2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

CM73616A

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											15%	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											55%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											10%	
												100%	
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
1	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Repeatable Tenders that were Expanded/Amended multiple times (%)	Measures the percentage of Expansions and Amendments on repeatable tenders. This indicator will only measure instances where there was more than one Expansion and/or Amendment on the same tender. This indicator thus measures instances where there was more than 5% of total repeatable tenders, expanded and/or amended, per the approved 2025/26 – 2027/28 Approved Demand Plan. However, the exclusion is not applicable if a tender extension is awarded within 45 calendar days of contract expiry of the current contracts arising from the tender. Thus, extensions are required to be awarded at least 45 days before expiry, ensuring proactive planning and due consideration of administrative effort for the timeous processing of the expansion. A Directorate will not be affected if 5% or less of the total repeatable tenders are expanded (as per above definition) in the financial year. Directorates will achieve Outstanding performance if all expansions of tenders are only single expansions, and all are approved 45 or more days prior to the expiry of the current contract. **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. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = >7% or if a tender extension is awarded within 45 calendar days of contract expiry Not fully effective= ≥ 5.1% – 7% Fully effective = 4.1% - 5% Significant performance = 2% - 4% Outstanding performance = <2% In exceptional circumstances, consideration will be given to exclude items from the calculation that are deemed outside of the control of the Departments, such as	7.94%	5%	5%	AT	AT	AT	5%	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: CMRS (Contract Register and Monitoring System) and Tender Tracking System Contact person: Maureen Whare 069 367 4023
2	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduction in the number of SCM deviations (%)	The objective is to achieve a 20% reduction on SCM deviations. 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 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% - 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.	2	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
3	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	**Irregular, Fruitless and Wasteful, Unauthorised** Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating and Capital Expenditure	The indicator measures the extent to which the municipality has incurred irregular, fruitless and wasteful and unauthorised expenditure on its total budget (operating and capital budget). Fruitless and wasteful expenditure is expenditure that was made in vain and would have been avoided had reasonable care been exercised. Irregular expenditure is incurred by the municipality in contravention of a requirement of the law (specific legislation, per MFMA legislation). Unauthorized expenditure includes overspending of the total amount appropriated in the approved budget. 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%	2 Instances R-Value =R240 630	0.75%	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
4	4	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	External audit (Auditor General) audit actions completed as per audit action plan (%)	This indicator measures how many actions was completed in the financial cycle within in the unique deadline set, as per the audit action plan. The Audit Action Plan sets out the total number audit actions required to address the internal control deficiencies as identified by the Auditor-General in their management report. 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%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	2%	Department: Investor Relations Source document: Completed Audit Action plan Contact person: Lynn Fortune:021 400 5987

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Annual Target	Annual Target	Q1 Target	Q2 Target	Q3 Target	Q4 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
					2024/2025	2025/2026	2026/2027	30-Sept-26	31-Dec-26	31-Mar-27	30-Jun-27		
5	5	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Final council and Mayco decisions implemented within timeframes (%)	This indicator measures all final Council and Mayco decisions allocated to the ED with implementation date for the quarter. Items marked as "implementation approved" that were due in the quarter (utilising the project end date as a filter) will be used to calculate the actual performance. The indicator excludes: •All council and Mayco decisions for noting. •Decisions taken by Council and Mayco where there is no budget to implement actions. •Decisions outside of the control of the ED. •Decisions marked as "terminated" or "status completed – ready for approval." •These exclusions must be supported by valid evidence and reflected on each quarterly report for the City Manager and/or panel's awareness. 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. The project start date will be utilised to ensure projects with no end dates are included. Implementation is the date of completion of the actions or achievement of councils request or expectation ("implementation approved" date). Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 69% of ALL decisions Not fully effective = 69% - 99% of ALL decisions Fully effective = 100% of ALL decisions Significant performance = N/A Outstanding performance = N/A If "Not Applicable" weighting must be reallocated it within the 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)
6	6	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.J Budget spent on implementation of Workplace Skills Plan (%)	Measures the percentage of budget spent on the Workplace Skills Plan .The Workplace Skills Plan outlines the planned education, training and development interventions for the organisation. 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%	94.08%	95%	95%	12%	40%	60%	95%	2%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851
7	7	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Internal independent assurance provider's recommendations and action plans implemented (%)	It is the monitoring and reporting of the implementation (expressed as a percentage) of corrective actions to address internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans, issued within the directorate of the responsible Executive Director. The internal independent assurance providers included in this KPI are **Internal Audit, Ombudsman, Integrated Risk Management** (limited to the Strategic Risks: Corporate, Transversals and Executive Risk Registers)**, Ethics and Forensics departments.** 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** = > 90% - 94.99% **Outstanding performance**= ≥ 95%	100%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	3%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mothibi
8	8	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Community satisfaction survey (average)	Measures the average score on the Community satisfaction survey. A statistically valid, scientifically defendable score from the annual survey of residents' perceptions of the overall performance of the City. The aim of the indicator is to improve the community's perception of the City. 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. 1. A score of 2.8 and below based on the previous year's survey outcome: Performance rating*: Unacceptable performance = ≤ 2.7 Not fully effective = 2.8 Fully effective = 2.9 Significantly performance = 3.0 Outstanding performance = ≥ 3.1 2. A score of 2.9 and above based on the previous year's survey outcome: Performance rating*: Unacceptable performance = ≤2.8 Not fully effective = 2.9 Fully effective = 3.0 Significant performance = 3.1 Outstanding performance = ≥ 3.2 *No ranges due to nature of the KPI, which is based on outcome of a survey.	3.0	3.0	EDs in the 2.8 and below range, the fully effective target will be 2.9. For EDs in the 2.9 and above range, the fully effective target will be 3.0.	AT	AT	AT	EDs in the 2.8 and below range, the fully effective target will be 2.9. For EDs in the 2.9 and above range, the fully effective target will be 3.0.	1%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: Community Satisfaction survey score Contact person: Bridgette Morris 021 400 3812

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
9	9	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Inclusion of C88 **Output** indicators (%)	Measure All Tier 1 and Tier 2 Circular 88 Output indicators that should be included into the Corporate scorecard, where relevant. This is a proxy indicator, which is used to reduce the number of KPIs in the performance scorecard of the Executive Directors (EDs). 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: 1) The inclusion of C88 Output indicators in the Directorate SDBIP, and 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 Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 80% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Not fully effective = 80% - 84.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Fully effective =85% - 90% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Significant performance = >90% - 95% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Outstanding performance = >95% - 100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Department: Organisational Performance Management (OPM) Source document: C88 scorecard and Directorate SDBIP Contact person: Adila Aboo - Manager: City Performance Management 021 400 9024
10	10	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Tenders in slippage at any given quarter end (%)	Measures tenders for MTREF in slippage at any given quarter end. This will drive the timeous implementation of the demand plan based on the agreed timeline. Abnormalities in the timeline will then impact each step of the process, such as where a tender only allows 30 days after award to Contract Required by Date (CRD), there will probably be a contract gap or a Value At Risk (VAR – Budget at risk of not being spent) on the Capital reporting. 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). Performance rating: **Unacceptable performance** = > 15% **Not fully effective** = > 10% - ≤ 15% **Fully effective** = ≤ 10% **Significant performance** = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9% **Outstanding performance** = < 5%	12%	≤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
11	11	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Gaps in repeatable tender continuity (average number of days)	This indicator is to ensure continued monthly service delivery implemented through repeatable tenders. A "gap" refers to the number of days between the expiring contract and the replacement contract commencing. Potential gaps should be mitigated via extension/expansion and/or deviation early enough so that it caters for any possible delay within a tender process. A gap less than one month will be included in the calculation. To drive the demand plan and improve Supply Chain Management (SCM) process and service delivery. The indicator is based on all repeatable tenders that currently has a gap at the time of reporting, i.e. the current contract had already expired and the new contract is not yet in place. 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	300	0	0	0	0	0	0	1%	Department: CPPPM Source document: GAP report prepared by Zubair Contact person: Maureen Whare
12	12	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Recurring Audit Findings and /or recurring root causes (number)	The extent to which the Executive Director ensures that audit findings ((Communication of audit findings (COMAFs) and Service Delivery (lived- reality / resident experience) findings) are addressed at root-cause level. Remedial and corrective actions are translated into strengthened controls, standard practices and preventative mechanisms across the respective directorate for areas of improvement (e.g. transaction, discipline, functions, controls and oversight). The indicator will be measured year-on-year during the duration of the ED's term of office/employment contract. New EDs will not be penalised for recurring findings and/or root causes prior to their appointment. **A COMAF is defined as**: Any Auditor General of South Africa (AGSA) Communication of audit finding as per the scope of the regulatory audit. **Indicator objective:** to ensure that no recurring findings or root causes arises from the AGSA audits. To ensure that all audit findings and/or root causes identified by the AGSA that fall within the Executive Director's area of responsibility are effectively addressed and resolved, preventing recurrence, demonstrating improved governance, internal controls and strengthening accountability within the directorate. **A recurring finding is defined as:** Recurring findings refer to those findings which have persisted from one year of reporting to the next or a prior year, regardless of whether it relates to the same project/indicator or a different project/indicator or same department or different department within the directorate. **Source:** Management Audit Action Plans (MAAPs), Management Report and COMAFs **Formula:** Count of the number of recurring findings and /or recurring root causes **Performance rating:** Unacceptable performance: Recurring findings and recurring root causes Not fully effective: N/A Fully effective: Zero recurring findings and/or zero recurring root causes Significant performance: N/A Outstanding performance: N/A The weighting for the indicator will be reallocated, if the ED has no recurring findings and/or recurring root causes	New	New	Zero recurring findings and recurring root causes	AT	AT	AT	Zero recurring findings and recurring root causes	2%	Office of the City Manager Contact person: Gayle Postings Specialist Advisor

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard Executive Director: Leonardo Manus 1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027													
	No.	**Objective**	**Key Performance Indicator**	**Definition**	**Baseline**	**Annual Target**	**Annual Target**	**Q1 Target**	**Q2 Target**	**Q3 Target**	**Q4 Target**	**WEIGHTING**	**Contact Department**
					2024/2025	**2025/2026**	**2026/2027**	**30-Sept-26**	**31-Dec-26**	**31-Mar-27**	**30-Jun-27**		
MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY												**15%**	
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% - 90.3% **Significant performance** = > 90.31% - 90.60% **Outstanding performance** = > 90.60%	94.01%	90%	90%	12%	33%	61%	90%	8%	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. Less soft-locked contractual grant construction contingency provisions projects provisions related to Human Settlements directorate. Q1 – Q4 reporting; Formula: Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. Q4 reporting for Human Settlements directorate: Formula: (1) Actual Operating Expenditure / (2) Budgeted Operating Expenditure, less contingencies in the contingency provisions. 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%	98.39%	95%	95%	18%	41%	64%	95%	5%	Directorate Finance Manager
15	**15**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	% of Capital Grant Funding Expenditure Spent	The purpose of the indicator is to ensure cashflow alignment, risk acceptance and strengthened governance requirements for Capital grant funded projects. **Disclaimer:** Achievement of at least 45% expenditure spent by 31 December is a non-negotiable requirement. This will include an internal November performance assessment benchmark to allow corrective action ahead of the National Treasury (NT) cut-off times. **Evidence:** Section 71 Monthly Budget Statements (November* and June). Grant Register/Expenditure Reports. Annual Financial Statement (AFS) Grant Extracts. **Formula:** % of Capital grant funding expenditure spent (excludes performance component of Urban Development Financing Grant (UDFG) and Operating grant funding) =Capital Grant expenditure spent/Total Capital grant allocation in budget • Q2 spent will be based on the latest available budget at 30 December. • FY spent will be based on the approved FY budget. • Grants received before Q2 will be included (grant dumps). • Grants received after Q2 will be excluded (grant dumps). Grant dumps refer to grant allocations received that fall outside the approved DORA (Division of Revenue Act) allocation process: • They are unplanned or irregular transfers of funds. • Unlike standard DORA allocations, which follow a structured approval and distribution framework, grant dumps are not part of the formal budgetary or legislative process. • They may arise from ad hoc decisions, emergency funding, or discretionary transfers that bypass the usual allocation mechanisms. **Performance rating:** Unacceptable performance: <90% (Q4 or y/end) or <45% spent by 30 December (Q2) Not fully effective: 90% - <93% (Q4 or y/end) or <45% spent by 30 December (Q2) Fully effective: 93% - 95% (Q4 or y/end) and 45% spent by 30 December (Q2) Significant performance: >95% - 97% (Q4 or y/end) and 45% spent by 30 December (Q2) Outstanding performance: >97% (Q4 or y/end) and 45% spent by 30 December (Q2)	New	New	93%	NA	45%	NA	93%	2%	Grant Funding Department

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	SERVICE DELIVERY / GOOD GOVERNANCE											55%	
16	16	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Adherence to the requirements of the Metro Trading Services reform (Applicable to W&S, EE and UWM)	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). Energy & W&S: 2025/26: 100% - Council commitment for the 8 minimum conditions. 2026/27: 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. UWM: 2025/26: 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. Performance rating 2025- 2027- Energy & W&S (UWM: 2025 - 2028): Unacceptable performance = N/A Not fully effective = N/A Fully effective = N/A Significant performance = N/A Outstanding performance = 100% Performance rating 2027/28 onwards - Energy & W&S (UWM: 2028/29 onwards): Unacceptable performance = Assessment score of below < 50% Not fully effective = Assessment score of 50% - < 75% Fully effective = Assessment score of 75% - 90% Significant performance = Assessment score of > 90% - 99.9% Outstanding performance = Assessment score of 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.	New	2025/26: 100% - Council commitment for the 8 minimum conditions.	100%	AT	AT	AT	100%	5%	Department: Grant Funding Source document: Submissions to NT and resultant score Contact person: Daniel Sullivan: 021 400 5097
17	17	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Sector Prioritisation	Sector prioritisation refers to trade-offs between needed infrastructure projects, due to budgetary tensions. These trade-offs have a direct impact on service delivery and the City's future growth. To navigate these pressures responsibly, a consistent, transparent, and rigorous approach to sectoral prioritisation is essential to understand and capture the risks and consequences of decisions. This process is a critical decision-support mechanism that ensures resources are directed to projects that maintain essential City functions and supports the implementation of Council-approved strategies. All sector-based prioritisation (capital infrastructure projects) must be fully documented (codified), with all assumptions clearly stated to ensure transparency and to enable independent review. The methodology must support and enable long term strategic planning for a 10- and 15-year planning horizon. The methodology in line with CM directive must be – •practical to apply. •replicable across years and sectors; and •grounded in reliable data. It must also clearly define the criteria used to assess projects, together with the associated metrics and weightings where appropriate. Furthermore, all methodologies and prioritised project lists must be open to review by corporate assurance providers to ensure a defendable, evidence-based framework for Citywide investment decisions. The outcome of this process will be a complete and prioritised project pipeline identifying key strategic infrastructure projects to be incorporated into the 2050 Long Term Plan and the New Term of Office (NTO) Integrated Development Plan (IDP). The annual target is only applicable for the following directorates: Energy, W&S, HS, SPE, UM, UWM Evidence required based on milestones towards sector prioritisation: •26/27: Prioritisation methodology captured and approved by relevant Executive Director. PPM data. SMF. •27/28 and beyond: Methodology is applied to infrastructure projects to produce rational results. Performance Rating: Unacceptable performance: No prioritisation methodology (50%) Not fully effective: Prioritisation methodology captured but not approved by Executive Director (70%) Fully effective: Prioritisation methodology approved by ED is codified and is transparent, practical and replicable and presented by the Sector Lead to the ICWG (Infrastructure Coordination Working Group) (100%) Significant performance: Prioritisation methodology is data driven and applied to the 10-year project pipeline and produces rational results that will provide capital project options for the New Term of Office IDP (120%) Outstanding performance: Prioritisation methodology is automated and applied to the 15-year project pipeline and results in a portfolio of prioritised projects required to meet demand up to and beyond 2040, which can be attached to the Long-Term Plan 2050 (150%)	New	New	100%	AT	AT	AT	100%	2%	Lucille Janssens (Strategic Planning, Policy and Strategy)
18	18	2.Improved access to quality and reliable basic services	2.A Taps provided in informal settlements (number) (NKPI)	Measures 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 per MSA Regulation 10(a). Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <713 Not fully effective: 713 — 749 Fully effective: 750 - 787 Significant performance: 788 — 827 Outstanding performance: >827	706	750	750	100	300	450	750	5%	Manager ISB

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
19	19	2.Improved access to quality and reliable basic services	2.B Toilets provided in informal settlements (number) (NKPI)	Measures 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 per MSA Regulation 10(a). Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <4275 Not fully effective: 4275 — 4499 Fully effective: 4500 - 4725 Significant performance: 4726 — 4961 Outstanding performance: >4961	5 670	4 000	4 500	1000	2000	3000	4500	7%	Manager ISB
20	20	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 - 99 999 Fully effective = 100 000 – 105 000 Significant performance = 105 001 – 110 251 Outstanding performance > 110 251	117 413	100 000	100 000	10 000	40 000	75 000	100 000	5%	Manager Reticulation
21	21	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	Percentage of drinking water samples complying to SANS241 (WS4.1)	The percentage of water samples measured that comply with the SANS 241 requirements over a 12 month period for the defined parameters. See the SANS 241 requirements for a detailed breakdown of the various tests involved and the associated standard limits for application. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <96% Not fully effective: 96% - 98% Fully effective = 99.00% Significant performance= range between = 99.01% - 99.10% Outstanding performance >99.10%	99.16%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	7%	Manager Bulk Water
22	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 closed within the standard days, expressed as a percentage of the total number of valid applications for residential water service received. "Valid applications are residential/domestic applications where service notifications has been created for the water service and down-payment for the service has been received. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(a)". Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: ≤ 80.95% Not fully effective: 80.96% - 84.99% Fully effective: 85% - 89.25% Significant performance: 89.26% — 93.5% Outstanding performance: ≥93.6%	87.62%	85%	85%	80%	80%	80%	85%	6%	Manager Customer Services
23	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 closed within the standard days, expressed as a percentage of the total number of valid applications for residential sewerage service received. Valid applications are residential/domestic applications where service notifications has been created for the sewerage service and downpayment for the service has been received. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(a). Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: ≤ 80.95% Not fully effective: 80.96% - 84.99% Fully effective: 85% - 89.25% Significant performance: 89.26% — 93.5% Outstanding performance: ≥93.6%	87.62%	85%	85%	80%	80%	80%	85%	6%	Manager Customer Services
24	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: <80% Not fully effective: 80% - 89.99% Fully effective: 90% - 91% Significant performance: 92% - 93% Outstanding performance: >93%	92.03%	90%	90%	Annual	Annual	Annual	90%	6%	Manager CSRM
25	25	4. Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	**Mayoral Priority Programme KPI:** Pump station failures restored < 24 hours (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). Formula: 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: <80% Not fully effective: 80% - 89.99% Fully effective: 90% - 91% Significant performance: 92% - 93% Outstanding performance: >93%	92.96%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	6%	Manager: Engineering & Asset Management Technical Services

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											**10%**	
26	**26**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government CM request	**Operational** Staff housing population verified, per directorate (%)	Measures the percentage of Staff Housing population verified by confirming occupancy, operational need, and conditions as per the approved allocation list, as compiled by the Directorate coordinators to ensure validity, accuracy and completeness by conducting an annual site visit 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. • Visual Assessments undertaken at the beginning of the lease period. **Closed out status- where all the above conditions are met.** **Exclusions Housing under litigation.** **Formula:** Numerator: All staff housing verified (with a closed-out status) Denominator: All staff housing Milestones: Q1 – 60% Site Visits Completed Q2 – 75% SAP Confirmation Q3 – 90% Lease Agreement Confirmed Q4 – 100% Fringe Benefits Confirmed **Performance rating:** Unacceptable performance: < 50%	100%	100%	100%	60%	75%	90%	100%	1%	Water and Sanitation - Auxillary Services
27	**27**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government CM request	**Non-Operational** Staff housing population disposal plan developed, per directorate (%)	Measures the percentage completion of a disposal plan for Non-Operational Staff Housing. Including confirming occupancy, operational status, and conditions (through visual assessments) as per the approved asset list, as compiled by the Directorate coordinators to ensure validity, accuracy and completeness. Each Directorate thus needs to determine the details of the disposal plan, given the many factors such as location, condition of the building and CoCT longer term plans. The Disposal plan must include the following: • Plan for disposal/re-use • Property Valuations • Property occupancy – Staff member occupying property by conducting a site visit. • Status Verification: Operational need determined. • Lease agreement in place (number and tenure). • Rental value. • Visual Assessments undertaken. Closed out status- where all the above conditions are met. **Exclusions Housing under litigation (eviction and legal proceedings).** **Formula:** Numerator: All staff housing verified (with a closed-out status) Denominator: All staff housing **Performance Rating:** Unacceptable performance: < 50% Not fully effective: 50 - 89% Fully effective: 90% - 95% Significant performance: > 95% - 99.99% Outstanding: 100%	New	New	100%	60%	75%	90%	100%	1%	Water and Sanitation - Auxillary Services
28	**28**	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government CM request	Business Improvement initiatives Implementation of the maintenance decentralisation project.	**Definition:** The maintenance decentralisation project in Water & Sanitation requires changing the reporting lines of maintenance staff within the “Engineering & Asset Management” branch to the various operations branches: “Bulk Water”, “Wastewater”, and “Reticulation”. The objective of this project is to create a single point of management accountability for both maintenance and operations. For each reporting period, the reporting structure will be extracted from SAP and compared to the signed-off "To-Be" design. Performance Rating: Unacceptable performance <76% Not fully effective = 76% - 79.9% Fully effective = 80% - 84.9% Significant performance = 85% - 89% Outstanding performance >89%	New	0%	80%	AT	AT	AT	80%	1%	Manager: Business Improvement & Organisational Design Future Planning and Resilience
29	**29**	1. Increased Jobs and Investment in the Cape Town economy Mayoral Priority Programme	**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. Formula: 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 Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <70% Not fully effective: 70 - 79.99% Fully effective = 80% - 84% Significant performance= 85% - 89% Outstanding performance > 89%	100%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	1%	Water and Sanitation - Customer Services

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Annual Target 2026/2027	Q1 Target 30-Sept-26	Q2 Target 31-Dec-26	Q3 Target 31-Mar-27	Q4 Target 30-Jun-27	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
30	30	1. Increased Jobs and Investment in the Cape Town economy Mayoral Priority Programme	**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 Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: <70% Not fully effective: 70 - 79.99% Fully effective = 80% - 84% Significant performance= 85% - 89% Outstanding performance > 89%	100%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	1%	Water and Sanitation - Customer Services
31	31	2. Improved access to quality and reliable basic services 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 - 220 501 Outstanding performance: >220 501	428 200m	200 000m	200 000m	20 000m	50 000m	150 000m	200 000m	2%	Water and Sanitation - Distribution Services
32	32	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government Unlawful Land Occupation (ULO)	Unlawful Land Occupation (ULO) Water & Sanitation Component: Report Unlawful Land Occupation to the Anti-Land Invasion/Displaced People Units within 24 hours	To report during working hours, complaints received regarding unlawful land occupation on Water & Sanitation facilities to the Anti-Land Invasion/Displaced People Units within 24 hours of being informed. Limited to Water and Sanitation facilities, which is: Water treatment facilities: 12 Wastewater (sanitation) treatment facilities: 27 Marine Outfalls: 3 Denominator total = 42 facilities Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = <90% Not fully effective = 90% - 99% Fully effective = 100% Significant performance = N/A Outstanding =N/A	New	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	All Water & Sanitation branches - Monitored via ULO email in Service Integration

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Leonardo Manus
1 July 2026 - 30 June 2027

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Annual Target	Annual Target	Q1 Target	Q2 Target	Q3 Target	Q4 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
					2024/2025	2025/2026	2026/2027	30-Sept-26	31-Dec-26	31-Mar-27	30-Jun-27		
33	33	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Revenue collected as a percentage of billed amount: (Water)	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: Water: Unacceptable performance: <85% Not fully effective: 85% - 91.9% Fully effective= 92% - 92.50% Significant performance= 92.51% - 93% Outstanding performance > 93%	92.48%	91%	92%	92%	92%	92%	92%	1%	Water and Sanitation - Commercial Services
34	34	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Revenue collected as a percentage of billed amount (sewerage)	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: Sanitation: Unacceptable performance: <85% Not fully effective: 85% - 93.99% Fully effective= 94% - 94.5% Significant performance=94.51% - 94.99% Outstanding performance ≥ 95%	97.02%	92.5%	94%	94%	94%	94%	94%	1%	Water and Sanitation - Commercial Services

Leonardo Manus Digitally signed by Leonardo Manus
Date: 2026.07.13 07:36:08 +02'00'

Executive Director **Date**

Leonardo Manus

Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo
Date: 2026.07.31 07:48:38 +02'00'

City Manager **Date**

Lungelo Mbandazayo