

2025/2026 Executive Director Performance Scorecard Executive Director: Ernest Sass 1 July 2025 - 30 June 2026													
					Baseline	Baseline	Annual Target	Q1 Target	Q2 Target	Q3 Target	Q4 Target	WEIGHTING	Contact Department
	No.	Objective	Key Performance Indicator	Definition	2023/2024	2024/2025	2025/2026	30-Sep-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%	
	DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS											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 PPM 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	1%	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	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% 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%	1.35%	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% -21%, for the number of deviations (year-on-year), or default criteria rating (refer exception protocol) Significant performance = a reduction > 21% - < 99.9%, for the number of deviations, year-on-year. Outstanding performance = a reduction of 100% for the number of deviations, year-on-year or no deviations for the current year.	2	20%	20%	AT	AT	AT	20%	2%	Department: SCM Source document: SCM deviations schedule Formula: Number of SCM deviations reduced by the target percentage % year on year for the department/ directorate. Contact person: Gayle Postings Office of the City Manager: Specialist Advisor 021 400 1268

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 (%) (CORPORATE SERVICES)	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%	93.20%	95%	95%	11%	73%	95%	95%	1%	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%	102%	85%	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	16.A Community satisfaction city-wide survey (average)	Measures the average score on the Community satisfaction City-wide survey. A statistically valid, scientifically defensible score from the annual survey of residents' perceptions of the overall performance of the City. The aim of the indicator is to improve the community's perception of the City. The measure is given against a non-symmetrical Likert scale, where 1 is poor, 2 is fair, 3 is good, 4 is very good, and 5 is excellent. The objective is to improve the current customer satisfaction average score per Directorate. Refer to the 'Survey - Levels & Baselines' tab. 1. A score of 2.9 and below based on the 2023/2024 survey outcome: <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.11 Not fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) – decrease of 0.1 Fully effective = increase of 0.1 - 0.2 Significantly performance = increase of 0.21 - 0.3 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.31 2. A score of 3 and above based on the 2023/2024 survey outcome: <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable performance = decrease of ≥ 0.21 Not fully effective = decrease of 0.1 – 0.2 Fully effective = 0.0 (no movement) - increase of 0.1 Significant performance = increase of 0.11 - 0.2 Outstanding performance = increase of ≥ 0.21	3	3.1	3.1	AT	AT	AT	3.1	2%	Department: Organisational Effectiveness and Innovation Source document: Community Satisfaction survey score Contact person: Bridgette Morris 021 400 3812

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.	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%	New	New	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	1%	Department: Supply Chain Management Source document: Demand Plan Overview Contact person: Bekumuzi Vumase and Razaan Arendse Manager Demand Management
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	0	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%	95%	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%	93.90%	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 to100%. 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%	91.80%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	≤ 100%	2%	Directorate Finance Manager	

SERVICE DELIVERY / GOOD GOVERNANCE													40%	
17	1	A capable and collaborative City government	Fleet maintained according to Maintenance Plan (%)	Definition : This indicator will measure the percentage of fleet maintained according to the maintainance plan for the Financial Year. It is a comparison of the number of fleet vehicles scheduled/planned for maintenance versus the number of fleet vehicles actually maintained for a specified period. Formula: A/B*100 A=Number of vehicles maintained B=Number of vehicles planned to be maintained Performance Rating: Unacceptable Performance = <90% Not fully effective = 90% - 94% Fully Effective = 95% - 96% Significant Performance =97% - 98% Outstanding Performance = 99% - 100%	New	New	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	5%	Director: Fleet Management	
18	2	A Capable and Collaborative City Government	Implementation of visible improvement initiatives (number)	DEFINITION: This indicator measures the implementation of visible improvement initiatives in alignment with the Departments strategic VIP business projects, Projects:1. Staff and customer centric space- Cape Town Civic Centre 2. Mechanical works of the Bellville conferencing and banqueting hall 3. Customer refresh at Plumstead Municipal Building, Fezeka Municipal Building & Durbanville Municipal Building. Implementation of visible improvement initiatives at 17 City facilities. Initiative Definition: Blitz project: Improve the aesthetics and functionality of the public facing facilities which include initiatives such as cleaning and greening painting, poster management, gutter cleaning, tiling, bird proofing, window cleaning et al. Q1- 2 1. IFM Area 1: Table view Library 2. IFM Area 1: Atlantis Depot Q2- 8 3. IFM Area 2: Macassar Municipal offices 4. IFM Area 1: Pienaar road depot 5. IFM Area 4: Philippi depot 6. IFM Area 3: Bonteheuwel Sub council 7. IFM Area 2: Lwandle Municipal 8. IFM Area 3: Leonsdale Clinic Q3-14 9. IFM Area 3: Bonteheuwel Municipal building 10. IFM Area 4: Fezeka Municipal building 11. IFM Area 1: Atlantis Fire Dept 12. IFM Area 2: Gordons bay Traffic 13. IFM Area 2: Site B Municipal building 14. IFM Area 3: Valhalla Park Clinic Q4-17 15. IFM Area 4: Lenteguer Municipal & 16. IFM Area 4: Hillstar Municipal building Complex 17. Transport Management Centre (TMC) Performance rating: Unacceptable Performance = N/A Not Fully Effective = <17 Fully Effective = 17 - 19 Significant Performance = 20 - 22 Outstanding Performance = 23 - 25	New	100%	17	2	8	14	17	5%	Department: Facilities Management Contact person: Regan Melody	

19	3	14. A Resilient City	Review of HR policy framework (%)	DEFINITION: This indicator will measure the review and submission for approval of HR Policies, S&Ps and Frameworks. This is a continuation of the work that commenced in the 2023\2024 financial year. Remaining 20% of the HR Policy Review to be completed. This includes the remaining Tranches and Change Management. Remaining 7 Policy instruments: Conditions of Employment for 5/8 employees Local Conditons of Service Cellular Telephone S&P Provision of meals for emergency work after normal working hours Standby Allowance S&PAd hoc Transport Allowance S&P Essential User Allowance S&P Q1 - 25% equivalent to 10% of the remaining 20% of the project that started in 2023/2024(90% of the entire project) Q2 - 50% of the remaining 20% of the remaining 20% of the projectthat started in 2023/2024(100% of the entire project) Q3 - 75% - Commencement of change management/ implementation Q4 - 100% Completion Close out report In terms of approvals, kindly note the following: 1. S&P= System and Procedure which requires City Manager approval 2. Policy- Council approval 3. Framework- Council approval 4. Guidelines- City Manager approval Performance Rating: Unacceptable Performance = N/A Not fully effective = < 100% Fully Effective = 100% Significant Performance = 110%. Operationalisation of all HR approved policy instruments. Outstanding Performance = 120%. Incorporation of all HR approved policy instruments into PEXA.	New	100%	100%	25%	50%	75%	100%	5%	Department: Human resources Management Contact person: Bevan van schoor
20	4	16 A capable and collaborative City government	GG 2.31 Percentage of official complaints responded to through the municipal complaint management system	DEFINITION: The number of official complaints responded to as per the municipality defined norms and standards, as a percentage of the number of official complaints received. A complaint is any formal grievance, concern or issue registered with municipality as per its established systems and protocols. An official complaint, in this instance, should be formally logged within the Municipal Complaints Management System. "Norms and standards" refer to a municipality's agreed ability to respond promptly and appropriately to the complaints from the public, in line with protocols determined by the municipality, whether or not this is consistent with any external guidance or benchmarking. Note that resolution refers to an official municipal response to the complaint and does not provide for a determination of "satisfaction" with the municipal response on the part of the public. Performance Rating: Unacceptable = < 79% Not fully effective = 79 - 89.99% Fully effective = 90%-93% Significant performance = between range of 93.1 - 96%. Outstanding performance = > 96% * ED Corporate Services will be measured on his Directorate Performance. ** Citywide will include all other Directorates Performance	97.55%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	90.00%	5%	Department: Citizen Interface Contact person: Pearl Nolutando Nongqongqo
21	5	4 Well-managed and modernised infrastructure to support inclusive economic growth	CRM Satisfaction Survey:	DEFINITION: Customer Relations Management Satisfaction Survey for Corporate Contact Centre (CCC) (Likert scale 1 to 5) Post-Call Surveys: is a customer feedback-collection mechanism where a customer is transferred to an interactive voice response (IVR) telephony system after they speak with a contact centre agent, so that they can answer questions to inform the organisation about their customer experience with the City's contact centre as well as with the City's services. Performance Rating: Unacceptable = < 3.5 Not fully effective = 3.6 - 4.3 Fully effective = 4.5 - 4.6 Significantly above expectation = 4.7 - 4.8 Outstanding performance = ≥4.9	4.78	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	5%	Department: Citizen Interface Contact person: Pearl Nolutando Nongqongqo

22	6	16.3 Evidence Based Decision Making Programme	Implement and action the Local Government elections Project Plan in preparation for the 2026 Local Government Elections (%)	DEFINITION: This indicator will measure the percentage implementation and actioning of the Elections Project Plan in preparation for the 2026 Local Government Elections 25% - Identifying milestones 50% - Identifying relevant role players and target action dates 75% - Schedule meetings with relevant role players to discuss action plans 100% - Completed plan Performance rating: Unacceptable Performance = N/A Not Fully Effective = <100% Fully Effective = 100% Significant Performance = N/A Outstanding Performance = N/A	NEW	NEW	100%	25%	50%	75%	100%	5%	Department: Executive and Councillor Support Operations Contact person: Vuyokazi Ngaobozi
23	7	16.2 Modernised and adaptive City Government Programme	Availability of Broadband Corporate Network (%)	DEFINITION: Measures the availability of the Broadband Corporate Network. Defined as the availability of Customer Premises Equipment on the network (i.e. visibility on network monitoring system at Telecommunications Operations Centre, or TOC). Performance rating: Unacceptable Performance = N/A Not Fully Effective = 0-98% Fully Effective = 99.1% - 99.5% Significant Performance = 99.6% - 99.9 Outstanding Performance = >99.9%	99.78%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	5%	Department: Information Systems & Technology Contact person: Andre Stelzner
24	8	16.2 Modernised and adaptive City Government Programme	Implementation of phase 1 of the Third-party assurance framework (%)	DEFINITION: The implementation of phase 1 of a Third-party assurance framework to provide second level assurance on Digital Applications sourced by line directorates from 3PA vendors Quarterly outputs: Q1 - 20%: Third Party Assurance Framework Implementation Plan workshopped with all line directorates Q2 - 50%: Development of governance checklists for Third Party Assurance Framework and appointment of manager 3PA Q3 - 75%: Conducting training with line departments Q4 - 100%: Develop dashboard to track implementation of Third Party Assurance implementation Performance rating: Unacceptable Performance = N/A Not Fully Effective =<100% Fully Effective = 100% Significant Performance = 105% (Additionally to the above, Have successfully provided assurance support on at least 15% of the OT systems for compliance) Outstanding Performance =110% (Additionally - Have successfully provided assurance support on at least 25% of the OT systems for compliance)	New	100%	100%	15%	50%	75%	100%	5%	Department: Information Systems & Technology Contact person: Andre Stelzner

DIRECTORATE SPECIFIC PROJECTS													30%	
25	1	5. Effective law enforcement to make communities safer	Implementation of the first tranche under the Corporate Security Framework (%)	This indicator will measure the progress made towards the implementation of the first tranche Corporate security framework. The purpose of the framework is to improve staff safety through the establishment of a armed escort unit. Q1 – 25% = Operationalise pilot program. Q2 – 50% = Implementation review with scheduled update to CM for noting/input Q3 – 75% = Conduct performance review , analyse data from the first year implementation of increased law enforcement Q4 - 100%= Develop a concept note and submit to PCC for review. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable Performance = N/A Not Fully Effective =<100% Fully Effective = 100% Significant Performance = 105% Conduct stakeholder surveys. Outstanding Performance = 110% Develop draft phase- out plan for contracted security services.	New	New	100%	25%	50%	75%	100%	5%	Department: Facilities Management Contact person: Regan Melody	
26	2	1. Increased Jobs and Investment in the Cape Town economy Mayoral Priority Programme	Rectification of Business Partner (BP) data errors (%)	Definition: This indicator measures the rectification of errors identified in the Business Partner (BP) data, as reported in the IS&T BP Central Validations Report, as at 30 June 2025. The scope of this initiative will focus solely on correcting the errors highlighted in this initial report and will exclude any additional errors identified during the 2025/26 financial year. By addressing these errors, the initiative aims to enhance the accuracy of business data on customer statements, ensuring that statements are delivered to BPs in a timely manner. Furthermore, this will improve the BP's ability to track and manage interactions, such as updates on call references and correspondence, thus contributing to a more seamless and efficient business experience. Ultimately, this indicator supports the City's goal of improving the ease of doing business by ensuring reliable, accurate, and timely information for BPs, enhancing overall customer satisfaction and operational efficiency. Quarterly Outputs: Q1 Target : 5% Q2 Target: 25% Q3 Target: 35% Q4 Target: 50% BP Central Validations Report reflecting 50% reduction in errors compared with baseline report as at 30 June 2025. <u>Performance rating:</u> Unacceptable Performance = N/A Not Fully Effective = <50% Fully Effective = 50% - 55% Significant Performance = 56% - 60% Outstanding Performance = >61%	New	New	50%	5%	25%	35%	50%	5%	Director Applications	
27	3	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government SMF/COVID-19	Visual assessments undertaken at City Facilities (Number)	DEFINITION: This indicator measures the number of Visual assessments undertaken at City Facilities Client Departments for 2025/2026: Supply Chain Management Economic Development & Investment A Visual Assessment is undertaken by our in-house Maintenance Planning team where they assess the condition of the building based on a visual analysis. This means that the assessment takes into account the areas that they can see – walls, floors, ceilings, sanitary fittings etc. The team assesses that the building components are functioning eg toilets, taps etc. This assessment will be used to generate maintenance plans. Q1- 20 Visual assessments Q2- 40 Visual assessments Q3- 60 Visual assessments Q4- 80 Visual assessments Performance Rating: Unacceptable Performance = <39 Not fully effective = 40 - 79 Fully Effective = 80 - 85 Significant Performance = 86 - 90 Outstanding Performance = >91	New	181	80	20	40	60	80	8%	Department: Facilities Management Contact person: Regan Melody	

28	4	2. Improved access to quality and reliable basic services Less Formal Township Establishment Act (LFTEA) areas	Mobile Office visits to all four areas of the City: Number of mobile office visits per year	DEFINITION: Mobile Offices provide access to service delivery through a walk-in centre (face to face) service. These services are provided to previously disadvantaged and remote areas, including areas of informality, to improve customer access and customer centricity. Services offered include accounts enquiries, general enquiries, complaints and service requests related to multiple City services. Mobile Offices visit all areas of the City on a rotational basis. Performance Rating: Unacceptable = < 36 Not fully effective = 37 to 47 Fully effective = 48 - 50 Significantly above expectation= 51 - 54 Outstanding performance= > 55	121	48	48	12	24	36	48	7%	Department: Citizen interface Contact person: Pearl Nolutando Nongqongqo
29	5	16. A Capable and Collaborative City Government Unlawful Land Occupation (ULO)	Landowner Engagements on the Impacts of Unlawful Land Occupation. (Number)	DEFINITION: The "Number of Landowner Engagements on the Impacts of Unlawful Land Occupation" refers to the total count of formal interactions, meetings, or sessions conducted by the City to educate and inform identified landowners (both City-owned and privately owned) about the consequences and implications of unlawful land occupation. Performance Rating: Unacceptable = < 75 Not fully effective = 76 to 99 Fully effective = 100 - 105 Significantly above expectation= 106 - 110 Outstanding performance= > 111	42	42	100	25	50	75	100	5%	Department: Citizen interface Contact person: Pearl Nolutando Nongqongqo
Executive Director Ernest Sass				  Digitally signed by Ernest Sass Date: 2025.07.24 14:59:24 +02'00'									
City Manager Lungelo Mbandazayo				  Digitally signed by Lungelo Mbandazayo Date: 2025.07.31 09:32:25 +02'00'									