2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Regan Melody
1 September 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Target	Annual Target	Q1 Target	Q2 Target	Q3 Target	Q4 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
					2023/2024	2024/2025	2025/2026	30-Sept-25	31-Dec-25	31-Mar-26	30-Jun-26		
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											60%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											10%	
												100%	
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
1	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Increase in P3M3 and EM maturity level (average)	The CPPPM maturity level is based on the PPPM and Engineering Management (Only applicable to Engineering Directorates) maturity assessment. The maturity assessment will reflect the average maturity level of: - 1. Portfolio, Programme, Project and - 2. Engineering Management level. This will occur on an annual basis in order to assess the increase in the maturity level for the Directorate. The maturity level is measured on a scale of 1 - 5. The maturity levels: * Level 1 – Initial Process: No standard process or tracking system – informal process * Level 2 – Repeatable Process: Minimum standards for processes and procedures * Level 3 – Defined Process: Defined Process which allow for flexibility * Level 4 – Managed Process: Obtain and retain specific measurements and quality requirements * Level 5 – Optimised Process: Continuous process improvement and proactive technology and problem management for future improvements All other EDs will be measured per the individual directorate. 1. A score of 3.1 and above based on the 2023/2024 baseline (for P3M3 and EM): <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.21 from existing maturity level Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 - 0.2 from existing maturity level Fully effective = maintain 3.1 or existing maturity level (no movement) Significant performance = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 from existing maturity level Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.21 from existing maturity level 2. A score of below 3.1based on the previous year's baseline. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.21 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 - 0.2 or increase to 2.99 Fully effective = maintain 3.0 or increase to 3.0 from existing maturity level Significant performance = increase of 0.11 - 0.2 above a baseline score of 3.0 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.21 above a baseline score of 3.0	New	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	AT	AT	AT	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: PPM assessment Contact person: Ben Peters 021 400 9206
2	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Increase in Contract Management maturity level	The Contract Management maturity level is based on the Contract Management maturity assessment only. This will occur on an annual basis in order to assess the increase in the maturity level for the Directorate. The maturity level is measured on a scale of 1 - 5. The maturity levels: * Level 1 – Initial Process: No standard process or tracking system – informal process * Level 2 – Repeatable Process: Minimum standards for processes and procedures * Level 3 – Defined Process: Defined Process which allow for flexibility * Level 4 – Managed Process: Obtain and retain specific measurements and quality requirements * Level 5 – Optimised Process: Continuous process improvement and proactive technology and problem management for future improvements All other EDs will be measured per the individual directorate. 1. A score of 3.75 and above: <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.11 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 – 0.2 Fully effective = maintain 3.75 or existing maturity level (no movement) Significant performance = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.21 2. A score of below 3.75: <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.11 Not fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.1 Fully effective = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 Significant performance = increase of 0.21 - 0.3 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.31	New	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	AT	AT	AT	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	1%	Department: CPPPM Source document: PPM assessment Contact person: Ben Peters 021 400 9207

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Regan Melody
1 September 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Target 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sept-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
				MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION								**20%**	
				MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY								**10%**	
				SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE								**60%**	
				DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS								**10%**	
												100%	
3	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Repeatable Tenders that were Expanded/Amended multiple times (%)	Measures the percentage of Expansions and Amendments on repeatable tenders. This indicator will only measure instances where there was more than one Expansion and/or Amendment on the same tender. Expansions or Amendments are defined by the SCM section 116 (3) guide and can change at any time. If a tender extension is awarded within 45 days of contract expiry of the current contracts arising from the tender, it will result in Unacceptable Performance. This would require all extensions to be awarded at least 45 days before expiry, ensuring proactive planning. 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. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = ≥ 3.1% or if tender extension is awarded within 45 days of contract expiry of the current contracts arising from the tender. Not fully effective= 2.1% – 3% Fully effective = 1.8% - 2% Significant performance = 0.1% - 1.79% Outstanding performance = 0%	3,57%	2%	2%	AT	AT	AT	2%	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: CMRS (Contract Register and Monitoring System) and Tender Tracking System Contact person: Maureen Whare 069 367 4023
4	4	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.	0%	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
5	5	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 performance = ≥ 1.5% Not fully effective = > 0.75% - 1.49% Fully effective = 0.75% Significant performance = < 0.75% - > 0% Outstanding performance = 0%	173,7%	10%	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

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Regan Melody
1 September 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Target 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sept-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											**20%**	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											**10%**	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											**60%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**10%**	
												100%	
6	**6**	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 performance = 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
7	**7**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Final council and Mayco decisions implemented within timeframes (%)	The indicator excludes all council and Mayco decisions for noting. Decisions taken by council and Mayco where there is no budget to implement actions or outside of the control of the ED. These exclusions must be supported by valid evidence. These decisions must be reflected on each quarterly report for the City Manager and/or panel's awareness. All final Council and Mayco decisions allocated to the ED with implementation date for the quarter must be implemented and reported on for the quarter to achieve the target. Implementation that runs over a period longer than a financial year will be measured according to milestones identified for implementation within the current financial year. Each ED must ensure that a date is allocated of when action will be completed and implemented. This must be captured in the CDIT system by the relevant implementer. If no timeframe was allocated the timeframe is deemed to be one month for implementation. Implementation is the date of completion of the actions or achievement of councils request or expectation. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < 69% of ALL decisions Not fully effective = 69% - 79.99% of ALL decisions Fully effective = 80% - 85% of ALL decisions Significant performance = 85.1% - 94.99% of ALL decisions Outstanding performance = ≥ 95% of ALL decisions If "Not Applicable"-weighting will be "zero" and must be reallocated it within the Transversal Category.	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)
8	**8**	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%	97,63%	95%	95%	25%	40%	70%	95%	2%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Regan Melody
1 September 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Target	Annual Target	Q1 Target	Q2 Target	Q3 Target	Q4 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
					2023/2024	2024/2025	2025/2026	30-Sept-25	31-Dec-25	31-Mar-26	30-Jun-26		
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											**20%**	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											**10%**	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											**60%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**10%**	
												100%	
9	9	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%	91%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	2%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mothibi
10	10	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 2) The inclusion of C88 Outcome and Output indicators on the Corporate Scorecard (CSC) (graduating), whether replacing existing CSC indicators. 1) Formula: Inclusion in the directorate SDBIP - Total number of Tier 1& 2 Output indicators included in the directorate SDBIP divided by Tier 1 & 2 indicators required for inclusion as per C88 (auditable) * 100 2) Formula: Replacement and/ or inclusion of C88 Outcome and Output indicators on the CSC Graduating criteria: Meet the strategic mandate of the City, with the Mayor's approval and Indicators should be auditable with systems and controls in place. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < 80% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Not fully effective = 80% - 84.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Fully effective =85% - 99.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Significant performance =100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Outstanding performance =100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 and at least one replacement/ graduation to the CSC Exception rule: If an ED included less than 100% of the Output indicators (verbatim), however graduated at least one indicator, they will receive a default rating of Significant performance.	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

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Regan Melody
1 September 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Target	Annual Target	Q1 Target	Q2 Target	Q3 Target	Q4 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
					2023/2024	2024/2025	2025/2026	30-Sept-25	31-Dec-25	31-Mar-26	30-Jun-26		
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											60%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											10%	
												100%	
11	11	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%	17%	≤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
12	12	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: GAP report prepared by Zubair Contact person: Zubair Adams
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
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. <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%	85,56%	90%	90%	14%	37%	63%	90%	6%	Directorate Finance Manager

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Regan Melody
1 September 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Target 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sept-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											**20%**	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											**10%**	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											**60%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**10%**	
												100%	
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. 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%	98,73%	95%	95%	17%	43%	64%	95%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager
15	**3**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Performance on cash backed expenditure over cash back budget items only (%)	In terms of the Directive 7 of 2023, directorates cannot offset primary operating budgeted expenditure that translates into a cash outflow against non-cash flow expenditures such as Impairments, Depreciation, Debt impairment, Write-offs, Post-retirement medical aid (PRMA) provision, Rehabilitation of landfill sites, Water Inventory, labour to operating, Interest and Prior year adjustments. This indicator measures the outcome of cash backed items only over the budget and if the outcome is higher than 100% then, it reflects reliance on non-cash items. The aim of the indicator is to achieve an outcome of less than or equal to100%. Source: Financial information. Formula: Operating expenditure (cash items only) / Operating budget (cash items only). Measured quarterly. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = > 100% Not fully effective = N/A Fully effective = 100% Significantly performance = ≥ 98% - 99.9% Outstanding performance = ≥ 95% - 97.9%	0%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager
	SERVICE DELIVERY / GOOD GOVERNANCE											**60%**	
16	**1**	12 A sustainable transport system that is integrated, efficient and provides safe and affordable travel options for all	Percentage completion of construction of IRT Phase 2A project (E6 Trunk Route package	Refers to the construction of E6 Trunk Route work package (AZ Berman). The quarterly targets are reflected as a percentage of contract spend at time of reporting. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = <50% Not fully effective =50% - <55% Fully effective = 55% - 58% Significant performance = >58% - 61% Outstanding performance = >61%	New	New	55%	35%	40%	50%	55%	5%	Director: Transport Infrastructure Implementation
17	**2**	12 A sustainable transport system that is integrated, efficient and provides safe and affordable travel options for all	Foreshore Freeway/Bridge Project: Progress Conceptual design	Commence with Conceptual design for the foreshore Freeway Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = Draft Preliminary Design Report (with Drawings) not complete. Not fully effective = Final Preliminary Design Report (with Drawings) not complete. Fully effective = Final Preliminary Design Report (with Drawings). Significant performance = Table report for conceptual design of the Foreshore Precinct at SC and PC. Outstanding performance = Table report for conceptual design of the Foreshore Precinct at SC, PC and Council.	Complete the Options report for the Foreshore Freeway Integrated with the Land use	Technical Feasibility report applying multi criteria analysis and selection of prefered Integrated solution.	Final Preliminary Design Report (with Drawings)	Prepare a public participation plan	Execute the public participation of the prefered solution	Draft Preliminary Design Report (with Drawings)	Final Preliminary Design Report (with Drawings)	3%	Director: Transport Planning and Network Management
18	**3**	A sustainable transport system that is integrated, efficient and provides safe and affordable travel options for all	12.A Passengers transported for each scheduled kilometer travelled by MyCiTi buses (ratio)	Measures the ratio of the passengers transported for each kilometre scheduled on MyCiTi buses. The aim is to have more passengers travelling per kilometre scheduled on the MyCiTi transport system. The purpose of the indicator is to measure efficiency improvements in the usage of MyCiTi buses. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <0.969 Not fully effective: 0.969 - 1.019 Fully effective: 1.02 - 1.07 Significant performance: 1.071 - 1.12 Outstanding performance: >1.12	1,05	1,00	1,02	1,02	1,02	1,02	1,02	5%	Director: Public Transport
19	**4**	A sustainable transport system that is integrated, efficient and provides safe and affordable travel options for all	12.B Passenger journeys travelled on MyCiTi buses (number)	An efficient, integrated transport system is measured in part through the increase in passenger journeys undertaken. A passenger journey is calculated from the first boarding of a bus at a feeder stop or main station to the last exit from a bus at a feeder stop or main station, including any transfers between buses (single journey). Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <18.9 million Not fully effective: 18.9 million - 19.899 million Fully effective: 19.9 million - 20.89 million Significant performance: 20.891 million - 21.89 million Outstanding performance: >21.89 million	19 335 446	18 900 000	19 900 000	4 975 000	9 950 000	14 925 000	19 900 000	5%	Director: Public Transport

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Regan Melody
1 September 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Target 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sept-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											60%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											10%	
												100%	
20	5	A sustainable transport system that is integrated, efficient and provides safe and affordable travel options for all	12.C Road corridors on which traffic signal timing plans are updated (number)	Measures the number of road corridors on which the traffic signal timing plans were updated to account for the impact of changing traffic volumes and patterns on the manner in which traffic signals are coordinated. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance ≤ 3 Not fully effective = 4 Fully effective = 5 (no ranges) Significant performance = 6 Outstanding performance = >7	6	5	5	AT	AT	AT	5	7%	Director: Transport Planning and Network Management
21	6	Safe and quality roads for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles	13.A Surfaced road resurfaced (kilometres) 13.A	Measures the kilometres of surfaced roads resurfaced. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance: <104.5 Not fully effective: 104.5 - 109.99 Fully effective: 110 - 115.5 Significant performance: 115.51 - 121 Outstanding performance: >121	182,6	150	110	15	40	80	110	5%	Director: Roads Infrastructure Management
22	7	Safe and quality roads for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles	13.B Number of potholes reported per 10kms of municipal road network	The indicator measures the number of potholes reported to the municipality normalised for the length of the municipality's surfaced road network. A municipal road network typically consists of residential roads and roads in built-up areas within its borders, that allow for the movement of goods, services and people that are the responsibility of the municipality to maintain. Potholes are defined as a depression in a road surface, usually asphalt pavement, where traffic has removed broken pieces of the pavement. It is usually the result of water in the underlying soil structure and traffic passing over the affected area. This indicator does not count multiple reports of the same pothole at the same location. Each municipality may have different systems or protocols to determine when it receives multiple reports for the same pothole. The Standard Operating Procedure by the municipality for the indicator should be instructive in this regard. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance: >59 Not fully effective: >57 - 59 Fully effective: 53 - 56 Significant performance: 52 - 49 Outstanding performance: <49	27,15	56	56	19	28	37	56	7%	Director: Roads Infrastructure Management
23	8	A resilient city	14. C Storm water cleaning budget spend (%)	Measures the percentage budget spent on stormwater cleaning. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = <87% Not fully effective = >87% - 89.9% Fully effective = 90% - 91% Significant performance = 91.1% - 94% Outstanding performance = > 94%	97,97%	90%	90%	15%	30%	60%	90%	5%	Director: Roads Infrastructure Management
24	9	Safe and quality roads for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles	Kilometres of roads resurfaced / rehabilitated / resealed	The km of roads to be rehabilitated in the financial year, without any external interference in the delivery of this service, including prolonged adverse weather conditions, service delivery protests, racketeering towards the service providers, etc Km of surfaced roads resealed, without any external interference in the delivery of this service. Km of surfaced roads resurfaced, without any external interference in the delivery of this service. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance: <166.8 Not fully effective: 166.8 - 175.6 Fully effective: 175.61 - 184.39 Significant performance: 184.4 - 193.6 Outstanding performance: >193.6	227,64	194,5	175,61	15	55	115,36	175,61	5%	Director: Roads Infrastructure Management
25	10	13 Safe and quality roads for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles	Km of new pedestrian walkways to be constructed	For 2025-26 the number of NMT kms to be constructed is derived from the sum of the lengths of the sidewalk, or pavement, footpath, footway, and sometimes platform, path along the side of a road to be constructed, measured in terms of Kms of Asphalt laid, on the following projects: <u>Non-motorised Transport Programme:</u> 1. Kuils River Ph2 NMT 2. NMT Impr: Area-wide Mitchells Plain 3. NMT Impr: Area-wide Khayelitsha 4. NMT Impr:Kensington, Fracteton&Maitland 5. NMT Impr: Hanover Park 6. NMT Impr: Heideveld 7. NMT Impr: Klipfontein Rd, Gugulethu <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance: <19 Not fully effective: 19 - 19.99 Fully effective: 20 - 21 Significant performance: 21.1 - 22 Outstanding performance: >22	8,95	12	20	2	6	12	20	3%	Director: Transport Infrastructure Implementation

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Regan Melody
1 September 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Target	Annual Target	Q1 Target	Q2 Target	Q3 Target	Q4 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
					2023/2024	2024/2025	2025/2026	30-Sept-25	31-Dec-25	31-Mar-26	30-Jun-26		
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											**20%**	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											**10%**	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											**60%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**10%**	
												100%	
26	**11**	13 Safe and quality roads for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles	School traffic calming projects implemented (Number)	Means the construction of traffic calming projects, normally of varying size and value, at 60 schools. Also the construction of historically approved projects awaiting implementation on the so-called backlog list. The number of backlog projects to be implemented cannot be defined in advance and is entirely dependent on the amount of budget remaining after implementation of the 60 school projects. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <53 Not fully effective: 53 - 59 Fully effective: 60 - 63 Significant performance: 64 - 67 Outstanding performance: >67	94	60	60	N/A	N/A	20	60	5%	Director: Transport Planning and Network Management
27	**12**	13 Safe and quality roads for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles	Road safety assessments completed on arterials (number)	Means an assessment of road infrastructure and crash history in order to identify the need for safety improvement projects. An arterial is a major road in the network, normally classified as a secondary or primary arterial or expressway. Arterials requiring the road safety assessment will be identified in Quarter 1. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <3 Not fully effective: 3 Fully effective: 4 Significant performance: 5 Outstanding performance: ≥6	New	4 Road Safety Assessments complete	4	N/A	N/A	2	4	5%	Director: Transport Planning and Network Management
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**10%**	
28	**1**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government CM request	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 visits to confirm staff occupancy for operational purposes. The approved list must include the following: Property occupancy – Staff member occupying property by conducting a site visit. Operational need - staff member and staff number confirmed on SAP. Lease agreement in place (number and tenure). Rental value. Fringe benefit registration, confirmed with Payroll. Closed out status- where all the above conditions are met. Formula: Numerator: All staff housing verified (with a closed out status) Denominator: All staff housing Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 50% Not fully effective = 50 - 89% Fully effective = 90% - 95% Significant performance = > 95% - 99.99% Outstanding = 100%	100%	100%	100%	60%	75%	90%	100%	2%	Director: Roads Infrastructure Management
29	**2**	A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Urban Mobility Wayleaves Processed	The indicator measures all wayleave applications applicable to Urban Mobility that is successfully processed within a period of 30 days from the start of all required information received. Applications that are still open (within 30 days) during the reporting period is not counted. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <70% Not fully effective: 70 - 79.9% Fully effective: 80% - 84% Significant performance:84.1% - 88% Outstanding performance: >88%	Electronic Wayleave Management Project Implemented	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	3%	Director: Roads Infrastructure Management
30	**3**	A sustainable transport system that is integrated, efficient and provides safe and affordable travel options for all (SMF related)	Complete Final Draft MYFIN	The MYFIN Report constitutes the annual update of the City of Cape Town's (City) Multi-Year Financial Operational Plan and Medium-term Strategic Business Plan (MYFIN) for the implementation of the City's Integrated Public Transport Network (IPTN) plan over the coming 15 years. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = MYFIN process plan for 2026 and Opex and Capex for MTREF for 2026 MYFIN not complete Not fully effective = Draft MYFIN 2026 not complete Fully effective = Complete the Draft MYFIN 2026 Significant performance = Incorporating insights and recommendations from the Annual Infrastructure Report. Outstanding performance = Integrating all Catalytic Land Development Plan (CLDP) reports/plans implications for transport draft Myfin 2026.	Complete the Draft MYFIN 2024	Complete the Draft MYFIN 2025	Complete the Draft MYFIN 2026	Submission MYFIN 2025 to Council and NDoT	Start with the Preparation of Draft Opex and Capex MTREF for MYFIN	Completion of MYFIN process plan for 2026. Finalize Opex and Capex for MTREF for 2026 MYFIN	Complete the Draft MYFIN 2026	2%	Directorate Finance Manager

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Regan Melody
1 September 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Target	Annual Target	Q1 Target	Q2 Target	Q3 Target	Q4 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
					2023/2024	2024/2025	2025/2026	30-Sept-25	31-Dec-25	31-Mar-26	30-Jun-26		
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											60%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											10%	
												100%	
31	4	Focused service delivery approach in informal settlements, including but not limited to townships established in terms of LFTEA (Less Formal Township Establishment Act)	Value of Informal settlement improvements of tracks and surface drainage (R)	Rand value of access tracks and stormwater drainage provided. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <R5.98 million Not fully effective: R5.98 million - R6.29 million Fully effective: R6.3 million - R6.615 million Significant performance: R6.616 million - R6.94 million Outstanding performance: >R6.94 million	R4 459 770,77	R4 500 000	R6 300 000	R1 107 000	R2 722 500	R4 414 500	R6 300 000	2%	Director: Roads Infrastructure Management
32	5	5. Effective law enforcement to make communities safer	Report Unlawful Land Occupation to the Anti-Land Invasion/Displaced People Units within 24 hours	To report during working hours, complaints received regarding unlawful land occupation in the road reserve to the Anti-Land Invasion/Displaced People Units within 24 hours of being informed. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = <90% Not fully effective = 90% - 99% Fully effective = 100% Significant performance = 30% of incidents reported within 18 hours. Outstanding performance = 60% of incidents reported within 18 hours.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Director: Transport Shared Services
33	6	5.1 Operational Sustainability	Percentage completion of MFMA Competency by Executive Directors	The indicator measures the adherence to the MFMA.Section 16 of the MFMA requires Executive Directors to meet the minimum competency levels. The attainment of competency levels must be obtained within prescribed timeframes and must be included in performance agreements. Performance rating: Fully effective = 100%	New	New	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	0%	Executive Director: Urban Mobility

Executive Director: Urban Mobility

Regan Melody

Digitally signed by Regan Melody
Date: 2025.10.27 11:29:55 +02'00'

City Manager

Lungelo Mbandazayo

Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo
Date: 2025.10.30 17:37:16 +02'00'