2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Annual Target 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 30 Sep 2024 Target	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											**58%**	
SPECIAL PROJECTS											**12%**	
											100%	
MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											**20%**	
1	Transversal Management	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:** 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 Significant performance= increase of 0.21 - 0.3 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.31 **2. A score of 2.9 and above based on the 2023/2024 baseline:** Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.21 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 - 0.2 Fully effective = increase of 0.0 - 0.1 Significant performance = increase of 0.11 - 0.2 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.21	New	New	Baseline Established +increase 0.1 - per directorate	AT	AT	AT	Baseline Established +increase 0.1 - per directorate	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: PPM assessment Contact person: Ben Peters 021 400 9206
2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Repeatable Tenders that were Expanded/Amended multiple times (%)	Measures the percentage of Expansions and Amendments on repeatable tenders. This indicator will only measure instances where there was more than one Expansion and/or Amendment on the same tender. Expansions or Amendments are defined by the SCM section 116 (3) guide and can change at any time. Source: Contract Register and Monitoring System and Tender Tracking System. Measurement will commence only when the second Expansions and/or Amendments are released in SAP MM and only applies to repeatable tenders that are active in the current FY (i.e. commenced before or in the financial year and expires in or after the FY). Formula: Total number of repeatable contracts tenders expanded and/ or amended multiple times ÷ Total number of repeatable contract active in the FY. Measured cumulatively. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = ≥ 3.1% Not fully effective= 2.6% – 3% Fully effective = 2% - 2.5% Significant performance = 0.1% - 1.99% Outstanding performance = 0%	1.85%	2%	2%	AT	AT	AT	2%	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: CMRS (Contract Register and Monitoring System) and Tender Tracking System Contact person: Maureen Whare 069 367 4023

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Annual Target	Annual Target	Q1 30 Sep 2024	Q 2 31 Dec 2024	Q 3 31 Mar 2025	Q4 30 Jun 2025	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
				2022/2023	2023/2024	2024/2025	Target	Target	Target	Target		
3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduction in the number of SCM deviations (%)	**The objective is to achieve a 20% reduction on SCM deviations.** 01 January – 30 June 2024 - The indicator **only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R750 000 (inclusive of VAT).** Sole/single service provider deviations, anti-corruption deviations and deviations relating to emergencies will be excluded from the measurement as per section 36 of SCM regulations. The indicator will measure the percentage year on year reduction from the previous year's. Target = reduction of 20% Formula: (No. of SCM deviations for current year – No of SCM deviations for prior year)/ Number of SCM deviations for prior year X 100" **Exception protocols:** A default performance rating of fully effective will be awarded if you have 2 or less deviations from a base of 2 or less **Performance rating:** Unacceptable performance = Any positive increase in the number of deviations, year-on-year Not fully effective = a reduction > 0% - < 19.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. Fully effective = a reduction of 20%, for the number of deviations (year-on-year), or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol) Significant performance = a reduction > 20% - < 99.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. Outstanding performance = 0 deviation	4 deviations attained, which equated to a 33% reduction	20% reduction, which equates to a maximum of 3 deviations allowed	20%	AT	AT	AT	20%	2%	Department: SCM Source document: SCM deviations schedule Contact person: Gayle Postings Office of the City Manager: Specialist Advisor 021 400 1268

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Annual Target 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 30 Sep 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
4	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduce and maintain nominal (number and value) irregular expenditure within the Directorate (year-on-year) (average %)	**The objective is to reduce past on irregular expenditure by 10% and limit irregular expenditure..** The indicator will measure the average percentage reduction in the number and value of irregular expenditure i.e. contravention of legislation as defined in the MFMA irregular expenditure definition and maintain lower levels of irregular expenditure. Irregular expenditure is defined as expenditure that is in contravention of, or not in accordance with, a requirement of the Local Government: Municipal Finance Management Act 56 of 2003, the Local Government: Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000, the Remuneration of Public Office Bearers Act 20 of 1998, or the municipality's supply chain management (SCM) policy. Indicator will measure Irregular expenditure that was incurred (transaction) during the time of employment of the Executive Director (in the position as Executive Director). This also applies if an Existing ED moves to another portfolio. i.e. previous irregular expenditure wont impact the new Executive Director. NOTES: a. Irregular expenditure will be included, if identified by other assurance provider, irrespective if it is self-disclosed or not. b. New Executive Directors will be impacted by existing contracts that incur irregular expenditure in the term of their office. If the existing contract had irregular expenditure in the period before ED's appointment, it will not be considered for the new EDs performance. **1. New Executive Director or Executive Director taking up a post in another directorate as an Executive Director (in the year of review)** **Formula:** Number of non-compliance incidents (irregular expenditure) for the current year, while employed as Executive Director and the amount of irregular expenditure, while employed as an Executive Director. (No baseline) This also applies if an existing ED moves to another directorate, the ED will be regarded as "New" I.e. previous irregular expenditure will not be carried over. **Performance rating:** Unacceptable performance = where more than 2 incidents exist or the total amount is more than R2.5 million, starting from a baseline of zero. Not fully effective = N/A Fully effective = 2 or less incidents and the total amount is less than R2.5 million. Significant performance = N/A Outstanding performance = 0 incidents **2. Executive Director with baseline information** **Formula:** 1) Non-compliance **incidents** incurred for the current year – Non-compliance **incidents** incurred for prior year / Non-compliance incidents incurred for prior year x 100% Target = reduction of 10% 2) Irregular expenditure **amount** incurred for the current year – Irregular expenditure **amount** incurred for the prior year)/ Irregular expenditure amount incurred for the prior year X 100" Target = reduction of 10% **Performance rating:** Unacceptable performance = Any positive increase in incidents or amount > R2.5 million, year-on-year Not fully effective = a reduction > 0% - < 9.9%, for incidents and amounts, year-on-year. Fully effective = a reduction of 10% or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol) Significant performance = a reduction > 10% - < 99.9%, for incidents and amount year-on-year. Outstanding performance = 0 incidents **Exception protocols applicable to New Executive Directors and Executive Directors with baseline data:** **A default rating will apply (fully effective), if you have a zero baseline - provided that the default criteria is achieved, anything more will be unacceptable performance.** **A default criteria rating of fully effective will be awarded if you have 2 or less incidents and the total amount is less than R2.5 million.**	7 Instances which had a Rand-Value of R3 166 966.70. This equated to a 638% increase	10%	10%	AT	AT	AT	10%	2%	Department: City Manager Office Source document: Irregular Register and the AG's findings **in the quarter that it is available**. Contact person: Gayle Postings 021 400 1268

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Annual Target 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 30 Sep 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
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. Should there be no actions required for a Directorate the indicator will be 'Not Applicable'. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = N/A Not fully effective =< 99.99% Fully effective = N/A Significant performance = N/A Outstanding =100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	Department: Investor Relations Source document: Completed Audit Action plan Contact person: Lynn Fortune:021 400 5987
6	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Final council and Mayco decisions implemented within timeframes (%)	The indicator excludes all council and Mayco decisions for noting. Decisions taken by council and Mayco where there is no budget to implement actions or outside of the control of the ED. These exclusions must be supported by valid evidence. These decisions must be reflected on each quarterly report for the City Manager and/or panel's awareness. All final Council and Mayco decisions allocated to the ED with implementation date for the quarter must be implemented and reported on for the quarter to achieve the target. Implementation that runs over a period longer than a financial year will be measured according to milestones identified for implementation within the current financial year. Each ED must ensure that a date is allocated of when action will be completed and implemented. This must be captured in the CDIT system by the relevant implementer. If no timeframe was allocated the timeframe is deemed to be one month for implementation. Implementation is the date of completion of the actions or achievement of councils request or expectation. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 69% of ALL decisions Not fully effective = 69% - 79.99% of ALL decisions Fully effective = 80% - 85% of ALL decisions Significant performance = 85.1% - 94.99% of ALL decisions Outstanding performance = ≥ 95% of ALL decisions If "Not Applicable"-weighting will be "zero" and must be reallocated it within the Transversal Category.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Each ED is responsible for implementation, evidence and updates to the tracking system. Source document: SharePoint tracking Tracking System contact person: Rehana Razack (021 400 1246) **Weighting must be reallocated where there were no council decisions for the year.**
7	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.J Budget spent on implementation of Workplace Skills Plan (%)	Measures the percentage of budget spent on the Workplace Skills Plan .The Workplace Skills Plan outlines the planned education, training and development interventions for the organisation. Its purpose is to formally plan and allocate budget for appropriate training interventions that will address the needs arising out of local government's skills sector plan, the IDP, the individual departmental staffing strategies, individual employees' personal development plans and the employment equity plan. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(f). Formula: % spent on the implementation of the WSP measured against the training budget. (A/B)*100 A: Actual spend per quarter on training budget B: Planned spend on training Budget for the year Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 90% Not fully effective = 90% - 94.99% Fully effective = 95% - 96% Significant performance = 96.1% - 97.99% Outstanding performance = ≥ 98%	98%	95%	90%	10%	30%	60%	95%	1%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Annual Target	Annual Target	Q1 30 Sep 2024	Q 2 31 Dec 2024	Q 3 31 Mar 2025	Q4 30 Jun 2025	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
				2022/2023	2023/2024	2024/2025	Target	Target	Target	Target		
8	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Internal independent assurance provider's functions recommendations and action plans implemented (%)	It is the monitoring and reporting of the implementation (expressed as a percentage) of corrective actions to address internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans, issued within the directorate of the responsible Executive Director. The internal independent assurance providers included in this KPI are **Internal Audit, Ombudsman, Integrated Risk Management** (limited to the Corporate Risk Register)**, Ethics and Forensics departments.** Each internal independent assurance provider as mentioned above has their own unique input to this KPI. This KPI will be "not applicable" to management when there are no recommendations, thus only those that could provide inputs will be included in the calculation. Future recommendations and action plans implemented (not recommended for implementation for the current financial year), will be taken into account for the measurement of this indicator, thereby creating an advantage for the ED. Formula: **Numerator:** Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans implemented (current and future implementations) **Denominator:** Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans made for the current period under review (recommendations and actions plans postponed as approved by the City Manager will be excluded) Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 75% Not fully effective = 75% - 84.99% Fully effective = 85% - 90% Significant performance = 91% - 94% Outstanding performance= ≥ 95%	97%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	1%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mothibi
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 (WS)	2.9	Actual averaged score for 2023/2024 per ED + 0.1	Annual Target	Annual Target	Annual Target	Actual averaged score for 2023/2024 per ED + 0.1	2%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: Community Satisfaction survey score Contact person: Brigette Morris 021 400 3812

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

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

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Annual Target 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 30 Sep 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
12	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Average of tenders in slippage at any given quarter end (%)	Measures the average of tenders for MTREF in slippage at any given quarter end. This will drive the timeous implementation of the demand plan based on the agreed timeline. Abnormalities in the timeline will then impact each step of the process, such as where a tender only allows 30 days after award to Contract Required by Date (CRD), there will probably be a contract gap or a Value At Risk (VAR – Budget at risk of not being spent) on the Capital reporting. Slippage is defined as tenders on the demand plan which are behind schedule based on the agreed timelines for each tender. Slippage in the implementation of the demand plan, is a contributor to the cause of VAR. This will include the submission of draft specifications as per the minimum timeframe before the CRD. Formula: Total count of tenders in red or amber as a percentage of the total number of tenders required for the MTREF period (average %). Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = > 15% Not fully effective = > 10% - ≤ 15% Fully effective = ≤ 10% Significant performance = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9% Outstanding performance = < 5%	New	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	1%	Department: Supply Chain Management Source document: Demand Plan Overview Contact person: Bekumuzi Vumase and Razaan Arendse Manager Demand Management
13	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Gaps in repeatable tender continuity (average number of days)	This indicator is to ensure continued monthly service delivery implemented through repeatable tenders. A "gap" refers to the number of days between the expiring contract and the replacement contract commencing. Potential gaps should be mitigated via extension/expansion and/or deviation early enough so that it caters for any possible delay within a tender process. A gap less than one month will be included in the calculation. To drive the demand plan and improve Supply Chain Management (SCM) process and service delivery. The indicator is based on all repeatable tenders that currently has a gap at the time of reporting, i.e. the current contract had already expired and the new contract is not yet in place. Average number of days refer to calendar days (inclusive of weekends). Formula: Total number of gaps in days/ Total number of tenders with a gap of more than zero days = Average number of gaps (days) (Effectively the report should be 'blank'.) Using the gap report developed by Zubair which takes current status and projected time for completion into account. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = repeatable tenders with ≥ 150 days gap Not fully effective = repeatable tenders with ≥ 90 - < 150 days gap Fully effective = repeatable tenders with ≥ 30 - < 90 days gap Significant performance = repeatable tenders with gaps < 30 days gap Outstanding performance = zero repeatable tenders with gaps	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: GAP report prepared by Zubair Contact person: Zubair Adams

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard Executive Director: Leonardo Manus 1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025												
No.	**Objective**	**Key Performance Indicator**	**Definition**	**Baseline**	**Annual Target**	**Annual Target**	**Q1 30 Sep 2024**	**Q 2 31 Dec 2024**	**Q 3 31 Mar 2025**	**Q4 30 Jun 2025**	**WEIGHTING**	**Contact Department**
				2022/2023	**2023/2024**	**2024/2025**	**Target**	**Target**	**Target**	**Target**		
MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											**10%**	
14	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Total Capital Expenditure as a percentage of Total Capital Budget less contingencies (%)	This indicator measures the extent to which budgeted capital expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Capital expenditure is all costs incurred by the municipality to acquire, upgrade, and renew physical assets such as property, plants, buildings, technology, or equipment. Less contractual contingencies on projects and insurance contingencies. **Q1 – Q3 reporting:** Formula: (1) YTD Actual Capital Expenditure / (2) Total Budgeted Capital Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. **Q4 reporting:** Formula: (1) Actual Capital Expenditure / (2) Total Budgeted Capital Expenditure **less contingencies**. The latest approved budget is applicable. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 85% or >100% (non-compliance) Not fully effective = ≥ 85% - ≤ 89.99% Fully effective = 90% - 93% Significant performance = > 93% - 96% Outstanding performance = > 96%	95%	90%	90%	12%	33%	61%	90%	6%	Directorate Finance Manager
15	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%	100.30%	95%	95%	18%	41%	64%	95%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager
16	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 ≤ 0% Significantly performance = N/A Outstanding performance = N/A	New	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Annual Target	Annual Target	Q1 30 Sep 2024	Q 2 31 Dec 2024	Q 3 31 Mar 2025	Q4 30 Jun 2025	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
				2022/2023	2023/2024	2024/2025	Target	Target	Target	Target		
SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											58%	
17	2.Improved access to quality and reliable basic services	2.A Taps provided to informal settlements (number) (NKPI)	Measure the number of Taps provided in informal settlements during the period under review. Some taps may, however, have been vandalised or removed after provision. Proxy measure for NKPI.MSA Regulation 10(a). Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <650 Not fully effective: 650 — 749 Fully effective: 750 Significant performance: 751 — 760 Outstanding performance: >761	769	700	750	100	300	450	750	9%	
18	2.Improved access to quality and reliable basic services	2.B Toilets provided to informal settlements (number) (NKPI)	Measure the number of Toilets provided in informal settlements during the period under review. Some toilets may, however, have been vandalised or removed after provision. Proxy measure for NKPI. MSA Regulation 10(a). Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <2750 Not fully effective: 2750 — 3499 Fully effective: 3500 - 3700 Significant performance: 3701 — 4000 Outstanding performance: >4000	5 215	3 000	3 500	500	1 100	1 700	3 500	10%	
19	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	4.A Sewer reticulation pipeline replaced (metres)	Measures the metres of sewer reticulation pipeline that are replaced Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <85 000 Not fully effective: 85 001 - 95 000 Fully effective: 95 001 - 100 000 Significant performance: 100 001- 101 000 Outstanding performance: >101 000	55 164	100 000	100 000	15 000	40 000	75 000	100 000	3%	
20	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	4.B Compliance with drinking water quality standards (%)	Measures the potable water sample pass rate according to the SANS 241 standard. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <96% Not fully effective: 96% - 98% Fully effective = 99.00% Significant performance= range between = 99.01% - 99.05% Outstanding performance >99.06%	99.18%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	8%	
21	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	4.C Total augmented water capacity in mega litres per day (MLD)	Measures the augmented water production capacity brought online from New Water Programme schemes since the adoption of the Cape Town Water Strategy in 2020 measured in megalitres per day (MLD) as a cumulative total. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: < 30MLD Not fully effective: 30 - 41.99MLD Fully effective = 42 MLD Significant performance = 42.1 MLD - 42.5 MLD Outstanding performance ≥ 42.6 MLD	23.92 MLD	40MLD	42MLD	AT	AT	AT	42MLD	3%	
22	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	4.D Valid applications for residential water services closed within the response standard (%) (NKPI)	Measures the number of valid applications for residential water service applications closed within the standard days expressed as a percentage of the total number of valid applications for residential water service received. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(a). Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <70% Not fully effective: 70 - 79.99% Fully effective: 80 - 84% Significant performance: 84.01 — 90% Outstanding performance: >90%	67.32%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	6%	
23	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	4.E Valid applications for residential sewerage services closed within the response standard (%) (NKPI)	Measures the number of valid applications for residential sewerage service applications closed within the standard days expressed as a percentage of the total number of valid applications for residential sewerage service received. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(a). Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <70% Not fully effective: 70 - 79.99% Fully effective: 80 - 84% Significant performance: 84.01 — 90% Outstanding performance: >90%	67.32%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	6%	

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2022/2023	Annual Target 2023/2024	Annual Target 2024/2025	Q1 30 Sep 2024 Target	Q 2 31 Dec 2024 Target	Q 3 31 Mar 2025 Target	Q4 30 Jun 2025 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
24	10. Clean and healthy waterways and beaches	10.B Days in a year that Vleis are open (%)	Measures the percentage of days in a year that the Rietvlei, Zeekoevlei and Zandvlei are open to intermediate contact recreation excluding dredging and other management activities. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <75% Not fully effective: 75 - 82.99% Fully effective: 83 - 87% Significant performance: 87.01 - 92% Outstanding performance: >92%	93.33%	75%	83%	AT	AT	AT	83%	8%	
25	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	**Mayoral Priority Programme KPI:** Pump station failures restored < 24hrs (percentage)	Pump station failure is defined as an event at a pump station that leads to a sewage overflow. Number of Pump Station failures that are restored in less than 24-hours. It is therefore the time taken from when an overflow is reported until the overflow stops (Manually driven data compilation process). Note that quarters 1 - 3 will be calculated on a quarterly basis. Quarter 4 will be calculated on a cumulative (12-month) sum Formula: Quarterly percentage = (No pump station failures (3 month sum)) - (No of pump station failures restored > 24hrs (3 month sum)) / (No pump station failures (3 month sum)) x 100 Quarter 4 cumulative percentage = (No pump station failures (12 month sum)) - (No of pump station failures restored > 24hrs (12 month sum)) / (No pump station failures (12 month sum)) x 100 Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <75% Not fully effective: 75 — 84.99% Fully effective = 85% Significant performance = 85.1% - 85.3% Outstanding performance= ≥ 85.4%	89%	82.50%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	5%	
			SPECIAL PROJECTS								**12%**	
26	COVID-19 and EoDB	**COVID-19 recovery KPI:** Water meters read on a monthly basis (%)	Percentage consumer water meters read on a monthly basis. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: < 75% Not fully effective: 75% - 87.99% Fully effective = 88% Significant performance= 88.01% - 88.50% Outstanding performance≥ 88.51%	88.36%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	88%	1%	
27	Less Formal Township Establishment Act (LFTEA) areas	**Less Formal Township Establishment Act (LFTEA) to broadly covering areas of informality:** KPI: Planned sewer jetting/ bulk network cleaning of 200km of pipeline (metres) (City-wide/LFTEA & Areas of Informality)	Cleaning of the Sewer reticulation system. Note: This KPI is not limited to LFTEA areas only as the reticulation system is interconnected. Sewer jetting will need to be conducted in a wide array of areas in order to mitigate sewer overflows in LFTEA areas as well as areas of informality. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <180 000 Not fully effective: 180 000 - 199 999 Fully effective: 200 000 - 210 000 Significant performance: 210 001 - 240 000 Outstanding performance: >240 000	243 200m	200 000m	200 000m	20 000m	50 000m	150 000m	200 000m	2%	

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Annual Target	Annual Target	Q1 30 Sep 2024	Q 2 31 Dec 2024	Q 3 31 Mar 2025	Q4 30 Jun 2025	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
				2022/2023	2023/2024	2024/2025	Target	Target	Target	Target		
28	CM request CM memo	**Staff housing population verified, per directorate (%)** • Water and Sanitation	Measures the percentage of Staff Housing population verified by confirming occupancy, operational need, and conditions as per the approved allocation list, as compiled by the Directorate coordinators to ensure validity, accuracy and completeness by conducting an annual site visits to confirm staff occupancy for operational purposes. The approved list must include the following: • Property occupancy – Staff member occupying property by conducting a site visit. • Operational need - staff member and staff number confirmed on SAP. • Lease agreement in place (number and tenure). • Rental value. • Fringe benefit registration, confirmed with Payroll. Closed out status- where all the above conditions are met. Formula: Numerator: All staff housing verified (with a closed out status) Denominator: All staff housing Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = below 50% Not fully effective = 50 - 89% Fully effective = 100% Significant performance = N/A Outstanding=N/A	50%	100% (100 staff houses verified out of 100)	100% (100 staff houses verified out of 100)	60%	75%	90%	100% (100 staff houses verified out of 100)	2%	
29	CM request	**Unlawful Land Occupation (ULO)** **Water & Sanitation Component:** Assistance in the Provision of interim or emergency basic services to unlawful occupants (%)	In accordance with the Unlawful Occupation By-Law, 2021, Section 5(1). Water & Sanitation will assist in the provision of interim or emergency basic services to Unlawful Land Occupants, however this will only occur once section 4(1) is satisfied of the Unlawful Occupation By-Law, 2021, and authorisation is given to Water & Sanitation's ED from Human Settlements. Furthermore supplementary resources are needed by Water & Sanitation: - Financial resources - A geo-technical study to assess whether the services are viable - stakeholder engagement to assess the receptiveness of the community - Accessibility to the ULO site Note: Assistance will mean any distribution of portable toilets and water for the period specified by Human Settlements during the financial year. <u>Performance rating:</u> Outstanding =100% No scores for fully effective and significant.	No formal requests received from HS for the provision of Services to ULOs	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	
30	**EoDB**	8.1. Water connections based on valid applications for Commercial / Industrial / Agriculture services installed within the response standard	Measures the number of water connections where the water meter is installed within 30 working days (response standard), expressed as a percentage of the total number of valid applications (full payment received and sites ready for installations) for Commercial / Industrial / Agriculture water services received. **<u>Formula:</u>** The number of water meters installed for Commercial / Industrial / Agricultural water service (I) / total number of valid applications for Commercial / Industrial / Agricultural water service received (R) X 100 = I/R X 100 <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance: <70% Not fully effective: 70 - 79.99% Fully effective = 80% - 85% Significant performance= 85.1% - 90% Outstanding performance > 90%	New	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	1%	
31	**EoDB**	8.2. Sewerage connections based on valid applications for Commercial / Industrial / Agriculture services that are tagged to water connections within the response standard	Measures the number of sewerage connections where the connections are tagged to the water meter installation within 30 working days (response standard), expressed as a percentage of the total number of valid applications (full payment received and sites ready for installations) for Commercial / Industrial / Agriculture sewerage services received. Linked to the number of water meters installed for Commercial / Industrial / Agricultural water service (I) / total number of valid applications for Commercial / Industrial / Agricultural water service received (R) X 100 = I/R X100 <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance: <70% Not fully effective: 70 - 79.99% Fully effective = 80% - 85% Significant performance= 85.1% - 90% Outstanding performance > 90%	New	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	1%	

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025

No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Annual Target	Annual Target	Q1 30 Sep 2024	Q 2 31 Dec 2024	Q 3 31 Mar 2025	Q4 30 Jun 2025	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
				2022/2023	2023/2024	2024/2025	Target	Target	Target	Target		
32	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. Performance rating: Fully effective = 100%	100%	100%	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	100% completion	1%	Compulsory for all EDs that have not completed the MFMA competency and/ or have outstanding modules. Zero rated weighting.
33	16. A capable and collaborative City government	Revenue collected as a percentage of billed amount: (Water)	Revenue collected refers to the receipts collected. The billed amount refers to the accruals billed to the debtors account for water. Performance rating: Water: Unacceptable performance: <85% Not fully effective: 85% - 91.49% Fully effective= 91.5% Significant performance= 91.51% - 91.60% Outstanding performance≥ 91.61%	88.58%	89%	91.5%	91.5%	91.5%	91.5%	91.5%	1%	
34	16. A capable and collaborative City government	Revenue collected as a percentage of billed amount: (Sanitation)	Revenue collected refers to the receipts collected. The billed amount refers to the accruals billed to the debtors account for sewerage. Performance rating: Sanitation: Unacceptable performance: <85% Not fully effective: 85% - 92.99% Fully effective= 93 - 93.04% Significant performance=93.05% - 93.10% Outstanding performance≥ 93.11%	90.71%	91%	93%	93%	93%	93%	93%	1%	
	Executive Director: Leonardo Manus **Water and Sanitation**			Leonardo Manus Digitally signed by Leonardo Manus Date: 2024.07.24 14:54:10 +02'00'								
	City Manager: **Lungelo Mbandazayo**			Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo Date: 2024.07.30 18:24:07 +02'00'								