it relates to the same project/indicator or a different project/indicator or same department or different department within the directorate. Source: Management Audit Action Plans (MAAPs), Management Report and COMAFs Formula: Count of the number of recurring findings and /or recurring root causes <u>Performance rating</u>: **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											**15%**	
13	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Total Capital Expenditure as a percentage of Total Capital Budget less contingencies (%)	This indicator measures the extent to which budgeted capital expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Capital expenditure is all costs incurred by the municipality for acquiring, upgrading, and renewing assets such as property, equipment, plants, buildings, intangible assets, investment property or any other assets meeting the definition of assets in terms of GRAP. Less soft-locked contractual contingencies on projects and insurance contingencies. **Q1 – Q3 reporting:** Formula: (1) YTD Actual Capital Expenditure / (2) Total Budgeted Capital Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. **Q4 reporting:** Formula: (1) Actual Capital Expenditure / (2) Total Budgeted Capital Expenditure **less contingencies**. The latest approved budget is applicable. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 85% or >100% (non-compliance) **Not fully effective** = ≥ 85% - 89.99% **Fully effective** = 90% - 93% **Significant performance** = > 93% - 96% **Outstanding performance** = > 96%	96.3%	90%	90%	10%	35%	60%	90%	4%	Directorate Finance Manager
14	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Total Operating Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating Expenditure budget	This indicator measures the extent to which operating expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Operating Expenditure (non-capital spending) is costs which the municipality incurs through its normal operations. The latest approved budget is applicable. Less soft-locked contractual grant construction contingency provisions projects provisions related to Human Settlements directorate. Q1 – Q4 reporting; Formula: Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. Q4 reporting for Human Settlements directorate: Formula: (1) Actual Operating Expenditure / (2) Budgeted Operating Expenditure, less contingencies in the contingency provisions. The latest approved budget is applicable. Formula: Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. Performance rating: **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%	99.31%	95%	95%	15%	40%	65%	95%	9%	Directorate Finance Manager

15	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	% of Capital Grant Funding Expenditure Spent	The purpose of the indicator is to ensure cashflow alignment, risk acceptance and strengthened governance requirements for Capital grant funded projects. Disclaimer: Achievement of at least 45% expenditure spent by 31 December is a non-negotiable requirement. This will include an internal November performance assessment benchmark to allow corrective action ahead of the National Treasury (NT) cut-off times. Evidence: Grant Performance Reports Issued by Grant Funding Department Formula: % of Capital grant funding expenditure spent (excludes performance component of Urban Development Financing Grant (UDFG)) =Capital Grant expenditure spent/Total Capital grant allocation in budget • Q2 spent will be based on the latest available budget at 31 December. • FY spent will be based on the approved FY budget. • Grants received before Q2 will be included (grant dumps). • Grants received after Q2 will be excluded (grant dumps). Grant dumps refer to grant allocations received that fall outside the approved DORA (Division of Revenue Act) allocation process: • They are unplanned or irregular transfers of funds. • Unlike standard DORA allocations, which follow a structured approval and distribution framework, grant dumps are not part of the formal budgetary or legislative process. • They may arise from ad hoc decisions, emergency funding, or discretionary transfers that bypass the usual allocation mechanisms. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance**: <90% (Q4 or y/end) or <45% spent by 31 December (Q2) **Not fully effective**: 90% - <93% (Q4 or y/end) or <45% spent by 31 December (Q2) **Fully effective**: 93% - 95% (Q4 or y/end) and 45% spent by 31 December (Q2) **Significant performance**: >95% - 97% (Q4 or y/end) and 45% spent by 31 December (Q2) **Outstanding performance**: >97% (Q4 or y/end) and 45% spent by 31 December (Q2)	New	New	93%	N/A	45%	N/A	93%	2%	Grant Funding Department

	SERVICE DELIVERY / GOOD GOVERNANCE											**55%**	
16	1	2. Improved access to quality and reliable basic services	2.C Percentage of recognised informal settlements receiving basic waste removal services (ENV3.11)	The proportion of recognised informal settlements within the municipal area which are receiving at least a basic standard of service for refuse collection and cleaning services all weeks in the year. A "recognised informal settlement" refers to any process whereby the municipality officially documents the existence of the informal settlement and its obligations with regards to servicing its residents. This excludes "known" settlements that may emerge in the course of the reporting as a result of land invasions or on private property which the municipality is not responsible for. If the informal settlement has not received a basic standard of service in duration of more than one week, it should not be counted. Informal settlements that have experienced delayed collection of more than a week, or skipped weeks, are not considered to have received a basic standard of refuse removal. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance:** <90% **Not fully effective:** 90% - 98.99% **Fully effective:** 99% - 99.2% **Significant performance:** 99.3% - 99.7%. **Outstanding performance:** > 99.7%	N/A	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	1%	Director: Waste Services
17	2	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support inclusive economic growth	4.F Service requests for non-collection of refuse resolved within 3 working days (Percentage) (NKPI)	Measures the number of non-collections for residential refuse removal, reported and closed within 3 days, expressed as a percentage. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(a). <u>Performance rating</u> **Unacceptable performance**: < 90% **Not fully effective**: 90% - 95.99% **Fully effective**: 96% - 97% **Significant performance**: 97.1% - 98% **Outstanding performance**: > 98%	New	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	5%	Director: Waste Services
18	3	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support inclusive economic growth	Formal Beats receiving a refuse collection service on scheduled day (Percentage)	Measures the number of formal beats receiving collection services on a scheduled day, at current resource availability, expressed as a percentage at the end of the reporting period. Formula: Total number of beats / Total number of backlog beats expressed as a percentage <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance:** <93% **Not fully effective:** 93% - 94.9% **Fully effective:** 95% - 97% **Significant performance:** ≥ 97.1% - 98% **Outstanding performance:** > 98%	98.36%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	7%	Director: Waste Services
19	4	4. Well managed modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	Drop-offs facilities open to the public (Percentage)	Measures the percentage access to City drop-off facilities provided to the public. Formula: For any specific quarter: Month 1 % Access + Month 2 % Access + Month 3 % Access / 3= Total access for the quarter <u>Performance rating</u> **Unacceptable performance:** < 94% **Not fully effective:** 94% - 98.9% **Fully effective:** 99% - 99.2% **Significant performance:** 99.3% - 99.5% **Outstanding performance:** ≥ 99.6%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	7%	Director: Waste Services

20	5	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support inclusive economic growth	ENV3.2 Percentage of scheduled waste collection service points experiencing collection delays of more than one day	This is a measure of the number of scheduled kerbside waste collection service points affected by waste collection delays of more than one scheduled collection day, out of the total population of municipal scheduled kerbside waste collection points over the reporting period. A scheduled waste collection service user is someone residing at a site for which the municipality provides a scheduled kerbside collection service on a weekly basis in terms of the National Environment Management: Waste Act, National Domestic Waste Collection Standards, Section 9a. The service points are proxies for users. The indicator measures the instance of service points affected by collection delays exceeding the scheduled waste collection standard of one collection day in terms of section 9c. "c. When collection has been missed the waste must be removed not later than on the next scheduled collection day". The indicator is measured in terms of scheduled waste collection in relation to the total number of kerbside wate collection service points multiplied by 52 weekly collections. Formula: (1) Aggregate of the number of scheduled waste collection service points experiencing collection delays of more than one day / ((2) Total number of scheduled waste collection service points x 52)' Performance rating **Unacceptable performance:** >0.13% **Not fully effective:** 0.11% - 0.13% **Fully effective:** 0.09% - 0.1% **Significant performance:** 0.01% - 0.08% **Outstanding performance:** < 0.00%	New	New	0.1%	AT	AT	AT	0.1%	7%	Director: Waste Services
21	6	4. Well managed modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	Operation rate of compactors availability (%)	Measures the operation of the compactors capacity for refuse removal (%). Formula: Number of compactors available for scheduled refuse collection / Total number of compactors for scheduled refuse collection Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance:** <90% **Not fully effective:** 90% - 94.99% **Fully effective:** 95% - 96% **Significant performance:** 96.1% - 97% **Outstanding performance:** > 97.1%	103%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	7%	Director: Waste Services
22	7	4. Well managed modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	Community activities undertaken to increase the levels of awareness and understanding about making better choices in managing waste (Number)	Promote behavioural change by raising awareness and encouraging individuals to do their part to make the right choices and waste minimisation. Formula: The indicator will be measured based on the total number of activities to take place across all 21 subcouncils and thus contribute to the overall annual target. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance:** <380 **Not fully effective:** 380 to 399 **Fully effective:** 400 - 420 **Significant performance:** 421 - 442 **Outstanding performance:** > 442	631	400	400	100	200	300	400	7%	Director: Integrated Planning & Waste Strategy
23	8	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	Waste diverted from landfill sites through council waste minimisation initiatives (Percentage)	This indicator reflects the percentage of waste reduced, through the City's own waste minimisation initiatives, by diverting recyclables from the waste stream in relation to the mass of waste disposed at council waste management facilities. Formula: Total Waste diverted through Council's initiatives / Total Waste generated for disposal at Council facilities Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance:** < 33% **Not fully effective:** 33% - 34.99% **Fully effective:** 35% - 36.75% **Significant performance:** 36.76% - 38.60% **Outstanding performance:** > 38.60%	New	35%	35%	AT	AT	AT	35%	7%	Director: Waste Services

24	9	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, and 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 and 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- and 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. <u>Performance rating:</u> **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%	Strategic Planning, Policy and Strategy Contact person: Lucille Janssens & Director: Integrated Planning & Waste Strategy

25	10	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Adherence to the requirements of the Metro Trading Services reform	National Treasury has initiated the trading services reform in metropolitan municipalities through performance-based financial incentive component of the Urban Development Finance Grant (UDFG), as set out in the Division of Revenue Bill, 2025. The financial incentive will be used to reward good accountability and performance. Frequency of reporting is annual. The purpose of the indicator: 1. Is to ensure the timeous submission of all trading services related deliverables (technical, non-financial, tariff and financial) as identified in the approved trading service reform roadmap. 2. To ensure 100% award of grant funding is achieved, through achieving full points during the assessment score. This assessment score is reviewed by an independent assessor as assigned by NT. Evidence Requirements: 1. Evidence of submission of necessary assessment documentation to National Treasury (per latest approved programme implementation plans). 2. Resultant score for the trading service awarded by the appointed independent assessors and officially communicated to the City. Non-submission of deliverables and poor implementation will result in non-compliance or poor performance. This will have an direct impact on grant funding allocated to the City of Cape Town, which negatively impacts various projects funded by the funding and the City's overall balance sheet. Disclaimer: The above definition and evidence are in accordance with the MTSR guidelines, which may change from time to time. The resultant score as assessed by the National Treasury in accordance with the associated Guidance Note (addendum to guidance note 4: annexure: technical indicator description and minimum commitments definition sheets). Per the note, the calculation of this score will vary as the programme is rolled out with the first score being binary (full points, or no points and subsequent years being weighted according to performance, but with requirement to maintain the binary commitments or the weighted score will be zero). UWM: 2025/26: Entry into the programme. 2026/27: 100% - Council commitment for the 8 minimum conditions. 2027/28: 100% - Assessment based on achievement of 8 minimum conditions. Thereafter the 100% will equate to the assessment based on partial or full achievement of targets as per A3 PIAP. The weighting for the indicator will not be reallocated. <u>Performance rating</u> (UWM: 2025 - 2028): **Unacceptable performance:** N/A **Not fully effective**: N/A **Fully effective**: N/A **Significant performance**: N/A **Outstanding performance**: 100% <u>Performance rating</u> (UWM: 2028/29 onwards): **Unacceptable performance:** Assessment score of below < 50% **Not fully effective**: Assessment score of 50% - < 75% **Fully effective**: Assessment score of 75% - 90% **Significant performance:** Assessment score of > 90% - 99.9% **Outstanding performance:** Assessment score of 100% Disclaimer: The performance rating for non-adherence/ non-submission/ non-entry into the Trading Services Reform (including the non-achievement of binary indicators) will be scored at zero. Note: Performance for UWM will be assessed against the submission of required programme documentation to National Treasury and the resultant inclusion of UWM in the programme (full points)(applicable 2025)	New	100%	100%	AT	AT	AT	100%	5%	Department: Grant Funding Source document: Submissions to NT and resultant score Contact person: Daniel Sullivan: 021 400 5097

	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**10%**	
26	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government SMF	Implementation of the approved Waste Strategy based on identified milestones/ actions (Percentage)	The implementation plan outlines the proposed Waste Strategy interventions, the role-players involved, and the resources required to fulfil the core objectives and commitments of the Strategy. It is envisaged that the implementation will be over a long-term period of 10-12 years and more and is divided into three priority levels. Formula: To measure the achievement of the identified actions for 2026/2027 in the implementation plan of the Waste Strategy based on the action plan express in percentage. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance**: < 60% Implementation of the identified milestones/actions during the financial year achieved **Not fully effective**: 61 - 79% implementation of the identified milestones/actions during the financial year achieved **Fully effective**: 80% implementation of the identified milestones/actions during the financial year achieved **Significant performance**: 81% - 85% Implementation of the identified milestones/actions during the financial year achieved **Outstanding performance**: >85% Implementation of the identified milestones/actions during the financial year achieved	New	80% implementation of the identified actions for 2025/2026 in the approved Implementation Plan achieved	80% implementation of the identified milestones/ actions during the financial year achieved	20%	40%	60%	80% implementation of the identified milestones/ actions during the financial year achieved	5%	Director: IP&WS in conjunction with all other contributing departments and branches
27	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	BI Initiative Waste Compactors Fuel Consumption (L/100 km)	Measures fuel consumption of Compactor vehicles (used by collections and cleansing) as litres of fuel consumed per 100 km travelled. Formula: Fuel Consumption (L/100km) = (Total fuel consumed ÷ Total distance travelled) × 100 Performance rating: **Unacceptable:** > 85 L/100km **Not Fully Effective:** 79.2 - 84.9- L/100km **Fully effective:** 75 - 79.1 L/100km **Significant performance:** 70 - 74.9 L/100km **Outstanding performance:** < 70 L/100km	New	New	75 L / 100km	AT	AT	AT	75 L / 100km	1%	Corporate BI Team
28	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government MFMA compliance	Completion of MFMA Competency by Executive Directors (%)	The indicator measures the adherence to the MFMA. Section 16 of the MFMA requires Executive Directors (EDs) to meet the minimum competency levels. The attainment of competency levels must be obtained within prescribed timeframes and must be included in performance agreements. EDs have 18 months to complete, which commences on date that contract was signed. Within the 18 month period the 100% target will represent the modules completed for the year. Performance rating: **Fully effective** = 100%	New	100%	100%	AT	AT	AT	100%	0%	ED: UWM

29	4	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Revenue collected as a percentage of billed amount	To measure the receipts as a percentage of billing covering the immediate 12 months period for all directorate responsible for services. Formula: Revenue collected over Billed amount. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance:** < 90% **Not fully effective:** 90% - 94.99% **Fully effective:** 95% - 95.9% **Significant performance:** 96% - 97% **Outstanding performance:** > 97%	96%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	4%	Corporate Finance

Jason Mc Neil
Digitally signed by Jason Mc Neil
Date: 2026.07.15 12:51:11 +02'00'

SIGN HERE

Executive Director **Date**

Jason McNeil

Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo
Date: 2026.07.31 07:49:29 +02'00'

City Manager **Date**

Lungelo Mbandazayo