2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Dalene Campbell
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Annual Target	Annual Target	Q1 30 Sep 2024	Q2 31 Dec 2024	Q3 31 Mar 2025	Q4 30 Jun 2025	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
					2022/2023	2023/2024	2024/2025	Target	Target	Target	Target		
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											**20%**	
	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 CPPPM maturity level based on the PPM Operating Model (%) (average)	The CPPPM maturity level is based on the PPPM, Contract Management and Engineering Management (Only applicable to Engineering Directorates) maturity assessment. The maturity assessment will reflect the average maturity level of: - 1. Portfolio, Programme, Project - 2. Contract management and - 3. Engineering Management level. This will occur on an annual basis in order to assess the increase in the maturity level for the Directorate. The maturity level is measured on a scale of 1 - 5. The maturity levels: * Level 1 – Initial Process: No standard process or tracking system – informal process * Level 2 – Repeatable Process: Minimum standards for processes and procedures * Level 3 – Defined Process: Defined Process which allow for flexibility * Level 4 – Managed Process: Obtain and retain specific measurements and quality requirements * Level 5 – Optimised Process: Continuous process improvement and proactive technology and problem management for future improvements The ED for Finance will be measured on a City-wide maturity level. All other EDs will be measured per the individual directorate. 1. A score of 2.89 and below based on the 2023/2024 baseline: Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease ≥ 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 2. A score of 2.9 and above based on the 2023/2024 baseline: Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.21 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 - 0.2 Fully effective = increase of 0.0 and 0.1 Significant performance = increase of 0.11 and 0.2 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.21	2.81	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	Repeatable Tenders that were Expanded/Amended multiple times (%)	Measures the percentage of Expansions and Amendments on repeatable tenders. This indicator will only measure instances where there was more than one Expansion and/or Amendment on the same tender. Expansions or Amendments are defined by the SCM section 116 (3) guide and can change at any time. Source: Contract Register and Monitoring System and Tender Tracking System. Measurement will commence only when the second Expansions and/or Amendments are released in SAP MM and only applies to repeatable tenders that are active in the current FY (i.e. commenced before or in the financial year and expires in or after the FY). Formula: Total number of repeatable contracts tenders expanded and/ or amended multiple times ÷ Total number of repeatable contract active in the FY. Measured cumulatively. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = ≥ 3.1% Not fully effective= 2.6% – 3% Fully effective = 2% - 2.5% Significant performance = 0.1% - 1.99% Outstanding performance = 0%	0%	2%	2%	AT	AT	AT	2%	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: CMRS (Contract Register and Monitoring System) and Tender Tracking System Contact person: Maureen Whare 069 367 4023

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Dalene Campbell
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Annual Target	Annual Target	Q1 30 Sep 2024	Q2 31 Dec 2024	Q3 31 Mar 2025	Q4 30 Jun 2025	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
					2022/2023	2023/2024	2024/2025	Target	Target	Target	Target		
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											60%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											10%	
3	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduction in the number of SCM deviations (%)	The objective is to achieve a 20% reduction on SCM deviations. July – December 2023 - The indicator only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R200 000 (inclusive of VAT). 01 January – 30 June 2024 - The indicator only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R750 000 (inclusive of VAT). Sole/single service provider deviations, anti-corruption deviations and deviations relating to emergencies will be excluded from the measurement as per section 36 of SCM regulations. The indicator will measure the percentage year on year reduction from the previous year's. Target = reduction of 20% Formula: (No. of SCM deviations for current year – No of SCM deviations for prior year)/ Number of SCM deviations for prior year X 100" Exception protocols: A default performance rating of fully effective will be awarded if you have 2 or less deviations from a base of 2 or less Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = Any positive increase in the number of deviations, year-on-year Not fully effective = a reduction > 0% - < 19.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. Fully effective = a reduction of 20%, for the number of deviations (year-on-year), or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol) Significant performance = a reduction >20% - <99.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. Outstanding performance = 0 deviations	80%	20%	20%	AT	AT	AT	20%	2%	Contact person: Gayle Postings Office of the City Manager: Special Advisor 021 400 1268

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Dalene Campbell
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Annual Target 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 30 Sep 2024 Target	Q2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
				MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION								**20%**	
				MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY								**10%**	
				SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE								**60%**	
				DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS								**10%**	
4	4	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduce and maintain nominal (number and value) irregular expenditure within the Directorate (year-on-year) (average %)	The objective is to reduce past on irregular expenditure by 10% and limit irregular expenditure.. The indicator will measure the average percentage reduction in the number and value of irregular expenditure i.e. contravention of legislation as defined in the MFMA irregular expenditure definition and maintain lower levels of irregular expenditure. Irregular expenditure is defined as expenditure that is in contravention of, or not in accordance with, a requirement of the Local Government: Municipal Finance Management Act 56 of 2003, the Local Government: Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000, the Remuneration of Public Office Bearers Act 20 of 1998, or the municipality's supply chain management (SCM) policy. Indicator will measure Irregular expenditure that was incurred (transaction) during the time of employment of the Executive Director (in the position as Executive Director). This also applies if an Existing ED moves to another portfolio. i.e. previous irregular expenditure wont impact the new Executive Director. NOTES: a. Irregular expenditure will be included, if identified by other assurance provider, irrespective if it is self-disclosed or not. b. New Executive Directors will be impacted by existing contracts that incur irregular expenditure in the term of their office. If the existing contract had irregular expenditure in the period before ED's appointment, it will not be considered for the new EDs performance. 1. New Executive Director or Executive Director taking up a post in another directorate as an Executive Director (in the year of review) Formula: Number of non-compliance incidents (irregular expenditure) for the current year, while employed as Executive Director and the amount of irregular expenditure, while employed as an Executive Director. (No baseline) This also applies if an existing ED moves to another directorate, the ED will be regarded as "New" I.e. previous irregular expenditure will not be carried over. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = where more than 2 incidents exist or the total amount is more than R2.5 million, starting from a baseline of zero. Not fully effective = N/A Fully effective = 2 or less incidents and the total amount is less than R2.5 million. Significant performance = N/A Outstanding performance = 0 incidents 2. Executive Director with baseline information Formula: 1) Non-compliance incidents incurred for the current year – Non-compliance incidents incurred for prior year / Non-compliance incidents incurred for prior year x 100% Target = reduction of 10% 2) Irregular expenditure amount incurred for the current year – Irregular expenditure amount incurred for the prior year)/ Irregular expenditure amount incurred for the prior year X 100" Target = reduction of 10% Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = Any positive increase in incidents or amount > R2.5 million, year-on-year Not fully effective = a reduction >0% - < 9.9%, for incidents and amounts, year-on-year. Fully effective = a reduction of 10% or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol) Significant performance = a reduction >10% –< 99.9%, for incidents and amount year-on-year. Outstanding performance = 0 incidents Exception protocols applicable to New Executive Directors and Executive Directors with baseline data: A default rating will apply (fully effective), if you have a zero baseline - provided that the default criteria is achieved, anything more will be unacceptable performance. A default criteria rating of fully effective will be awarded if you have 2 or less incidents and the total amount is less than R2.5 million.	54%	10%	10%	AT	AT	AT	10%	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

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Dalene Campbell
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Annual Target 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 30 Sep 2024 Target	Q2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
				MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION								**20%**	
				MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY								**10%**	
				SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE								**60%**	
				DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS								**10%**	
5	5	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	External audit (Auditor General) actions completed as per audit action plan (%)	This indicator measures how many actions was completed in the financial cycle within in the unique deadline set, as per the audit action plan. The Audit Action Plan sets out the total number audit actions required to address the internal control deficiencies as identified by the Auditor-General in their management report. The unique deadline is set in consultation with the relevant ED. Completed would mean that the actions as stipulated in the audit action plan has been executed by the relevant delegated authority. Should there be no actions required for a Directorate the indicator will be 'Not Applicable'. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = N/A Not fully effective = < 99.99% Fully effective = N/A Significant performance = N/A Outstanding =100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	Department: Investor Relations Source document: Completed Audit Action plan Contact person: Lynn Fortune:021 400 5987
6	6	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Final Council and Mayco decisions implemented within timeframes (%)	The indicator excludes all Council and Mayco decisions for noting. Decisions taken by Council and Mayco where there is no budget to implement actions or outside of the control of the ED. These exclusions must be supported by valid evidence. These decisions must be reflected on each quarterly report for the City Manager and/or panel's awareness. All final Council and Mayco decisions allocated to the ED with implementation date for the quarter must be implemented and reported on for the quarter to achieve the target. Implementation that runs over a period longer than a financial year will be measured according to milestones identified for implementation within the current financial year. Each ED must ensure that a date is allocated of when action will be completed and implemented. This must be captured in the CDIT system by the relevant implementer. If no timeframe was allocated the timeframe is deemed to be one month for implementation. Implementation is the date of completion of the actions or achievement of councils request or expectation. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 69% of ALL decisions Not fully effective = range between 69% - 79.99% of ALL decisions Fully effective = range between 80% - 85% of ALL decisions Significant performance = range between 85.1% - 94.99% of ALL decisions Outstanding performance = ≥ 95% of ALL decisions If "Not Applicable"-weighting will be "zero" and must be reallocated it within the Transversal Category.	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) Weighting must be reallocated where there were no council decisions for the year.
7	7	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.J Budget spent on implementation of Workplace Skills Plan (%)	Measures the percentage of budget spent on the Workplace Skills Plan .The Workplace Skills Plan outlines the planned education, training and development interventions for the organisation. Its purpose is to formally plan and allocate budget for appropriate training interventions that will address the needs arising out of local government's skills sector plan, the IDP, the individual departmental staffing strategies, individual employees' personal development plans and the employment equity plan. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(f). Formula: % spent on the implementation of the WSP measured against the training budget. (A/B)*100 A: Actual spend per quarter on training budget B: Planned spend on training Budget for the year Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 90% Not fully effective = 90% - 94.99% Fully effective = 95% - 96% Significant performance = 96.1% - 97.99% Outstanding performance = ≥ 98%	102.6%	90%	95%	10%	30%	60%	95%	1%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Dalene Campbell
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Annual Target 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 30 Sep 2024 Target	Q2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
				MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION								**20%**	
				MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY								**10%**	
				SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE								**60%**	
				DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS								**10%**	
8	8	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Internal independent assurance provider's functions recommendations and action plans implemented (%)	It is the monitoring and reporting of the implementation (expressed as a percentage) of corrective actions to address internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans, issued within the directorate of the responsible Executive Director. The internal independent assurance providers included in this KPI are Internal Audit, Ombudsman, Integrated Risk Management (limited to the Corporate Risk Register), Ethics and Forensics departments. Each internal independent assurance provider as mentioned above has their own unique input to this KPI. This KPI will be "not applicable" to management when there are no recommendations, thus only those that could provide inputs will be included in the calculation. Future recommendations and action plans implemented (not recommended for implementation for the current financial year), will be taken into account for the measurement of this indicator, thereby creating an advantage for the ED. Formula: Numerator: Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans implemented (current and future implementations) Denominator: Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans made for the current period under review (recommendations and actions plans postponed as approved by the City Manager will be excluded) Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 75% Not fully effective = 75% - 84.99% Fully effective = 85% - 90% Significant performance = 91% - 94% Outstanding performance= ≥ 95%	95%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	1%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mothibi
9	9	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.A Community satisfaction city-wide survey (average)	Measures the average score on the Community satisfaction City-wide survey. A statistically valid, scientifically defensible score from the annual survey of residents' perceptions of the overall performance of the City. The aim of the indicator is to improve the community's perception of the City. The measure is given against a non-symmetrical Likert scale, where 1 is poor, 2 is fair, 3 is good, 4 is very good, and 5 is excellent. The objective is to improve the current customer satisfaction average score per Directorate. Refer to the 'Survey - Levels & Baselines' tab. 1. A score of 2.9 and below based on the 2023/2024 survey outcome: Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.11 Not fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.1 Fully effective = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 Significantly performance = increase of 0.21 - 0.3 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.31 2. A score of 3 and above based on the 2023/2024 survey outcome: Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.21 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 – 0.2 Fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) - increase of 0.1 Significant performance = increase of 0.11 - 0.2 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.21	3	Individual ED score as at 30 June 2024	Actual averaged score for 2023/2024 per ED + 0.1	AT	AT	AT	Actual averaged score for 2023/2024 per ED + 0.1	2%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: Community Satisfaction survey score Contact person: Brigette Morris 021 400 3812

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Dalene Campbell
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Annual Target	Annual Target	Q1 30 Sep 2024	Q2 31 Dec 2024	Q3 31 Mar 2025	Q4 30 Jun 2025	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
					2022/2023	2023/2024	2024/2025	Target	Target	Target	Target		
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											60%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											10%	
10	10	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Increase in City Pulse	The City Pulse survey measures the organisational culture and aims to improve employee experience at the City. The measure is given against a non-symmetrical Likert scale, measured biennial. The measurement for the 2024/25 will be based on the ED's lowest scoring pillar: Organisational Pillar in 2022/2023. Refer to the 'City Pulse baselines' tab. 1. A score of 3.4 and below based on the 2022/2023 baseline: Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.2 Not fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.19 Fully effective = increase of 0.1 - 0.19 Significantly performance = increase of 0.2 - 0.29 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.3 2. A score of 3.5 and above based on the 2022/2023 baseline: Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.2 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 - 0.19 Fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) - increase of 0.1 Significantly performance = increase of between 0.11 and 0.2 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.2	3.3	N/A	Actual score of the lowest scoring pillar for 2022/2023 per ED + 0.1	AT	AT	AT	Actual score of the lowest scoring pillar for 2022/2023 per ED + 0.1	1%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: City Pulse 2021 Results and City Pulse 2019 results with the 3 questions identified in the attachment Contact person: Monica Pregnolato 021 400 9221
11	11	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Inclusion of C88 output indicators (%) (Average)	All Tier 1 and Tier 2 Circular 88 Output indicators should be included into the performance scorecards of the Executive Directors, where relevant. All indicators must be included verbatim into the corporate (auditable) and Directorate SDBIP (cascading principle) and the measurement must be in compliance with the Technical Indicator Descriptions (TID) as issued by National Treasury. This indicator will be measured during the annual review process and no mid-year adjustments will be taken into account. Measurement: Q1 Weighting must be reallocated where there the ED has no Output indicators. Note: Indicators that have barriers and challenges are excluded from the formula. The indicator will measure two aspects: 1) The inclusion of C88 Output indicators in the Directorate SDBIP, and 2) The inclusion of C88 Output indicators on the Corporate Scorecard (CSC) (graduating), whether replacing existing CSC indicators. 1) Formula: Inclusion in the directorate SDBIP - Total number of Tier 1& 2 Output indicators included in the directorate SDBIP divided by Tier 1 & 2 indicators required for inclusion as per C88 (auditable) * 100 2) Formula: Replacement and/ or inclusion of C88 Output indicators on the CSC - Total number of Tier 1& 2 indicators graduated on the CSC divided by Total number of Tier 1& 2 indicators graduated on the CSC * 100 Average: (Formula 1 + Formula 2) divided by 2 Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 80% inclusion of Tier 1&2 Not fully effective = 80% - 84.99% inclusion of Tier 1&2 Fully effective =85% - 89.99% inclusion of Tier 1&2 Significant performance = 90% - 99% inclusion of Tier 1&2 Outstanding performance =100% inclusion of Tier 1&2	new	100%	100%	AT (YTD progress)	AT (YTD progress)	AT (YTD progress)	100%	1%	Department: Organisational Performance Management (OPM) Source document: C88 scorecard/ Directorate SDBIP Contact person: Monique Fillies - Manager: City Performance Management 021 400 9024

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Dalene Campbell
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Annual Target	Annual Target	Q1 30 Sep 2024	Q2 31 Dec 2024	Q3 31 Mar 2025	Q4 30 Jun 2025	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
					2022/2023	2023/2024	2024/2025	Target	Target	Target	Target		
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											60%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											10%	
12	12	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Average of tenders in slippage at any given quarter end (%)	Measures the average of tenders for MTREF in slippage at any given quarter end. This will drive the timeous implementation of the demand plan based on the agreed timeline. Abnormalities in the timeline will then impact each step of the process, such as where a tender only allows 30 days after award to Contract Required by Date (CRD), there will probably be a contract gap or a Value At Risk (VAR – Budget at risk of not being spent) on the Capital reporting. Slippage is defined as tenders on the demand plan which are behind schedule based on the agreed timelines for each tender. Slippage in the implementation of the demand plan, is a contributor to the cause of VAR. This will include the submission of draft specifications as per the minimum timeframe before the CRD. Formula: Total count of tenders in red or amber as a percentage of the total number of tenders required for the MTREF period (average %). Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = > 15% Not fully effective = > 10% - ≤ 15% Fully effective = ≤ 10% Significant performance = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9% Outstanding performance = < 5%	new	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	1%	Department: Supply Chain Management Source document: Demand Plan Overview Contact person: Bekumuzi Vumase and Razaan Arendse Manager Demand Management
13	13	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Gaps in repeatable tender continuity (average number of days)	This indicator is to ensure continued monthly service delivery implemented through repeatable tenders. A "gap" refers to the number of days between the expiring contract and the replacement contract commencing. Potential gaps should be mitigated via extension/expansion and/or deviation early enough so that it caters for any possible delay within a tender process. A gap less than one month will be included in the calculation. To drive the demand plan and improve Supply Chain Management (SCM) process and service delivery. 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	new	0	0	0	0	0	0	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: GAP report prepared by Zubair Contact person: Zubair Adams
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
14	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 to acquire, upgrade, and renew physical assets such as property, plants, buildings, technology, or equipment. Less contractual contingencies on projects and insurance contingencies. Q1 – Q3 reporting: Formula: (1) YTD Actual Capital Expenditure / (2) Total Budgeted Capital Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. Q4 reporting: Formula: (1) Actual Capital Expenditure / (2) Total Budgeted Capital Expenditure less contingencies. The latest approved budget is applicable. 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%	79%	90%	90%	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	90%	6%	Directorate Finance Manager

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Dalene Campbell
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Annual Target 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 30 Sep 2024 Target	Q2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
				MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION								**20%**	
				MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY								**10%**	
				SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE								**60%**	
				DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS								**10%**	
15	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	FM1.12: Total Operating Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating Expenditure budget	This indicator measures the extent to which operating expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Operating Expenditure (non-capital spending) is costs which the municipality incurs through its normal operations. The latest approved budget is applicable. Formula: Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. 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%	95%	95%	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	95%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager
16	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 to 100%. Source: Financial information. Formula: Operating expenditure (cash items only) / Operating budget (cash items only). Measured quarterly. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = >100% Not fully effective = N/A Fully effective = ≤ 100% Significantly performance = N/A Outstanding performance = N/A	New	New	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager
				SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE								**60%**	
17	1	12 A sustainable transport system that is integrated, efficient and provides safe and affordable travel options for all	Completion of construction of IRT Phase 2A project (Depot Building Works - Mitchells Plain & Khayelitsha) (%)	Refers to the construction of the Depot Building Works -Mitchells Plain & Khayelitsha work package. The 2024-25 FY year-end target is 100% completion. The quarterly targets are reflected as a percentage of contract spend at time of reporting. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = 80% Not fully effective = 90% Fully effective = 100% Significant performance = Certificate of Works Completion issued to contractor. Outstanding performance = Handover documentation to operators prepared.	19%	65%	100%	70%	75%	85%	100%	4%	Director: Transport Infrastructure Implementation
18	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 = The timeous completion of the conceptual design of the prefered transport solution would release excess land to be rezoned and developed generating an income to the City. Outstanding performance = The timeous completion of the conceptual design of the preferred transport solution and obtain endorsement from the port authorities for the development on their land.	Project Inception Report Completed	Complete the Options report for the Foreshore Freeway Integrated with the Land use	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)	4%	Director: Transport Planning and Network Management

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Dalene Campbell
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Annual Target 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 30 Sep 2024 Target	Q2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
				MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION								**20%**	
				MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY								**10%**	
				SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE								**60%**	
				DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS								**10%**	
19	3	12 A sustainable transport system that is integrated, efficient and provides safe and affordable travel options for all	Provision of professional services to undertake an investigation enabling the City of Cape Town to support the restoration and sustainability of passenger rail services that aligns with the City's Comprehensive Integrated Transport Plan	The purpose of this project is to investigate the feasibility, risk and the implications of the urban passenger rail function as part of the City's public transport function i.e. as the rail component of an authority-controlled network at municipal level of integrated, quality public transport services. As such the project would focus on the development of a feasible incremental and structured approach towards the planning, operations and management of an improved urban rail service. Therefore, this will confirm the probability of the City of Cape Town to incorporate all transport modes effectively and efficiently into a fully integrated public transport system and articulate this in its CITP. Appointment of Service Provider - Appointment of the Service Provider including the signing of the relevant contract document by both parties. Phase 1: Development of Inception Report - The Inception Report shall set out inter alia the initial project programme, estimated budget and resources allocations for this project. This may be updated from time to time and shall form the basis on which all work and progress can be monitored. Phase 2: Baseline assessment of the City's rail system - The baseline assessment will include the development of the level-of-service criteria for the City's passenger rail system. It will further set the groundwork for the development and analysis of alternatives options for the City to undertake rail functions as a component of its municipal public transport mandate. Phase 3: Alternative Institutional Report - Analysis of alternative institutional and business models to establish a sustainable and effective functional role for the City of Cape Town to manage its urban rail system. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = Phase 3: Alternative Institutional Report - not 100% complete and Phase 4: Development of the Business Plan: Preferred Option - not 100% complete Not fully effective = Phase 3: Alternative Institutional Report - 100% complete and Phase 4: Development of the Business Plan: Preferred Option - not 100% complete Fully effective = Phase 3: Alternative Institutional Report - 100% complete and Phase 4: Development of the Business Plan: Preferred Option - 100% complete Significant performance = City advocacy action that results in final deliverable presented to National for alignment and influencing national policy. Outstanding performance = Completing the Business Plan of the preferred option before 30 June 2025.	Phase 2: Baseline assessment of the City's rail system - 86% complete	Phase 2: Baseline assessment of the City's rail system - 100% complete Phase 3: Alternative Institutional Report - 50% complete	Phase 3: Alternative Institutional Report - 100% complete Phase 4: Development of the Business Plan: Preferred Option - 100% complete	Phase 3: Alternative Institutional Report - 75% complete	Phase 3: Alternative Institutional Report - 100% complete	Phase 4: Development of the Business Plan: Preferred Option - 25% complete	Phase 3: Alternative Institutional Report - 100% complete Phase 4: Development of the Business Plan: Preferred Option - 100% complete	4%	Director: Transport Planning and Network Management
20	4	A sustainable transport system that is integrated, efficient and provides safe and affordable travel options for all	Passengers transported for each scheduled kilometre travelled by MyCiTi bus (ratio) 12.A	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: <0.96 Not fully effective: 0.96 - 0.99 Fully effective: 1.00 - 1.03 Significant performance: 1.031 - 1.07 Outstanding performance: >1.07	1.06	1.01	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	4%	Director: Public Transport
21	5	A sustainable transport system that is integrated, efficient and provides safe and affordable travel options for all	Passenger journeys travelled on MyCiTi buses (Number) 12.B	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: <17.3 million Not fully effective: 17.3 million - 18.899 million Fully effective: 18.9 million - 19.3 million Significant performance: 19.301 million - 19.8 million Outstanding performance: >19.8 million	18 323 763	18 500 000	18 900 000	4 725 000	9 450 000	14 175 000	18 900 000	5%	Director: Public Transport
22	6	A sustainable transport system that is integrated, efficient and provides safe and affordable travel options for all	Road corridors on which traffic signal timing plans are updated (number) 12.C	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. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = 3 Not fully effective = 4 Fully effective = 5 (no ranges) Significant performance = 6 Outstanding performance = 7	5	5	5	AT	AT	AT	5	5%	Director: Transport Planning and Network Management

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Dalene Campbell
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Annual Target	Annual Target	Q1 30 Sep 2024	Q2 31 Dec 2024	Q3 31 Mar 2025	Q4 30 Jun 2025	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
					2022/2023	2023/2024	2024/2025	Target	Target	Target	Target		
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											60%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											10%	
23	7	Safe and quality roads for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles	Surfaced road resurfaced (km) 13.A	Measures the kilometres of surfaced roads resurfaced. This indicator is affected by the increasing price of Bitumen and available budget which remains constant. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <108 Not fully effective: 108 - 119.9 Fully effective: 120 - 123 Significant performance: 123.1 - 127 Outstanding performance: >127	180.2	169	120	10	35	75	120	5%	Director: Roads Infrastructure Management
24	8	Safe and quality roads for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles	Number of potholes reported per 10kms of municipal road network (TR6.2) 13.B	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. The maintenance of these roads is the municipality's responsibility. A pothole is 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. This indicator is worded such that potholes are counted once and only when they have been reported, signalling awareness of and dissatisfaction with road quality by the public. Proxy measure for C88 TR6.2. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: >58 Not fully effective: >56 - 58 Fully effective: 53 - 56 Significant performance: <53 - 50 Outstanding performance: <50	27.91	56	56	19	28	37	56	5%	Director: Roads Infrastructure Management
25	9	A resilient city	Stormwater cleaning budget spent (%) 14.C	Measures the percentage budget spent on stormwater cleaning. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = <87% Not fully effective = >87% - 89.9% Fully effective = 90% - 91% Significant performance = 91.1% - 94% Outstanding performance = > 94%	95%	90%	90%	15%	30%	60%	90%	4%	Director: Roads Infrastructure Management
26	10	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. This indicator is affected by the increasing price of Bitumen and available budget which remains constant. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <138 Not fully effective: 138 - 155.59 Fully effective: 155.6 - 158 Significant performance: 158.1 - 163 Outstanding performance: >163	209.45km	203.9km	155.6km	10.63km	43.23km	98.71km	155.6km	4%	Director: Roads Infrastructure Management

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Annual Target 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 30 Sep 2024 Target	Q2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
				MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION								**20%**	
				MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY								**10%**	
				SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE								**60%**	
				DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS								**10%**	
27	11	A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Percentage spend on repairs and maintenance	Percentage reflecting year to date spend (including secondary cost) / total repairs and maintenance budget (Note that the in-year reporting during the financial year will be indicated as a trend (year to date spend). Maintenance is defined as the actions required for an asset to achieve its expected useful life. Planned Maintenance includes asset inspection and measures to prevent known failure modes and can be time or condition-based. Repairs are actions undertaken to restore an asset to its previous condition after failure or damage. Expenses on maintenance and repairs are considered operational expenditure. Primary repairs and maintenance cost refers to Repairs and Maintenance expenditure incurred for labour and materials paid to outside suppliers. Secondary repairs and maintenance cost refers to Repairs and Maintenance expenditure incurred for labour provided In-house / internally.) Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = <92% Not fully effective = 92.1% - 94.9% Fully effective = 95% - 96% Significant performance = 96.1% - 97% Outstanding performance = >97%	96.9%	95%	95%	14.9%	38.8%	62%	95%	3%	Directorate Finance Manager
28	12	13 Safe and quality roads for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles	KMs of new pedestrian walkways to be constructed	This performance indicator is aligned to the definition of the Circular 88 TR5.41 - Length of NMT paths built. The total length (in KMs) of NMT paths (defined as surfaced pedestrian sidewalks, footpaths and cycling lanes) built and completed over the financial year. This indicator is affected by the increasing price of Bitumen and available budget which remains constant. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <15.8 Not fully effective: 15.8 - 17.89 Fully effective: 17.9 - 18.1 Significant performance: 18.2 - 18.5 Outstanding performance: >18.5	10.51km	4.5km	17.9km	0.7km	4.6km	10.5km	17.9km	3%	Director: Transport Infrastructure Implementation
29	13	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 - 62 Significant performance: 63 - 64 Outstanding performance: >64	65	60	60	N/A	N/A	20	60	5%	Director: Transport Planning and Network Management
30	14	12 A sustainable transport system that is integrated, efficient and provides safe and affordable travel options for all	KMs of new paved roads to be built	This performance schedule relates to the kilometers of new paved roads built in terms of the capital budget for the Congestion Relief programme. This indicator is affected by the increasing price of Bitumen and available budget which remains constant. The number of kilometers constructed includes new road links only, and excludes the dualling of existing carriageways or the addition of lanes to existing carriageways. This performance indicator is aligned to the definition of the Circular 88 TR6.13 - Km of new road network. The distance of municipal road network built in kilometres within the municipal area, by the municipality (inclusive of all its departments and implementing agents). This is inclusive of both surfaced and unsurfaced roads built by the municipality. A surfaced road refers to road installed with a durable surface material intended to sustain traffic, usually pavement or concrete. Total municipal road network length is measured irrespective of the road lanes for this indicator. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <0.41 Not fully effective: 0.41 - 0.799 Fully effective: 0.8 - 0.849 Significant performance: 0.85 - 0.92 Outstanding performance: >0.92	N/A	0.2km	0.8km	0.1km	0.2km	0.4km	0.8km	5%	Director: Transport Infrastructure Implementation

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Annual Target 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 30 Sep 2024 Target	Q2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard Executive Director: Dalene Campbell 1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025												
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											**20%**	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											**10%**	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											**60%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**10%**	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**10%**	
31	1	16 A capable and collaborative City government	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% - 99% Fully effective = 100% Significant performance = N/A Outstanding performance =N/A	84%	100% (100 staff houses verified out of 100)	100% (100 staff houses verified out of 100)	30%	50%	80%	100% (100 staff houses verified out of 100)	2%	Director: Roads Infrastructure Management
32	2	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 = Opex and Capex for MTREF for 2025 MYFIN not complete Not fully effective = Draft MYFIN 2025 not complete Fully effective = Complete the Draft MYFIN 2025 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 2025.	Complete the Draft MYFIN 2023	Complete the Draft MYFIN 2024	Complete the Draft MYFIN 2025	Submission MYFIN 2024 to Council and NDoT	Completion of MYFIN process plan for 2025 and 50% of Draft Opex and Capex MTREF for MYFIN	Finalize Opex and Capex for MTREF for 2025 MYFIN	Complete the Draft MYFIN 2025	2%	Directorate Finance Manager
33	3	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 = N/A Outstanding performance = N/A	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Director: Transport Shared Services
34	4	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% - 82% Significant performance: 83% - 87% Outstanding performance: >87%	new	Close out report on full implementation submitted to the City Manager	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	3%	Executive Director: Urban Mbility

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Dalene Campbell
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Annual Target 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 30 Sep 2024 Target	Q2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											60%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											10%	
35	5	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: <R4 million Not fully effective: R4 million - R4.49 million Fully effective: R4.5 million - R4.65 million Significant performance: R4.66 million - R4.8 million Outstanding performance: >R4.8 million	R3 825 252	R3 000 000	R4 500 000	R864 000	R2 538 000	R3 649 500	R4 500 000	2%	Director: Roads Infrastructure Management

Executive Director: Urban Mobility

Dalene Campbell

Dalene Campbell

Digitally signed by Dalene Campbell
Date: 2024.07.23 13:19:36 +02'00'

City Manager

Lungelo Mbandazayo

Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo
Date: 2024.07.30 18:26:22 +02'00'