

2024/2025 Executive Director Performance Scorecard template													
Executive Director: Future Planning & Resilience													
Gareth Morgan													
1 July 2024 - 30 June 2025													
File Ref.	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%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											10%	
	MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION											20%	
1	1	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Increase in CPPPM maturity level (%) (Average)	The CPPPM maturity level is based on the PPPM, Contract Management and Engineering Management (Only applicable to Engineering Directorates) maturity assessment. The maturity assessment will reflect the average maturity level of: - 1. Portfolio, Programme, Project - 2. Contract management and - 3. Engineering Management level. This will occur on an annual basis in order to assess the increase in the maturity level. 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 ≥ 0.1 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 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	2.90	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement (Target 2.8)	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement (Target 2.9)	AT	AT	AT	Actual achieved of prior year +increase 0.1 - per directorate individual achievement (Target 2.9)	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: PPM assessment Contact person: Director : CPPPM

2	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Repeatable Tenders that were Expanded/Amended multiple times (%)	Measures the percentage of Expansions and Amendments on repeatable tenders. This indicator will only measure instances where there was more than one Expansion and/or Amendment on the same tender. Expansions or Amendments are defined by the SCM section 116 (3) guide and can change at any time. Source: Contract Register and Monitoring System and Tender Tracking System. Measurement will commence only when the second Expansions and/or Amendments are released in SAP MM and only applies to repeatable tenders that are active in the current FY (i.e. commenced before or in the financial year and expires in or after the FY). Formula: Total number of repeatable tenders expanded and/ or amended multiple times ÷ Total number of repeatable tenders active in the FY. Measured cumulatively. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = ≥ 3.1% Not fully effective= 2.6% – 3% Fully effective = 2% - 2.5% Significant performance = 0.1% - 1.99% Outstanding performance = 0%	New	2%	2%	AT	AT	AT	2%	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: CMRS (Contract Register and Monitoring System) and Tender Tracking System Contact person: Manager: Contract Management
3	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduction in the number of SCM deviations (%)	The objective is to achieve a 20% reduction on SCM deviations. 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	20%	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: Specialist Advisor- OCM

4	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Reduce and maintain nominal (number and value) irregular expenditure within the Directorate (year-on-year) (average %)	The objective is to reduce past on irregular expenditure by 10% and limit irregular expenditure. The indicator will measure the average percentage reduction in the number and value of irregular expenditure i.e. contravention of legislation as defined in the MFMA irregular expenditure definition and maintain lower levels of irregular expenditure. Irregular expenditure is defined as expenditure that is in contravention of, or not in accordance with, a requirement of the Local Government: Municipal Finance Management Act 56 of 2003, the Local Government: Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000, the Remuneration of Public Office Bearers Act 20 of 1998, or the municipality's supply chain management (SCM) policy. Indicator will measure Irregular expenditure that was incurred (transaction) during the time of employment of the Executive Director (in the position as Executive Director). This also applies if an Existing ED moves to another portfolio. i.e. previous irregular expenditure wont impact the new Executive Director. NOTES: (a) Irregular expenditure will be included, if identified by other assurance provider, irrespective if it is self-disclosed or not. (b) New Executive Directors will be impacted by existing contracts that incur irregular expenditure in the term of their office. If the existing contract had irregular expenditure in the period before ED's appointment, it will not be considered for the new EDs performance. 1. New Executive Director or Executive Director taking up a post in another directorate as an Executive Director (in the year of review) Formula: Number of non-compliance incidents (irregular expenditure) for the current year, while employed as Executive Director and the amount of irregular expenditure, while employed as an Executive Director. (No baseline) This also applies if an existing ED moves to another directorate, the ED will be regarded as "New" I.e. previous irregular expenditure will not be carried over. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = where more than 2 incidents exist or the total amount is more than R2.5 million, starting from a baseline of zero. Not fully effective = N/A Fully effective = 2 or less incidents and the total amount is less than R2.5 million. Significant performance = N/A Outstanding performance = 0 incidents	50%	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: Specialist Advisor - OCM
			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% and < 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% and < 9.9%, 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.										
5	5	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	External audit (Auditor General) audit actions completed as per audit action plan (%)	This indicator measures how many actions was completed in the financial cycle within in the unique deadline set, as per the audit action plan. The Audit Action Plan sets out the total number audit actions required to address the internal control deficiencies as identified by the Auditor-General in their management report. The unique deadline is set in consultation with the relevant ED. Completed would mean that the actions as stipulated in the audit action plan has been executed by the relevant delegated authority. Should there be no actions required for a Directorate the indicator will not be 'Not Applicable' Performance rating: 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%	100%	2%	Department: Investor Relations Source document: Completed Audit Action plan Contact person: Manager: Investor Relations

				The indicator excludes all council and Mayco decisions for noting. Decisions taken by Mayco and council 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 run 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. Weighting must be reallocated where there were no council decisions for the year. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = <69% of ALL decisions Not fully effective = 69% - 79.99% of ALL decisions Fully effective = 80% - 85% of ALL decisions Significant performance =85.1% - 94.99% of ALL decisions Outstanding performance = ≥95% of ALL decisions If "Not Applicable" weighting will be "zero" and must be reallocated within the Transversal Category.	100%	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: Manager: Committee Services Weighting must be reallocated where there were no council and Mayco decisions for the year.
--	--	--	--	---	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	----	---

7	7	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.J Budget spent on implementation of Workplace Skills Plan (%)	Measures the percentage of budget spent on the Workplace Skills Plan .The Workplace Skills Plan outlines the planned education, training and development interventions for the organisation. Its purpose is to formally plan and allocate budget for appropriate training interventions that will address the needs arising out of local government's skills sector plan, the IDP, the individual departmental staffing strategies, individual employees' personal development plans and the employment equity plan. Proxy measure for NKPI per MSA Regulation 10(f). Formula: % spent on the implementation of the WSP measured against the training budget. (A/B)*100 A: Actual spend per quarter on training budget B: Planned spend on training Budget for the year Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 90% Not fully effective = 90% - 94.99% Fully effective = 95% - 96% Significant performance = 96.1% - 97.99% Outstanding performance = ≥ 98%	90%	90%	95%	10%	30%	60%	95%	2%	Source documents: WSP report per quarter Contact person: Manager: Support Services - Corporate Services
8	8	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Internal independent assurance provider's functions recommendations and action plans implemented (%)	It is the monitoring and reporting of the implementation (expressed as a percentage) of corrective actions to address internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans, issued within the directorate of the responsible Executive Director. The internal independent assurance providers included in this KPI are Internal Audit, Ombudsman, Integrated Risk Management (limited to the Corporate Risk Register), Ethics and Forensics departments. Each internal independent assurance provider as mentioned above has their own unique input to this KPI. This KPI will be "not applicable" to management when there are no recommendations, thus only those that could provide inputs will be included in the calculation. Future recommendations and action plans implemented (not recommended for implementation for the current financial year), will be taken into account for the measurement of this indicator, thereby creating an advantage for the ED. Formula: Numerator: Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans implemented (current and future implementations) Denominator: Total internal independent assurance providers' recommendations and action plans made for the current period under review (recommendations and actions plans postponed as approved by the City Manager will be excluded) Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = <75% Not fully effective = 75% - 84.99% Fully effective = 85% - 90% Significant performance = 91% - 94% Outstanding performance= ≥ 95%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	85%	1%	Department: Office of City Manager Source documents: refer to definition Contact person: Executive Manager: OCM

[illegible]

11	11	Objective 14: A Resilient City	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 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%	100%	100%	100%	100%	1%	Department: Organisational Performance Management (OPM) Source document: C88 scorecard/ Directorate SDBIP Contact person: Acting Director: OPM
----	----	-----------------------------------	--	---	-----	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	----	--

12	12	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Average of tenders in slippage at any given quarter end (%)	Measures the average of tenders for MTREF in slippage at any given quarter end. This will drive the timeous implementation of the demand plan based on the agreed timeline. Abnormalities in the timeline will then impact each step of the process, such as where a tender only allows 30 days after award to Contract Required by Date (CRD), there will probably be a contract gap or a Value At Risk (VAR – Budget at risk of not being spent) on the Capital reporting. Slippage is defined as tenders on the demand plan which are behind schedule based on the agreed timelines for each tender. Slippage in the implementation of the demand plan, is a contributor to the cause of VAR. This will include the submission of draft specifications as per the minimum timeframe before the CRD. Formula: Total count of tenders in red or amber as a percentage of the total number of tenders required for the MTREF period (average %). Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = > 15% Not fully effective = > 10% - ≤ 15% Fully effective = ≤ 10% Significant performance = ≥ 5% - ≤ 9% Outstanding performance = < 5%	New	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	1%	Department: Supply Chain Management Source document: Demand Plan Overview Contact persons: Manager Demand Management and Head: Procurement Excellence and Governance
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. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = repeatable tenders with ≥ 150 days gap Not fully effective = repeatable tenders with ≥ 90 - < 150 days gap Fully effective = repeatable tenders with ≥ 30 - < 90 days gap Significant performance = repeatable tenders with gaps < 30 days gap Outstanding performance = zero repeatable tenders with gaps	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	2%	Department: CPPPM Source document: GAP report prepared by Principal Portfolio Analyst Contact person: Principal Portfolio Analyst

		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 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%	96.30%	90%	90%	31%	54%	75%	90%	5%	Directorate Finance Manager Contact person: Manager: Finance FP&R
15	2	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government	FM1.12: Total Operating Expenditure as a percentage of Total Operating Expenditure budget	This indicator measures the extent to which operating expenditure has been spent during the financial year. Operating Expenditure (non-capital spending) is costs which the municipality incurs through its normal operations. The latest approved budget is applicable. Formula: Actual Operating Expenditure / Budgeted Operating Expenditure. The latest approved budget is applicable. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 90.% or > 100% (non-compliance) Not fully effective = ≥ 90% - ≤ 94.99% Fully effective = 95% - 96% Significant performance= ≥ 96.1% - ≤ 97% Outstanding performance= ≥ 97.1% - 100%	94.23%	95%	95%	22.78%	49.26%	77.77%	95%	3%	Directorate Finance Manager Contact person: Manager: Finance FP&R

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. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = - >100% Not fully effective = N/A Fully effective = ≤100% Significantly performance = N/A Outstanding performance = N/A	New	0%	≤ 100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	≤ 100%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager Contact person: Manager: Finance - FP&R
SERVICE DELIVERY/GOOD GOVERNANCE													60%	
17	1	4: Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support economic growth	Submission of the final draft of the City of Cape Town Long-Term Plan to the Executive Mayor (number)	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 – Finalisation of scenarios for the LTP Q2 – Draft of the LTP ready for public participation Q3 – Public participation on the LTP Q4 – 100% Submission of the final draft of the CoCT Long-Term Plan to the Executive Mayor Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = No draft to submit Not fully effective = Submission of final draft to ED Fully effective =Submission of the final draft of the CoCT Long-Term Plan to the Executive Mayor Significant Performance = Final draft of the CoCT Long-Term Plan has been authorised by FPR PC for public participation. Outstanding Performance = CoCT Long-Term Plan approved by Council	New	New	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	8%	Department : Policy & Strategy Contact person: Director: Policy & Strategy

18	2	16: A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Opinion of the Auditor- General on PDO (2023/2024) (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: Fully effective = Reliable and usefulness opinion of the Auditor General Unacceptable performance = N/A (0) Not fully effective = N/A (0) Fully effective = N/A (0) Significant performance = Reliable and usefulness opinion (Material findings resolved for PDO) Outstanding performance = Reliable and usefulness opinion (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 2022/23	Useful and reliable audit opinion for 2022/23	Submission of annual performance report for 2023/24	N/A	Useful and reliable audit opinion for 2023/24	N/A	5%	Department : OPM Contact Persons: Acting Director: OPM
19	3	16: A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Completion of the Corporate SDBIP - 2025/2026 (%)	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= signed by City Manager and Executive Mayor Significant Performance = Final designed product for publication completed. Outstanding Performance = Final Designed product published	100%	100%	100%	25%	50%	75%	100%	10%	Department : OPM Contact Persons: Acting Director: OPM
20	4	16: A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Departments with completed Strategic Workforce Plans (Number)	The number of strategic workforce plans revised in the year based on directive 4 of 2023. This indicator has changed from a rolling cumulative target as we have completed SWPs per department and efforts are now being invested in revising SWPs that have been completed two to three years ago. SWPs completed via Talent Forums. Performance Rating: Unacceptable performance = <13 Not fully effective = 13 - 14 Fully effective= 15 - 17 Significant performance = between 18 - 20 Outstanding performance = >20	69	83	15	3	6	10	15	10%	Department: OE&I Contact person: Director: OE&I

21	5	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 <u>Performance Rating:</u> 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 deisgned product published on City website	100%	100%	100%	25%	50%	75%	100%	8%	Department : Policy & Strategy Contact person: Director: Policy & Strategy
22	6	4: Well Managed and modernism 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. <u>Performance Rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = < 80% Not fully effective = 80% - 81.99% Fully effective= 82% -85% Significant performance = 85.1% - 90% Outstanding = > 90%	75%	80%	82%	20%	40%	60%	82%	8%	Department: CPPPM Contact person: Manager: Contract Management

23	7	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 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%	7%	Department: Policy & Strategy Contact persons: Director: Policy & Strategy Manager: Strategic Planning
24	8	16:A A Capable and Collaborative City Government	16.A Community satisfaction citywide survey (score 1–5)	Measures the score on the Citywide community satisfaction survey. A statistically valid, scientifically defensible score from the annual survey of residents' perceptions of the overall performance 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. 1. A score of 2.9 and below based on the 2023/2024 survey outcome: Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.11 Not fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.1 Fully effective = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 Significantly performance = increase of 0.21 - 0.3 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.31 2. A score of 3 and above based on the 2023/2024 survey outcome: Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.21 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 – 0.2 Fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) - increase of 0.1 Significant performance = increase of 0.11 - 0.2 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.21 (This indicator measures Future, Planning & Resilience: Communications outcome)	2.8	2.9	3	AT	AT	AT	3	3%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: Community Satisfaction survey score Contact person: Manager: Innovation and Customer Insights
25	9	16:A 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 = <75% Not fully effective = 75% - 75.99% Fully effective= 76% - 76.49% Significant performance = 76.5% to 77% Outstanding performance = >77%	73,63%	75%	76%	76%	76%	76%	76%	1%	Department: OE&I Contact person: Manager: Diversity & Inclusiveness

		DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS										10%	
26	1	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%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	2%	Department: CPPPM Contact person: Director: CPPPM Manager: Engineering Management
27	2	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 = < 8 Not fully effective = 8 - 9 Fully effective = 10 - 12 Significant performance = 13 - 14 Outstanding performance= > 14	8	8	10	2	5	7	10	3%	Department: Communications Contact person: Director: Communications
28	3	Informality Establishment Act (LFTEA) areas	Data Science products developed to support IDP programmes and projects (Number)	The indicator measure the number of data science products developed per annum, 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. Performance rating: Unacceptable performance = < 3 Not fully effective = 3 - 4 Fully effective: 5 - 6 Significant performance = 7 - 8 Outstanding = > 8	New	New	5	1	3	4	5	3%	Department : Policy & Strategy Contact person: Director: Policy & Strategy

29	4	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
----	---	--------------------------------	--	------	------	------	-----	-----	-----	------	----	---

Gareth Morgan

Digitally signed by Gareth Morgan

Date: 2024.07.23 14:33:36 +02'00'

Executive Director : Future Planning & Resilience

Gareth Morgan



Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo

Date: 2024.07.30 18:22:50 +02'00'

City Manager

Lungelo Mbandazayo

Date

Date