FINAL 2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Acting Executive Director: Phila Mayisela
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q 1 30 Sept 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 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%	
												100%	
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
1	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Increase in CPPPM maturity level (%) (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:** <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = decrease of ≥0.11 **Not fully effective** = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.1 **Fully effective** = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 **Significant performance** = increase of 0.21 - 0.3 **Outstanding performance** = increase of ≥0.31	2.59	2.60	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 (Actual of 2023/24 TBC)	AT	AT	AT	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 (Actual of 2023/24 TBC)	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).	11.18%	2%	2%	AT	AT	AT	2%	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: CMRS (Contract Register and Monitoring

FINAL 2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Acting Executive Director: Phila Mayisela
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q 1 30 Sept 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	Weighting	Contact Department
2	2			Formula: Total number of repeatable contracts tenders expanded and/ or amended multiple times ÷ Total number of repeatable contract active in the FY. Measured cumulatively. <u>Performance rating</u>: **Unacceptable performance** = ≥3.1% **Not fully effective**= range between 2.6% – 3% **Fully effective** = range between 2% - 2.5% **Significant performance** = range between 0.1% - 1.99% **Outstanding performance** = 0%									System) and Tender Tracking System Contact person: Maureen Whare 069 367 4023
				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).**									Department: SCM

FINAL 2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Acting Executive Director: Phila Mayisela
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q 1 30 Sept 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	Weighting	Contact Department
3	**3**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduction in the number of SCM deviations (%)	**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 of > 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	0%	20%	20%	AT	AT	AT	20%	2%	Department: SCM Source document: SCM deviations schedule Formula: Number of SCM deviations reduced by the target percentage % year on year for the department/ directorate. Contact person: Gayle Postings Office of the City Manager: Specialist Advisor 021 400 1268

FINAL 2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Acting Executive Director: Phila Mayisela
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q 1 30 Sept 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	Weighting	Contact Department
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. Formula: New Executive Director or Executive Director taking up a post in another directorate as an Executive Director (in the year of review)** 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	70% reduction	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

FINAL 2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Acting Executive Director: Phila Mayisela
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q 1 30 Sept 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	Weighting	Contact Department
				2. Formula: Executive Director with baseline information 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.***									
5	5	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	External audit (Auditor General) audit actions completed as per audit action plan (%)	This indicator measures how many actions was completed in the financial cycle within in the unique deadline set, as per the audit action plan. The Audit Action Plan sets out the total number audit actions required to address the internal control deficiencies as identified by the Auditor-General in their management report. The unique deadline is set in consultation with the relevant ED. Completed would mean that the actions as stipulated in the audit action plan has been executed by the relevant delegated authority.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	Department: Investor Relations Source document: Completed Audit Action plan Contact person: Lynn Fortune:021 400 5987

FINAL 2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Acting Executive Director: Phila Mayisela
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q 1 30 Sept 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	Weighting	Contact Department
				Should there be no actions required for a Directorate the indicator will be 'Not Applicable'. <u>Performance rating</u>: **Unacceptable performance** = N/A **Not fully effective** = <99.99% **Fully effective** = N/A **Significant performance** = N/A **Outstanding** =100%									
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. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = <69% of ALL decisions **Not fully effective** = 69% - 79.99% of ALL decisions **Fully effective** = 80% - 85% of ALL decisions **Significant performance** = 85.1% - 94.99% of ALL decisions **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 95% of ALL decisions If "Not Applicable"-weighting will be "zero" and must be reallocated it within the Transversal Category.	0%	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.**
				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									

FINAL 2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Acting Executive Director: Phila Mayisela
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q 1 30 Sept 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	Weighting	Contact Department
7	**7**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.J Budget spent on implementation of Workplace Skills Plan (%)	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 <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = <90% **Not fully effective** = 90% - 94.99% **Fully effective** = 95% - 96% **Significant performance** = 96.1% - 97.99% **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 98%	182.51%	90%	95%	10%	30%	60%	95%	1%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851
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) <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = <75% **Not fully effective** = 75% - 84.99% **Fully effective** = 85% - 90% **Significant performance** = 91% to 94% **Outstanding performance**= ≥95%	50%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	1%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mothibi

FINAL 2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Acting Executive Director: Phila Mayisela
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q 1 30 Sept 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	Weighting	Contact Department
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	3.1	2.9 (Actual of 2023/24 TBC)	Actual averaged score for 2023/2024 per ED + 0.1 (Actual of 2023/24 TBC)	AT	AT	AT	Actual averaged score for 2023/2024 per ED + 0.1 (Actual of 2023/24 TBC)	2%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: Community Satisfaction survey score Contact person: Brigette Morris 021 400 3812
				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									Department: Organisational

FINAL 2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Acting Executive Director: Phila Mayisela
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q 1 30 Sept 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	Weighting	Contact Department
10	10	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Increase in City Pulse	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	3.4	N/A	3.5	AT	AT	AT	3.5	1%	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 -**	New	100%	100%	AT	AT (YTD progress)	AT (YTD progress)	100%	1%	Department: Organisational Performance Management (OPM) Source document: C88 scorecard/ corporate SDBIP Contact person: Monique Fillies - Manager: City Performance Management 021 400 9024

FINAL 2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Acting Executive Director: Phila Mayisela
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q 1 30 Sept 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	Weighting	Contact Department
				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 <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = < 80% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Not fully effective** = 80% - 84.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Fully effective** =85% - 89.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Significant performance** = 90% - 99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Outstanding performance** =100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2									
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 %). <u>Performance rating:</u> **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
				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.									

FINAL 2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Acting Executive Director: Phila Mayisela
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q 1 30 Sept 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	Weighting	Contact Department
13	13	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Gaps in repeatable tender continuity (average number of days)	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** = above 96%	96.25%	90%	90%	Based on the directorate projected cash flow	Based on the directorate projected cash flow	Based on the directorate projected cash flow	90%	5%	Directorate Finance Manager

FINAL 2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Acting Executive Director: Phila Mayisela
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q 1 30 Sept 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	Weighting	Contact Department
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%	99.98%	95%	95%	Based on the directorate projected cash flow	Based on the directorate projected cash flow	Based on the directorate projected cash flow	95%	3%	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	0%	≤ 100%	N/A	N/A	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											60%	
				Simple count of the number of short-term work opportunities provided through the municipality by Public Employment Programmes such as Expanded Public Works Programme, Community Works Programme and other related infrastructure initiatives. EPWP is a nationwide programme covering all spheres									

FINAL 2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Acting Executive Director: Phila Mayisela
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q 1 30 Sept 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	Weighting	Contact Department
17	1	1. Increased Jobs and Investment in the Cape Town economy	1.G Number of work opportunities created through public employment programmes (incl. EPWP, CWP and other related employment programmes) (LED1.21) (City-wide)	of government and State Owned Enterprises. EPWP projects employ workers on a temporary or ongoing basis with government, contractors, or other non-governmental organisations under the Ministerial Conditions of Employment for the EPWP or learnership employment conditions. The CWP was established to provide an employment safety net to eligible members of target communities by offering them a minimum number of regular days of work each month. The programme targets unemployed and underemployed people. The stipends participants receive supplement their existing livelihood means and provide them with a basic level of income security. The indicator tracks the number of unique work opportunities generated within the quarter, regardless of the duration. Proxy for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(a). Proxy measure for C88 LED1.21. Formula: Number equates to Sum of All EPWP opportunities per Directorate. stipends participants receive supplement their existing livelihood means and provide them with a basic level of income security. The indicator tracks the number of unique work opportunities generated within the quarter, regardless of the duration. Proxy for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(a). Proxy measure for C88 LED1.21. Performance rating **Unacceptable performance**: >29 000 **Not fully effective**: 29 000 - 29 999 **Fully effective**: 30 000 - 31 500 **Significant performance**: 31 501 - 33 000 **Outstanding performance**: > 33 000	43 230	35 000	30 000	7 500	12 500	19 500	30 000	7%	Director: Public Engagement and Empowerment
18	2	2. Improved access to quality and reliable basic services	2.C Percentage of recognised informal settlements receiving basic waste removal services (ENV3.11)	The proportion of recognised informal settlements within the municipal area which are receiving at least a basic standard of service for refuse collection and cleaning services all weeks in the year. A "recognised informal settlement" refers to any process whereby the municipality officially documents the existence of the informal settlement and its obligations with regards to servicing its residents. This excludes "known" settlements that may emerge in the course of the reporting as a result of land invasions or on private property which the municipality is not responsible for. If the informal settlement has not received a basic standard of service in duration of more than one week, it should not be counted. Informal settlements that have experienced delayed collection of more than a week, or skipped weeks, are not considered to have received a basic standard of refuse removal. Formula: '((1) Number of informal settlements receiving basic waste removal services / (2) Total number of recognised informal settlements) Performance rating **Unacceptable performance**: <90%	99.78%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	7%	Director: Waste Services

FINAL 2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Acting Executive Director: Phila Mayisela
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q 1 30 Sept 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	Weighting	Contact Department
				Not fully effective: 90% - 98.99% **Fully effective**: 99% - 99.2% **Significant performance**: 99.3% - 99.7%. **Outstanding performance**: > 99.7%									
19	3	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support inclusive economic growth	4.F Service requests for non-collection of refuse resolved within 3 working days (Percentage) (NKPI)	Measures the number of non-collections for refuse removal, reported and closed within 3 working days, expressed as a percentage. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(a). Performance rating **Unacceptable performance:** < 90% **Not fully effective:** 90% - 95.99% **Fully effective:** 96% - 97% **Significant performance:** 97.1% - 98% **Outstanding performance:** > 98%	37.59%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	96%	6%	Director: Waste Services
20	4	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support inclusive economic growth	Formal Beats receiving a refuse collection service on scheduled day (Percentage)	Measures the number of formal beats receiving collection services on a scheduled day, at current resource availability, expressed as a percentage at the end of the reporting period. A Formal beat is the geographical area where refuse from formal residential and non-residential properties is collected by a vehicle with a driver and crew on a scheduled day. Formula: Total Number of Beats completed on the scheduled day/Total Number of Beats expressed as a percentage Performance rating **Unacceptable performance**: <93% **Not fully effective**: 93% - 94.9% **Fully effective**: 95% - 97% **Significant performance**: > 97.1% - 98% **Outstanding performance**: > 98%	New	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	6%	Director: Waste Services
21	5	4. Well managed modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	(Beats) Averaged planned number of formal Beats to receive a refuse collection service per quarter	Averaged planned number of formal Beats to receive a refuse collection service per quarter Performance rating **Unacceptable performance**: <155 **Not fully effective**: 155 - 157 **Fully effective**: 158 - 163 **Significant performance**: 164 - 170 **Outstanding performance**: >170	158	158	158	158	158	158	158	6%	Director: Waste Services

FINAL 2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Acting Executive Director: Phila Mayisela
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q 1 30 Sept 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	Weighting	Contact Department
22	6	4. Well managed modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	Operation rate of compactors availability (%)	Measures the operation of the compactors capacity for refuse removal (%). Performance rating **Unacceptable performance:** < 90% **Not fully effective:** 90% - 94.99% **Fully effective:** 95% - 96% **Significant performance:** 96.1% - 97% **Outstanding performance:** > 97%	95%	90%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	6%	Director: Waste Services
23	7	4. Well managed modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	Community activities undertaken to increase the levels of awareness and understanding about making better choices in managing waste (Number)	Promote behavioural change by raising awareness and encouraging individuals to do their part to make the right choices and waste minimisation. The indicator will be measured based on the total number of activities to take place per Subcouncil. Performance rating **Not fully effective:** 190 - 199 **Fully effective:** 200 - 210 **Significant performance:** 211 - 220 **Outstanding performance:** > 220	New	200 activities across 21 Subcouncils	200	50	50	50	50	6%	Director: Integrated Planning and Waste Strategy
24		4. Well managed modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	Explore Backyard dwelling service support initiative	Research conducted on appropriate methodology to rollout Backyard dwelling support to ensure responsible waste management and commitment to sustainable service delivery. Performance rating **Unacceptable performance:** Non submission of Report on findings of the research on service provision to Backyard dwellings. **Not fully effective:** Report pending for approval **Fully effective:** Report approved by City Manager **Significant performance:** Report approved and budget allocation underway **Outstanding performance:** Implementation of research findings underway	New	New	Report on findings of the research on service provision to Backyard dwellings	AT	AT	AT	Report on findings of the research on service provision to Backyard dwellings	5%	Director: Waste Services

FINAL 2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Acting Executive Director: Phila Mayisela
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q 1 30 Sept 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	Weighting	Contact Department
25		4. Well managed modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	Illegal dumping monitoring and enforcement initiative	Number of operations undertaken on monitoring and enforcement initiative conducted. 20 Compulsory operations per annum (5 per Area) excluding joint operations. <u>Performance rating</u> **Not fully effective:** 15 - 19 **Fully effective:** 20 - 25 **Significant performance:** 26 - 30 **Outstanding performance:** > 30	New	New	20	AT	AT	AT	20	5%	Director: Waste Services
26	**8**	4. Well managed modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	Drop-offs facilities open to the public (Percentage)	Measures the percentage access to City drop-off facilities provided to the public. Formula: For any specific quarter: Month 1 % Access + Month 2 % Access + Month 3 % Access / 3= Total access for the quarter <u>Performance rating</u> **Unacceptable performance:** < 94% **Not fully effective:** 94% - 98.9% **Fully effective:** 99% - 99.2% **Significant performance:** 99.3% - 99.5% **Outstanding performance:** ≥ 99.6%	99.84%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	6%	Director: Waste Services
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**10%**	
27	**2**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government SMF	Percentage progress in the development of a Waste Strategy	To measure the progress in the development of the Waste Strategy. <u>Performance rating</u> **Unacceptable performance:** 70% Progress on development **Not fully effective:** 71% - 99% Progress on development **Fully effective:** 100% Completion of the development **Significant performance:** Approval of the Waste Startegy **Outstanding performance:** 10% Commencement of implimentation	70%	100%	100%	AT	AT	AT	100%	3%	Director: Integrated Planning and Waste Strategy

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Baseline 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q 1 30 Sept 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	Weighting	Contact Department
28	**3**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government SMF	Research conducted on best practice in waste management including alternative waste treatment technologies and beneficiation	Research conducted to establish sustainable and innovative beneficiation methods to ensure responsible waste management and commitment to sustainable practices through the following: extraction of landfill gas to energy, alternative approaches to organic waste handling and management as well as more suitable waste treatment technologies to ensure adherence to the waste minimisation hierarchy. The outcome of the initial research will be consolidated into a research progress report that must be approved by the City Manager. Performance rating **Unacceptable performance**: Non submission of Report on findings of the research on waste to energy conversion **Not fully effective**: Report pending for approval **Fully effective**: Alternative technology waste assessment report approved by City Manager **Significant performance**: Report approved and budget allocation underway **Outstanding performance**: Implementation of research findings underway	The Regional Facility Project will elaborate on alternatives. In the interim there has been other reports developed which will feed into this project. One such report relates to the Italy Study, another is the Innovation Expo, which was conducted via the Special Projects and Innnovation team. Both these were completed which encapsulate a high level review which needs to be taken forward. Alternative technology waste assessments studies still under way.	Report on findings of the research on waste to energy conversion	Report on findings of the research on various waste interventions for sustainable and beneficial waste management options	AT	AT	AT	Report on findings of the research on various waste interventions for sustainable and beneficial waste management options	3%	Director: Waste Services
29	**4**	3.1 Excellence in Basic Service delivery	Revenue collected as a percentage of billed amount	To measure the receipts as a percentage of billing covering the immediate 12 months period for all directorate responsible for services. Formula: Revenue collected over Billed amount. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance:** < 88% **Not fully effective:** 88% - 92.99% **Fully effective:** 93% - 93.9% **Significant performance:** 94% - 95% **Outstanding performance:** > 95%	92%	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%	4%	Directorate Finance Manager Mawande Mtyi

Phila Mayisela Digitally signed by Phila Mayisela Date: 2024.07.24 22:42:16 +02'00'

Acting Executive Director: Urban Waste Management
Phila Mayisela **Date:**

City Manager
Lungelo Mbandazayo **Date:**

Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo
Date: 2024.07.30 18:25:21 +02'00'