

PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT

MADE AND ENTERED INTO BY AND BETWEEN:

SENQU MUNICIPALITY

"(Hereinafter referred to as the employer)"
Represented by

Mayor
Councillor Velile Victor Stokhwe

and

Mr Thembinkosi Mawonga
Municipal Manager

"(Hereinafter referred to as the employee)"

2023/2024

PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT: PART A

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The **Employer** has entered into a contract of employment with the **Employee** in terms of section 57(1) (a) of the Local Government: Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000 ("the Systems Act"). The **Employer** and the **Employee** are hereinafter referred to as "the Parties".
- 1.2 Section 57(1) (b) (ii) of the Systems Act, read with the Contract of Employment concluded between the parties, requires the parties to conclude an annual performance agreement within one (1) month after the beginning of each financial year of the Municipality.
- 1.3 The parties wish to ensure that they are clear about the goals to be achieved and secure the commitment of **both the Employer the Employee** to a set of outcomes that will secure Local Government policy goals.
- 1.4 Section 57(1) (a) (b), (4A), (4B) ,(4C) and (5) of the Systems Act; No 32 of 2000 and subsequent amendments (the Systems Act, No Act 7 of 2011) , read with the Contract of Employment concluded between the parties, requires the parties to conclude an annual performance agreement within 60 days after the beginning of the financial year. The updated Performance review of the previous year will occur no later than July each year.
- 1.5 In its comprehensive version, this Performance Agreement is made up of five components, namely.
 - 1.5.1 PART A: The generic contextualizing agreement, which is not to be measured / assessed for performance but rather sets the legal and relationship context and stage for all other subsequent assessable sections / parts of this performance agreement.
 - 1.5.2 PART B (Approximate weighting = 80%): Employee's Core Contributory Performance Top Layer SDBIP-Based Scorecard Issues. It is the Performance Plan for which this executive employee alone leads and is accountable for achieving the specific and unique outcomes set out for his / her department across the whole municipality in the Top Layer SDBIP. Part B does not focus on outcomes that a generic for all executives performed within and for their departments. It is the first measurable Part, wherein measurable targets in all unique Strategic (from the TL SDBIP) and Functional (From Job Profiles) outcomes and objectives have been set. For brevity, these outcomes and objectives must come from all only those KPAs wherein the executive employee's work cannot be generalized with that of her / his other executive peers (in Part C below). The individual executive employee targets are based on the (i) Top Layer (Institutional) and (ii) Departmental /Directorate SDBIPs objectives and targets wherein the

- section 57 Manager plays a unique significant leadership contribution (iii) whatever strategic targets set in the Executive's Employment Contract Performance Clause.
- 1.5.3 PART C (approximate weighting = 0%): This is a crucial part of the executive employee's scorecard. It measures those aspects of work that all executives at this level are expected to perform on and achieve working as Heads for their departments. Since all executive directors do most of their work through other employees below them (subordinate / divisional managers), at this executive level, this Part C carries the greatest weighting of all the other scorecards in the Performance Agreement. It plans out and measures all departmental level strategic (in the departmental SDBIP) and generic / core managerial competence areas largely found in the functional list of the executive's COGTA Job Profile list of activities and outputs. Though most important, these core managerial competences (CMC and Critical Competence Requirements (CCRs), these are not unique. They are generic competences and performances that every section 57 executive employee must perform and be assessed on. These cover all 6 KPAs though mostly weighted heaviest on KPAs 3 (Financial Management & Viability); KPA 4: Institutional Transformation and Municipal Development) and KPA 5: Good Governance & Public These come from annually selected and prioritized Core Managerial Participation). Competences (CMCs) and Core Competency Requirements (CCRs). This selection process in this year has been streamlined to pick and use only those aspects which are already listed in the various Directors & MM's Job Profiles combined with those leadership roles implied in achieving each of the Top Layer SDBIP objectives and targets unique to the department that the executive leads.
- PART D (0%): Antecedent Input Behaviours. These are strategically winning behaviours 1.5.4 that define what an individual must do in order that they succeed in leading strategic performance in the municipality and in their department. These have been given a weighting of zero - meaning they will be understood to be applicable in future but are not measured this Financial Year as a way of not slowing down the overwhelming parts of change management. In the years when these will be measured, their weighting will be borrowed from Parts B and C above so that this Part D weighs a maximum of 15% and still retain the overall weighting of Parts B, C & D at 80. The logic of including Part D Scorecard in the Performance Agreement is that, any manager or any employee's performance is enhanced or reduced by certain behavioral habits / practices that they adopt and display, for example, how they manage time, how the make decisions, how they build, lead or work in teams to mention a few. To ensure that these winning antecedent behaviours are always at their most positive to impact performance, KPIs and Targets are set in this Part to measure the institutionally selected behaviours. The selection of the top five or so can be agreed at executive management level or assigned to the MM and her / his delegated director (like Corporate Services Director where Individual Performance resides).

- 1.5.5 PART E (20%): Competence based Individual Development or Learning Plan (CBIDP). These are commonly called Personal Development Plans (PDPs) or Individual Development Plans (IDPs). Different from previous practices in many organisations, in this Part E, these competence development areas will be planned and measured against (i) competence gaps in fulfilling current job requirements and performances (roughly 40% of this Part E) (ii) generic individual managerial or developmental competence / performance gaps (roughly 40% weighting of this Part E) (iii) life development goals (at 20% weighting at own cost but leave time allowed for examinations). Unlike in Senqu's previous practices on the PDPs, and unlike what many other municipalities where PDPs are just a "wish list", whose actual achievement does not impact the employee's performance, in this case these Competence-Based Individual Development Plans CBIDPs have set targets and will constitute 20% of the overall performance of that employee in line with the provisions of the Skills Dev Act.
- 1.5.6 This Performance Agreement cannot be interpreted as if it is replaceable by the Performance Clause in the Executive's 5 Year Contract of Employment as some do at times. This agreement is an annualized sub-set through whose cumulative performance measurement and tracking, whatever the executive would have committed to deliver in 5 years gets achieved.

2. PURPOSE OF THIS AGREEMENT

The purpose of this Agreement, as agreed by both parties, is to, inter alia.

- comply with the provisions of Section 57(1)(b), (4A),(4B) and (5) of the Act as well as the employment contract entered into between the parties;
- 2.2 specify objectives and targets defined and agreed with the employee and to communicate to the employer's expectations of the employee's performance and accountabilities in alignment with the Integrated Development Plan, Service Delivery and Budget Implementation Plan (SDBIP) and the Budget of the Municipality.
- 2.3 specify accountabilities as set out in a performance plan, which forms an annexure to the performance agreement.
- 2.4 monitor and measure performance against set targeted outputs.
- 2.5 use the performance agreement as the basis for assessing whether the employee has met the performance expectations applicable to his or her job.

- 2.6 in the event of outstanding performance, to appropriately reward the employee; and
- 2.7 give effect to the employer's commitment to a performance-orientated relationship with its employee in attaining equitable and improved service delivery.

3 COMMENCEMENT AND DURATION

- 3.1 Notwithstanding the date of signature hereto, this Agreement will commence on the 1st July 2023 and will remain in force until 30th June 2024. Thereafter, a new Performance Agreement, made up of the Performance Plan (the four parts B, C, & D Scorecards) and Personal Development Plan (CBIDP) shall be concluded between the parties for the next financial year or any portion thereof along the lines explained above.
- 3.2 The parties will review all the provisions of this Performance Agreement against its own efficaciousness as well as against existing and / or new local government policy changes in June of each year as part of the Performance Management System Annual Review. The parties will conclude a new Performance Agreement and Performance Plan that replaces this Agreement at least once a year by not later than 31st July of each successive financial year.
- 3.3 This Agreement will terminate on the termination of the **Employee**'s contract of employment for any reason.
- 3.4 The content of this Agreement may be revised at any time during the above-mentioned period to redetermine the applicability of the matters agreed upon.
- 3.5 If at any time during the validity of this Agreement, the work environment alters (whether as a result of Government or Council decisions or otherwise) to the extent that the contents of this Agreement are no longer appropriate, the contents shall immediately be revised.
- 3.6 All revisions and amendments of this Agreement must be **immediately** noted and **immediately** counter-signed by the two agreeing parties, namely, the Employer and the Employee.

- 4 PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES, KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (KPIs), BASELINES AND TARGETS
 - 4.1 Mutually aligned performance objectives, related KPIs, their KPI related baselines and targets form the basis and value chain of any strategic performance management system of any organisation like the municipality.
 - 4.2 They are kept in proper alignment through a Performance Plan as described below.
 - 4.3 The full Performance Plan or Scorecard (Parts B, C, D & E) sets out-
 - 4.1.1 the performance objectives and targets that must be met by the Employee; and
 - 4.1.2 the time frames within which those performance objectives and targets must be met.
 - 4.4 The performance objectives and targets reflected in (Parts B, C and D) as well as the Part E: (Competence Based Individual Development Plan (CBIDP) are set by the Employer in consultative agreement (hence the term Performance Agreement) with the Employee and are all based on or clearly aligned to the approved Integrated Development Plan, Top Layer Service Delivery and Budget Implementation Plan (TL SDBIP) and the Budget of the Employer and shall include key strategic and functional objectives; key performance indicators; target dates, weightings to reflect urgency and prioritisation, resource requirements, Means of Evidence Verification (MOVs).
 - 4.2.1 The key objectives describe the main intended achievements that need to be accomplished as derived from the Institutional (Top Layer) and Departmental SDBIPs wherein the Director makes their contribution in the Municipality.
 - 4.2.2 The **key performance indicators** provide the details of the evidence that must be provided to show that a key objective has been achieved. **Key** here means that there are many indicators from where one can chose, so the choice must prioritise only the few that will move forward the strategic objectives the most.
 - 4.2.3 The **baselines** are very important and must be decided consistent with language and units implied in the performance indicator when measurement of the indicator starts at the beginning of the year.

- 4.2.4 The **targets** describe the quantity or quality of the performance achieved in that objective and key performance indicator. In most cases, because the timeframe for achieving such a target is understood to be quarterly, semi-annually or annually, timeframes are not mentioned beyond these terms or columns.
- 4.2.5 The **weightings in** % show the importance of the key performance indicators and their targets relative to each other. They are crucial in computing the weighted average ratings at the end of period (quarterly, semi-annually, or annually). It is prudent to always work with an internal total weighting of 100% for each Scorecard (be it Part B, C, D or E).
- 4.5 The **Employee**'s performance will, always, be measured in terms of contributions to the goals and strategies set out in the **Employer**'s Integrated Development Plan and other sub-ordinate plans and projects that support the achievement of this IDP.

5 THE MUNICIPALITY'S PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

- 5.2 The Employee accepts that the purpose of the performance management system is to provide a comprehensive system with specific performance standards and targets to assist the Employer, Management and Municipal staff to perform to reach the standards required for each local government KPA.
- 5.3 The Employer will consult and support the Employee about all aspects required to achieve the specific performance standards that will be included in the performance management system as applicable to the Employee.
- The Employee undertakes to actively focus towards the promotion and implementation of all the KPAs, objectives and KPIs (including special projects relevant to the employee's responsibilities) within the Local Government framework.
- 5.5 The criteria upon which the performance of the Employee shall be assessed shall consist of two components, both of which shall be contained in the Performance Agreement.

- 5.5.1 The Employee must be assessed against both components, with a weighting of 80:20 allocated to the Key Performance Areas, Objectives and Targets set in PARTS B, C, & D (when Part D is being measured) and the Competence Based Individual Development Plans (CBIDP in lieu of the usual PDP) based on prioritized Learning & Development Requirements (CCRs) respectively.
- 5.5.2 Each area of assessment (as per the four Parts described above) will be weighted and will contribute a specific part to the total score accordingly.
- 5.5.3 KPAs covering the main areas of work (PARTS B, C & D) will account for 80% and selected Developmental CRs (in the PART E CBIDP) will account for 20% of the final assessment.
- 5.5.4 The total score must be determined using the rating calculator which will always be appropriately calibrated to accommodate all the three or four measurable scorecards and the weighting given to each KPI and target within each KPA as found in the four measurable scorecards, namely, Parts B, C, D and E. (This year Part D has been left out for introduction next year).
- 5.6 The Employee's assessment will be based on his / her performance in terms of the outputs / outcomes (measured through the performance indicators and their related targets) identified as per attached Performance Plan (PARTS B, C & D), which are collectively and distributively linked to all the 6 KPA's, and will constitute 80% of the overall assessment result as per the weightings agreed to between the Employer and Employee. The weightings are set based, firstly, on this director's key job profiles which specify key activities / roles assigned to the incumbent as the director (HOD) of the department in their pursuit of each their own core KPAs, notwithstanding that this director, like all others must play supportive roles in the work done in other KPAs (signified by varying weighting each year).
- 5.7 The weightings shown below, while changeable to align with both the prevailing strategic and functional thrusts that this director must pursue, they must align with the average weighting per KPA assigned to each of the 80% Scorecards (Parts B and C combined). The Table below shows the weightings agreed for this current year for this director.

Key Performance Areas (KPA's)	Weighting
Basic Service Delivery	21%
Municipal Institutional Development and Transformation	18%
Local Economic Development (LED)	7%

1 1 . 1

Key Performance Areas (KPA's)	Weighting
Municipal Financial Viability and Management	14%
Good Governance and Public Participation	36%
Spatial Planning and Environmental Development	4%
Total	100%

- In the case of managers / directors directly accountable to the Municipal Manager, the weighting of the key performance areas related to the strategic and functional area of the relevant Manager, will always be subject to negotiation between the Municipal Manager and the relevant manager / director. These agreed weightings must be translated to the top of each KPA in the actual Plan templates (PARTS B, C & D).
- The developmental Competency Requirements (CR) (learning requirements in the CBIDP) will make up part of the other 20% of the Employee's assessment score. CRs that are deemed to be most critical for the Employee's specific job should be selected (√) from the list below as agreed to between the Employer and Employee. Three of the CRs are compulsory for Municipal Managers. These Leading CRs make PART C − Generic / Core Managerial Competences (which are common to every Director / Senior Manager as agreed. A selection of Optional Core Competencies is selected each year and will form part of the Antecedent Input Behaviours (as explained earlier).
- In this year's Performance Agreement, all of the critical and desired competency requirements have mostly been taken care of through Part C built largely on the directors' Job Profiles, which, coming from COGTA have already selected which of the CRs are important. So the table below is only a quide not a prescription for the KPIs and targets set out in Part C.

LEADING COMPETENCIES	√	WEIGHT
Strategic Direction and Leadership	1	10%
People Management	7	10%
Program and Project Management	1	10%
Financial Management	1	10%
Change Leadership	1	10%
Governance Leadership	1	10%
CORE COMPETENCIES		
Moral Competence	1	6%

CORE COMPETENCY REQUIREMENTS (CCRs) FOR EMPLOYEES – Same Weighting for executives and managers at the same level!								
LEADING COMPETENCIES	V	WEIGHT						
Planning and Organising	1	6%						
Analysis and Innovation	1	8%						
Knowledge and Information Management	1	6%						
Communication	1	8%						
Results and Quality Focus	1	6%						
Total percentage	-	100%						

6. EVALUATING PERFORMANCE

- 6.1 The Performance Plan Scorecards (Parts B, C and D) to this Agreement each set out -
 - 6.1.1 the standards and procedures for evaluating the Employee's performance; and
 - 6.1.2 the intervals for the evaluation of the Employee's performance.
- 6.2 Despite the establishment of agreed intervals for evaluation, the Employer may in addition, review the Employee's performance at any stage while the contract of employment remains in force, subject to sufficient notice and reasons for justifying the variation being given to the employee.
- 6.3 Personal growth and development needs identified during any performance review discussion must be documented in a Competence-Based Individual Development Personal Development Plan as well as the actions agreed to and implementation must take place within set time frames.
- 6.4 The Employee's performance will be measured in terms of contributions to the goals and strategies set out in the Employer's IDP and subordinate TL SDBIP and Departmental SDBIP and operational plans.
- 6.5 The annual performance appraisal will involve:
 - 6.5.1 Assessment of the achievement of results as outlined in the performance plan:
 - (a) Each KPA should be assessed according to the extent to which the specified standards or performance targets set for each key performance indicator (KPI) have been met and with due regard to ad hoc tasks that had to be performed under the KPA.

- (b) An indicative rating on the five-point scale should be provided for each target first and then aggregated for each KPA.
- (c) The applicable assessment rating calculator (refer to paragraph 6.5.3 below) must then be used to add the scores and calculate a final weighted average rating for each KPA score.

6.5.2 Assessment of the Competency Requirements

- (a) Each Competency Requirement should be assessed according to the extent to which the specified standards (based on the standard being treated as a KPI and calibrated targets set, agreed and subsequently met).
- (b) An indicative rating on the five-point scale should be provided for each selected CR based on set KPIs and related targets.
- (c) This rating should be multiplied by the weighting given to each selected CR during the contracting process, to provide a score.
- (d) The applicable assessment rating calculator (refer to paragraph 6.5.1) must then be used to add the scores and calculate a final CR score.

6.5.3 Overall rating

An overall rating is calculated by using the applicable assessment-rating calculator. Such overall rating represents the outcome of the performance appraisal.

- The calibration of all set targets in each section / PART of the Performance agreement as well as the subsequent assessment of the performance attained by the Employee for each target will be based on the following rating scale for KPA's and the selected Competence Requirements (CRs) as reflected Part C taking from the Directors' Job Profiles which in turn have drawn them from the following CRs.
- 6.7 Below is the local government municipal regulations rating scale that each municipality has adopted.

Lovel	Torminology	Description	Ra	ting			
Level	Terminology	Description	1	2	3	4	5
5	Outstanding performance	Performance far exceeds the standard expected of an employee at this level. The appraisal indicates that the Employee has achieved above fully effective results against all performance criteria and indicators as specified in the PA and Performance plan and maintained this in all areas of responsibility throughout the year.					
4	Performance significantly above expectations	Performance is significantly higher than the standard expected in the job. The appraisal indicates that the Employee has achieved above fully effective results against more than half of the performance criteria and indicators and fully achieved all others throughout the year.					
3	Fully effective	Performance fully meets the standards expected in all areas of the job. The appraisal indicates that the Employee has fully achieved effective results against all significant performance criteria and indicators as specified in the PA and Performance Plan.					
2	Not fully effective	Performance is below the standard required for the job in key areas. Performance meets some of the standards expected for the job. The review/assessment indicates that the employee has achieved below fully effective results against more than half the key performance criteria and indicators as specified in the PA and Performance Plan.					

Level	Terminology	Description	Ra	ting	j		
Level	reminology	Description	1	2	3	4	5
		Performance does not meet the standard expected		•			
·		for the job. The review/assessment indicates that					
		the employee has achieved below fully effective					
		results against almost all of the performance criteria					
	Unacceptable	and indicators as specified in the PA and					
1	performance	Performance Plan. The employee has failed to					
		demonstrate the commitment or ability to bring					
		performance up to the level expected in the job					
		despite management efforts to encourage					
		improvement.					

- 6.7 For purposes of evaluating the annual performance of the Municipal Manager, an evaluation panel constituted of the following persons must be established moderate the ratings first agreed between the Employee i.e. the MM and their supervisor (Executive Mayor)-
 - 6.7.1 Executive Mayor or Mayor.
 - 6.7.2 Chairperson of the performance audit Committee or the Audit Committee in the absence of a performance audit committee.
 - 6.7.3 Member of the Mayoral or Executive Committee or in respect of a plenary type of Municipality, another member of Council.
 - 6.7.4 Mayor and/or Municipal Manager from another Municipality; and
 - 6.7.5 Member of a Ward Committee as nominated by the Executive Mayor or Mayor.
- 6.8 For purposes of evaluating the annual performance of Managers directly accountable to the Municipal Managers, an evaluation panel constituted of the following persons must be established;
 - 6.8.1 The Municipal Manager.
 - 6.8.2 Chairperson of the performance Audit Committee or the Audit Committee in the absence of a performance Audit Committee.
 - 6.8.3 Member of the Mayoral or Executive Committee or in respect of a plenary type of Municipality, another member of Council; and
 - 6.8.4 another Municipal Manager from another Municipality.
- 6.9 The Manager responsible for Human Resources of the Municipality must provide secretariat services to the evaluation panels referred to in sub-regulations (6.7) and (6.8).

7. SCHEDULE FOR PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

- 7.1 Before the on-set of the Performance Management Cycle, all targets in PARTS B, C, and D must be calibrated against the rating scale of 1 5 in order to minimize common subjectivity that occurs when assessments are done during appraisal time.
- 7.2 The performance of each **Employee** in relation to his / her performance agreement shall be reviewed on the following dates with the understanding that reviews in the first and third quarter may be verbal if performance is satisfactory:

- 7.2 During these review sessions, targets are scored or rated, the targets may also be renegotiated and adjusted in re-alignment to the available budgets and other prevailing environmental conditions as necessary. The Employer shall keep a record of the mid-year review and annual assessment meetings and scores for cumulative averaging at the end of each year as provided by the policy.
- 7.3 Performance feedback shall be based on the Employer's assessment of the Employee's performance done in mutual agreement with the employee.
- 7.4 The Employer will be entitled to review and make reasonable changes to the provisions of all PARTS "B, C & D & E" from time to time for operational reasons. The Employee will be fully consulted before any such change is made.
- 7.5 The Employer may amend the provisions of PARTS B, C, and D & E whenever the performance management system is adopted, implemented and / or amended as the case may be. In that case the Employee will be fully consulted and ideally be in agreement before any such change is made. Both parties will sign-off any amendments made as such agreements are legally binding on both parties.

8. DEVELOPMENTAL REQUIREMENTS

The Competence-Based Individual Development Plan (CBIDP) in lieu of the normal Personal Development Plan (PDP) for addressing developmental gaps is attached as Part E as annexed.

9. OBLIGATIONS OF THE EMPLOYER

- 9.1 The Employer shall -
 - 9.1.1 create an enabling environment to facilitate effective performance by the employee.
 - 9.1.2 provide access to skills development and capacity building opportunities.
 - 9.1.3 work collaboratively with the Employee to solve problems and generate solutions to common problems that may impact on the performance of the Employee.
 - 9.1.4 on the request of the Employee delegate such powers reasonably required by the Employee to enable him / her to meet the performance objectives and targets established in terms of this Agreement; and
 - 9.1.5 make available to the Employee such resources as the Employee may reasonably require from time to time to assist him / her to meet the performance objectives and targets established in terms of this Agreement.

10. CONSULTATION

- 10.1 The Employer agrees to consult the Employee timeously where the exercising of the Employer and / or Employee's delegated powers will have amongst others, a direct effect on the performance of any of the Employee's key functions, in particular;
 - 10.1.1 at the initial agreement of this document called the Performance Agreement (Parts A, B, C, D and E), it is envisaged that consultative discussions will be held and that the final signed off agreement will be signed for each part to signify that there was discussion and consensus for each part of this agreement. It is envisaged that the employee will prepare and present to the Employer a draft Performance Agreement (in all its agreed Parts showing calibrated targets for each scorecard) for discussion at a timely agreed date and time. Once agreed, dated and signed by both parties, the Performance Agreement is deemed to be legally binding to both parties, such that no party shall vary any part of it without consultation and agreement with the other Party.
 - 10.1.2 at every performance appraisal / review session (quarterly in line with the municipal performance regulations, unless agreed otherwise within the municipality's Performance Management policy),

the Employee shall present their own self rating scores and reasons for discussion and comparing notes with the Employer (who will also have already scored the employee independently prior to the meeting). In this meeting notes are being compared, agreements on performance levels to be maintained, or improved agreed with clear additional support for the employee being agreed. Such support will include necessary coaching and mentoring, training and development arrangement. It is at these formal review / appraisal sessions that any targets may be adjusted, in writing and all changes co-signed against this initial agreement by both parties indicating reasons for such a change.

- 10.1.3 continuously commit the Employee to implement or to give effect to a decision made by the Employer that affect and are affected by this agreement;
- 10.1.4 continuously commit the Employer to render all necessary support (resources, emotional, intellectual and physical) as may be reasonably needed by the employee to optimally perform what has been agreed in this Performance Agreement; and
- 10.1.5 that has a substantial financial effect on the Employer.
- 10.2 The Employer agrees to inform the Employee of any outcome of any decisions taken outside the consultation with the employee, with regards to the implementation of this Performance Agreement pursuant to the exercise of powers contemplated in 10.1 above as soon as is practicable, as part of the Employer's coaching roles in order to enable the Employee to take any necessary action without delay. It is envisaged that such decisions will be rare and mostly coming from outside the municipal administration sphere like council, COGTA, National Treasury, SALGA etc.

11. MANAGEMENT OF EVALUATION OUTCOMES

- 11.1 The final evaluation of the Employee's performance will be conclusively pronounced by the selected panel as envisaged in section 27 (d) of the Performance Regulation, also recapped in sub-sections 6.7 and 6.8 in this document above. The panel will perform a moderating role on all signed performance appraisal reports of each review session held and agreed between the Employer and Employee in the course of the year. For administrative fairness, both the Employer and the Employee should always be present or at least represented to clarify any issues that the panel may wish to have clarified.
- 11.2 Based on the final scores / ratings presented to and confirmed by the panel, a performance bonus of between 5% to 14% of the total remuneration package may be paid to the Employee (subject to the policy and the resources available to the municipality as stated in the Systems Act) in recognition

- of outstanding performance that the municipality wishes to sustain and also in line with the provisions of the municipal performance management regulations. Such reward will be constituted as follows:
- 11.2.1 a rating of 4 out of the 5 point rating scale is given a score of between 130% to 149% is awarded a performance bonus ranging from 5% to 9%; and
- 11.2.2 a rating of 5 out of the 5 point rating scale is given a score of between 150% and above is awarded a performance bonus ranging from 10% to 14%.
- N.B.: It should be noted that the rating process (against the 5 point scale) must always happen first before the use of the percentage equivalents ranging from 70% 166%+ because not all targets can be calibrated up to 166%+, so it is better to rate first on the numbers and use the % as qualifiers as shown below.
- 11.3 In the case of unacceptable performance, the Employer shall -
 - 11.3.1 On confirming performance shortfalls, immediately provide systematic remedial or developmental support to assist the Employee to improve his or her performance; and
 - 11.3.2 After appropriate performance counselling and having provided the necessary guidance and/ or support as well as reasonable time for improvement in performance, the Employer may consider steps to terminate the contract of employment of the Employee on grounds of unfitness or incapacity to carry out his or her duties.

12.0 MANAGEMENT OF EVALUATION OUTCOMES

12.1 The evaluation of the Employee's performance shall form the basis for rewarding outstanding and excellent performance only (ratings 4 and 5) or correcting unacceptable performance (Ratings 2 and below) as reflected in the table below –

Rating (out of the 5 point scale)	% Score (for those instances where performance is meaningfully stretchable beyond 100%)	Equivalent on a Usual 100% Maximum (where performance can never be meaningfully calibrated beyond 100%)	% of annual package payable as a performance Bonus
4.00 - 4.19	130.0% - 133.8%	(65.0% - 66.9%)	5%
4.20 – 4.39	134.0% – 137.8%	(67.0% - 68.9%)	6%

4.40 – 4.59	138.0% - 141.8%	(69.0% - 70.9%)	7%
4.60 – 4.79	142.0% - 145.8%	(71.0% - 72.9%)	8%
4.80 – 4.99	146.0% - 149.8%	(73.0% - 74.9%)	9%
5.00 – 5.19	150.0% - 152.8%	(75.0% - 76.4%)	10%
5.20 - 5.39	153.0% - 155.8%	(76.5% - 77.9%)	11%
5.40 - 5.59	156.0% - 158.8%	(78.0% - 79.4%)	12%
5.60 - 5.79	159.0% - 161.8%	(79.5% - 80.9%)	13%
5.80 - 5.99	162% - 164.8% +	(81.0% - 82.4%) +	14%

- 12.1.1 At the end of the 4th quarter, the Executive Authority will determine, based on the final panel ratings based on the rating / scoring table above, if the s56 / s57 Director / manager is eligible for a performance bonus as envisaged in his/her contract of employment based on the bonus allocations shown in the table above.
- 12.2 In the case of unacceptable performance, the Employer shall
 - 12.2.1 Provide systematic remedial or developmental support to assist with **Employee** to improve his or her performance; and
 - 12.2.2 After appropriate performance counseling and having provided the necessary guidance and/or support as well as reasonable time for improvement in performance, the **Employer** may consider steps to firstly shift the employee to another position within the municipality (if possible). If that does not help, then and only then will the Employer invoke procedures to terminate the contract of employment of the **Employee** on grounds of unfitness or incapacity to competently perform out his or her duties.
 - 12.2.3 Nothing contained in this Agreement in any way limits the right of the Municipality to terminate the Municipal Manager's contract of employment with or without notice for any other breach by the Municipal Manager of his obligations to the Municipality or for any other valid reason in line with fair labour practice and law.

13 MERITS AWARDS

13.1.1 Merit awards for Section 56 employees are determined by performance against targets. Once performance criteria have been established, performance targets are reviewed regularly. At the end of the financial year, actual performance is compared against the agreed performance targets to determine the magnitude of the merit increase. The merit increase is calculated as a percentage of the total annual package of the employee, as indicated in the table hereunder.

Score / 200	Merit
130 to 141 (65%-70%)	1% of total package
142 to 149 (71% - 74%)	2% of total package
150 to 161 (75%-80%)	3% of total package

162 to 165 (81 – 82%)	4% of total package
166+ (83% +)	5% of total package

13.1.2 Merit awards are subject to policy and Budgetary provisions made on an annual basis the merit bonuses may be paid as a 'once off' payment or at agreed quarterly intervals i.e. over a number of months.

14 DISPUTE RESOLUTION

- 14.1 Any disputes about the nature of the Municipal Manager's performance agreement, whether it relates to key responsibilities, priorities, methods of assessment and/ or any other matter provided for, shall be mediated by
 - 14.1.1 The MEC for Local Government in the province within thirty (30) days of receipt of a formal dispute from the Employee; or
 - 14.1.2 Any other person appointed by the MEC.
 - 14.1.3 In the case of Managers directly accountable to the Municipal Manager, a member of the Municipal Council, provided that such member was not part of the evaluation panel provided for in sub-regulation 27(4)(e) of the Municipal Performance Regulations, 2006, within thirty (30) days of receipt of a formal dispute from the employee.
- 14.2.1 In the event that the mediation process contemplated above fails, clause 20.3 of the Contract of Employment shall apply.

15. GENERAL

- 15.1 The contents of this agreement and the outcome of any review conducted in terms of Annexure A may be made available to the public by the Employer.
- 15.2 Nothing in this agreement diminishes the obligations, duties, or accountabilities of the Employee in terms of his/ her contract of employment, or the effects of existing or new regulations, circulars, policies, directives or other instruments.
- 15.3 The performance assessment results of the Municipal Manager must be submitted to the MEC responsible for Local Government in the relevant province as well as the National Minister responsible for Local Government, within fourteen (14) days after the conclusion of the assessment.

Performance Agreement – Part A: Municipal Manager, 2023/2024

16.	The signatures below signify that the Empton contained and implied in this Part A of the	oloyer and the Employee have discussed and agree on every detail e Performance Agreement.
Thus	s done and signed at	on this the day of 2023.
AS \	WITNESSES:	
1		
		EMPLOYEE (Municipal Manager)
2		
AS	WITNESSES:	
1	·	
2		MAYOR (V.V STOKHWE)

SENGU LM PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT PART B - MUNICIPAL CORE MANAGERIAL SCORECARD 2023/24

ID of incumbent:

Name of Director / Incumbent:

Title of Incumbent: Municipal Manager

MEIGHL OF PART B = 80% of ENTIRE 3 PART SCORECARDS OF THE PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT:

	EVIDENCE	AUDITED		STABRAT Y.	IRETERI			IsunnA Isubivibut	Individual KPI	I ni prittipie IV		DEVELOPMENT (WEI		VICES DELIVERY S	1
Supporting	Means of Evidence Verification	Evidence	₽ЯТФ	εятρ	<u>s</u> ятр	гятр	IsnotiibhA vaA	facilities (about the facilities)	Baseline (as at tase) and solve (as at tase)	KPI Weighting in	Performance Performance Indicators (based on outcomes, strategic actions and outputs)	Individual Strategic Actions	OUTCOME	Priority / Focus Area	TL SDBIP KPI NUMBER and I or MM JOB PROFILE
All Directors and Manager Governance	Resolution	AIBOS bavordAk ebeen ert genisellen AOI ertt in belitinebi bessolle bre 1egbud	1, = < not even a draft available 2 = First draft available but not yet approved 3 = submitted for approved in last due date; date; 4 = submitted before	approved 3 = submitted for approval on last due date;	Α\n	ΑΝ		1, = < not even a draft available 2 = First draft available but not yet approved 3 = submitted for approved on last due date; 4 = submitted before	меи	3%	oo'koe's service delivery needs and and and and and Mayoral imbiso's are the aburdes of in the include of and and and wishle quarterly thisk griphoral	indicator based IDP and TL SDBIP plans (nocluding service plans) that focus on attention on people's attention on people's cries; track and reduce suffering from	High Municipal Service Delivery Excellence Culture	Service Delivery	remain of pasts of the pattern of the pasts
CFO and Manager BTO		Jagbud bavorqqA	+ 606 = 5	+%06 = 5 %68 - 382 = 788 2 - 809 - 52 %68 - 52 = 78 %7 - 68	ΑſΝ	ΑW		+%06 = S %68 - \%8\L = \nu \%2\L - \%09 = E \%69 - \%2\nu = \l \%2\nu > = \l		%E	% of Strategic Session resolutions and service delivery needs allocated funds	lack of services			Louvel ellip or cause
bli Directors and Manager Governance	and the second s	Departmental Performance strocts	= 2 80%+ = 28% - 86% = 20% - 22% = 25% - 26% = 45% - 26%	+%06 = S %68 - %8 <i>L</i> = <i>t</i> % 2L - %09 = E %69 - %7 <i>t</i> = Z %7 <i>t</i> > = 1	+%06 = S %68 - %8 <i>L</i> = <i>t</i> % 22 - %09 = E %69 - %7 <i>t</i> = Z %7 <i>t</i> > = 1			+%06 = S %68 - %8L = b %LL - %09 = E %65 - %7b = 7 %7b > 1	weu	%€	%X municipal targets schieved) focused on quarterly focused on granterly focused on granterly factors and focus fo				
Director Technical Services and Manager Roads and Stormwater	PMO reports confirmed by contracts	ƏIM bəlibuA shoqər	2 = 60%+ 4 = \lambda 8.6 - 83% 3 = 60% - 82% 5 = 45% - 26% 1 = < 45%	2 = 60%+ v = 18% - 86% 3 = 60% - 11% 5 = 45% - 66% 1 = < 45%	2 = 60%+ v = 18% - 83% 3 = 60% - 12% 5 = v5% - 63% 1 = c v5%	%68 - %8L = t % LL - % 09 = E		+%06 = S %68 - %8L = t %LL - %09 = E %65 - %7t = Z %7t > = 1		%8	%X capital intrastrure projects target met on fime, within budget and in the right quality				
Director Technical Services and Manager Roads and Stormwater	Approved by SEM	Fleet report	%\$1 = \$\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	%91 = 9 %97'2 - %97'9 = 7 %96'7 - %9'6 = 7 %96'7 - %9'6 = 1 %96'7 - %9'8	%\$1 = \$ %\$7'2* %\$7'9 = \$ %\$6'4* %\$7'9 * %\$ %\$6'4* %\$7'8 = \$ %\$6'4* %\$7'8 * \$ \$1'8* %\$1'8 * \$ \$1'8* *	3 = 5% - 6,45% 4= 6,45%		%\$1 = 9 %\$7'2 - %\$7'9 = 7 %\$7'9 - %9 = 6 %\$6'7 - %\$'E > 7 %\$6'2 > 1		%€	% reduction on service delivery breakdowns due to allocated vehicles/plant that is not properly mantained or registered on time.				
All Directors	Approved by SEM and Council (where applicable)	Strategies, Masterplan, Divisional / Functional Plans	+%06 = S + 88 - 88 = 88 = 86 = 86 = 86 = 86 = 86 =	ΑW	ΨN	ΑW		+%06 = S %68 - 884 = b %44 - 898 = E %65 - 487 = Z %87 >= 1		%€	% / Proportion of municipal wide Strategies, Masterplan, Divisional / Functional Plans	Ensure the development, teviewal and tevision teviewal and tevision of municipal wide Stralgus, Divisional Masterplan, Divisional Venctional Plans			

	1. = < not even a NVA NVA de actiable de describble de la first death averiable but not yet approved on last due des and approved with micor corrections to be auggested; 5 = submitted on time & approved												
WA WA	t = < not oven a MA MA MA described of described between a serial described but not yet approved on lest due described but not yet approved on lest due described for a submitted before due desproved with mator corrections to be auggested; 5 = submitted on the	Council resolution											
WA WA	t = < not oven a MA MA MA described of described between a serial described but not yet approved on lest due described but not yet approved on lest due described for a submitted before due desproved with mator corrections to be auggested; 5 = submitted on the	Adopted by Council											
WA WA	t = < not oven a MA MA MA described of described between a serial described but not yet approved on lest due described but not yet approved on lest due described for a submitted before due desproved with mator corrections to be auggested; 5 = submitted on the	raft evelable	= First draft wailable but not yet	approved s = submitted for	approval on last due	acus; 1 = submitted before	tue date and	approved with minor	corrections to be	suggested;	a submitted on	ime & approved	
W	1. = < not oven a draft available 2 = Frat draft 2 = Frat draft 2 = proved 3 = sproved 3 = sproved 4 = sproved with ration corrections to be suggested; 5 = submitted on firm & supposed with ration corrections to be suggested; 5 = submitted on firm & sproved	1, = < not even a draft avallable	2 = First draft available but not yet	approved 3 = submitted for	approval on last due	date;	due date and	approved with minor					
x & & 5	1.1 = < not even a draft aveitable 2.2 = First draft 2.2 = First draft 2.2 = First draft 2.2 = First draft 2.2 = Submitted for 3.2 = Submitted for 3.2 = Submitted for 3.2 = Submitted before due date and exproved on last due expressed with minor corrections to be suggested: 5.2 = Submitted on time & approved time & Submitted on time & approved time & Submitted on time & Submitted Subm	AN.											
1. = < not oven a drast aveilable 2 = First draft 2 = First draft 2 = First draft 3 = submitted for approved on last due date; 4 = submitted before due date are dete are det		N/A											
		1. = < not even a draft available	2 = First draft available but not yet	approved	approval on last due	date;	due date and	approved with minor	corrections to be	:pelsegers	5 = submitted on	time & approved	
3% broportion of		Oversee the reviewal 9 of the new 5 year IDP in	for 2024/25 to 2024	,					•		-	-	
Oversee the reviewed 1% proportion of 3% of the new 2 year IDP reviewed IDP for 2024/25 to 2028/27 by June 2024	Oversee the reviewed 19 of the new 5 year IDP in the 2004/25 to the 2024/25 by tune 2024												

	Supporting	Director	Director DTPS, Technical Services, Conmunity Services and Manager Governance	CFO and IPED Manager	
	AUDITED EVIDENCE	Means of Evidence Verification	Standing Committee	V Standing Committee	
	AUDITED	Evidence	Report on adherence to the implementation plan	Report approved by Standing the Director for the Committee Technical Services/ Finance Standing Committee Consideration	
		QTR4	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	
	TARGETS	QTR 3	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	N/A	
	TAR	QTR 2	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	N/A	
		OTR 1	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	N/A	
	Additional	Resources			
	Individual Annual	Target	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	
	Individual KPI		пем	пем	
	Weighting in %		3%	4%	1%
	Individual Key	Performance Indicators (based on outcomes, strategic actions and outputs)	9d 5	% of the jobs created through LED initiatives, EPWP and capital projects	
HTING = 8%)	Individual Strategic	Actions	ere is of the egy	Improved socio economic conditions of the poor	Sub-Total Weighting for this KPA
KPA 2: LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (WEIGHTING = 8%)	OUTCOME		Well planned and Oversees that the productive municipal a proper annual approach to local implementation conomic 5 year LED strated development	Contribution to job creation	Sub-Total Weigh
AL ECONOMIC D	29	Priolrity I Focus An	Vgətst2 G3J	S drowth & Resilience	
KPA 2: LOC	8	LL SDBIP KPI NUMBE	Infrastructure Development	מבס	

		Supporting Director	CFO as SCM Managers (Menand and Acquisition); other directors as line project directors	CFO	CFO
	AUDITED EVIDENCE	Means of Evidence Verification	Project Director - co-Sign-off	Auditor Sign-off	BID committee Char sign-off
	AUDITED	Evidence	SCM Audited and Project Manager Reports	SCM Audited Reports	BID Committee Meeting Invites against minutes and resolution dates
		QTR 4	N/A	1 = < 7% 2 = 7% - 9,9% 3 = 10% -12,9% 4 = 13% - 14,9% 5 = 15%	1 = < 7% 2 = 7% - 9,9% 3 = 10% -12,9% 4 = 13% - 14,9% 5 = 15%
	QUARTERLY TARGETS	QTR 3	implementation compliance to compliance to approved plan per quarter 1 = <42% 58% 2 = 42% -58% 3 = 60% -17% 4 = 18% -89% 5 = 90% +	1 = < 7% 2 = 7% - 9,9% 3 = 10% - 12,9% 4 = 13% - 14,9% 5 = 15%	1 = <7% 2 = 7% - 9,9% 3 = 10% -12,9% 4 = 13% - 14,9% 5 = 15%
	QUARTER	QTR 2	Implementation compliance to compliance to approved plan per quarter 2.2 = 4.2% - 59% 3 = 60% - 4.77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +	1 = < 7% 2 = 7% - 9,9% 3 = 10% -12,9% 4 = 13% - 14,9% 5 = 15%	1 = < 7% 2 = 7% - 9.9% 3 = 10% - 12.9% 4 = 13% - 14,9% 5 = 15%
		QTR 1	Implementation compliance to compliance to compliance to quarter 1 = < 42% 5 = 42% 5 = 42% 5 = 69% 177% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% 1	1 = < 7% 2 = 7% - 9.9% 3 = 10% -12,9% 4 = 13% - 14,9% 5 = 15%	1 = < 7% 2 = 7% - 9,9% 3 = 10% - 12,9% 4 = 13% - 14,9% 5 = 15%
		Additional Resources Required			
		Individual Annual Target	implementation compilarios to compilarios to approved plan per quarter quarter 1 = 42% 5 = 56% 77% 4 = 76% - 89% 5 = 50%+	1 = < 7% 2 = 7% - 9,9% 3 = 10% -12,9% 4 = 13% - 14,9% 5 = 15%	1 = < 7% 2 = 7% - 9,9% 3 = 10% - 12,9% 4 = 13% - 14,9% 5 = 15%
		Individual KPI Baseline (as at June 2022)	мем	пем	пем
		Weighting in %	2%	5%	5%
		Individual Key Performance Indicators (based on outcomes, strategic actions and outputs)	% of projects awarded as per the approved procurement plan	% reduction in tenders 2% which collapse due to SCM errors	% reduction in tenders which collapse due to Bid Committes that fail to conclude their business on time
WEIGHTING = 14%)		Individual Strategic Actions	Oversee plans to reduce unnecessary outsourcing of good and service and delays in the processees. Randomly sample running contracts to ensure full in compliance, act swiftly compliance, act swiftly compliance, act swiftly	enforce compliant % reduction value -for -money which collap service appointments. SCM errors Apply corrective measures to the CFO	
KPA 3: FINANCIAI VIARIITTY & MANAGEMENT (WEIGHTING = 14%		OUTCOME	Smooth, speed and Oversee plans to efficient running of reduce unnecessary outsourced municipal outsourced running of modernical procurement products processess; Randomly sample running contracts to ensure full compliance, at swill compliance, at swill compliance, at swill compliance, and swill compliance,	Cost-effective procurement and implementation of services and products	
ANCIAL VIABILITY		Priority / Focus	ТИРРLY СНАІМ МАМАGEMENT (ВОМІМІЗТАВТІОМ АND ПОМІТАВТІОМ В ВЕРОВТІМО В МЕМУОТ	- (эмпяочэя о	SUPPLY CHAIN M. MEMINISTRATION AN MEMVO
KPA 3. FIN	W	TL SDBIP KPI NUMBER and / of M	MFMV01-01	10-	MFMV01

Budget Expenditure Deviations	S	sustainable municipality	corrective advice to CFO	expenditure (CAPEX and OPEX) deviation	2%	1 =>5,77% 2 = 5,03% - 5,77% 3 = 3,87 - 5% 4 = 2,71% - 3,83% 5 = < 2,71%	3 = 3,87 - 4 = 2,719 5 = < 2,7	% - 5,77% - 5% % - 3,83% 1%	2 = 5,03% - 5,77% 3 = 3,67 - 5% 4 = 2,71% - 3,83% 5 = < 2,71%	2 = 5,03% - 5,77% 3 = 3,87 - 5% 4 = 2,71% - 3,83% 5 = < 2,71%	2 = 5,03% - 5,77% 3 = 3,87 - 5% 4 = 2,71% - 3,83% 5 = < 2,71%	Statements	•	CFO
Municipal Ratios	Compliance to finar Conf		NT required performance ratios	% increase of municipal non-grant revenue against previous comparable time last financial year	2%	1 = < 3,5% 2 = 3,5% - 4,95% 3 = 5% -6,45% 4 = 6,45% - 7,45% 5 = 15%	N/A		2 = 3,5% - 4,95% 3 = 5% -6,45% 4= 6,45% - 7.45% 5 = 15%		1 = < 3,5% 2 = 3,5% - 4,95% 3 = 5% -6,45% 4= 6,45% - 7.45% 5 = 15%	Financial Statements	External Audit sign- offs as applicable	
MIQ Expenditure	CFO, MM and Technical Director's Job Profile	infrastructure focused and efficient muricipatity	MiGproject implementation capacity; ensure	% spend of avallable MIG funding against monthly and quarterly MIG Projects / Operational Plans	2%	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 80% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 421 2 = 42% 3 = 60% 4 = 78% 5 = 90%	- 59% - 77% - 89%	2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	Financial Reports		Technical Services Director
Effectiveness of Financial Strategies - compilant to MFMA legislation	MM's Job Profile	Municipal Financial Revenue Growth	implementation of the revenue enhancement strategy	impementation of the Revenue Improvement Strategy		1 = < 3,5% 2 = 3,5% - 4,95% 3 = 5% - 6,45% 4 = 6,45% 7.45% 5 = 15%			1 = < 3.5% 2 = 3.5% - 4.95% 3 = 5% - 6.45% 4 = 6.45% - 7.45% 5 = 15%	1 = < 3,5% - 4,95% 2 = 3,5% - 4,95% 3 = 5% - 6,45% 4 = 6,45% - 7,45% 5 = 15%	1 = < 3.5% 2 = 3.5% - 4,95% 3 = 5% - 6,45% 4 = 6,45% - 7.45% 5 = 15%	Monthly and Quarterly Financial Statements		all directors

Weighting in % 14%

	Supporting Director	All directors, Manager Governace	All directors, Manager Governace and Manager HR and Legal Services	Director Corporate Services	Director Corporate Services	Director Corporate Services	
NIDENCE	s of nce ation	Sign-off by SEM A	SEM and Corporate Services N	SEM and Council Resolutions	Auditors sign-off	All Performance D Agreements & Q quarterly review S quarterly review S reports are Co- signed as compliant and compliant and Composite Corporate Corporate Services and Auditors thereafter	
AUDITED EVIDENCE	Evidence	Document listing all the agreed the agreed and agreed changes	Business Process Reengineering conceptual document approved by SEM	Council Approval of the structure	HRM Half - yearly Reports confirmed by Director	MM reportees signed Perf signed Perf Agreements and subsequently quarterly review reports co-signed-off by MM & employee	
	QTR 4	V/N		Not a target this quarter	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +	1 = 42% 24% 59% 3 = 60% 77% 4 = 78% 89% 5 = 90%+	
QUARTERLY TARGETS	QTR 3	N/N		1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	NVA	1 = < 42% 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	
QUARTER	QTR 2	N/A	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	Not a target this quarter	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	
	QTR 1	1. = < not even a addra vailable 2 = First draft available but not yet available but not yet available but not yet approved on 1 as submitted for approved on last due date; 4 = submitted before due date and approved with minor corrections to be suggested; 5 = submitted on time & approved without correctors		Not a target this quarter	N/A	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	
	Additional Resources Needed						
	Individual Annual Target	1. = knot even a managed and analysis of a managed and an available but not yet approved a papproved approval on last due adales; submitted before due date and approved with minor procurbons to be suggested; 5 = submitted on time & approved with minor procurbons to be suggested; 5 = submitted on time & approved without ocrrectons	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 5 = 90% +	
	Individual KPI Baseline (as at June 2022)	мөи	мем		new	ивм	
	Weighting in %	%5	%5	2%	2%		
es W	individual Key Performance Indicators (based on outcomes, strategic actions and outputs)	Availability of a report changes and processes agreed upon by all Directorates	% of Change initiatives captured in the Business Process Reengineering conceptual document	% of strategic session resolution captured in the draft organogram	% of Acting Positions for periods longer than 12 for Senior Managers and 6 months for all other	(%)proportion of directors & MM direct reportees with PA signed on & subsequently updated on time after planning & quarterly treview deliberations with MM deliberations with MM	
0	olgetatic laubividual anotical	Analyse changes required, debale and s agree on the changes processes to achieve p processes and u create and use a create and use a change readiness i agility measuring tool applied to every department quarterity department quarterity		Ensure that the strategy of the municipality is supported by a realistic structure and		Ensure each director has timeously signed a participatively engaged Performance Agreement has a light signed with MM's agreement as well as agreement as well as GNBIP to ADOptial PL and Doptial PL SNBIP to Boptial PL SNBIP to	Ξ
	ООТСОМЕ	increased state of readness to bounce to back after institutional subsectivity of the control of		Stable Municipal Administration			
Pi	Priority / Focus Are	stitutional Agility - Change Readiness	suj				tnent
W	TL SDBIP KPI JOB PROFILE	elitor9 dol. MM					

Manager Governance		
surfess fr. 3.	Confirmed by Director Corporate Services Signed by Survey Director Corporate Services	Signed by Survey administrative Responsible Director
ne not for st	tations borts	Erraktytee ergagements Reports
1. = < not even a 1. = < not even a ctra even a ctra evenable ctra evenable ctra evenable ctra evenable ctra evenable ctra evenable control even averable but not yet exproved on less due expreved on less expreved on les	1 = <42% 2 = 62% - 524 - 59% 3 = 66% - 577 × 4 = 78% - 69% 5 = 90% + 1 = <42% 1 = <42% 2 = 26% - 59% - 59% - 59% - 59% - 59% + 59% -	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +
	11 = 42% 21 = 42% - 53% 3 = 67% - 53% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	
	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89%	
1. = <not 2="First" 5="subgrashed;" 6="subgrashed;" 7="subgrashed;" 8="subgrashed;" 9="subgrashed</td" a="" approved="" available="" be="" corrections="" detail="" due="" last="" mirror="" not="" on="" oven="" subgrashed;="" to="" ut="" with="" yet=""><td>1 = < 42% 2 = 64% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+</td><td></td></not>	1 = < 42% 2 = 64% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	
11. = < not even a durat averable durat averable et are averable everable but not yet approved on last due approved on last due dean. Sabrithad before due dean. Sabrithad before due dean averable et averable	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% + 1 = < 42% 1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +	1 = < 42% 2 = 47% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+
** C'	%2 %2	% R &
Whroporton of amusa 2% performance reports compiled inal automitied by their due dates	% of disciplinary case initiated within 3 months amounts % of employee average satisfaction levels	% of emptoyees engagments designed for emptoyees to know and feel the MM as their leader
Ensure that at performance related performance treports are submitted completed nat by the due datas attentited by the cue datas dates	Intervene threously to % of disciplinary cases 2% resolve conflicts, initiated within 3 whether they have months been brought to you of not enough to you of not enough to you disciplinate to the concurage of not enough to what we have a settisfaction recognition and levels address of employee needs (completing	Be vistive, auctible and a guiding vice and ight to administrational employees; use at platforms to show presence and leadership.
Oversee structured land improved and improved land Evatuation and Evatuation land Evatuation l	Motivated and satisfact employee organisation	Viscoray, stabe and Be vistbe, audibe statego municipatity and a guidring viceo and fight to all municipal emplyres use at patients to show presence and leadership
rizik ekqoeq		ww.e Leadership
RECRUITMENT, SELECTION ANT EMPLOYEE MANAGEMENT - MITD		

Sub-Total Weighting for this KPA

- 18

	Supporting Director	Director Corporate Services	CAE and Manager Governance	Managers: Strategy and Governance	Manager: Executive Offices	CAE and Manager Governance
EVIDENCE	Means of Evidence Verification	Signature by Council witnessed by Responsible Director / Mgr	Signature by ARC Chair withressed by rector / Mgr	Sign-off by District Managers: Strategy an Governanc	Approved implementation plan for Councillors	Plan approved by AC and Council
AUDITED EVIDENCE	Evidence	Resolution Register	Resolution Register Signature by ARC Chair withressed by Responsible Director / Mgr	IPPF Meeting and Resolution & Implementation Reports,	Recordings of ward Approved based IDP and implemen Budget Review plan for Altendance Registers and	Management, AC and Council approvals
	QTR 4	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	V N
QUARTERLY TARGETS	QTR 3	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 21% 2 = 21% - 29% 3 = 30% - 38% 4 = 39% - 45% 5 = 46%+	N/A
QUARTER	QTR 2	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	Not for reporting (pending election)	N/A
		1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 66% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	Not for reporting (before election of new councillors)	1 = no draft comprehensive communication plan 2 = good draft available but not approved 3 = available and approved approved
Additional	Additional Resources Required (specify if there are any)				9	
	Individual Annual Target	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 2 = 42% - 59% 4 = 185% - 89% 5 = 90% +		1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = no draft comprehensive communication plan 2 = good draft available but not approved 3 = available and approved
- 4	Individual KPI Baseline (as at June 2021)	wau	маи	пем	пем	мем
Mainhting in the	Weighting in the whole Performance Agreement	5%	,	5%	2%	5%
Individual Key	Performance Indicators (based on outcomes, strategic actions and outputs)	% of Overall Council Resolutions implemented on time as intended per quarter	% of Overall ARC, MPAC, Top Executive and Serior Executive and Resolutions implemented on time as intended per quarter	% of DDM stakeholders (including IGR partners) now flow partners) now flow partners and the manicipal planning and development initiated by the MM	% of Councillor capacity building initiatives implemented	% level of annual audit action plan completed on time
	Individual Strategic Actions	Oversees all structures listed do sit as required, within MM's Mandate Record & roll call	calegory (ike Council) ARG, Executive and ARG, Executive and Senior Mgt); Record implementation stages reached for stages where macospitable delays areas where unacospitable delays areas where unacospitable delays areas where for consequence management for unreasonably recurrently delays	Engage and Initiate DDM model		Ensure and support the risk and audit committee
	оитсоме		mandated structures' resolutions. Improved & resolutions. enhanced Oversight and functioning of municipality of municipality.	Cooperative Governance with other spheres of SA govt		Safer and risk exposure reduced environment
٨	Focus Are.	Implementation of Resolutions made by Mandated Municipal Structures	-	IGR Collaboration		
NI	TL SOBIP KPI		GGPP03-05	elitor9 doL MM		

CAE and Manager Governance	CAE, Manager: Executive Offices and Manager Governance	Manager Strategic Support	Manager Stratagic Support	CFO and Manager Governance
Audited reports writte Audit end Risk. Plens	udited, MM igned Reports	uctind Communication Aira and related apports	Audited A constructeron S media utilisation reports	AG and Other G
Audi and Risk Management Plans and their implementation plans and reports	IA, ARC and MPAC Austrise, MM reports signed Report	<u>8</u>	EXCO and SEM reports	Auditors Opinion feedback reports
1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1=<42% 2=42%-56% 3=60%-77% 4=78%-89% 5=90%+	1 = no draft communication plan 2 = good draft approved 3 = aveilable but not approved communication plan 4 = approved in thre without comebacks 5 = approved and accommunication plan communication Plan communication Plan	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%	N/A
%68 %77 %68	1=<42% 2=42%-59% 3=60%-77% 4=78%-89% 5=90%+	NA A	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 85% 5 = 90%+	1 = Disclaimer 2 = Qualified 3 = Unqualified with matters of emphasis 4 = Unqualified 5 = Gean
59% 77% 89%	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = no draft communication plan 2 = good draft approved 3 = available but not approved communication plan 4 = approved without comebacks 5 = approved and accarrent communication plan	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	N/A
1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1=<42% 2=42%-59% 3=60%-77% 4=78%-89% 5=90%+	W	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	N/A
	:	5 5 5		3 2 3 2 1
1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 76% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = no draft communication plan 2 = good draft aeratable but not approved 3 = avaitable and communication plan 4 = approved in the without cornebacks is exproved in conceptually communication plan communication plan communication plan communication Plan communication Plan communication Plan	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1= Disclaimer 2 a Qualified 3 = Unqualified with matters of emphasis 4 = Unqualified 5 = Clean
now.	M 80		new	Mgu
5%	%2	ž	£	£
% level of compliance, risk and declaration of interest complete and approved as per the stipulated timetrames	% of internal Audit, ARC, MPAC reports produced and submitted on time and up to the right quality	Availability of comprehensive approved municipal approved municipal annual Communication Plan	Metroportion of implementation of the communication ection plan	Level of Audit Opinion given (from ARC and Internal Audit for in year audits; AG for final audit)
Ensure all reports are produced with sufficient legally requists details, infring and recommendations / recommendations		Ensure that there is a comprehensive Communication Plan (chinal & authoral) Communication plan at a communication plan at active of, very the model of communication communication communication communication communication		Ensure all departments keep all heri auditable information up to speed at all time; ensure every director ale hands in all documents required by any level of auditmes ann'th.
		High productivity, low megative or megativ		Accountable and clean municipal administration
				Audit Opinions
-				

	1	
MM, CAE	MM and SEM	
MM approva or again compliance again compliance again compliance again a	AG and Council Approval Comments	
Audi and Nesk Audi and general implementation plans and reports	Approved AG and C portomanoo report Approval Comments comments	
2 = 42% 2 = 42% 3 = 65% 4 = 72% 5 = 90%	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	
2 = 42% - 69% - 3 = 60% - 77% - 4 = 75% - 69% - 5 = 90% + 6 = 60% - 77% - 6 = 60% - 77% - 6 = 60% - 60% - 6 = 60% - 6 = 60% - 6 = 60% - 6 = 60% - 6 = 60% - 6 = 60% -	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 56% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 75% - 89% 5 = 90%+	
2 = 42% 2 = 42% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 76% - 89% 5 = 90%+	
1 = 42% 2 = 42% 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 178% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%	
2 = 4.2% 2 = 4.2% 3 = 6.0% - 7.7% 4 = 178% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	
Meu	W	
% levels of complance 2% to explance 2% to explorable Performance Performance Requirements to firmsines, quality and quantity	Approve i rating of Final 2% Pedromanoe Report (% of Unresched Opersight and Audit Ophron issues on the Final Amural Report that still romain unaddriessed.	
Versee and lead % levels of o preparation, oversight to applicable by IA and other committees of council Requirement of the 2020/21 Annual Emelines, quantity cardental fine port councid fine to port of the 50 for opition by 31 st August, 2022	Get final council approval of the 300021 Annual showing % A6 audit queries / issues from those concided in the final report.	
increased and levels of municipal municipal municipal municipal governance		
Accountable and marsparent municipie governance and performance		
(20- A0) - TOGITM ENITRO939 T	TRETEGIC - PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT	

Departmental Managers	CAE and Manager Stretogic Support	Governance Governance	Drector Corporate Services	95 81
Audited and Departmen properly eigened-off Managers minutes of these controllibes	Audited reports wrt the Audi and Risk Plans	periode CAE and Management approval administration and reports audit reports	Audited, MM signed Reports submission to COGTA	Audited Audit Activity Plan and related reports
Minutes of properly constituted ARC, MPAC committees	Audit and Risk Management Plans and their implementation plans and reports	Updated Conflict of Updated Conflict of Updated With Incident of violation reports	Litgaton Report	Approved Audi Activity Plan
1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1=<42% 2=42%-59% 3=60%-77% 4=78%-89% 5=90%+	1=>9.0% 2=1.7% 6.0% 4=5.9% 4.2% 5=<4.2%	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 53% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 76% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = no drafl comprehensive communication plan 2 = good drafl available but not approved approved approved communication plan 4 = approved in time 4 = approved in time 6 = approved in time 7 = approv
1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1=<42% 2=42%-59% 3=62%-77% 4=78%-89% 5=90%+	1 => 9,0% 3 = 7,7% 6,0% 4 = 5,9% 4,2% 5 = <4,2%	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 76% - 89% 5 = 90%+	
1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 76% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 75% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 => 9,0% 18.9% -7.7% -6.0% 4 = 5.9% -4.2% 5 = <4.2%	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 75% 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = no draft comprehensive communication plan 2 = good draft aveitable but not approved 3 = available and communication plan communication plan 4 = approved in time thinked comebacks 5 = approved and 5 = approved and
1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = > 9.0% 2 = 8.9% - 7.8% 3 = 7.7% - 6.0% 4 = 5.9% - 4.2% 5 = <4.2%	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	
1 = <2% 2 = 2% - 29% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 4 = 50% - 77% 4 = 75% - 59% 5 = 90% +	1 = > 9.0% 2 = 89% - 7.8% 3 = 7.7% - 8.0% 4 = 5.9% - 4.2% 5 = <4.2%	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 76% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = no drafl comprehensive communication plan 2 = good draft aveitable but not approved 3 = aveitable and approved communication plan 4 = approved in time without competeds
M6M	M-94	MADO.	MDU.	NOO.
% level of well 2% constituted and constituted and quorested risk, audit and ourseight committees in completes in regulations	wentenants *k level of Risk *kanagement *Corrutible Resolution Corruptiance to corruptiance to corruptiance to Risk Management Plans	% of periodically 2% reported instances of widelone of conflict of interest register interests register interests register interpretable groups of informatical active holders (employees and councilors).	% of status of logal 2% matters correctly rateded in the littleation register	Availability of 2% comprehensive approved Activity Plan
5 m	Ensure all reports are produced with cufficient legaly (industry odelate, it is thing and industry and industry and inecommendations (inecobutions	Develop a comprehensive for comprehensive for comprehensive for financial of lineral Declaration Register. Lead in the activation in the activation in redividuals against this updated register this updated register the updated register and a texcultives, eshion manager and other targetted other targetted manager and oner targetted manager and oner targetted municipal policy for violations of this register	Ersure that all legal metures are his all legal and trasponds to trasponds to trasponds to the outple that is not be dish liftgation register is maintained	Ensure that there is a comprehensive internal Audit Activity Plan adgred to the Charter/Strategy. Mortitor the implementation of the implementation of the bests.
Safer, risk exposure Ensure and supplementation development the risk and sudit with hightened recommendation organisational morate & ethics where personal conflict of intravel to managed				incressed accountable and accountable and and levels of municipal municipal municipal povernance
Ensure compliance on Overal Audit Action Plan and Risk Management Compliance (
		80- 8044999 pur 10- 204499	Compliance 6	

Ilance 2% 1=<42%	Audit 2 = 42% - 53% 3 = 60% - 77%	4 = 78% - 89%	+906+		
	3 = 60% - 77%		+%06 = 5		
	3=60%-77% 3=6		5 = 90%+		
1 = < 42%	3=60%-77% 3=60%-77%		+%06 = 5		
IA and ARC Audited					
Audited, MM CAE and all	sports sports				

Employee's Name:

Supervising Manager's Name and Title:

Corporate Services Performance Mgt Unit Witness's Name (Representing Performance Mgt Office): Witness's Signature

Employee Signature Supervisors Signature

		Land Related Disputes	Environment friendly Project Implemntation	TL SDBIP KPI NUMBER and / or MM JOB PROFILE
		Reduction in land Management conflicts with communities	SDF And other Building / Construction Guidelines compliance	Priority / Focus Area
GRAND TOTAL WEIGHTING	Weighting for this KPA	Improved decision making and dissemination of information by Management	Environmental and conservation friendly municipality	TL SDBIP KPI NUMBER and / or MM JOB PROFILE Priority / Focus Area OUTCOME Individual Strategic Indicators (based outcomes, strateg actions and output)
WEIGHTING	his KPA	Gather intelligence on brewing land problems in municipality, draw in all other stakeholders including community leaders; champion quick and smooth conflict resolutions	Track and ensure, % of municipal through project plans, Projects in full SDF comparisons and compliance with environmental impact environmental impact environmental assessments that all conservation leg municipal projects requirements at always comply with time environmental and conservation requirements.	individual Strategic Actions
		% of land related issues resolved timeously, smoothly on a win-win bases	% of municipal Projects in full Projects in full compliance with environmental and conservation legislative requirements at any time	Individual Key Performance Indicators (based on outcomes, strategic actions and outpurts)
100%	4%	2%	2%	Weighting in %
	101	new	new	Individual KPI Baseline (as at June 2021)
		1 = < 42% 2 = 42%, 59% 3 = 60%, 77% 4 = 18%, 89% 5 = 90%+	16-59% 2 =60%-77% 3 =78%-89% 4=90%-95% 5=96%+	Individual Annual Target
				Additional Resources Required
		1 = <42% 2 = 42% 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = <59% 2 = 60% - 97% 3 = 78% - 97% 5 = 90% - 95% 5 = 96%+	QTR 1
		1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = <59% = 60% - 77% 3 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% - 95% 5 = 96%+	QUARTER QTR 2
		1 = <42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 78% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	2 1 = <59% = 60% - 77% 3 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% - 95% 5 = 96%+	R2 QTR3
		1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	2 1 = <59% = 60% - 77% 3 = 78% - 89% 4 = 90% - 95% 5 = 96%+	QTR4
		Land Affairs, police Sign-off by (fil moheed) and atthorised other corroborating stakeholder evidence of involved (til), resolved disputes affairs and p	2 Project Environmental Impact Analysis and SDF compliance Reports and approved plans	AUDITED
		e Land volice)	signed authority by Director Responsible Townpla Environmental Authority	AUDITED EVIDENCE Means of Evidence Verification
		Director Town planning and Director Corporate Services	Director Townplanning	Supporting Director

SENQU MUNICIPALITY

PART C - CORE MANAGERIAL COMPETENCIES SCORECARD 2023/24



SEX

Name of Employee:
Current Job Tide:
Employee Supervisor:
Period Covered by this Agreement:
WEIGHT OF PART C = 20% of ENTIRE 3 PART SCORECARDS OF THE PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT:

Strategic Source Ref	Focus Area	Outcome	Personal Individual Strategic Action to	Personal Key Performance Indicator (KPI) for listed actions	in % Baseline for this KPI	Baseline for this KPI	Individual AnnualTarget	Annual Budget (if additional funds	TARGETS				Evidence of Performance		Supporting Director(s) /
Nr (CMC /			achieve outcome					specify them here)	QUARTER 1	QUARTER 2	QUARTER 3	QUARTER 4		verication	Manager(s)
	Human	Empowering,	Support HRM in the	% of departmental notification of	3%	new	1 =<49% rating					1 =<49% rating	Departmental sign	Signed off letters	All Senior
	(People)	enabling	management of all	processing submitted on time and in	12		3 = 70% - 80%					3 = 70% - 80%		of submission Manager HR	Manager HR
	Management	departmental HR environment,	departmental actions and new initiatives which	full compliance with the termination policy			4 = 81% - 90% 5 = 91% +				-	4 = 81% - 90% 5 = 91% +	ı	(date stamp)	
		municipal and public	municipal and public performance, sanctions	% of departmental recruitment & selection documents signed off and	3%	new	1 =<49% rating 2 = 49% - 69%					1 =<49% rating 2 = 49% - 69%	Departmental sign offs	HR tracking book	All Senior Managers and
		provisions	enhances development of	enhances development of submitted back to HR in 3 days			3 = 70% - 80%					3 = 70% - 80%			Manager HR
		Ti Cracio	new departmental skills				4 = 81% - 90% 5 = 91% +					4 = 81% - 90% 5 = 91% +			
				% of consequence management	3%	new	1 =<49% rating			1 =<49% rating		1 =<49% rating	Labour Relations	Standing	All Senior
				initiatives initiated within 5 days of			2 = 49% - 69%			2 = 49% - 69%		2 = 49% - 69%	Reports		Managers and
	_			the HOD being aware of these			3 = 70% - 80%			3 = 70% - 80%		3 = 70% - 80%		submission	Manager HR
				1			4 = 81% - 90%			4 = 81% - 90%		4 = 81% - 90%			-
							5=91%+			5 = 91% +		5=91%+			

							= submitted on time & approved			approved without				
							minor corrections to be suggested; 5			corrections to be suggested; 5 = submitted on time &				
							before due date and approved with			due date and approved with minor	,			
							due date; 4 = submitted			date; 4 = submitted before				
							3 = submitted for approval on last			3 = submitted for approval on last due				
			timeframes prescibed by HR as coordinators				available but not yet approved			available but not yet approved		119 81	9 11	
	Formulation		policies are reviewd annually and within the	policies reviewed		i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	draft available 2 = First draft			draft available 2 = First draft		minutes		Managers and Manager HR
	Policy		Ensure that Departmental	%/Proportion report on departmental	2%	new	5 = 91% + 1. = < not even a			1. = < not even a	0-3170+	Policy reviewal	Sign off by HR	All Senior
				performance coaching & assessments(formal or informal)			3 = 70% - 80% 4 = 81% - 90% 5 = 91% +			4 = 81% - 90%	4 = 81% - 90% 5 = 91% +	Sessions	Tepotis	manager FIX
CSP: 2				%/Proportion of directorate staff (including director) who are receiving	3%	new	1 =<49% rating 2 = 49% - 69%			1 =<49% rating 2 = 49% - 69% 3 = 70% - 80%	1 =<49% rating 2 = 49% - 69% 3 = 70% - 80%	Coaching and assessment sessions	Coaching and assessment reports	Managers and Manager HR
	2		departmental plans, processes as intended.							1 100 1	4 4000	Continued	Casabina and	All Senior
			scorecards. Implement all the											
			appropriate approvals for all the departmental											
			their Indicators Get Ensure the				0-01/0+					to a little		Maleria
			IDP & TL SDBIP Outcomes, Outputs and	the prescribed timeframes			4 = 81% - 90% 5 = 91% +		4 = 81% - 90% 5 = 91% +	F 38 11	4 = 81% - 90% 5 = 91% +	1 1		
			KPIs clearly capable to	(including director) who are submitting performance reports with	376	new	2 = 49% - 69% 3 = 70% - 80%	:*	2 = 49% - 69% 3 = 70% - 80%		2 = 49% - 69% 3 = 70% - 80%	Trock of outstrisonor	register	Managers and Manager HR
		and processes.	Directorate.	% Proportion of directorate staff	3%	new	1 =<49% rating		1 =<49% rating		1 =<49% rating	Proof of submission	Submission	All Senior
		driven IDP and its subordinate plans	feed into the scorecards of indivuals within the	timeframes and which are aligned properly			4 = 81% - 90% 5 = 91% +		4 = 81% - 90% 5 = 91% +					
	Planning and Development		departmental strategies	whose scorecards are concluded within the prescribed/agreed upon			2 = 49% - 69% 3 = 70% - 80%	5	2 = 49% - 69% 3 = 70% - 80%			offs	agreements	Managers and Manager HR

Employee Signature:

Date of Signing:

Employer / Supervisor's Signature:

Date of Signing:

Note 2: Rating Scale applied in the calibrations, where getting over 100% performance is possible, as in Note 1.

Normal Rating scale (for use in target calibration as well as quarterly reviews and final evaluations of performance) 1 = 70%; 2 = 70.99%; 3 = 100 - 129%; 4 = 130%; 169%; 5 = 150%e

Note 3: The total weighting for Parts B and C (where there is no Part D used) = 80%, while the last Scorecard Part is 20%. Total = 100%.

PART E: COMPETENCE - BASED INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN - WEIGHTING OF 20%

This Part of the Performance Agreement is about the development of the employee. Development have has been divided into three aspects in order to meet all the employee work and personal development needs as provided for by the Skills development legislation of South Africa. The focus is on ensuring every employee develops and grows every year since job demands and the broader environment is constantly changing.

The competence development in this Past E has been made measurable to stop the habit of employees always issing competence areas which they have no intention of the development of the has been made measurable to stop the habit of employees always is single or organisation seems to be obvious of this accomplications. Further, because incorresquential principleshoon by the second Development Development Development Development (DPP) intentions will other take the principleshood of the second and co-algored by both parties at will. This Part E is meant to change that culture, shifting the acquisition to be as important an performance achievement as achieving any other targets.

A previous skills audit against compatence area agreed between the emptoyee and hisher manager is assumed. If there has been no formal skills audit done, aneodotal self and manager performance-based audits will have be used to initiate the process of finding meaningful baselines).

The following assumptions are important to fulfil, namely;

1. For the employee's Manager to;

- o Provide all resources (lime, money, transport etc.) to afford the employee the desired development or To subsequently look out for new work challenges that will use as much of the employee's new competences
- o To ensure that the competences dealed and pursued by all employees in her. I his Business unit compty, with the municipal Worlpides Skills Develorment Plan (WSP)

 O To ensure that this Part E is appropriately scored and corrective action taken just like all other sections of the Performance Scoreard Smillarly that it is given its due weighting in calculating the overall performance rating of the employee.

2. For the employee to;

Complete all agreed training and development to the required competence levels

of being rated lowly in this area.

Marra of Empkryse: Thembehosi Marenga Current Job Role / Tibe: Manicpal Manager (MM) Name of Charter / Department Where Empkryed: Manicpal Manager;s Office Period Cowered by this Part B of the Empkryse's Performance Plan: 1" July, 2020 to 30" June 2024.

cocher and	chan teachers			rada:	Targeto Congestion Control	ELECTROPHOLITER CAR COURSE THE		act seem in the contract the co		Assessment of Comp	Assessment of Competence Achievement I Inclutoral Dev Levels Albithed	Abest Dev Levelts Attabast			_
Name of IdeaChed 201 Competence		Weigning of the ICR1 8	Baeeline (Cerrari Competence ProCle Invel e.g. Baek)			Mancal	Ductor to achieve this competence	Method to be used to acquire Chis competence	Means of Evidence Verfication (BOVs)	Placed Target	BECCON .	Devlation	Acting second	Liftig score for Performance Perposes	
ı		-													
ma used in the	used in the														
í															
100 -T00M		1 6 7	Ox. Average of Competence level in selected avera = 17	in selected Average Target	Targetad Competenc	ad Competence level in selected = 77	4	Most Preferred Methods •	Most preferred MOVs =	Average Planeed Target = C?		Actuals in Average for this Section •		Average Puting Score for this Section of Part E =	
action 2. Connectal Managestal / Employee Personal Development - 100% of Part E. for Year 200204	il Development - 100% of Part	1 E for Year 202304													ł
per seque			_	Targeted Compadence Lavel		Tat one of these two possible C levels)	Bodget to acideme Dale	ability of the season of the characters of the c	Magne of Evidence		***************************************	Lessenned of Compilance Achievement I InchAbusi Dev Levets Although	I InchAbad Dev Levels Attabas		
Name of Identified Compatience	and the local companies		e.g. Competent Level)	Competent Level	Advanced		ermpelanca	computance		Target Actual			Deviation from larget (reflected at Shencket year end)	ed act Post-top G.Core L.J. Post-tomanco Purposes (20	Į.
2.1 Strategie Management	100,001		Competent		Advanced		u	cosching, formal blended self-education with a service provider		Advanced Competent	tent				
% level of competence on the 5 level scale	55.	ų.	Competent		Advanced		u_	coaching, formal blended self-education with a service provider	Most preferred MOVs a Certification by the same Accrecited Pechanetric	Advanced Competent					
			Competent		Advanced		z.	coaching, formal blended self-education with a service provider		Advanced Competent	THE STATE OF				
340 -Total Becton 2		F 96001	Average of Sulected Average of Competences Average - Competence	Averge of Selected Its Advanced	Average of Selected Managerial Tempeled Competences. Invels. Advanced		u	Most Preserved Methods = orthe or blended learning	Certified by the Accredited Psychometric Bervice Provider	Paracel Paracel Paracel	Average for Actuals in this Section • Computed	a v Computant	Awarge deviation tor this Saction =	Average Ruing Score to: Section 2 of Part E =	25
GRAND TOTAL (Decisions 1 & 2)		2001 7 6 7	Average of Selected 100% Managerial Competence Average of Selected Tombourial Competent	Total of Selected Manay Advanced	Total of Selected Managerial Tergeled Competences Invets = Advanced	oberces brets .	u	Most Preferred Methods = ordine or clended herriting	Most preferred BONs = Ra- the Dynchemetribook	Average Paramet Lingal -	Average for Actook in Bectico 2 = Computent?	· Cempetaer?	Avverage for Bection 2 **	Average Rading Boors for Section 2 of Part E =	21

Corporate Services Performance Mgt Unit Witness's Name (Representing Performance Mgt Office):

Date of Signing

Witness's Signature

Date of Signing: Date of Signing:

Employee Signature Supervisors Signature

Supervising Manager's Name and Title:

Employee's Name: