**2026/2027 Executive Director Performance Scorecard**

**Executive Director: *Regan Melody***

CM73614A

**1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027**

| No. | | Objective | Key Performance Indicator | Definition | Baseline | Baseline | Annual Target | Q1 Target | Q2 Target | Q3 Target | Q4 Target | WEIGHTING | Contact Department |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | 2024/2025 | 2025/2026 | 2026/2027 | 30-Sep-26 | 31-Dec-26 | 31-Mar-27 | 30-Jun-27 | | |
| MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION | | | | | | | | | | | | 20% | |
| MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY | | | | | | | | | | | | 15% | |
| SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE | | | | | | | | | | | | 54% | |
| DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS | | | | | | | | | | | | 11% | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | 100% | |
| MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION | | | | | | | | | | | | 20% | |
| 1 | 1 | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | Repeatable Tenders that were Expanded/Amended multiple times (%) | Measures the percentage of Expansions and Amendments on repeatable tenders. This indicator will only measure instances where there was more than one Expansion and/or Amendment on the same tender.<br><br>This indicator thus measures instances where there was more than 5% of total repeatable tenders, expanded and/or amended, per the approved 2025/26 – 2027/28 Approved Demand Plan. However, the exclusion is not applicable if a tender extension is awarded within 45 calendar days of contract expiry of the current contracts arising from the tender. Thus, extensions are required to be awarded at least 45 days before expiry, ensuring proactive planning and due consideration of administrative effort for the timeous processing of the expansion. A Directorate will not be affected if 5% or less of the total repeatable tenders are expanded (as per above definition) in the financial year.<br><br>Directorates will achieve Outstanding performance if all expansions of tenders are only single expansions, and all are approved 45 or more days prior to the expiry of the current contract.<br><br>**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).<br><br>**Formula:**<br>Total number of repeatable tenders expanded and/ or amended multiple times ÷ Total number of repeatable tenders active in the FY. Measured cumulatively.<br><br>**<u>Performance rating:</u>**<br>**Unacceptable performance** = >7% or if a tender extension is awarded within 45 calendar days of contract expiry<br>Not fully effective= ≥ 5.1% – 7%<br>**Fully effective** = 4.1% - 5%<br>**Significant performance** = 2% - 4%<br>**Outstanding performance** = <2%<br><br>In exceptional circumstances, consideration will be given to exclude items from the calculation that are deemed outside of the control of the Departments, such as, but not limited to, unforeseen cancellations of replacement tenders close to the expiry of the preceding contract and legal proceedings that may lead to restrictions | 0% | 5% | 5% | AT | AT | AT | 5% | 2% | Department:<br>CPPPM<br><br>Source document:<br>CMRS (Contract Register and Monitoring System) and Tender Tracking System<br><br>Contact person:<br>Maureen Whare<br>069 367 4023 |
| 2 | 2 | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | Reduction in the number of SCM deviations (%) | The objective is to achieve a 20% reduction on SCM deviations.<br>The indicator only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R750 000 (inclusive of VAT).<br>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.<br><br>Target = reduction of 20%<br><br>Formula:<br>(Number of SCM deviations for current year – Number of SCM deviations for prior year)/ Number of SCM deviations for prior year X 100"<br><br>Exception protocols:<br>A default performance rating of fully effective will be awarded if you have 2 or less deviations from a base of 2 or less<br><br>**<u>Performance rating:</u>**<br>**Unacceptable performance** = Any positive increase in the number of deviations, year-on-year<br>**Not fully effective** = a reduction > 0% - < 19.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year.<br>**Fully effective** = a reduction of 20% - 21%, for the number of deviations (year-on-year), or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol)<br>**Significant performance** = a reduction > 21% - < 99.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year.<br>**Outstanding performance** = a reduction of 100% for the number of deviations, year-on-year or no deviations for the current year. | 100% | 20% | 20% | AT | AT | AT | 20% | 2% | Department: SCM<br><br>Source document: SCM deviations schedule<br><br>Formula: Number of SCM deviations reduced by the target percentage % year on year for the department/ directorate.<br><br>Contact person:<br>Gayle Postings<br>Office of the City Manager: Specialist Advisor<br>021 400 1268 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3** | **3** | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | **Irregular, Fruitless and Wasteful, Unauthorised** Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating and Capital Expenditure | The indicator measures the extent to which the municipality has incurred irregular, fruitless and wasteful and unauthorised expenditure on its total budget (operating and capital budget). Fruitless and wasteful expenditure is expenditure that was made in vain and would have been avoided had reasonable care been exercised. Irregular expenditure is incurred by the municipality in contravention of a requirement of the law (specific legislation, per MFMA legislation). Unauthorized expenditure includes overspending of the total amount appropriated in the approved budget.<br><br>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.<br><br>Irregular expenditure will be included, if identified by other assurance providers, irrespective if it is self-disclosed or not.<br><br>**Formula:** Per Directorate incidents value as a percentage of Directorate Opex and Capex<br>((1) Irregular + (2) Fruitless and Wasteful + (3) Unauthorised Expenditure) / (4) Total Operating and Capital Expenditure x 100<br><br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performanc**e = ≥ 1.5%<br>**Not fully effective** = > 0.75% - 1.49%<br>**Fully effective** = 0.75%<br>**Significant performance** = < 0.75% - > 0%<br>**Outstanding performance** = 0% | New | 1% | 0.75% | AT | AT | AT | 0.75% | 2% | Department: City Manager Office<br><br>Source document: Irregular Register and the AG's findings **in the quarter that it is available**.<br><br>Contact person:<br>Gayle Postings<br>021 400 1268 |
| **4** | **4** | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | External audit (Auditor General) audit actions completed as per audit action plan (%) | This indicator measures how many actions was completed in the financial cycle within in the unique deadline set, as per the audit action plan. The Audit Action Plan sets out the total number audit actions required to address the internal control deficiencies as identified by the Auditor-General in their management report.<br><br>The unique deadline is set in consultation with the relevant ED.<br><br>Completed would mean that the actions as stipulated in the audit action plan has been executed by the relevant delegated authority.<br><br>Should there be no actions required for a Directorate the indicator will be 'Not Applicable'.<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance** = N/A<br>**Not fully effective** = < 99.99%<br>**Fully effective** = N/A<br>**Significant performanc**e = N/A<br>**Outstanding performance** =100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 2% | Department:<br>Investor Relations<br><br>Source document:<br>Completed Audit Action plan<br><br>Contact person:<br>Lynn Joshua :021 400 5987 |
| **5** | **5** | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | Final council and Mayco decisions implemented within timeframes (%) | This indicator measures all final Council and Mayco decisions allocated to the ED with implementation date for the quarter. Items marked as "implementation approved" that were due in the quarter (utilising the project end date as a filter) will be used to calculate the target.<br><br>The indicator excludes:<br>•All council and Mayco decisions for noting.<br>•Decisions taken by Council and Mayco where there is no budget to implement actions.<br>•Decisions outside of the control of the ED.<br>•Decisions marked as "terminated" or "status completed ".<br>•Decisions actioned close to the end of the quarter which would be impossible to implement during that quarter due to time constraints – for example, if Council is on the last day of March, the decisions can only be work flowed to relevant EDs during April.<br>•These exclusions must be supported by valid evidence and reflected on each quarterly report for the City Manager and/or panel's awareness.<br><br>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.<br><br>Each ED must ensure that a date is allocated of when action will be completed and implemented. This must be captured in the CDIT system by the relevant implementer. If no timeframe was allocated, the timeframe is deemed to be one month for implementation. The project start date will be utilised to ensure projects with no end dates are included.<br><br>Implementation is the date of completion of the actions or achievement of councils request or expectation ("implementation approved" date).<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance** = < 69% of ALL decisions<br>**Not fully effective** = 69% - 99.99% of ALL decisions<br>**Fully effective** = 100% of ALL decisions<br>**Significant performance** =N/A<br>**Outstanding performance** = ≥N/A | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 1% | Each ED is responsible for implementation, evidence and updates to the tracking system.<br><br>Source document: SharePoint tracking<br><br>Tracking System contact person: Rehana Razack (021 400 1246) |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | 6 | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | 16.J Budget spent on implementation of Workplace Skills Plan (%) | Measures the percentage of budget spent on the Workplace Skills Plan .The Workplace Skills Plan outlines the planned education, training and development interventions for the organisation.<br><br>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.<br>Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(f).<br><br>**Formula:** % spent on the implementation of the WSP measured against the training budget.<br>(A/B)*100<br>A: Actual spend per quarter on training budget<br>B: Planned spend on training Budget for the year<br><br>Q4 (as at end of June) reporting will be based on the latest period available at the time of reporting.<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance** = < 90%<br>**Not fully effective** = 90% - 94.99%<br>**Fully effective** = 95% - 96%<br>**Significant performance** = 96.1% - 97.99%<br>**Outstanding performance** = ≥ 98% | 67.75% | 95% | 95% | Per the KOI schedule | Per the KOI schedule | Per the KOI schedule | 95% | 2% | Source documents:<br>WSP report per quarter<br>Contact person:<br>Grant Stephens<br>021 400 9851 |
| 7 | 7 | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | Internal independent assurance provider's recommendations and action plans implemented (%) | It is the monitoring and reporting of the implementation (expressed as a percentage) of corrective actions to address internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans, issued within the directorate of the responsible Executive Director. The internal independent assurance providers included in this KPI are **Internal Audit, Ombudsman, Integrated Risk Management** (limited to the Strategic Risks: Corporate, Transversals and Executive Risk Registers), **Ethics and Forensics departments.**<br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>**Formula:**<br>**Numerator:** Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans implemented (current and future implementations)<br>**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)<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance** = < 75%<br>**Not fully effective** = 75% - 84.99%<br>**Fully effective** = 85% - 90%<br>**Significant performance** = > 90% - 94.99%<br>**Outstanding performance**= ≥ 95% | 100% | 85% | 85% | 85% | 85% | 85% | 85% | 3% | Department:<br>Office of City Manager<br><br>Source documents: refer to definition<br><br>Contact person:<br>Babalwa Mothibi |
| 8 | 8 | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | Community satisfaction survey (average) | Measures the average score on the Community satisfaction survey. A statistically valid, scientifically defendable score from the annual survey of residents' perceptions of the overall performance of the City. The aim of the indicator is to improve the community's perception of the City.<br><br>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.<br><br>A score of 2.9 and above based on the previous year's survey outcome:<br><br>**Performance rating*:**<br>**Unacceptable performance** = ≤2.8<br>**Not fully effective** = 2.9<br>**Fully effective** = 3.0<br>**Significant performance** = 3.1<br>**Outstanding performance** = ≥ 3.2 | 3 | NA | 3.00 | AT | AT | AT | 3.00 | 1% | Department:<br>Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation<br><br>Source document:<br>Community Satisfaction survey score<br><br>Contact person:<br>Bridgette Morris 021 400 3812 |
| 9 | 9 | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | Inclusion of C88 **Output** indicators (%) | All Tier 1 and Tier 2 Circular 88 Output indicators should be included into the performance scorecards of the Executive Directors, where relevant. All indicators must be included verbatim into the Corporate (auditable) and Directorate SDBIP (cascading principle) and the measurement must be in compliance with the Technical Indicator Descriptions (TID) as issued by National Treasury. This indicator will be measured during the annual and mid-year review process. Measurement: Q1 and Q3 (after mid-year amendments).<br><br>Weighting must be reallocated where the ED has no Output indicators.<br><br>Note: Indicators that have barriers and challenges are excluded from the formula.<br><br>The indicator will measure two aspects:<br>1) The inclusion of C88 Output indicators in the Directorate SDBIP, and<br><br>**Formula**: Inclusion in the directorate SDBIP -<br>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<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance** = < 80% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2<br>**Not fully effective** = 80% - 84.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2<br>**Fully effective** =85% - 90% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2<br>**Significant performance** = >90% - 95% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2<br>**Outstanding performance** = >95% - 100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 1% | Department: Organisational Performance Management (OPM)<br><br>Source document:<br>C88 scorecard and Directorate SDBIP<br><br>Contact person:<br>Adila Aboo -<br>Manager: City Performance Management<br>021 400 9024 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | 10 | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | Tenders in slippage at any given quarter end (%) | Measures tenders for MTREF in slippage at any given quarter end. This will drive the timeous implementation of the demand plan based on the agreed timeline. Abnormalities in the timeline will then impact each step of the process, such as where a tender only allows 30 days after award to Contract Required by Date (CRD), there will probably be a contract gap or a Value At Risk (VAR – Budget at risk of not being spent) on the Capital reporting.<br><br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>**Formula:**<br>Total count of tenders in red or amber as a percentage of the total number of tenders required for the MTREF period (%) (non-cumulative).<br><br>**<u>Performance rating:</u>**<br>**Unacceptable performance** = > 15%<br>**Not fully effective** = > 10% - ≤ 15%<br>**Fully effective** = ≤ 10%<br>**Significant performance** = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9%<br>**Outstanding performance** = < 5% | 3% | ≤10% | ≤10% | ≤10% | ≤10% | ≤10% | ≤10% | 1% | Department: Supply Chain Management<br><br>Source document:<br>Demand Plan Overview<br><br>Contact person:<br>Bekumuzi Vumase and Razaan Arendse<br>Manager Demand Management |
| 11 | 11 | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | Gaps in repeatable tender continuity (average number of days) | This indicator is to ensure continued monthly service delivery implemented through repeatable tenders. A "gap" refers to the number of days between the expiring contract and the replacement contract commencing. Potential gaps should be mitigated via extension/expansion and/or deviation early enough so that it caters for any possible delay within a tender process. A gap less than one month will be included in the calculation. To drive the demand plan and improve Supply Chain Management (SCM) process and service delivery. The indicator is based on all repeatable tenders that currently has a gap at the time of reporting, i.e. the current contract had already expired and the new contract is not yet in place.<br><br>Average number of days refer to calendar days (inclusive of weekends).<br><br>**Formula:**<br>Total number of gaps in days/ Total number of tenders with a gap of more than zero days = Average number of gaps (days)<br>(Effectively the report should be 'blank'.)<br>Using the gap report developed by Zubair which takes current status and projected time for completion into account.<br><br>**<u>Performance rating:</u>**<br>**Unacceptable performance** = repeatable tenders with ≥ 150 days gap<br>**Not fully effective** = repeatable tenders with ≥ 90 - < 150 days gap<br>**Fully effective** = repeatable tenders with ≥ 30 - < 90 days gap<br>**Significant performance** = repeatable tenders with gaps < 30 days gap<br>**Outstanding performance** = zero repeatable tenders with gaps | 255% | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1% | Department:<br>CPPPM<br><br>Source document:<br>GAP report prepared by Zubair<br><br>Contact person:<br>Maureen Whare |
| 12 | 12 | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | Recurring Audit Findings and /or recurring root causes (number) | The extent to which the Executive Director ensures that audit findings ((Communication of audit findings (COMAFs) and Service Delivery (lived- reality / resident experience) findings) are addressed at root-cause level. Remedial and corrective actions are translated into strengthened controls, standard practices and preventative mechanisms across the respective directorate for areas of improvement (e.g. transaction, discipline, functions, controls and oversight).<br><br>The indicator will be measured year-on-year during the duration of the ED's term of office/employment contract. New EDs will not be penalised for recurring findings and/or root causes prior to their appointment.<br><br>A COMAF is defined as: Any Auditor General of South Africa (AGSA) Communication of audit finding as per the scope of the regulatory audit.<br><br>**Indicator objective:** to ensure that no recurring findings or root causes arises from the AGSA audits. To ensure that all audit findings and/or root causes identified by the AGSA that fall within the Executive Director's area of responsibility are effectively addressed and resolved, preventing recurrence, demonstrating improved governance, internal controls and strengthening accountability within the directorate.<br><br>**A recurring finding is defined as:** Recurring findings refer to those findings which have persisted from one year of reporting to the next or a prior year, regardless of whether it relates to the same project/indicator or a different project/indicator or same department or different department within the directorate.<br><br>**Source:** Management Audit Action Plans (MAAPs), Management Report and COMAFs<br><br>**Formula:** Count of the number of recurring findings and /or recurring root causes<br><br>**<u>Performance rating:</u>**<br>**Unacceptable performance:** Recurring findings and recurring root causes<br>**Not fully effective:** N/A<br>**Fully effective:** Zero recurring findings and/or zero recurring root causes<br>**Significant performance:** N/A<br>**Outstanding performance:** N/A<br>The weighting for the indicator will be reallocated, if the ED has no recurring findings and/or recurring root causes. | New | New | Zero recurring findings and recurring root causes | AT | AT | AT | Zero recurring findings and recurring root causes | 2% | Office of the City Manager<br><br>Contact person:<br>Gayle Postings<br>Specialist Advisor |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY** | | | | | | | | | | | | **15%** | |
| **13** | **1** | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | Total Capital Expenditure as a percentage of Total Capital Budget less contingencies (%) | This indicator measures the extent to which budgeted capital expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Capital expenditure is all costs incurred by the municipality for acquiring, upgrading, and renewing assets such as property, equipment, plants, buildings, intangible assets, investment property or any other assets meeting the definition of assets in terms of GRAP. Less soft-locked contractual contingencies on projects and insurance contingencies.<br><br>**Q1 – Q3 reporting:**<br>**Formula:** (1) YTD Actual Capital Expenditure / (2) Total Budgeted Capital Expenditure.<br>The latest approved budget is applicable.<br><br>**Q4 reporting:**<br>**Formula:** (1) Actual Capital Expenditure / (2) Total Budgeted Capital Expenditure **less contingencies**.<br>The latest approved budget is applicable.<br><br>**<u>Performance rating:</u>**<br>**Unacceptable performance** = < 85% or >100% (non-compliance)<br>**Not fully effective** = ≥ 85% - 89.99%<br>**Fully effective** = 90% - 93%<br>**Significant performance** = > 93% - 96%<br>**Outstanding performance** = > 96% | 77% | 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 (Karen Fourie) |
| **14** | **2** | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | Total Operating Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating Expenditure budget | This indicator measures the extent to which operating expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Operating Expenditure (non-capital spending) is costs which the municipality incurs through its normal operations. The latest approved budget is applicable. Less soft-locked contractual grant construction contingency provisions projects provisions related to Human Settlements directorate.<br><br>**Q1 – Q4 reporting;**<br>Formula: Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure.<br>The latest approved budget is applicable.<br><br>**Formula:**<br>Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure.<br>The latest approved budget is applicable.<br><br>**<u>Performance rating:</u>**<br>**Unacceptable performance** = < 90% or > 100% (non-compliance)<br>**Not fully effective** = ≥ 90% - ≤ 94.99%<br>**Fully effective** = 95% - 96%<br>**Significant performance** = ≥ 96.1% - ≤ 97%<br>**Outstanding performance** = ≥ 97.1% - 100% | 96% | 95% | 95% | Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget | Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget | Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget | 95% | 7% | Directorate Finance Manager |
| **15** | **3** | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | % of Capital Grant Funding Expenditure Spent | The purpose of the indicator is to ensure cashflow alignment, risk acceptance and strengthened governance requirements for capital grant funded projects.<br><br>Disclaimer: Achievement of at least 45% expenditure spent by 31 December is a non-negotiable requirement. This will include an internal November performance assessment benchmark to allow corrective action ahead of the National Treasury (NT) cut-off.<br><br>Evidence: Grant Performance Reports Issued by Grant Funding Department<br><br>Formula: % of capital grant funding expenditure spent (excluding performance component of Urban Development Financing Grant (UDFG))<br><br>=Capital Grant expenditure spent/Total Capital grant allocation in budget<br>•Q2 spent will be based on the latest available budget at 31 December.<br>•FY spent will be based on the approved FY budget.<br>•Grants received before Q2 will be included (grant dumps).<br>•Grants received after Q2 will be excluded (grant dumps).<br>Grant dumps refer to grant allocations received that fall outside<br>the approved DORA (Division of Revenue Act) allocation process:<br>•They are unplanned or irregular transfers of funds.<br>•Unlike standard DORA allocations, which follow a structured approval and distribution framework, grant dumps are not part of the formal budgetary or legislative process.<br>•They may arise from ad hoc decisions, emergency funding, or discretionary transfers that bypass the usual allocation mechanisms.<br><br>**<u>Performance rating:</u>**<br>**Unacceptable performance:** <90% (Q4 or y/end) or <45% spent by 31 December (Q2)<br>**Not fully effective:** 90% - <93% (Q4 or y/end) or <45% spent by 31 December (Q2)<br>**Fully effective**: 93% - 95% (Q4 or y/end) and 45% spent by 31 December (Q2)<br>**Significant performance**: >95% - 97% (Q4 or y/end) and 45% spent by 31 December (Q2)<br>**Outstanding performance**: >97% (Q4 or y/end) and 45% spent by 31 December (Q2) | New | New | 93% | N/A | 45% | N/A | 93% | 2% | Grant Funding Department |

| | | | | SERVICE DELIVERY / GOOD GOVERNANCE | | | | | | | | 54% | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **16** | **1** | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | Sector Prioritisation | Sector prioritisation refers to trade-offs between needed infrastructure projects, due to budgetary tensions. These trade-offs have a direct impact on service delivery and the City's future growth. To navigate these pressures responsibly, a consistent, transparent, and rigorous approach to sectoral prioritisation is essential to understand and capture the risks and consequences of decisions. This process is a critical decision-support mechanism that ensures resources are directed to projects that maintain essential City functions and supports the implementation of Council-approved strategies.<br>All sector-based prioritisation (capital infrastructure projects) must be fully documented (codified), with all assumptions clearly stated to ensure transparency and to enable independent review. The methodology must support and enable long term strategic planning for a 10- and 15-year planning horizon.<br>The methodology in line with CM directive must be –<br>•practical to apply.<br>•replicable across years and sectors; and<br>•grounded in reliable data.<br>It must also clearly define the criteria used to assess projects, together with the associated metrics and weightings where appropriate. Furthermore, all methodologies and prioritised project lists must be open to review by corporate assurance providers to ensure a defendable, evidence-based framework for Citywide investment decisions.<br>The outcome of this process will be a complete and prioritised project pipeline identifying key strategic infrastructure projects to be incorporated into the 2050 Long Term Plan and the New Term of Office (NTO) Integrated Development Plan (IDP).<br>The annual target is only applicable for the following directorates: Energy, W&S, HS, SPE, UM, UWM<br><br>Evidence required based on milestones towards sector prioritisation:<br>•26/27: Prioritisation methodology captured and approved by relevant Executive Director. PPM data. SMF.<br>•27/28 and beyond: Methodology is applied to infrastructure projects to produce rational results.<br><br>**Performance Rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance:** No prioritisation methodology (50%)<br>**Not fully effective**: Prioritisation methodology captured but not approved by Executive Director (70%)<br>**Fully effective**: Prioritisation methodology approved by ED is codified and is transparent, practical and replicable and presented by the Sector Lead to the ICWG (Infrastructure Coordination Working Group) (100%)<br>**Significant performance:** Prioritisation methodology is data driven and applied to the 10-year project pipeline and produces rational results that will provide capital project options for the New Term of Office ID (120%)<br>**Outstanding performance**: Prioritisation methodology is automated and applied to the 15-year project pipeline and results in a portfolio of prioritised projects required to meet demand up to and beyond 2040, which can be attached to the Long-Term Plan 2050 (150%) | New | New | 100% | AT | AT | AT | 100% | 2% | Lucille Janssens (Strategic Planning, Policy and Strategy) |
| **17** | **2** | A sustainable transport system that is integrated, efficient and provides safe and affordable travel options for all | 12.A Passengers transported for each scheduled kilometre 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.<br>The purpose of the indicator is to measure efficiency improvements in the usage of MyCiTi buses.<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance:** <0.988<br>**Not fully effective:** 0.988 - 1.0399<br>**Fully effective:** 1.04 - 1.09<br>**Significant performance:** 1.091 - 1.14<br>**Outstanding performance:** 1.15-1.121 | 1.06 | 1.02 | 1.04 | 1.04 | 1.04 | 1.04 | 1.04 | 5% | Director: Public Transport |
| **18** | **3** | 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) | Measures the number of passenger journeys travelled on MyCiTi buses.<br>An efficient, integrated transport system is measured in part through the increase in passenger journeys undertaken.<br><br>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).<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance:** <19.19 million<br>**Not fully effective:** 19.19 million - 20.199 million<br>**Fully effective:** 20.2 million - 21.21 million<br>**Significant performance:** 21.211 million - 22.272 million<br>**Outstanding performance:** >22.272 million | 20,022,183 | 19,900,000 | 20,200,000 | 5,050,000 | 10,100,000 | 15,150,000 | 20,200,000 | 5% | Director: Public Transport |
| **19** | **4** | 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.<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performanc**e ≤ 3<br>**Not fully effective** = 4<br>**Fully effective** = 5 (no ranges)<br>**Significant performance** = 6<br>**Outstanding performance** = ≥7 | 6 | 5 | 5 | AT | AT | AT | 5 | 5% | Director: Transport Planning and Network Management |
| **20** | **5** | Safe and quality roads for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles | 13.A Surfaced road resurfaced (kilometres) | Measures the kilometres of surfaced roads resurfaced.<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance:** <144<br>**Not fully effective:** 144 – 159.99<br>**Fully effective:** 160 - 168<br>**Significant performance:** 168.1 - 176<br>**Outstanding performance:** >176 | 166.8 | 155 | 160 | 7.6 | 95 | 150 | 160 | 5% | Director: Roads Infrastructure Management |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **21** | **6** | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance**: >59<br>**Not fully effective:** >56 - 59<br>**Fully effective:** 53 - 56<br>**Significant performance:** 53 - 49<br>**Outstanding performance**: <49 | 24.59 | 56 | 56 | 19 | 28 | 37 | 56 | 7% | Director: Roads Infrastructure Management |
| **22** | **7** | A resilient city | 14. C Storm water cleaning budget spend (%) | Measures the percentage budget spent on stormwater cleaning.<br><br>**Performance Rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance =** < 85% or >100% (non-compliance)<br>**Not fully effective =** ≥ 85% - 89.99%<br>**Fully effective =** 90% - 93%<br>**Significant performance =** > 93% - 96%<br>**Outstanding performance =** > 96% | 95.1% | 90% | 90% | 15% | 30% | 60% | 90% | 5% | Director: Roads Infrastructure Management |
| **23** | **8** | 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) % | This indicator measures the percentage spend and 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.<br>Target achievement can be affected by external interference in the delivery of this service,including, but not limited to prolonged adverse weather conditions, service delivery protests, racketeering towards the service providers, etc.<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance** = <91%<br>**Not fully effective** =91%-94.9%<br>**Fully effective** = 95%-100%<br>**Significant performance** = 100% at end May 2027<br>**Outstanding performance** = 100% at end April 2027 | 45.7% | 70% | 100% | 75% | 83% | 91% | 100% | 5% | Director: Transport Infrastructure Implementation |
| **24** | **9** | Safe and quality roads for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles | Percentage of unsurfaced roads graded | The length of unsurfaced road which has been graded as a percentage of overall unsurfaced road network. Unsurfaced road is understood as a road without a prepared, durable surface intended to withstand traffic volume, usually a tar macadam (asphalt) or concrete surface. Usually dirt, gravel or natural surface. Road "graded" is the process of restoring the driving surface of a gravel or natural surface road to a desired smoothness and shape by removing irregularities such as corrugations and potholes and redistributing gravel. Usually dirt, gravel or natural surface. Road "graded" is the process of restoring the driving surface of a gravel or natural surface road to a desired smoothness and shape by removing irregularities such as corrugations and pot holes and redistributing gravel.<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance** = <90%<br>**Not fully effective** = >90% - 99%<br>**Fully effective** = 100% - 105%<br>**Significant performance** = 105.1% - 110%<br>**Outstanding performance** = > 110% | New | 110% | 100% | 30% | 65% | 90% | 100% | 5% | Director: Roads Infrastructure Management |
| **25** | **10** | 13 Safe and quality roads for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles | School traffic calming projects implemented (Number) | This indicator measures the construction of traffic calming projects (without any external interference in the delivery of this service, including but not limited to prolonged adverse weather conditions, service delivery protests, racketeering towards the service providers, etc), normally of varying size and value, at 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 initial planned school projects.<br><br>**Q1** - Issue long-list of projects to RIM and commence planning and costing.<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance**: <63<br>**Not fully effective:** 63 - 69<br>**Fully effective:** 70 - 73<br>**Significant performance:** 74 - 77<br>**Outstanding performance:** >77 | 86 | 60 | 70 | N/A | 20 | 40 | 70 | 5% | Director: Transport Planning and Network Management |
| **26** | **11** | 13 Safe and quality roads for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles | Number of road safety assessments completed on arterials (number) | This indicator measures the 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.<br><br>**Q1**- Identification of road safety assessments on arterials.<br>**Q2**- Investigation of road safety assessments on arterials.<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance**: <4<br>**Not fully effective**: 5<br>**Fully effective:** 6<br>**Significant performance:** 7<br>**Outstanding performance:** ≥8 | 11 | 4 | 6 | N/A | N/A | 3 | 6 | 5% | Director: Transport Planning and Network Management |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | **DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS** | | | | | | | | **11%** | |
| **27** | **1** | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government<br><br>CM request | **Non-Operational**<br>Staff housing population disposal plan developed, per directorate (%) | Measures the percentage completion of a disposal plan for Non-Operational Staff Housing. Including confirming occupancy, operational status, and conditions (through visual assessments) as per the approved asset list, as compiled by the Directorate coordinators to ensure validity, accuracy and completeness. Each Directorate thus needs to determine the details of the disposal plan, given the many factors such as location, condition of the building and CoCT longer term plans.<br>The Disposal plan must include the following:<br>• Plan for disposal/re-use<br>• Property Valuations<br>• Property occupancy – Staff member occupying property by conducting a site visit.<br>• Status Verification: Operational need determined.<br>• Lease agreement in place (number and tenure).<br>• Rental value.<br>• Visual Assessments undertaken.<br><br>Closed out status- where all the above conditions are met.<br><br>**Exclusions** Housing under litigation (eviction and legal proceedings).<br><br>**Performance Rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance**: < 50%<br>**Not fully effective**: 50 - 99%<br>**Fully effective**: 100%<br>**Significant performance:** N/A<br>**Outstanding performance:** N/A | New | New | 100% | 60% | 75% | 90% | 100% | 1% | Corporate Services<br><br>Contact person:<br>Grant Stephens<br>021 400 9851 |
| **28** | **2** | 1. Increased Jobs and Investment in the Cape Town economy<br><br>Mayoral Priority Programme | Urban Mobility Wayleaves Processed (%) | Ease of doing business index:<br><br>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.<br><br>Applications that are still open (within 30 days) during the reporting period is not counted.<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance:** <70%<br>**Not fully effective:** 70 - 79.9%<br>**Fully effective:** 80% - 84%<br>**Significant performance:** 84,1% - 88%<br>**Outstanding performance:** >88% | 86.73% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 2% | Director: Roads Infrastructure Management |
| **29** | **3** | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | Public Transport - Develop programme and cost the projects of Three Priority Corridors | City Manager Delivery System (CM-DS) Initiative:<br><br>This indicator measures the programme development and project costing of the Three Priority Corridors<br><br>**Performance Rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance:** Either no draft programme developed or no costing of projects<br>**Not fully effective:** Consolidated draft programme and associated project cost estimates completed<br>**Fully effective:** Submission of the finalised consolidated programme and project cost estimates to the Director: Transport Planning and Network Management by 30 June 2027<br>**Significant performance:** Target achieved one (1) month prior to 30 June 2027<br>**Outstanding performance:** Target achieved two (2) months prior to 30 June 2027 | New | Final Preliminary Design Report (with Drawings | Submission of the finalised consolidated programme and project cost estimates to the Director: Transport Planning and Network Management | Develop a draft programme and define the scope of work | Prepare a draft programme and project cost estimates and facilitate a workshop with relevant internal officials to review and discuss the draft programme and costs | Consolidated draft programme and associated project cost estimates completed | Submission of the finalised consolidated programme and project cost estimates to the Director: Transport Planning and Network Management | 3% | Director: Transport Planning and Network Management |
| **30** | **4** | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | Complete Final Draft MYFIN | SMF/COVID-19:<br><br>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.<br><br>**Q1**- Submission MYFIN 2026 to Council and NDoT<br>**Q2**- Start with the Preparation of Draft Opex and Capex MTREF for MYFIN<br>**Q3**-Completion of MYFIN process plan for 2027. Finalize Opex and Capex for MTREF for 2027 MYFIN<br>**Q4**-Complete the Draft MYFIN 2027<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance** = MYFIN process plan for 2026 and Opex and Capex for MTREF for 2026 MYFIN not complete<br>**Not fully effective** = Draft MYFIN 2026 not complete<br>**Fully effective** = Complete the Draft MYFIN 2026<br>**Significant performance** = Incorporating insights and recommendations from the Annual Infrastructure Report.<br>**Outstanding performance** = Integrating Catalytic Land Developments and/or revenue generation initiatives in draft Myfin 2026. | Complete the Draft MYFIN 2025 | Complete the Draft MYFIN 2026 | 100% | 15% | 35% | 50% | 100% | 1% | Manager: Transport Finance |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 31 | 5 | 2. Improved access to quality and reliable basic services | Value of Informal settlement improvements of tracks and surface drainage (R) | Less Formal Township Establishment Act (LFTEA) areas:<br><br>This indicator measures the total verified Rand value of completed works for the construction, upgrading, or rehabilitation of access tracks and surface stormwater drainage within informal settlements.<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance**: <R5.98 million<br>**Not fully effective:** R5.98 million - R6.29 million<br>**Fully effective:** R5.6 million - R5.880 million<br>**Significant performance:** R5.881 million - R6.160 million<br>**Outstanding performance:** >R6.160 million | R5,655,450 | R6,300,000 | R5,600,000 | R580,000 | R2,500,000 | R4,500,000 | R5,600,000 | 2% | Director: Roads Infrastructure Management |
| 32 | 6 | 16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government | Report Unlawful Land Occupation to the Anti-Land Invasion/Displaced People Units within 24 hours | Unlawful Land Occupation (ULO):<br><br>This indicator measures the reporting during working hours, complaints sent to ULO@UrbanMobility@capetown.gov.za regarding unlawful land occupation (ULO) on Urban Mobility land assets to the City of Cape Town's Public Emergency Communication Centre (PECC), within 24 hours after receiving the complaint.<br><br>**Performance rating:**<br>**Unacceptable performance** = <88%<br>**Not fully effective** = 88% - 94%<br>**Fully effective** =94% -100%<br>**Significant performance** = 30% of incidents reported within 18 hours.<br>**Outstanding performanc**e = 60% of incidents reported within 18 hours. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 2% | Director: Roads Infrastructure Management |

2026/07/10

**Executive Director**
**Regan Melody**

**Date**

Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo
Date: 2026.07.31 07:49:46 +02'00'

**City Manager**
**Lungelo Mbandazayo**

**Date**