

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Ruby Gelderbloem
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 previous year's 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 previous year's baseline (for P3M3 and EM): <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.21 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 - 0.2 or increase to 2.99 Fully effective = maintain 3.0 or increase to 3.0 from existing maturity level Significant performance = increase of 0.11 - 0.2 above a baseline score of 3.0 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.21 above a baseline score of 3.0	New	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	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

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Ruby Gelderbloem
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sept-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
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	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	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% 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% - 2.5% Significant performance = 0.1% - 1.79% Outstanding performance = 0%	0%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	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

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Ruby Gelderbloem
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		
4		4	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduction in the number of SCM deviations (%)	The objective is to achieve a 20% reduction on SCM deviations. The indicator only applies to Supply Chain Management (SCM) deviations above R750 000 (inclusive of VAT). Sole/single service provider deviations, deviations relating to emergencies and unforeseen situations (at this time being – anti-corruption investigations and extortion management, with associated human life threats (threat to limb and life) will be excluded from the measurement as per section 36 of SCM regulations. Target = reduction of 20% Formula: (Number of SCM deviations for current year – Number of SCM deviations for prior year)/ Number of SCM deviations for prior year X 100" Exception protocols: A default performance rating of fully effective will be awarded if you have 2 or less deviations from a base of 2 or less <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = Any positive increase in the number of deviations, year-on-year Not fully effective = a reduction > 0% - < 19.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. Fully effective = a reduction of 20% - 21%, for the number of deviations (year-on-year), or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol) Significant performance = a reduction > 21% - < 99.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. Outstanding performance = a reduction of 100% for the number of deviations, year-on-year or no deviations for the current year.	100%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	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

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Ruby Gelderbloem
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		
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%	N/A	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	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%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	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)

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Ruby Gelderbloem
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		
8	8	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.J Budget spent on implementation of Workplace Skills Plan (%)	Measures the percentage of budget spent on the Workplace Skills Plan .The Workplace Skills Plan outlines the planned education, training and development interventions for the organisation. Its purpose is to formally plan and allocate budget for appropriate training interventions that will address the needs arising out of local government's skills sector plan, the IDP, the individual departmental staffing strategies, individual employees' personal development plans and the employment equity plan. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(f). Formula: % spent on the implementation of the WSP measured against the training budget. (A/B)*100 A: Actual spend per quarter on training budget B: Planned spend on training Budget for the year Q4 (as at end of June) reporting will be based on the latest period available at the time of reporting. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 90% Not fully effective = 90% - 94.99% Fully effective = 95% - 96% Significant performance = 96.1% - 97.99% Outstanding performance = ≥ 98%	96%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	95%	Per the KOI schedule	Per the KOI schedule	Per the KOI schedule	95%	2%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Grant Stephens 021 400 9851

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Ruby Gelderbloem
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sept-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
9	9	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Internal independent assurance provider's recommendations and action plans implemented (%)	It is the monitoring and reporting of the implementation (expressed as a percentage) of corrective actions to address internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans, issued within the directorate of the responsible Executive Director. The internal independent assurance providers included in this KPI are Internal Audit, Ombudsman, Integrated Risk Management (limited to the Strategic Risks: Corporate, Transversals and Executive Risk Registers), Ethics and Forensics departments. Each internal independent assurance provider as mentioned above has their own unique input to this KPI. This KPI will be "not applicable" to management when there are no recommendations, thus only those that could provide inputs will be included in the calculation. Future recommendations and action plans implemented (not recommended for implementation for the current financial year), will be taken into account for the measurement of this indicator, thereby creating an advantage for the ED. Formula: Numerator: Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans implemented (current and future implementations) Denominator: Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans made for the current period under review (recommendations and actions plans postponed as approved by the City Manager will be excluded) Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 75% Not fully effective = 75% - 84.99% Fully effective = 85% - 90% Significant performance = > 90% - 94.99% Outstanding performance= ≥ 95%	90%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	2%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Babalwa Mothibi
10	10	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Inclusion of C88 Output indicators	All Tier 1 and Tier 2 Circular 88 Output indicators should be included into the performance scorecards of the Executive Directors, where relevant. All indicators must be included verbatim into the Corporate (auditable) and Directorate SDBIP (cascading principle) and the measurement must be in compliance with the Technical Indicator Descriptions (TID) as issued by National Treasury. This indicator will be measured during the annual and mid-year review process. Measurement: Q1 and Q3 (after mid-year amendments). Weighting must be reallocated where there the ED has no Output indicators. Note: Indicators that have barriers and challenges are excluded from the formula. The indicator will measure two aspects: 1) The inclusion of C88 Output indicators in the Directorate SDBIP, and 2) The inclusion of C88 Outcome and Output indicators on the Corporate Scorecard (CSC) (graduating), whether replacing existing CSC indicators. 1) Formula: Inclusion in the directorate SDBIP - Total number of Tier 1 & 2 Output indicators included in the directorate SDBIP divided by Tier 1 & 2 indicators required for inclusion as per C88 (auditable) * 100 2) Formula: Replacement and/ or inclusion of C88 Outcome and Output indicators on the CSC Graduating criteria: Meet the strategic mandate of the City, with the Mayor's approval and Indicators should be auditable with systems and controls in place. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 80% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Not fully effective = 80% - 84.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Fully effective =85% - 99.99% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Significant performance =100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 Outstanding performance =100% inclusion of Tier 1 & 2 and at least one replacement/ graduation to the CSC Exception rule: If an ED included less than 100% of the Output indicators (verbatim), however graduated at least one indicator, they will receive a default rating of Significant performance.	100%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	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

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard Executive Director: Ruby Gelderbloem 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		
11	11	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Tenders in slippage at any given quarter end (%)	Measures tenders for MTREF in slippage at any given quarter end. This will drive the timeous implementation of the demand plan based on the agreed timeline. Abnormalities in the timeline will then impact each step of the process, such as where a tender only allows 30 days after award to Contract Required by Date (CRD), there will probably be a contract gap or a Value At Risk (VAR – Budget at risk of not being spent) on the Capital reporting. Slippage is defined as tenders on the demand plan which are behind schedule based on the agreed timelines for each tender. Slippage in the implementation of the demand plan, is a contributor to the cause of VAR. This will include the submission of draft specifications as per the minimum timeframe before the CRD. Measurement: The indicator is measured on a quarterly basis (non-cumulative), as such any recoveries are considered. The annual performance is based on the tenders in slippage as at the 4th quarter. ED's are able to recover if there are tenders in slippage throughout the year. There are processes in place to remedy tenders that are in amber or red. Formula: Total count of tenders in red or amber as a percentage of the total number of tenders required for the MTREF period (%) (non-cumulative). <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = > 15% Not fully effective = > 10% - ≤ 15% Fully effective = ≤ 10% Significant performance = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9% Outstanding performance = < 5%	0%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	≤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

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard Executive Director: Ruby Gelderbloem 1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026													
	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sept-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
12	12	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Gaps in repeatable tender continuity (average number of days)	This indicator is to ensure continued monthly service delivery implemented through repeatable tenders. A "gap" refers to the number of days between the expiring contract and the replacement contract commencing. Potential gaps should be mitigated via extension/expansion and/or deviation early enough so that it caters for any possible delay within a tender process. A gap less than one month will be included in the calculation. To drive the demand plan and improve Supply Chain Management (SCM) process and service delivery. The indicator is based on all repeatable tenders that currently has a gap at the time of reporting, i.e. the current contract had already expired and the new contract is not yet in place. Average number of days refer to calendar days (inclusive of weekends). Formula: Total number of gaps in days/ Total number of tenders with a gap of more than zero days = Average number of gaps (days) (Effectively the report should be 'blank'.) Using the gap report developed by Zubair which takes current status and projected time for completion into account. <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	0	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	0	0	0	0	0	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: GAP report prepared by Zubair Contact person: Zubair Adams
MUNICIPAL FINANCIAL VIABILITY												10%	
13	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%	85%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	90%	15%	35%	70%	90%	5%	Directorate Finance Manager

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Ruby Gelderbloem
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		
14	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. 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%	94%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	95%	20%	45%	68%	95%	3%	Directorate Finance Manager
15	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. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = > 100% Not fully effective = N/A Fully effective = 100% Significantly performance = ≥ 98% - 99.9% Outstanding performance = ≥ 95% - 97.9%	0%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard Executive Director: Ruby Gelderbloem 1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026													
	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sept-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
SERVICE DELIVERY / GOOD GOVERNANCE												60%	
16	1	1: Increased Jobs and Investment within the Cape Town economy	1.E Council approved trading plans developed or revised for informal trading (number)	This indicator measures the total number of Council approved informal trading plans <u>Performance Rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = ≤7 New or Revised Plans approved Not fully effective = 7 New or Revised Plans approved Fully effective = All 8 New or Revised Plans approved Significant performance = 1 of the 8 new or revised approved plans implemented Outstanding performance = ≥ 2 of the 8 new or revised approved plans implemented	7	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	8	AT	AT	AT	8	5%	Director: Economic Development and Investment
17	2	1: Increased Jobs and Investment within the Cape Town economy	Investments facilitated by Special Purpose Vehicles (SPV's) and Wesgro (Rand Value)	Value of investments facilitated; jobs created as well as skills development training in the Cape Town economy by strategic business partners. These strategic partners include Western Cape Tourism, Trade and Investment Promotion Agency (Wesgro), BlueCape, Cape Business Process Outsourcing (BPO), Craft and Design Institute (CDI), Cape Clothing and Textile Cluster (CCTC), Economic Development Partnership (EDP) and GreenCape. Two (2) reports per year reflecting achievements in relation to investment/jobs and skills targets will be submitted as follows : 1st report: July - Dec 2nd Report: Jan - June <u>Performance Rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = <R4.5bn Not fully effective = R4.5bn-R4.99bn Fully effective= R5bn-R5.25bn Significant performance=>R5.25bn-R6bn Outstanding performance=>R6bn	New	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	R5bn	N/A	R1,5bn	N/A	R5bn	5%	Director: Economic Development and Investment
18	3	1.6: A capable and collaborative City Government	New trading opportunities created per year (number)	Number of trading bays created via a Council approved trading plan process <u>Performance Rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = <108 Not fully effective = 108-119 Fully effective= 120 - 126 Significant performance=>126- 144 Outstanding performance=>144	487	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	120	A/T	A/T	A/T	120	5%	Director: Economic Development and Investment

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard Executive Director: Ruby Gelderbloem 1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026													
	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sept-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
19	4	1. Increased Jobs and Investment within the Cape Town economy	Direct jobs created from the investments facilitated by Strategic Business Partners and Wesgro (number)	This KPI tracks the number of direct jobs created as a result of investments facilitated by the City's strategic business partners (including Wesgro, BlueCape, CapeBPO, CDI, CCTC, EDP, and GreenCape). Job creation figures are based on investor declarations submitted during or after facilitation processes, and measured using the full-time equivalent (FTE) standard. The reported jobs are attributed to the efforts of the strategic partners through activities such as investment facilitation, business expansion support, and destination marketing — all of which are supported or funded by the City of Cape Town. Performance Rating: Unacceptable performance = <9000 Not fully effective = 9000 -9999 Fully effective= 10 000 - 10 500 Significant performance= > 10 500 - 12 000 Outstanding performance= >12 000	New	New	10 000	N/A	500	N/A	10 000	8%	Director: Economic Development and Investment
20	5	4: Well managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	Acquisition of land to support infrastructure delivery and basic services to support economic growth (number)	Administration of the Sale Agreement or Expropriation noticed finalised for Acquisition of approximately 30 properties completed Performance Rating: Unacceptable performance = <25 Acquisitions completed (Sale Agreement / Expropriation notice finalised) Not fully effective = 25-29 Acquisitions completed (Sale Agreement / Expropriation notice finalised) Fully effective= 30-31 Acquisitions completed (Sale Agreement / Expropriation notice finalised) Significant performance= >31 - 36 Acquisitions completed (Sale Agreement / Expropriation notice finalised) Outstanding performance= > 37 Acquisitions completed (Sale Agreement / Expropriation notice finalised)	57 Acquisitions completed (Sale Agreement / Expropriation notice finalised)	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	30 Acquisitions completed (Sale Agreement / Expropriation notice finalised), subject to demand	N/A	N/A	N/A	30 Acquisitions completed (Sale Agreement / Expropriation notice finalised), subject to demand	8%	Director: Property Transactions
21	6	1: Increased Jobs and Investment within the Cape Town economy	Release of properties to market via the City's disposal management system (Number)	The planned release of 40 viable properties to the market via the City's disposal process. This KPI includes disposals aimed at addressing urgent service delivery needs (e.g., social care sites, at-risk or problematic residential properties) and excludes routine non-competitive, non-viable releases such as gardening or security servitudes. While some properties may present development opportunities, this is not the primary intent of this KPI, which differs from the development-focused releases tracked by the Property Development Department Performance Rating: Unacceptable performance = <36 released to the market via the City's disposal management system Not fully effective = 36-39 released to the market via the City's disposal management system Fully effective= 40 -42 released to the market via the City's disposal management system Significant performance= >42 - 48 released to the market via the City's disposal management system Outstanding performance= > 48 released to the market via the City's disposal management system	New	New	40 properties released to the market via the City's disposal management system	N/A	N/A	N/A	40 properties released to the market via the City's disposal management system	8%	Director: Property Transactions

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Ruby Gelderbloem
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		
22	7	1. Increased Job and Investment within the Cape Town economy	Bookings hosted at Strategic Assets (number)	Leveraging and improving the Strategic Asset facilities as safe and compliant venues for the hosting of events, by creating an enabling environment through efficient and effective operating models, thereby contributing to economic growth and job creations. These Strategic Assets include: Green Point Precinct: Green Point Park and Green Point Athletics Stadium Athlone Precinct: Athlone Stadium City Centre Precinct: City Hall and Grand Parade A booking hosted will require the following elements to be included in this indicator; - Venue Hire Agreement - Invoice - Payment/SPEVCO Resolution <u>Performance Rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = <139 Not fully effective = 139-154 Fully effective= 155 -162 Significant performance= > 162-186 Outstanding performance= >186	New	New	155	45	103	130	155	8%	Director: Strategic Assets
23	8	1.6: A capable and collaborative City Government	Initiate and obtain MATR approvals for two (2) high impact transactions	High Impact Transaction is defined as either a High Value Transaction in terms of MATR (Municipal Asset Transfer Regulations) (Value greater than R50mil) or alternatively, a High Socio-Economic Impact transaction as approved by the CLP. The KPA is achieved on the submission to Delegated authority of the first and/or second and/or third phase of transactions, which is the Municipal Asset Transfer Regulations, i.e. approved Authority to Advertise (ATA) and/or In-principle approval and/or Final transfer approval. The indicator forms a large part of the key strategic deliverables of the Economic Growth Directorate to improve Cape Town's economic climate by extracting substantial socio-economic value from its immovable property asset portfolio and enabling sustained economic growth. The following properties are currently prioritised under this indicator: •In-Principle : Good Hope Centre •Final Approval: Good Hope Centre •ATA Approval: Stikland Triangle •In-Principle Approval: Three Anchor Bay •In-Principle Approval Athlone Stadium •Final Approval: Athlone Stadium •Final Approval: Portion 9 of Paarl Farms •Final Approval: Velodrome <u>Performance Rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = 0 approvals submitted or obtained for the listed transactions Not fully effective = Submission or approval of 1 milestone from the list of identified properties Fully effective = 2 approvals submitted or obtained Significant performance = 3 approvals submitted or obtained Outstanding performance = 4 or more approvals submitted or obtained	New	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	2	A/T	A/T	A/T	2	8%	Director: Property Development
DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS												10%	

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard Executive Director: Ruby Gelderbloem 1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026													
	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sept-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
24	1	1. Increased Jobs and Investment in the Cape Town economy	Developing action plan to improve Ease of Doing Business (EoDB) index implementation	- Average time taken to finalise informal trading permits Indicator: The indicator measures the average amount of time (taken in days) to finalise informal trading permits within a municipality, from the point of complete application to the point of adjudication. An informal trading permit is a permission provided by the municipality to small-scale businesses with limited trading intentions to operate under certain conditions, usually in terms of a by-law, policy or plan governing informal trading in the municipality. - Transferring of Public Land Indicator: This indicator evaluates the procedures and efficiency involved in transferring ownership or rights to use public land from the government to private entities or individuals. It considers the time taken to complete the transfer, the clarity and complexity of the regulatory framework, associated costs, and the overall transparency of the process. Improving this indicator aims to streamline land transactions, promote investment, and ensure efficient use of public land for economic and social development. Q1 – Not Applicable Q2 – Progress on interventions toward continuous improvements submitted to City Manager Q3 – Not Applicable Q4 – Close-out report on interventions toward continuous improvements submitted to City Manager Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = Major milestones are missed Not fully effective = Not all milestones achieved Fully effective: All milestones achieved Significantly performance = all milestones achieved and output KPIs implemented Outstanding performance = all milestone achieved and improvement in outcome indicator	Close-out report on full implementation of EoDB index reported and presented to City Manager and EMT on 27 May 2024 and improvement in outcome indicators	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	Interim progress on interventions toward continuous improvement submitted to City Manager <i>(Final figures to be submitted by end August)</i>	Annual Target	Annual Target	Annual Target	Interim progress on interventions toward continuous improvement submitted to City Manager <i>(Final figures to be submitted by end August)</i>	5%	Executive Director

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard
Executive Director: Ruby Gelderbloem
1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026

	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	Baseline 2023/2024	Baseline 2024/2025	Annual Target 2025/2026	Q1 Target 30-Sept-25	Q2 Target 31-Dec-25	Q3 Target 31-Mar-26	Q4 Target 30-Jun-26	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
25	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Council approved Bellville Trading Plan implemented	A trading plan demarcates trading areas (locations) within a particular ward or precinct. This KPI measures the implementation of the Council approved Bellville Trading Plan of 15 locations for public trading. Qualifying traders are allocated bays in terms of the permitting system. This allocation will be advertised in 2 phases. This follows day to day management which may involve a number of directorates providing support services, such as cleansing and security. As part of the allocation of bays certain traders will also have to be moved to allow for qualifying traders to be awarded a trading bay. <u>Performance Rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = No active management of trading bays in place, or severe breakdowns in operational support. Not fully effective = Basic management of trading bays in place, but with ongoing issues such as inconsistent cleansing, poor enforcement, or unaddressed trader concerns. Fully effective = Consistent management of all trading bays in line with the approved trading plan, including coordination with key directorates (e.g. cleansing, law enforcement, permitting). Significant performance = Fully effective management plus additional efforts demonstrated, such as proactive issue resolution across multiple sites, regular monitoring, or visible improvement in trader compliance and site cleanliness. Outstanding performance = All of the above plus implementation of a formal, sustainable management mechanism — e.g., inter-departmental coordination framework, scheduled site audits, and/or documented stakeholder feedback showing effective day-to-day operation	New	New	Management of all trading bays	Advertising of trading bays – Phase 1	Advertising of trading bays – Phase 2 and Allocation of Bays – Phase 1	Allocation of trading bays Phase 2 and commence Management Plan for Phase 1	Management of all trading bays	3%	Executive Director
26	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government Unlawful Land Occupation (ULO)	Effective response to line department requests to determine accountability for City of Cape Town Immovable Property Assets (%)	Investigation and determination of departmental accountability for City of Cape Town Immovable Property Assets within 72 hours of notification. Maximum 5 properties per request within 72hours. Investigations involving more than 5 properties will be scoped and feedback of the time and date for the completion of the investigation will be provided within 36 hours. <u>Performance rating</u> Unacceptable performance = ≤65% achievement Not fully effective = 65% - 74% achievement Fully effective = 75% - 80% achievement Significant performance = 80% - 95% achievement Outstanding performance = > 95% achievement	100%	Individual ED actual as at 30 June 2025	75%	75%	75%	75%	75%	2%	Director: Property Transactions

Executive Director: Economic Growth
Ruby Gelderbloem

Signature: 

Digitally signed by Ruby Gelderbloem
Date: 2025.07.15 14:30:51 +02'00'

City Manager:
Lungelo Mbandazayo

Signature: 

Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo
Date: 2025.07.31 09:34:38 +02'00'