2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Jason McNeil
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	Annual Target	Q1 Target	Q2 Target	Q3 Target	Q4 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
					2023/2024	2024/2025	2025/2026	30-Sept-25	31-Dec-25	31-Mar-26	30-Jun-26		
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											55%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											15%	
												100%	
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
1	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Increase in P3M3 and EM maturity level (average)	The CPPPM maturity level is based on the PPPM and Engineering Management (Only applicable to Engineering Directorates) maturity assessment. The maturity assessment will reflect the average maturity level of: - 1. Portfolio, Programme, Project and - 2. Engineering Management level. This will occur on an annual basis in order to assess the increase in the maturity level for the Directorate. The maturity level is measured on a scale of 1 - 5. The maturity levels: * Level 1 – Initial Process: No standard process or tracking system – informal process * Level 2 – Repeatable Process: Minimum standards for processes and procedures * Level 3 – Defined Process: Defined Process which allow for flexibility * Level 4 – Managed Process: Obtain and retain specific measurements and quality requirements * Level 5 – Optimised Process: Continuous process improvement and proactive technology and problem management for future improvements All other EDs will be measured per the individual directorate. 1. A score of 3.1 and above based on the previous year's baseline: Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = decrease of ≥ 0.21 from existing maturity level **Not fully effective** = decrease of 0.1 - 0.2 from existing maturity level **Fully effective** = maintain 3.1 or existing maturity level (no movement) **Significant performance** = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 from existing maturity level **Outstanding performance** = increase of ≥ 0.21 from existing maturity level	2.6	2.7	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	AT	AT	AT	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: PPM assessment Contact person: Ben Peters 021 400 9206

				2. A score of below 3.1based on the previous year's baseline: <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = decrease of ≥ 0.21 **Not fully effective** = decrease of 0.1 - 0.2 or increase to 2.99 **Fully effective** = maintain 3.0 or increase to 3.0 from existing maturity level **Significant performance** = increase of 0.11 - 0.2 above a baseline score of 3.0 **Outstanding performance** = increase of ≥ 0.21 above a baseline score of 3.0									
2	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Increase in Contract Management maturity level	The Contract Management maturity level is based on the Contract Management maturity assessment only. This will occur on an annual basis in order to assess the increase in the maturity level for the Directorate. The maturity level is measured on a scale of 1 - 5. The maturity levels: * Level 1 – Initial Process: No standard process or tracking system – informal process * Level 2 – Repeatable Process: Minimum standards for processes and procedures * Level 3 – Defined Process: Defined Process which allow for flexibility * Level 4 – Managed Process: Obtain and retain specific measurements and quality requirements * Level 5 – Optimised Process: Continuous process improvement and proactive technology and problem management for future improvements All other EDs will be measured per the individual directorate. 1. A score of 3.75 and above: <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = decrease of ≥ 0.11 **Not fully effective** = decrease of 0.1 – 0.2 **Fully effective** = maintain 3.75 or existing maturity level (no movement) **Significant performance** = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 **Outstanding performance** = increase of ≥ 0.21 2. A score of below 3.75: <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = decrease of ≥ 0.11 **Not fully effective** = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.1 **Fully effective** = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 **Significant performance** = increase of 0.21 - 0.3 **Outstanding performance** = increase of ≥ 0.31	New	3	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	AT	AT	AT	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	1%	Department: CPPPM Source document: PPM assessment Contact person: Ben Peters 021 400 9207

3	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Repeatable Tenders that were Expanded/Amended multiple times (%)	Measures the percentage of Expansions and Amendments on repeatable tenders. This indicator will only measure instances where there was more than one Expansion and/or Amendment on the same tender. Expansions or Amendments are defined by the SCM section 116 (3) guide and can change at any time. If a tender extension is awarded within 45 days of contract expiry of the current contracts arising from the tender, it will result in Unacceptable Performance. This would require all extensions to be awarded at least 45 days before expiry, ensuring proactive planning. Source: Contract Register and Monitoring System and Tender Tracking System. Measurement will commence only when the second Expansions and/or Amendments are released in SAP MM and only applies to repeatable tenders that are active in the current FY (i.e. commenced before or in the financial year and expires in or after the FY). Formula: Total number of repeatable tenders expanded and/ or amended multiple times ÷ Total number of repeatable tenders active in the FY. Measured cumulatively. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance**: ≥ 3.1% or if tender extension is awarded within 45 days of contract expiry of the current contracts arising from the tender. **Not fully effective:** 2.1% – 3% **Fully effective:** 1.8% - 2% **Significant performance:** 0.1% - 1.79% **Outstanding performance**: 0%	0%	2%	2%	AT	AT	AT	2%	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: CMRS (Contract Register and Monitoring System) and Tender Tracking System Contact person: Maureen Whare 069 367 4023

4	4	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduction in the number of SCM deviations (%)	The objective is to achieve a 20% reduction on SCM deviations. The indicator only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R750 000 (inclusive of VAT). Sole/single service provider deviations, deviations relating to emergencies and unforeseen situations (at this time being – anti-corruption investigations and extortion management, with associated human life threats (threat to limb and life) will be excluded from the measurement as per section 36 of SCM regulations. Target = reduction of 20% Formula: (Number of SCM deviations for current year – Number of SCM deviations for prior year)/ Number of SCM deviations for prior year X 100" Exception protocols: A default performance rating of fully effective will be awarded if you have 2 or less deviations from a base of 2 or less <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance:** Any positive increase in the number of deviations, year-on-year **Not fully effective:** a reduction > 0% - < 19.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year **Fully effective:** a reduction of 20% - 21%, for the number of deviations (year-on-year), or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol) **Significant performance:** a reduction > 21% - < 99.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year **Outstanding performance:** a reduction of 100% for the number of deviations, year-on-year or no deviations for the current year	100%	20%	20%	AT	AT	AT	20%	2%	Department: SCM Source document: SCM deviations schedule Formula: Number of SCM deviations reduced by the target percentage % year on year for the department/ directorate. Contact person: Gayle Postings Office of the City Manager: Specialist Advisor 021 400 1268

5	5	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Irregular, Fruitless and Wasteful, Unauthorised** Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating and Capital Expenditure	The indicator measures the extent to which the municipality has incurred irregular, fruitless and wasteful and unauthorised expenditure on its total budget (operating and capital budget). Fruitless and wasteful expenditure is expenditure that was made in vain and would have been avoided had reasonable care been exercised. Irregular expenditure is incurred by the municipality in contravention of a requirement of the law (specific legislation, per MFMA legislation). Unauthorized expenditure includes overspending of the total amount appropriated in the approved budget. The net amount after recoveries, write offs or condonement should be used in this calculation. The Q4 final figure is obtained from the Pre-audited AFS. Irregular expenditure will be included, if identified by other assurance providers, irrespective if it is self-disclosed or not. Formula: Per Directorate incidents value as a percentage of Directorate Opex and Capex ((1) Irregular + (2) Fruitless and Wasteful + (3) Unauthorised Expenditure) / (4) Total Operating and Capital Expenditure x 100 Note: New Executive Director or Executive Director taking up a post in another directorate as an Executive Director (in the year of review) will be measured on the UIFW Expenditure incidents for the current year, where the incident is in the term of appointment as Executive Director. This also applies if an existing ED moves to another directorate, the ED will be regarded as "New" I.e. previous UIFW expenditure incidents not in the term of employment of the ED will not be measured. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performanc**e = ≥ 1.5% **Not fully effective** = > 0.75% - 1.49% **Fully effective** = 0.75% **Significant performance** = < 0.75% - > 0% **Outstanding performance** = 0%	10%	10%	0.75%	AT	AT	AT	0.75%	2%	Department: City Manager Office Source document: Irregular Register and the AG's findings **in the quarter that it is available**. Contact person: Gayle Postings 021 400 1268

6	6	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	External audit (Auditor General) audit actions completed as per audit action plan (%)	This indicator measures how many actions was completed in the financial cycle within in the unique deadline set, as per the audit action plan. The Audit Action Plan sets out the total number audit actions required to address the internal control deficiencies as identified by the Auditor-General in their management report. The unique deadline is set in consultation with the relevant ED. Completed would mean that the actions as stipulated in the audit action plan has been executed by the relevant delegated authority. Should there be no actions required for a Directorate the indicator will be 'Not Applicable'. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = N/A **Not fully effective** = < 99.99% **Fully effective** = N/A **Significant performanc**e = N/A **Outstanding performance** =100%	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	Department: Investor Relations Source document: Completed Audit Action plan Contact person: Lynn Fortune:021 400 5987
7	7	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Final council and Mayco decisions implemented within timeframes (%)	The indicator excludes all council and Mayco decisions for noting. Decisions taken by council and Mayco where there is no budget to implement actions or outside of the control of the ED. These exclusions must be supported by valid evidence. These decisions must be reflected on each quarterly report for the City Manager and/or panel's awareness. All final Council and Mayco decisions allocated to the ED with implementation date for the quarter must be implemented and reported on for the quarter to achieve the target. Implementation that runs over a period longer than a financial year will be measured according to milestones identified for implementation within the current financial year. Each ED must ensure that a date is allocated of when action will be completed and implemented. This must be captured in the CDIT system by the relevant implementer. If no timeframe was allocated the timeframe is deemed to be one month for implementation. Implementation is the date of completion of the actions or achievement of councils request or expectation.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Each ED is responsible for implementation, evidence and updates to the tracking system. Source document: SharePoint tracking Tracking System contact person: Rehana Razack (021 400 1246)

				Performance rating: **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.									
8	8	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.J Budget spent on implementation of Workplace Skills Plan (%)	Measures the percentage of budget spent on the Workplace Skills Plan .The Workplace Skills Plan outlines the planned education, training and development interventions for the organisation. Its purpose is to formally plan and allocate budget for appropriate training interventions that will address the needs arising out of local government's skills sector plan, the IDP, the individual departmental staffing strategies, individual employees' personal development plans and the employment equity plan. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(f). Formula: % spent on the implementation of the WSP measured against the training budget. (A/B)*100 A: Actual spend per quarter on training budget B: Planned spend on training Budget for the year Q4 (as at end of June) reporting will be based on the latest period available at the time of reporting. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 90% **Not fully effective** = 90% - 94.99% **Fully effective** = 95% - 96% **Significant performance** = 96.1% - 97.99% **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 98%	95.77%	95%	95%	10%	30%	70%	95%	2%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851

9	9	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Internal independent assurance provider's recommendations and action plans implemented (%)	It is the monitoring and reporting of the implementation (expressed as a percentage) of corrective actions to address internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans, issued within the directorate of the responsible Executive Director. The internal independent assurance providers included in this KPI are **Internal Audit, Ombudsman, Integrated Risk Management** (limited to the Strategic Risks: Corporate, Transversals and Executive Risk Registers)**, Ethics and Forensics departments.** Each internal independent assurance provider as mentioned above has their own unique input to this KPI. This KPI will be "not applicable" to management when there are no recommendations, thus only those that could provide inputs will be included in the calculation. Future recommendations and action plans implemented (not recommended for implementation for the current financial year), will be taken into account for the measurement of this indicator, thereby creating an advantage for the ED. Formula: **Numerator:** Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans implemented (current and future implementations) **Denominator:** Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans made for the current period under review (recommendations and actions plans postponed as approved by the City Manager will be excluded) <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = < 75% **Not fully effective** = 75% - 84.99% **Fully effective** = 85% - 90% **Significant performance** = > 90% - 94.99% **Outstanding performance**= ≥ 95%	93%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	2%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mothibi

10	10	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Inclusion of C88 **Output** indicators	All Tier 1 and Tier 2 Circular 88 Output indicators should be included into the performance scorecards of the Executive Directors, where relevant. All indicators must be included verbatim into the **Corporate (auditable) and Directorate SDBIP (cascading principle)** and the measurement must be in compliance with the Technical Indicator Descriptions (TID) as issued by National Treasury. This indicator will be measured during the annual and mid-year review process. Measurement: Q1 and Q3 (after mid-year amendments). Weighting must be reallocated where there the ED has no Output indicators. Note: Indicators that have barriers and challenges are excluded from the formula. The indicator will measure two aspects: 1) The inclusion of C88 Output indicators in the Directorate SDBIP, and 2) The inclusion of C88 Outcome and Output indicators on the Corporate Scorecard (CSC) (graduating), whether replacing existing CSC indicators. 1) Formula: **Inclusion in the directorate SDBIP -** Total number of Tier 1& 2 Output indicators included in the directorate SDBIP divided by Tier 1 & 2 indicators required for inclusion as per C88 (auditable) * 100 2) Formula: **Replacement and/ or inclusion of C88 Outcome and Output indicators on the CSC** **Graduating criteria:** Meet the strategic mandate of the City, with the Mayor's approval and Indicators should be auditable with systems and controls in place. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = < 80% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Not fully effective** = 80% - 84.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Fully effective** =85% - 99.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Significant performance** =100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 **Outstanding performance** =100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 and at least one replacement/ graduation to the CSC Exception rule: If an ED included less than 100% of the Output indicators (verbatim), however graduated at least one indicator, they will receive a default rating of Significant performance.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Department: Organisational Performance Management (OPM) Source document: C88 scorecard and Directorate SDBIP Contact person: Monique Fillies - Manager: City Performance Management 021 400 9024

11	11	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Tenders in slippage at any given quarter end (%)	Measures tenders for MTREF in slippage at any given quarter end. This will drive the timeous implementation of the demand plan based on the agreed timeline. Abnormalities in the timeline will then impact each step of the process, such as where a tender only allows 30 days after award to Contract Required by Date (CRD), there will probably be a contract gap or a Value At Risk (VAR – Budget at risk of not being spent) on the Capital reporting. Slippage is defined as tenders on the demand plan which are behind schedule based on the agreed timelines for each tender. Slippage in the implementation of the demand plan, is a contributor to the cause of VAR. This will include the submission of draft specifications as per the minimum timeframe before the CRD. Measurement: The indicator is measured on a quarterly basis (non-cumulative), as such any recoveries are considered. The annual performance is based on the tenders in slippage as at the 4th quarter. ED's are able to recover if there are tenders in slippage throughout the year. There are processes in place to remedy tenders that are in amber or red. Formula: Total count of tenders in red or amber as a percentage of the total number of tenders required for the MTREF period (%) (non-cumulative). <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance** = > 15% **Not fully effective** = > 10% - ≤ 15% **Fully effective** = ≤ 10% **Significant performance** = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9% **Outstanding performance** = < 5%	6%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	1%	Department: Supply Chain Management Source document: Demand Plan Overview Contact person: Bekumuzi Vumase and Razaan Arendse Manager Demand Management

12	12	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Gaps in repeatable tender continuity (average number of days)	This indicator is to ensure continued monthly service delivery implemented through repeatable tenders. A “gap” refers to the number of days between the expiring contract and the replacement contract commencing. Potential gaps should be mitigated via extension/expansion and/or deviation early enough so that it caters for any possible delay within a tender process. A gap less than one month will be included in the calculation. To drive the demand plan and improve Supply Chain Management (SCM) process and service delivery. The indicator is based on all repeatable tenders that currently has a gap at the time of reporting, i.e. the current contract had already expired and the new contract is not yet in place. Average number of days refer to calendar days (inclusive of weekends). Formula: Total number of gaps in days/ Total number of tenders with a gap of more than zero days = Average number of gaps (days) (Effectively the report should be ‘blank’.) Using the gap report developed by Zubair which takes current status and projected time for completion into account. 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	932	0	0	0	0	0	0	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: GAP report prepared by Zubair Contact person: Zubair Adams

	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
13	13	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Total Capital Expenditure as a percentage of Total Capital Budget less contingencies (%)	This indicator measures the extent to which budgeted capital expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Capital expenditure is all costs incurred by the municipality for acquiring, upgrading, and renewing assets such as property, equipment, plants, buildings, intangible assets, investment property or any other assets meeting the definition of assets in terms of GRAP. Less soft-locked contractual contingencies on projects and insurance contingencies. **Q1 – Q3 reporting:** Formula: (1) YTD Actual Capital Expenditure / (2) Total Budgeted Capital Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. **Q4 reporting:** Formula: (1) Actual Capital Expenditure / (2) Total Budgeted Capital Expenditure **less contingencies**. The latest approved budget is applicable. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 85% or >100% (non-compliance) **Not fully effective** = ≥ 85% - 89.99% **Fully effective** = 90% - 93% **Significant performance** = > 93% - 96% **Outstanding performance** = > 96%	86.53%	90%	90%	Directorate projected cash flow/ total budget	Directorate projected cash flow/ total budget	Directorate projected cash flow/ total budget	90%	5%	Directorate Finance Manager
14	14	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Total Operating Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating Expenditure budget	This indicator measures the extent to which operating expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Operating Expenditure (non-capital spending) is costs which the municipality incurs through its normal operations. The latest approved budget is applicable. Formula: Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = < 90% or > 100% (non-compliance) **Not fully effective** = ≥ 90% - ≤ 94.99% **Fully effective** = 95% - 96% **Significant performance** = ≥ 96.1% - ≤ 97% **Outstanding performance** = ≥ 97.1% - 100%	96.84%	95%	95%	Directorate projected cash flow/ total budget	Directorate projected cash flow/ total budget	Directorate projected cash flow/ total budget	95%	3%	Directorate Finance Manager

15	15	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Performance on cash backed expenditure over cash back budget items only (%)	In terms of the Directive 7 of 2023, directorates cannot offset primary operating budgeted expenditure that translates into a cash outflow against non-cash flow expenditures such as Impairments, Depreciation, Debt impairment, Write-offs, Post-retirement medical aid (PRMA) provision, Rehabilitation of landfill sites, Water Inventory, labour to operating, Interest and Prior year adjustments. This indicator measures the outcome of cash backed items only over the budget and if the outcome is higher than 100% then, it reflects reliance on non-cash items. The aim of the indicator is to achieve an outcome of less than or equal to100%. Source: Financial information. Formula: Operating expenditure (cash items only) / Operating budget (cash items only). Measured quarterly. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = > 100% **Not fully effective** = N/A **Fully effective** = 100% **Significantly performance =** ≥ 98% - 99.9% **Outstanding performance =** ≥ 95% - 97.9%	0%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager
	SERVICE DELIVERY / GOOD GOVERNANCE											55%	
16	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)	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 of government and SOEs. 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. Formula: Number equates to sum of All EPWP opportunities per Directorate. Performance rating **Unacceptable performance:** < 28 570 **Not fully effective:** 28 570 - 29 999 **Fully effective:** 30 000 - 31 500 **Significant performance:** 31 501 - 33 076 **Outstanding performance:** > 33 076	43 962	30 000	30 000	7 500	12 500	19 500	30 000	8%	Acting Director: Public Empowerment & Development [PED]

17	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. Performance rating **Unacceptable performance**: <90% **Not fully effective**: 90% - 98.99% **Fully effective**: 99% - 99.2% **Significant performance**: 99.3% - 99.7%. **Outstanding performance**: > 99.7%	99.84%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	8%	Director: Waste Services [WS]
18	3	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support inclusive economic growth	Formal Beats receiving a refuse collection service on scheduled day (Percentage)	Measures the number of formal beats receiving collection services on a scheduled day, at current resource availability, expressed as a percentage at the end of the reporting period. Formula: Total number of beats / Total number of backlog beats expressed as a percentage Performance rating **Unacceptable performance**: <93% **Not fully effective:** 93% - 94.9% **Fully effective:** 95% - 97% **Significant performance:** ≥ 97.1% - 98% **Outstanding performance:** > 98%	97.36%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	8%	Director: WS

19	4	4. Well managed modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	Operation rate of compactors availability (%)	Measures the operation of the compactors capacity for refuse removal (%). Formula: Number of compactors available for scheduled refuse collection / Total number of compactors for scheduled refuse collection Performance rating **Unacceptable performance:** <90% **Not fully effective:** 90% - 94.99% **Fully effective:** 95% - 96% **Significant performance**: 96.1% - 97% **Outstanding performance:** > 97.1%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	8%	Director: WS
20	5	4. Well managed modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	Community activities undertaken to increase the levels of awareness and understanding about making better choices in managing waste (Number)	Promote behavioural change by raising awareness and encouraging individuals to do their part to make the right choices and waste minimisation. Formula: The indicator will be measured based on the total number of activities to take place across all 21 subcouncils and thus contribute to the overall annual target. Performance rating **Unacceptable performance**: <380 **Not fully effective**: 380 to 399 **Fully effective:** 400 - 420 **Significant performance:** 421 - 442 **Outstanding performance:** > 442	272	400	400	100	100	100	100	7%	Director: Integrated Planning & Waste Strategy [IP & WS]
21	6	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. 70 Compulsory operations per annum excluding joint operations. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance:** < 65 **Not fully effective:** 65 - 69 **Fully effective:** 70 - 73 **Significant performance:** 74 - 77 **Outstanding performance:** > 77	New	30	70	AT	AT	AT	70	6%	Director: IP & WS

22	7	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Adherence to the requirements of the Metro Trading Services reform	National Treasury has initiated the trading services reform in metropolitan municipalities through performance-based financial incentive component of the Urban Development Finance Grant (UDFG), as set out in the Division of Revenue Bill, 2025. The financial incentive will be used to reward good accountability and performance. Frequency of reporting is annual. The purpose of the indicator: 1. Is to ensure the timeous submission of all trading services related deliverables (technical, non-financial, tariff and financial) as identified in the approved trading service reform roadmap. 2. To ensure 100% award of grant funding is achieved, through achieving full points during the assessment score. This assessment score is reviewed by an independent assessor as assigned by NT. Evidence Requirements: 1. Evidence of submission of necessary assessment documentation to National Treasury (per latest approved programme implementation plans). 2. Resultant score for the trading service awarded by the appointed independent assessors and officially communicated to the City. Non-submission of deliverables and poor implementation will result in non-compliance or poor performance. This will have an direct impact on grant funding allocated to the City of Cape Town, which negatively impacts various projects funded by the funding and the City's overall balance sheet. Disclaimer: The above definition and evidence are in accordance with the MTSR guidelines, which may change from time to time. The resultant score as assessed by the National Treasury in accordance with the associated Guidance Note (addendum to guidance note 4: annexure: technical indicator description and minimum commitments definition sheets). Per the note, the calculation of this score will vary as the programme is rolled out with the first score being binary (full points, or no points and subsequent years being weighted according to performance, but with requirement to maintain the binary commitments or the weighted score will be zero). UWM: 2025/26: Submission of required documents for consideration for entry into the programme. 2026/27: 100% - Council commitment for the 8 minimum conditions. 2027/28: 100% - Assessment based on achievement of 8 minimum conditions. Thereafter the 100% will equate to the assessment based on partial or full achievement of targets as per A3 PIAP. The weighting for the indicator will not be reallocated.	New	New	100%	AT	AT	AT	100%	5%	Department: Grant Funding Source document: Submissions to NT and resultant score Contact person: Daniel Sullivan: 021 400 5097

				Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance**: N/A **Not fully effective:** N/A **Fully effective**: N/A **Significant performance:** N/A **Outstanding performance:** 100% Disclaimer: The performance rating for non-adherence/ non-submission/ non-entry into the Trading Services Reform (including the non-achievement of binary indicators) will be scored at zero. Note: Performance for UWM will be assessed against the submission of required programme documentation to National Treasury and the resultant inclusion of UWM in the programme (full points)(applicable 2025/26).									
23	8	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	Waste diverted from landfill sites through council waste minimisation initiatives (Percentage)	This indicator reflects the percentage of waste reduced, through the City's own waste minimisation initiatives, by diverting recyclables from the waste stream in relation to the mass of waste disposed at council waste management facilities. Formula: Total Waste diverted through Council's initiatives / Total Waste generated for disposal at Council facilities Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance:** < 33% **Not fully effective:** 33% - 34.99% **Fully effective:** 35% - 36.75% **Significant performance:** 36.76% - 38.60% **Outstanding performance:** > 38.60%	31.53%	New	35%	AT	AT	AT	35%	5%	Director: WS

	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											15%	
24	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government SMF	Implementation of the approved Waste Strategy based on identified milestones during 2025/26 (Percentage)	The implementation plan outlines the proposed Waste Strategy interventions, the role-players involved, and the resources required to fulfil the core objectives and commitments of the Strategy. It is envisaged that the implementation will be over a long-term period of 10-12 years and more and is divided into three priority levels. Formula: To measure the achievement of the identified actions for 2025/2026 in the implementation plan of the Waste Strategy based on the action plan express in percentage. Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance**: < 60% Implementation of the identified activities for 2025/26 in the approved implementation plan achieved **Not fully effective**: 61 - 79% Implementation of the identified activities for 2025/26 in the approved implementation plan achieved **Fully effective:** 80% Implementation of the identified activities for 2025/26 in the approved implementation plan achieved **Significant performance:** 81% - 85% Implementation of the identified activities for 2025/26 in the approved implementation plan achieved **Outstanding performance**: >85% Implementation of the identified activities for 2025/26 in the approved implementation plan achieved	New	New	80% implementation of the identified actions for 2025/2026 in the approved Implementation Plan achieved	Draft implementation plan completed	Implementation plan approved by the City Manager	20% implementation of the identified actions for 2025/2026 in the approved Implementation Plan achieved	80% implementation of the identified actions for 2025/2026 in the approved Implementation Plan achieved	5%	Director: IP&WS in conjunction with all other contributing departments and branches
25	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Long term airspace security establishment with implementation of alternative technologies.	Establish a landfill site and alternative technologies. This will align to the National Waste Management Strategy targets as well as the Provincial IWMP. Various changes to legislation necessitate the implementation of alternative technologies to ensure sustainable and innovative beneficiation methods for responsible waste management and commitment to sustainable practices through the following: extraction of landfill gas to energy and the concomitant carbon credit processes, 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 Project will also need to ensure that the target for 15 years' airspace security is achieved. Performance rating **Unacceptable performance**: Non finalisation and adoption of an implementation plan for the Long term airspace security **Not fully effective**: Delayed commencement of the rollout of the activities listed in the implementation plan **Fully effective**: Develop, finalise and adopt the initial implementation plan (100%) **Significant performance**: Commence action plan by the rollout of 10% of the captured activities in the implementation plan **Outstanding performance**: Completion of 10% or more of the activities captured in the implementation plan	New	New	Develop, finalise and adopt the initial implementation plan (100%)	AT	AT	AT	Develop, finalise and adopt the initial implementation plan (100%)	5%	Director: WS

26	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government MFMA compliance	Completion of MFMA Competency by Executive Directors (%)	The indicator measures the adherence to the MFMA. Section 16 of the MFMA requires Executive Directors (EDs) to meet the minimum competency levels. The attainment of competency levels must be obtained within prescribed timeframes and must be included in performance agreements. EDs have 18 months to complete, which commences on date that contract was signed. Within the 18 month period the 100% target will represent the modules completed for the year. Amendment to improve accuracy of indicator and provide clarity in terms of what should be excluded from calculation. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Fully effective** = 100%	New	New	100%	AT	AT	AT	100%	0%	ED: UWM
27	4	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Revenue collected as a percentage of billed amount	To measure the receipts as a percentage of billing covering the immediate 12 months period for all directorate responsible for services. Formula: Revenue collected over Billed amount. <u>Performance rating:</u> **Unacceptable performance:** < 88% **Not fully effective:** 88% - 92.99% **Fully effective:** 93% - 93.9% **Significant performance:** 94% - 95% **Outstanding performance:** > 95%	95.56%	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%	5%	Corporate Finance

Jason Mc Neil

Digitally signed by Jason Mc Neil
Date: 2025.07.25 11:59:30 +02'00'

SIGN HERE

Executive Director
Jason McNeil

Date

Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo
Date: 2025.07.31 11:45:03 +02'00'

City Manager
Lungelo Mbandazayo

Date