

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard template Executive Director: CORPORATE SERVICES - ERNEST SASS 1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025												
No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	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 INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											60%	
SPECIAL PROJECTS											10%	
											100%	
MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
1	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	DEFINITION: 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	2.70%	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	AT	AT	AT	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: PPM assessment Contact person: Ben Peters 021 400 9206

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	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		
2	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Repeatable Tenders that were Expanded/Amended multiple times (%)	DEFINITION: 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= range between 2.6% – 3% Fully effective = range between 2% - 2.5% Significant performance = range between 0.1% - 1.99% Outstanding performance = 0%	New	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
3	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduction in the number of SCM deviations (%)	DEFINITION: The objective is to achieve a 20% reduction on SCM deviations. July – December 2023 - The indicator only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R200 000 (inclusive of VAT). 01 January – 30 June 2024 - The indicator only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R750 000 (inclusive of VAT). 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 deviations	0%	20%	20%	AT	AT	AT	20%	2%	Department: SCM Source document: SCM deviations schedule Formula: Number of SCM deviations reduced by the target percentage % year on year for the department/ directorate. Contact person: Gayle Postings Office of the City Manager: Specialist Advisor 021 400 1268

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	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		
4	4	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduce and maintain nominal (number and value) irregular expenditure within the Directorate (year-on-year) (average %)	DEFINITION: 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.	16%	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

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	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		
5	5	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	External audit (Auditor General) audit actions completed as per audit action plan (%)	DEFINITION: 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	6	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Final Council and Mayco decisions implemented within timeframes (%)	DEFINITION: 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 = range between 69% - 79.99% of ALL decisions Fully effective = range between 80% - 85% of ALL decisions Significant performance = range between 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)

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	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		
7	7	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.J Budget spent on implementation of Workplace Skills Plan (%) (NKPI) (DIRECTORATE CORPORATE SERVICES)	DEFINITION: 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% - 98% Outstanding performance = > 98%	117.40%	90%	95%	10%	30%	60%	95%	1%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851
8	8	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Internal independent assurance provider's functions recommendations and action plans implemented (%)	DEFINITION: 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% to 94% Outstanding performance= ≥ 95%	100%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	1%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mothibi

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	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		
9	9	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.A Community satisfaction city-wide survey (average)	DEFINITION: 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: <u>Performance Rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥0.11 Not fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.1 Fully effective = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 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: <u>Performance Rating:</u> 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	Individual ED score as at 30 June 2024	Actual averaged score for 2023/2024 per ED + 0.1	AT	AT	AT	Actual averaged score for 2023/2024 per ED + 0.1	2%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: Community Satisfaction survey score Contact person: Bridgette Morris 021 400 3812
	10	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Increase in City Pulse	DEFINITION: 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: <u>Performance Rating:</u> 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: <u>Performance Rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.2 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 - 0.19 Fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) - increase of 0.1 Significantly performance = increase of between 0.11 and 0.2 Outstanding performance = increase of > 0.2	3.70	N/A	Actual score of the lowest scoring pillar for 2022/2023 per ED + 0.1	AT	AT	AT	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

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	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		
11	11	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Inclusion of C88 Output indicators (%) (average)	DEFINITION: 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%	100%	AT	AT	AT	1%	Department: Organisational Performance Management (OPM) Source document: C88 scorecard and Directorate SDBIP Contact person: Monique Fillies - Manager: City Performance Management 021 400 9024
12	12	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Average of tenders in slippage at any given quarter end (%)	DEFINITION: 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

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	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		
13	13	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Gaps in repeatable tender continuity (average number of days)	DEFINITION: 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. <u>Performance Rating:</u> 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

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	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	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Total Capital Expenditure as a percentage of Total Capital Budget less contingencies (%)	DEFINITION: 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%	95.80%	90%	90%	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	90%	5%	Directorate Finance Manager
15	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	FM1.12: Total Operating Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating Expenditure budget	DEFINITION: This indicator measures the extent to which operating expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Operating Expenditure (non-capital spending) is costs which the municipality incurs through its normal operations. The latest approved budget is applicable. Formula: Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 90.% or > 100% (non-compliance) Not fully effective = ≥ 90% - ≤ 94.99% Fully effective = 95% - 96% Significant performance= ≥ 96.1% - ≤ 97% Outstanding performance= ≥ 97.1% - 100%	99.40%	95%	95%	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	Dir/Dept. projected cash flow/ total budget	95%	3%	Directorate Finance Manager

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	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		
16	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Performance on cash back expenditure over cash back budget items only (%)	DEFINITION: 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 resilience on non-cash items. The aim of the indicator is to achieve an outcome of less than or equal to 100%. Source: Financial information. Formula: Operating expenditure (cash items only) / Operating budget (cash items only). Measured quarterly. Performance Rating: Unacceptable performance = > 100% Not fully effective = N/A Fully effective = ≤ 100% Significantly performance = N/A Outstanding performance = N/A	New	New	≤ 100%	N/A	N/A	0%	0%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											60%	
17	1	16 A capable and collaborative City government	Developing a Fleet Management Centre of Excellence framework	DEFINITION: A Centre of Excellence is a team or shared facility/ entity that provides leadership, best practices, research, support and/or training for a specific area that supports the overall strategic objectives of the organisation Q1 - 20% = Distributed the final draft COE Framework plan to all stakeholders for final input -Stakeholder Engagement Q2 - 40% = Submitted COE Framework to PC for oversight Q3 - 60% = Submitted to EMT for Consideration Q4 - 100% =Submitted COE framework plan to City Manager for Review Performance Rating: Unacceptable Performance = N/A Not fully effective = < 100% Fully Effective = 100% Significant Performance = 105% - Approved Roadmap Outstanding Performance = 110% - Implementation of Milestones as per Approved Roadmap	New	New	70%	20%	40%	60%	100%	5%	Department: Fleet Management Contact person: Acting Director Fleet

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	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		
18	2	16 A capable and collaborative City government	Visual assessments undertaken of all facilities for 2 Client Departments (%)	Definition: This indicator measures the number of Visual Assessments undertaken of identified facilities for 2 Client departments. Client Departments: Executive & Councillor Support (Councillor Accomodation) Safety & Security Q1- 40 Visual assessments Q2- 90 Visual assessments Q3- 130 Visual assessments Q4- 181 Visual assessments <u>Performance Rating:</u> Unacceptable Performance = N/A Not fully effective = < 181 Fully Effective = 181 Significant Performance = 182 - 185 Outstanding Performance = 186 - 190	New	100%	181	40	90	130	181	5%	Department: Facilities Management Contact person: Regan Melody
19	3	16 A capable and collaborative City government	Implementation of Visible Improvement Initiatives (%)	DEFINITION: This indicator measures the implementation of visible improvement initiatives in alignment with the Departments strategic VIP business projects. Projects: 1. Staff and customer centric space- Cape Town Civic Centre 2. Mechanical works of the Bellville conferencing and banqueting hall 3. Customer refresh at Plumstead Municipal Building, Fezeka Municipal Building & Durbanville Municipal Building. Q1 - 5% = Design and Assessments report Q2 - 50%= Project plan approved Q3 - 60%= Construction phase Q4 - 100%= Complete construction of the initiatives identified <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable Performance = N/A Not Fully Effective = < 100% Fully Effective = 100% Significant Performance = 105% -Provide an additional visible improvement initiative Outstanding Performance = 110%- Provide 2 or more additional visible improvement initiatives	New	New	100%	5%	50%	60%	100%	5%	Department: Facilities Management Contact person: Regan Melody

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	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		
20	4	16 A capable and collaborative City government	Review of HR policy framework (%)	DEFINITION: This indicator will measure the review and submission for approval of HR Policies, S&Ps and Frameworks. This is a continuation of the work that commenced in the 2023\2024 financial year. Q1 - 40% (14 policy instruments) of the remaining 70% (36 policy instruments) Policies reviewed and submitted to EMT for approval. Q2 - 60% (21 policy instruments) of the remaining 70% Policies (36 policy instruments) reviewed and submitted for approval. This means 7 policy instruments to be completed in Q2 which gives a total of 21 policy instruments completed (14 from Q1 plus 7 from Q2) Q3 - 80%(28 policy instruments) of the remaining 70% Policies (36 policy instruments) reviewed Policies completed. This means 7 policy instruments to be completed in Q3 which gives a total of 28 policy instruments completed (14 from Q1 plus 7 from Q2 and 7 from Q3) Q4 - 100% (36 policy instruments) of the remaining 70% reviewed Policies (36 policy instruments) completed for approval. This means 8 policy instruments to be completed in Q4 which gives a total of 36 policy instruments completed (14 from Q1 plus 7 from Q2, 7 from Q3 and 8 from Q4) In terms of approvals, kindly note the following: 1. S&P= System and Procedure which requires City Manager approval 2. Policy- Council approval 3. Framework- Council approval 4. Guidelines- City Manager approval <u>Performance Rating:</u> Unacceptable Performance = N/A Not fully effective = < 100% Fully Effective = 100% LIST OF 36 POLICIES, S&PS, FRAMEWORKS Significant Performance = Change Management plan developed for approved policy instruments Outstanding Performance = Operationalising of Approved Policy Instruments (eg. New leave types, categories of work, etc.)	New	New	100%	40%	60%	80%	100%	5%	Department: Humarn resources Contact person: Bevan van Schoor

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	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		
21	5	16 A capable and collaborative City government	GG 2.31 Percentage of official complaints responded to through the municipal complaint management system	DEFINITION: The number of official complaints responded to as per the municipality defined norms and standards, as a percentage of the number of official complaints received. A complaint is any formal grievance, concern or issue registered with municipality as per its established systems and protocols. An official complaint, in this instance, should be formally logged within the Municipal Complaints Management System. "Norms and standards" refer to a municipality's agreed ability to respond promptly and appropriately to the complaints from the public, in line with protocols determined by the municipality, whether or not this is consistent with any external guidance or benchmarking. Note that resolution refers to an official municipal response to the complaint and does not provide for a determination of "satisfaction" with the municipal response on the part of the public. Performance Rating: Unacceptable = < 79% Not fully effective = 79 - 89.99% Fully effective = 90%-93% Significant performance = between range of 93.1 - 96%. Outstanding performance = > 96% * ED Corporate Services will be measured on his Directorate Performance. ** Citywide will include all other Directorates Performance	99.77%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	10%	Department: Customer Relations Contact person: Pearl Nolutando Nongqongqo
22	6	16 A capable and collaborative City government	Assessment of the City of Cape Town's HR payscales	DEFINITION: This indicator will assess the City of Cape Town's Payscales Q1: Benchmarking and market research on Payscales (15%) Q2: Develop a process plan for the assessment of City of Cape Town Payscales and submit for approval to City Manager.and submit new proposed pay scales to EMT (30%) Q3: Engagement and consultative process with internal stakeholders on the outcome of the assessment on pay scales. (75%). Q4: Submission of the final proposed pay scales to the City Manager for consideration. (100%) Performance Rating: Unacceptable Performance = N/A Not fully effective = < 100% Fully Effective = 100% - Payscales review developed for consideration Significant Performance = 105% Submission of revised payscales to EMT Outstanding Performance = 110% - City Manager Approval	New	New	100%	15%	30%	75%	100%	9%	Department: Humarn resources Contact person: Bevan van Schoo
23	7	4 Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support inclusive economic growth	CRM Satisfaction Survey Score(Likert scale 1-5)	DEFINITION: Customer Relations Management Satisfaction Survey for Corporate Contact Centre (CCC) (Likert scale 1 to 5) Post-Call Surveys: is a customer feedback-collection mechanism where a customer is transferred to an interactive voice response (IVR) telephony system after they speak with a contact centre agent, so that they can answer questions to inform the organisation about their customer experience with the City's contact centre as well as with the City's services. Performance Rating: Unacceptable = < 3.5 Not fully effective = 3.6 - 4.3 Fully effective = 4.4 Significantly above expectation = 4.5 - 4.7 Outstanding performance = 4.8 - 5	4.8	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	10%	Department: Customer Relations Contact person: Pearl Nolutando Nongqongqo

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	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		
24	8	16: A capable and collaborative City government	NEW INDICATOR Security Risk Assessments completed at various City Facilities (Number)	DEFINITION: This Indicator measures the number of completed security risk assessments at various City facilities. (Target 60 Risk Assessments) Q1 – 15 Q2 – 30 Q3 – 45 Q4 – 60 <u>Performance Rating:</u> Unacceptable = < 55 Not fully effective = < 59 Fully effective = 60 Significantly above expectation = 61 - 64 Outstanding performance= > 65	N/A	New	60	15	30	45	60	10%	Department: Facilities Management Contact person: Regan Melody
25	9	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.J Budget spent on implementation of Workplace Skills Plan (%) (NKPI) (CITYWIDE)	DEFINITION: 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 <u>Performance Rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < 90% Not fully effective = 90% - 94.99% Fully effective = 95% - 96% Significant performance = 96.1% - 98% Outstanding performance = > 98%	90%	95%	95%	10%	30%	60%	95%	1%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	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			
		DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											10%	
26	1	16 A capable and collaborative City government	Prepare and finalise an elections Project Plan for the 2026 Local Government Elections (%)	DEFINITION: This indicator will measure the percentage completion of the 2026 Local Government Elections Project plan. During the Project Plan preparation phase all relevant role players will be consulted to unpack and provide input into the plan. Q1 - 25 % completion - Identify key deliverables and finalise draft plan Q2 - 50% completion - commence consultation with individual stakeholders to unpack deliverables for gap analysis Q3 - 75% completion - Amend and update draft plan, and prepare draft documents for ECS and Cllr Support programmes Q4 - 100% completion – Establishment of Elections Steering Committee and finalisation of Elections project plan for implementation in 25/26 financial year <u>Performance Rating:</u> Unacceptable Performance = N/A Not fully effective = < 100% Fully Effective = 100% Significant Performance = 105% = DRAFT recommendation of approval of steering committee Outstanding Performance = 110% = DRAFT elections plan 25/26 approved	New	New	100%	25%	50%	75%	100%	3%	Department: Executive Committee services and Operations Contact person: Vuyokazi Ngcobozi	
27	2	Less Formal Township Establishment Act (LFTEA) areas	Mobile Office visits to all four areas of the City: Number of mobile office visits per year	DEFINITION: Mobile Offices provide access to service delivery through a walk-in centre (face to face) service. These services are provided to previously disadvantaged and remote areas, including areas of informality, to improve customer access and customer centricity. Services offered include accounts enquiries, general enquiries, complaints and service requests related to multiple City services. Mobile Offices visit all areas of the City on a rotational basis. <u>Performance Rating:</u> Unacceptable = < 36 Not fully effective = 37 to 47 Fully effective = 48 - 50 Significantly above expectation= 51 - 54 Outstanding performance= > 55	36	48	48	12	24	36	48	3%	Department: Customer Relations Contact person: Pearl Nolutando Nongqongqo	
28	3	Unlawful Land Occupation (ULO)	Number of proactive interventions to inform identified land owners (City-owned) or privately owned), of the effects of unlawful land occupation.	DEFINITION: Measures the number of proactive interventions to landowners and property owners (internal and external) about the risks and legal consequences of unlawful land occupation. Conduct follow-up actions to ensure receipt and understanding of notifications by landowners, and monitor and document responses and any further actions taken by landowners. <u>Intervention includes:</u> identification of at risk land parcels for unlawful occupation Identification of land already occupied unlawfully <u>Performance Rating:</u> Unacceptable = NA Not Fully effective = NA Fully effective = 42 interventions Significantly above expectation= 43 - 46 Outstanding performance= 47 - 50	New	42	42	10	22	33	42	2%	Department: Citizen Interface Contact person: Pearl Nolutando Nongqongqo	

