

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard Executive Director: Gareth Morgan 1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026													
	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline	Baseline	Annual Target	Q1 Target	Q2 Target	Q3 Target	Q4 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
					2023/2024	2024/2025	2025/2026	30-Sept-25	31-Dec-25	31-Mar-26	30-Jun-26		
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
	MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY											10%	
	SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE											40% - 60%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											10% - 30%	
												100%	
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
1	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Increase in P3M3 and EM maturity level (average)	The CPPPM maturity level is based on the PPPM and Engineering Management (Only applicable to Engineering Directorates) maturity assessment. The maturity assessment will reflect the average maturity level of: - 1. Portfolio, Programme, Project and - 2. Engineering Management level. This will occur on an annual basis in order to assess the increase in the maturity level for the Directorate. The maturity level is measured on a scale of 1 - 5. The maturity levels: * Level 1 – Initial Process: No standard process or tracking system – informal process * Level 2 – Repeatable Process: Minimum standards for processes and procedures * Level 3 – Defined Process: Defined Process which allow for flexibility * Level 4 – Managed Process: Obtain and retain specific measurements and quality requirements * Level 5 – Optimised Process: Continuous process improvement and proactive technology and problem management for future improvements All other EDs will be measured per the individual directorate. 1. A score of 3.1 and above based on the 2023/2024 baseline (for P3M3 and EM): <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.21 from existing maturity level Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 - 0.2 from existing maturity level Fully effective = maintain 3.1 or existing maturity level (no movement) Significant performance = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 from existing maturity level Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.21 from existing maturity level 2. A score of below 3.1based on the 2023/2024 baseline (for P3M3 and EM):	New	3.22	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	AT	AT	AT	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: PPM assessment Contact person: Ben Peters 021 400 9206
2	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Increase in Contract Management maturity level	The Contract Management maturity level is based on the Contract Management maturity assessment only. This will occur on an annual basis in order to assess the increase in the maturity level for the Directorate. The maturity level is measured on a scale of 1 - 5. The maturity levels: * Level 1 – Initial Process: No standard process or tracking system – informal process * Level 2 – Repeatable Process: Minimum standards for processes and procedures * Level 3 – Defined Process: Defined Process which allow for flexibility * Level 4 – Managed Process: Obtain and retain specific measurements and quality requirements * Level 5 – Optimised Process: Continuous process improvement and proactive technology and problem management for future improvements All other EDs will be measured per the individual directorate. 1. A score of 3.75 and above: <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.11 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 – 0.2 Fully effective = maintain 3.75 or existing maturity level (no movement) Significant performance = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.21 2. A score of below 3.75: <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.11 Not fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.1 Fully effective = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 Significant performance = increase of 0.21 - 0.3 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.31	New	4.65	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	AT	AT	AT	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement	1%	Department: CPPPM Source document: PPM assessment Contact person: Ben Peters 021 400 9207
3	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Repeatable Tenders that were Expanded/Amended multiple times (%)	Measures the percentage of Expansions and Amendments on repeatable tenders. This indicator will only measure instances where there was more than one Expansion and/or Amendment on the same tender. Expansions or Amendments are defined by the SCM section 116 (3) guide and can change at any time. If a tender extension is awarded within 45 days of contract expiry of the current contracts arising from the tender, it will result in Unacceptable Performance. This would require all extensions to be awarded at least 45 days before expiry, ensuring proactive planning. Source: Contract Register and Monitoring System and Tender Tracking System. Measurement will commence only when the second Expansions and/or Amendments are released in SAP MM and only applies to repeatable tenders that are active in the current FY (i.e. commenced before or in the financial year and expires in or after the FY). Formula: Total number of repeatable tenders expanded and/ or amended multiple times ÷ Total number of repeatable tenders active in the FY. Measured cumulatively. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = ≥ 3.1% or if tender extension is awarded within 45 days of contract expiry of the current contracts arising from the tender. Not fully effective= 2.1% – 3% Fully effective = 1.8% - 2% Significant performance = 0.1% - 1.79% Outstanding performance = 0%	3.13%	2%	2%	AT	AT	AT	2%	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: CMRS (Contract Register and Monitoring System) and Tender Tracking System Contact person: Maureen Whare 069 367 4023

4	4	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduction in the number of SCM deviations (%)	The objective is to achieve a 20% reduction on SCM deviations. The indicator only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R750 000 (inclusive of VAT). Sole/single service provider deviations, deviations relating to emergencies and unforeseen situations (at this time being – anti-corruption investigations and extortion management, with associated human life threats (threat to limb and life) will be excluded from the measurement as per section 36 of SCM regulations. Target = reduction of 20% Formula: (Number of SCM deviations for current year – Number of SCM deviations for prior year)/ Number of SCM deviations for prior year X 100" Exception protocols: A default performance rating of fully effective will be awarded if you have 2 or less deviations from a base of 2 or less <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = Any positive increase in the number of deviations, year-on-year Not fully effective = a reduction > 0% - < 19.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. Fully effective = a reduction of 20%, for the number of deviations (year-on-year), or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol) Significant performance = a reduction > 20% - < 99.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. Outstanding performance = 0 deviation	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
5	5	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Irregular, Fruitless and Wasteful, Unauthorised Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating and Capital Expenditure	The indicator measures the extent to which the municipality has incurred irregular, fruitless and wasteful and unauthorised expenditure on its total budget (operating and capital budget). Fruitless and wasteful expenditure is expenditure that was made in vain and would have been avoided had reasonable care been exercised. Irregular expenditure is incurred by the municipality in contravention of a requirement of the law (specific legislation, per MFMA legislation). Unauthorized expenditure includes overspending of the total amount appropriated in the approved budget. The net amount after recoveries, write offs or condonement should be used in this calculation. The Q4 final figure is obtained from the Pre-audited AFS. Irregular expenditure will be included, if identified by other assurance providers, irrespective if it is self-disclosed or not. Formula: Per Directorate incidents value as a percentage of Directorate Opex and Capex ((1) Irregular + (2) Fruitless and Wasteful + (3) Unauthorised Expenditure) / (4) Total Operating and Capital Expenditure x 100 Note: New Executive Director or Executive Director taking up a post in another directorate as an Executive Director (in the year of review) will be measured on the UIFW Expenditure incidents for the current year, where the incident is in the term of appointment as Executive Director. This also applies if an existing ED moves to another directorate, the ED will be regarded as "New" I.e. previous UIFW expenditure incidents not in the term of employment of the ED will not be measured. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = ≥ 1.5% Not fully effective = > 0.75% - 1.49% Fully effective = 0.75% Significant performance = < 0.75% - > 0% Outstanding performance = 0%	New	New	0.75%	AT	AT	AT	0.75%	2%	Department: City Manager Office Source document: Irregular Register and the AG's findings in the quarter that it is available. Contact person: Gayle Postings 021 400 1268
6	6	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	External audit (Auditor General) audit actions completed as per audit action plan (%)	This indicator measures how many actions was completed in the financial cycle within in the unique deadline set, as per the audit action plan. The Audit Action Plan sets out the total number audit actions required to address the internal control deficiencies as identified by the Auditor-General in their management report. The unique deadline is set in consultation with the relevant ED. Completed would mean that the actions as stipulated in the audit action plan has been executed by the relevant delegated authority. Should there be no actions required for a Directorate the indicator will be 'Not Applicable'. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = N/A Not fully effective = < 99.99% Fully effective = N/A Significant performance = 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

7	7	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Final council and Mayco decisions implemented within timeframes (%)	The indicator excludes all council and Mayco decisions for noting. Decisions taken by council and Mayco where there is no budget to implement actions or outside of the control of the ED. These exclusions must be supported by valid evidence. These decisions must be reflected on each quarterly report for the City Manager and/or panel's awareness. All final Council and Mayco decisions allocated to the ED with implementation date for the quarter must be implemented and reported on for the quarter to achieve the target. Implementation that runs over a period longer than a financial year will be measured according to milestones identified for implementation within the current financial year. Each ED must ensure that a date is allocated of when action will be completed and implemented. This must be captured in the CDIT system by the relevant implementer. If no timeframe was allocated the timeframe is deemed to be one month for implementation. Implementation is the date of completion of the actions or achievement of councils request or expectation. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < 69% of ALL decisions Not fully effective = 69% - 79.99% of ALL decisions Fully effective = 80% - 85% of ALL decisions Significant performance = 85.1% - 94.99% of ALL decisions Outstanding performance = ≥ 95% of ALL decisions If "Not Applicable"-weighting will be "zero" and must be reallocated it within the Transversal Category.	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)
8	8	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.J Budget spent on implementation of Workplace Skills Plan (%)	Measures the percentage of budget spent on the Workplace Skills Plan .The Workplace Skills Plan outlines the planned education, training and development interventions for the organisation. Its purpose is to formally plan and allocate budget for appropriate training interventions that will address the needs arising out of local government's skills sector plan, the IDP, the individual departmental staffing strategies, individual employees' personal development plans and the employment equity plan. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(f). Formula: % spent on the implementation of the WSP measured against the training budget. (A/B)*100 A: Actual spend per quarter on training budget B: Planned spend on training Budget for the year Q4 (as at end of June) reporting will be based on the latest period available at the time of reporting. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < 90% Not fully effective = 90% - 94.99% Fully effective = 95% - 96% Significant performance = 96.1% - 97.99% Outstanding performance = ≥ 98%	110.9%	95%	95%	17%	40%	73%	95%	2%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851
9	9	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Internal independent assurance provider's functions recommendations and action plans implemented (%)	It is the monitoring and reporting of the implementation (expressed as a percentage) of corrective actions to address internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans, issued within the directorate of the responsible Executive Director. The internal independent assurance providers included in this KPI are Internal Audit, Ombudsman, Integrated Risk Management (limited to the Strategic Risks: Corporate, Transversals and Executive Risk Registers), Ethics and Forensics departments. Each internal independent assurance provider as mentioned above has their own unique input to this KPI. This KPI will be "not applicable" to management when there are no recommendations, thus only those that could provide inputs will be included in the calculation. Future recommendations and action plans implemented (not recommended for implementation for the current financial year), will be taken into account for the measurement of this indicator, thereby creating an advantage for the ED. Formula: Numerator: Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans implemented (current and future implementations) Denominator: Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans made for the current period under review (recommendations and actions plans postponed as approved by the City Manager will be excluded) <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < 75% Not fully effective = 75% - 84.99% Fully effective = 85% - 90% Significant performance = > 90% - 94.99% Outstanding performance= ≥ 95%	90%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	2%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babaiwa Mothibi

11	11	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Inclusion of C88 Output indicators	All Tier 1 and Tier 2 Circular 88 Output indicators should be included into the performance scorecards of the Executive Directors, where relevant. All indicators must be included verbatim into the Corporate (auditable) and Directorate SDBIP (cascading principle) and the measurement must be in compliance with the Technical Indicator Descriptions (TID) as issued by National Treasury. This indicator will be measured during the annual and mid-year review process. Measurement: Q1 and Q3 (after mid-year amendments). Weighting must be reallocated where there the ED has no Output indicators. Note: Indicators that have barriers and challenges are excluded from the formula. The indicator will measure two aspects: 1) The inclusion of C88 Output indicators in the Directorate SDBIP, and 2) The inclusion of C88 Outcome and Output indicators on the Corporate Scorecard (CSC) (graduating), whether replacing existing CSC indicators. 1) Formula: Inclusion in the directorate SDBIP - Total number of Tier 1 & 2 Output indicators included in the directorate SDBIP divided by Tier 1 & 2 indicators required for inclusion as per C88 (auditable) * 100 2) Formula: Replacement and/ or inclusion of C88 Outcome and Output indicators on the CSC Graduating criteria: Meet the strategic mandate of the City, with the Mayor's approval and Indicators should be auditable with systems and controls in place. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < 80% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Not fully effective = 80% - 84.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Fully effective =85% - 99.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Significant performance =100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Outstanding performance =100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 and at least one replacement/ graduation to the CSC Exception rule: If an ED included less than 100% of the Output indicators (verbatim), however graduated at least one indicator, they will receive a default rating of Significant performance.	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Department: Organisational Performance Management (OPM) Source document: C88 scorecard and Directorate SDBIP Contact person: Monique Fillies - Manager: City Performance Management 021 400 9024
12	12	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Tenders in slippage at any given quarter end (%)	Measures tenders for MTREF in slippage at any given quarter end. This will drive the timeous implementation of the demand plan based on the agreed timeline. Abnormalities in the timeline will then impact each step of the process, such as where a tender only allows 30 days after award to Contract Required by Date (CRD), there will probably be a contract gap or a Value At Risk (VAR – Budget at risk of not being spent) on the Capital reporting. Slippage is defined as tenders on the demand plan which are behind schedule based on the agreed timelines for each tender. Slippage in the implementation of the demand plan, is a contributor to the cause of VAR. This will include the submission of draft specifications as per the minimum timeframe before the CRD. Measurement: The indicator is measured on a quarterly basis (non-cumulative), as such any recoveries are considered. The annual performance is based on the tenders in slippage as at the 4th quarter. ED's are able to recover if there are tenders in slippage throughout the year. There are processes in place to remedy tenders that are in amber or red. Formula: Total count of tenders in red or amber as a percentage of the total number of tenders required for the MTREF period (%) (non-cumulative). <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = > 15% Not fully effective = > 10% - ≤ 15% Fully effective = ≤ 10% Significant performance = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9% Outstanding performance = < 5%	25%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	1%	Department: Supply Chain Management Source document: Demand Plan Overview Contact person: Bekumuzi Vumase and Razaan Arendse Manager Demand Management
13	13	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Gaps in repeatable tender continuity (average number of days)	This indicator is to ensure continued monthly service delivery implemented through repeatable tenders. A "gap" refers to the number of days between the expiring contract and the replacement contract commencing. Potential gaps should be mitigated via extension/expansion and/or deviation early enough so that it caters for any possible delay within a tender process. A gap less than one month will be included in the calculation. To drive the demand plan and improve Supply Chain Management (SCM) process and service delivery. The indicator is based on all repeatable tenders that currently has a gap at the time of reporting, i.e. the current contract had already expired and the new contract is not yet in place. Average number of days refer to calendar days (inclusive of weekends). Formula: Total number of gaps in days/ Total number of tenders with a gap of more than zero days = Average number of gaps (days) (Effectively the report should be 'blank'.) Using the gap report developed by Zubair which takes current status and projected time for completion into account. <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	248 Days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: GAP report prepared by Zubair Contact person: Zubair Adams

MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY													10%	
14	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Total Capital Expenditure as a percentage of Total Capital Budget less contingencies (%)	This indicator measures the extent to which budgeted capital expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Capital expenditure is all costs incurred by the municipality 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. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < 85% or >100% (non-compliance) Not fully effective = ≥ 85% - 89.99% Fully effective = 90% - 93% Significant performance = > 93% - 96% Outstanding performance = > 96%	98.41% including contingencies 98.73% excluding contingencies	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	Total Operating Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating Expenditure budget	This indicator measures the extent to which operating expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Operating Expenditure (non-capital spending) is costs which the municipality incurs through its normal operations. The latest approved budget is applicable. Formula: Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < 90% or > 100% (non-compliance) Not fully effective = ≥ 90% - ≤ 94.99% Fully effective = 95% - 96% Significant performance = ≥ 96.1% - ≤ 97% Outstanding performance = ≥ 97.1% - 100%	96.90%	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	
16	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Performance on cash backed expenditure over cash back budget items only (%)	In terms of the Directive 7 of 2023, directorates cannot offset primary operating budgeted expenditure that translates into a cash outflow against non-cash flow expenditures such as Impairments, Depreciation, Debt impairment, Write-offs, Post-retirement medical aid (PRMA) provision, Rehabilitation of landfill sites, Water Inventory, labour to operating, Interest and Prior year adjustments. This indicator measures the outcome of cash backed items only over the budget and if the outcome is higher than 100% then, it reflects reliance on non-cash items. The aim of the indicator is to achieve an outcome of less than or equal to 100%. Source: Financial information. Formula: Operating expenditure (cash items only) / Operating budget (cash items only). Measured quarterly. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = > 100% Not fully effective = N/A Fully effective = 100% Significantly performance = ≥ 98% - 99.9% Outstanding performance = ≥ 95% - 97.9%	N/A	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager	

SERVICE DELIVERY / GOOD GOVERNANCE													45%	
17	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Operational Workforce Plans	The indicator measures the number of operational workforce plans. This is a new indicator. Operational Work Force Plans replace strategic workforce plans. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance: < 2 Not full effective: 2 - 3 Fully effective: 4 Significant performance: 5 - 6 Outstanding performance: > 6	New	New	4	1	2	3	4	4%	Department: OE&I Contact person: Manager Innovation and Customer Insights	
18	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Opinion of the Auditor-General on PDO (2024/2025) (Pre-determined Objectives)	The PDO Audit opinion measures the Auditor-General opinion on performance information as reflected in the Annual Report. The AG report provides the outcome of the audit of performance information against the predetermined objectives for the financial period. The outcome will reflect the usefulness and reliability of the reported performance information against the predetermined objectives. In line with the AG Directive 2023, Section 15: The level of assurance provided may be reasonable (an opinion) or limited (a conclusion) or none (findings) as predetermined by the AGSA based on the following: - The importance of the mandate of the auditee - The size and nature of the auditee's business Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = N/A (0) Not fully effective = N/A (0) Fully effective = Useful and reliable audit opinion for 2024/25 Significant performance =Useful and reliable audit opinion for 2024/25 (Material findings resolved for PDO) Outstanding performance = Useful and reliable audit opinion for 2024/25 (No material findings for PDO) / default "Clean audit" outcome The weighting for the indicator will not be reallocated , the performance ratings for unacceptable, not fully effective and fully effective will be scored at zero.	Clean Audit	Useful and reliable audit opinion for 2023/24	Useful and reliable audit opinion for 2024/25	Submission of the audit file to the AGSA – 31 August	Audit in progress	Useful and reliable audit opinion for 2024/25	Useful and reliable audit opinion for 2024/25	7%	Department : OPM Contact Persons: Director: OPM	
19	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Completion of the Corporate SDBIP - 2026/2027 (%)	This indicator measures the completion of the Corporate SDBIP for the financial period under review and is aligned to the legislative timelines. The Corporate SDBIP is the top level SDBIP of the City. Quarterly measurements of this indicator are as follows: Q1 – 25%: SDBIP process plan approved by Director Q2 – 50%: Directorate reps briefed to complete SDBIP 2025/26 Draft One Year Corporate Scorecard communication send to OPRG Q3 – 75%: 2025/2026 Draft One Year Corporate Scorecard submitted to EMT and Council 2025/2026 Draft One Year CSC submitted to NT and PT as part of the draft Corporate SDBIP process Q4 – 100% :Final 2025/2026 Performance Rating: Unacceptable performance = Signed by Director Not fully effective = Signed by ED Fully effective = Performance components of the Corporate SDBIP completed (excluding financial information) Significant Performance = N/A Outstanding Performance = Performance components of the Corporate SDBIP published version completed (excluding financial information)	100%	100%	100%	25%	50%	75%	100%	7%	Department : OPM Contact Persons: Director: OPM	
20	4	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Annual review and amendment of the IDP (%)	This indicator measures the progress towards Annual Review and amendments of the IDP and the amendments effected based on an annual review of the IDP 2025/2026. Q1 – SMF Strategy Brief to give direction on review Q2 – Notification to all councillors and committees of Council of amendment process and time period Q3 – Amendments tabled in Council Q4 – Review and amendments approved by Council Performance Rating: Unacceptable performance = Signed off by Director Not fully effective = Signed off by ED Fully effective= Approval by Council (100%) Significant performance= Final designed product for publication completed. Outstanding performance = Final designed product published on City website	100%	100%	100%	25%	50%	75%	100%	7%	Department : Policy & Strategy Contact person: Director: Policy & Strategy	

		Objective 16: A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Number of Interventions implemented in line directorates as an outcome ofo City Pulse 2024/25 (Number)	This Indicator measures the number of Interventions that address the lowest scoring culture assessment outcomes per directorate Number of interventions measured per directorate Performance Rating : Unacceptable performance = < 6 Not fully effective = 6 - 8 Fully effective = 9 - 11 Significant performance = 12 - 13 Outstanding performance = > 13	New	New	9	2	5	7	9	7%	Department: OE&I Contact person: Manager Innovation and Customer Insights
		16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Completion of the Strategic Management Framework (SMF) (%)	The Strategic Management Framework is an annual internal strategic planning process aimed at producing a strategy-led budget. The intention is to enable consistant strategic direction across multiple strategic processes (eg. MSDf, IDP, budget etc.) Framework deliverables Q1– Completion of Strategy Brief – Endorsed by EMT (25%) Q2 – Strategy Brief issued (50%) Q3 - Item review completed with Executive Mayor- presentation (95%) Q4 – Lessons learned report (100%) Performance Rating : Unacceptable performance = N/A Not fully effective =<100% Fully effective = 100% Significant performance = strategy brief informs infrastructure strategy planning process including 2026 edition of Infrastructure Report Outstanding performance = informs IDP amendments/ review process # Informs refers to the fact that the outputs generated via the SMF provides inputs, which are utilised towards the IDP amendment/review - and the Infrastructure Strategy planning process.	100%	100%	100%	25%	50%	95%	100%	6%	Department: Policy & Strategy Contact persons: Director: Policy & Strategy Manager: Strategic Plannin
		4: Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	Contract managers/ administrators trained in the CCT contract management framework and guide (%)	This indicator will measure the percentage of all Project Managers or Administrators that received training in the Contract Management framework of the City. Performance Rating: Unacceptable performance = < 77% Not fully effective = 77% - 81.99% Fully effective= 82% - 85% Significant performance = 85.1% - 90% Outstanding = > 90%	80%	80%	82%	20%	40%	60%	82%	4%	Department: CPPPM Contact person: Manager: Contract Management
		16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.A Community satisfaction citywide survey (score 1–5)	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 level. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance < 2.7 Not fully effective = 2.7 - 3.0 Fully effective = 3.1 Significant performance = 3.2 - 3.5 Outstanding performance = > 3.5 (This indicator measures Future, Planning & Resilience: Communications outcome)	2.7	Not known yet	3.1	AT	AT	AT	3.1	1%	Department: OE&I Contact person: Manager Innovation and Customer Insights
21	5	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.I Employees from the Employment Equity (EE) designated groups in the three highest levels of management (%) (NKPI)	Measures the percentage of employees from Employment Equity (EE) target (designated) groups employed in the three highest levels of management, in compliance with the City's approved EE Plan and EE Act. Management Level 1 – City Manager and Executive directors Management Level 2 – Portfolio managers and directors Management Level 3 – Managers Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(e). Performance Rating: Unacceptable performance = <73% Not fully effective = 73% - 75.99% Fully effective= 76% - 76.99% Significant performance = 77% to 77.5% Outstanding performance = >77.5%	76%	76%	76%	76%	76%	76%	76%	2%	Department: OE&I Contact person: Manager: Diversity & Inclusivene

DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS													25%	
23	2	1. Increased Jobs and Investment in the Cape Town economy	Total wayleaves processed within the specific target timelines as per type of application (Average Percentage)	The objective is to improve the ease of doing business index relating to each EDs business processes. The indicator will measure the average percentage of the total wayleaves processed within specific target timelines as per the categories below: small – 10 day, medium – 15 day, large – 35 day and emergency – 1 day Formula - Total number of days per wayleave category divide by the total number of wayleave applications Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 70% Not fully effective = 70 - 79.99% Fully effective: 80 - 88% Significantly performance = 88.1 - 95% Outstanding performance = > 95%	New	80%	82%	82%	82%	82%	82%	2%	Department: CPPPM Contact person: Director: CPPPM Manager: Engineering Management	
24	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Major communication campaigns run (Number) (Mayoral Priority)	This indicator measures the total number of communication campaigns that were run in an effort to promote the City's service offering. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 13 Not fully effective = 13 - 15 Fully effective = 16 - 17 Significant performance = 18 - 19 Outstanding performance= > 19	8	10	16	4	8	12	16	5%	Department: Communications Contact person: Director: Communication	
27	6	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Data Science products delivered in collaboration with City directorates	The indicator measure the number of data science products (which includes both formal and informal areas) delivered in collaboration with City directorates, as agreed with the sponsor/owner of the data science product. The delivery of data science products is dependent on the need and readiness of the organisation/sponsor/management. This is a cumulative measure. Q4 - 10 Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 8 Not fully effective = 8 - 9 Fully effective: 10 - 12 Significant performance = 13 - 14 Outstanding = > 14	New	5	10	N/A	3	6	10	6%	Department : OPM Contact Persons: Director: OPM	
28	7	Unlawful Land Occupation (ULO)	Develop and implement a communication campaign on how ULO inhibits service delivery, town planning and bio-diversity (%) (Unlawful Land Occupation)	The Indicator measure the extent to which the City's media campaign on Unlawful Land Occupation highlights the adverse effects of ULO on service delivery, town planning issues and biodiversity. Q1 - 25% Produce and distribute campaign material on flooding risks and winter preparedness. Q2 - 50% Produce and distribute campaign material on the impacts of ULO on service delivery Q3 - 75% Produce and distribute campaign material on the impacts of ULO on service delivery Q4 - 100% Produce and distribute campaign material on flooding risks and winter preparedness Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = <90% Not fully effective = 90% - 99% Fully effective =100% Significant Performance = Value of earned media exceeds the campaign costs by 25% - 50% Outstanding Performance = Value of earned media exceeds the campaigns costs by 50% or more #Value earned media refers to a return on investment measure. It compares what the Directorate/City paid for the campaign in terms of concept phase, design, media buying etc. and the value received from that campaign. This includes the engagements with the public on social media, any free media received and other exposure.	100%	100%	100%	25%	50%	75%	100%	2%	Department: Communications Contact person: Director: Communications	
		16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Finalisation of the COCT Long-term Plan	This indicator measures the progress on an annual basis towards the finalisation of the City of Cape Town's Long-Term Plan 2050 which will reflect the development pathways that need to be pursued in the short (3 - 5 years) to long term (10 - 20 years) in order to meet the long-term needs of the city. Q1 – Public Participation on LTP completed Q2 – Approval of the LTP by Council Q3 – Approval of the LTP by Council Q4 – Approval of the LTP by Council Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = LTP not approved by Council Not fully effective = LTP approved Fully effective = LTP Approval by Council Significant Performance = Additional Infrastructure Report outlining infrastructure pipeline published by end of Q4 Outstanding Performance = Digital interactive version of the Infrastructure report or artificial intelligence infrastructure product by end of Q4	New	Final Draft of the Long-Term Plan to the Mayor (prior to public participation).	Approval of the LTP by Council.	Public Participation on LTP completed	Approval of the LTP by Council	Approval of the LTP by Council	Approval of the LTP by Council	5%	Department : Policy & Strategy Contact person: Director: Policy & Strategy	
28	7	Informality Establishment Act (LFTEA) areas	Develop a programmatic approach to projects required to support uptake of Small Scale Rental Units in pilot areas	The Indicator measure the progress on the development of the programmatic approach to preparation of projects required to support updatake of SSRUs in 3 identified pilot areas of the Cape Town. As of the end of 24/25 FY the planning brief had been concluded, and hence 25/26 concentrates on implementation thereof. Q1 - 25% Completion of Programme Initiation SG0 Q2 - 50% PPSC allocation and release to eligible infrastructure and planning activities Q3 - 75% Interim report on all technical assessments, capacity modelling and spatial outputs in accordance with the the planning brief. Q4 - 100% Consolidation of all inputs into the programme business case - draft Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = NA Not fully effective = <100% Fully effective = 100% Significant Performance = Lessons learnt document on programmatic approach presented to EMT Outstanding Performance = TBC	100%	100%	100%	25%	50%	75%	100%	5%	Department: Communications Contact person: Director: Communications	

Executive Director
Gareth Morgan

 Digitally signed by Gareth Morgan
Date: 2025.07.15 15:47:30 +02'00'

City Manager
Lungelo Mbandazayo

 Digitally signed by Lungelo
Mbandazayo
Date: 2025.07.31 09:38:09 +02'00'

Date