

PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT

MADE AND ENTERED INTO BY AND BETWEEN:

SENQU MUNICIPALITY

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

The Municipal Manager Mr Thembinkosi Mawonga

and

Mr. Kennith Fourie FINANCIAL SERVICES DIRECTOR "(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 Participation). These come from annually selected and prioritized Core Managerial 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.
- 1.5.4 PART D (0%): Antecedent Input Behaviours. These are strategically winning behaviours 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.
 - 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	25%
Local Economic Development	6%
Municipal Financial Viability and Management	36%

Key Performance Areas (KPA's)	Weighting
Institutional Transformation and Organisational Development	8%
Spatial Planning and Environmental Development	25%
Total	100%

- 5.7 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 guide not a prescription for the KPIs and targets set out in Part C.

CORE COMPETENCY REQUIREMENTS (CCRs) FOR EMPLOYEES – Same Weighting for executives and managers at the same level!				
LEADING COMPETENCIES	1	WEIGHT		
Strategic Direction and Leadership	7	10%		
People Management	1	10%		
Program and Project Management	1	10%		
Financial Management	1	10%		
Change Leadership	7	10%		
Governance Leadership	1	10%		
CORE COMPETENCIES				
Moral Competence	V	6%		
Planning and Organising	1	6%		

CORE COMPETENCY REQUIREMENTS (CCRs) I executives and managers at the same level!	FOR EMPLOYEES -	Same Weighting fo
LEADING COMPETENCIES	1	WEIGHT
Analysis and Innovation	7	8%
Knowledge and Information Management	7	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.

Performance Agreement – Part A: Financial Services Director, 2023/24

- (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.

Level	Terminology	Description		Rating				
	, commoney		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		Description		ting			
2575.	Tollings			2	3	4	5		
		Performance does not meet the standard expected	1				-		
		for the job. The review/assessment indicates that							
		the employee has achieved below fully effective							
Unacceptable		results against almost all of the performance criteria							
		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:

First quarter:	July – September	Period Review Report Concluded on
Second quarter	: October – December	Period Review Report Concluded on
Third quarter: Ja	nuary – MarchP	eriod Review Report Concluded on
Fourth quarter:	April – June F	Period Review Report Concluded on

- 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 Director's contract of employment with or without notice for any other breach by the Director 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: Financial Services Director, 2023/24

ID of Incumbent:

Title of Incumbent : CFO Name of Director / Incumbent:

WEIGHT OF PART B = 35% of ENTIRE 3 PART SCORECARDS OF THE PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT: Period of Scorecard Coverage: 1st July, 2023 - 30th June 2024

Individual KP Baseline (as a	KPI Weighting in %	Individual Key	Individual Strategic Actions	OUTCOME	AREA	M JOB NOFILE
	2 = 25%)	LOPMENT (WEIGHTING	RASTRUCTURE DEVE	INERY AND IN	ICE DEF	KPA 1: SERV
		TO A LANGE COMMERCE	1 MILL D - 22 W OL FILLE	10 11101711		

	Means of Evidence Verification	EAIGEUCE	\$ ATD	£ ЯТО	इ आ ठ	t ATD	Any Additional Resources				indicators (based on outcomes, strategic actions and outputs)			PRIORITY/FOCUS AREA	and / or MM JOB PROFILE
Manager BTO	Council or SEM Approval		beviseen studin > = 1 beviseen studin > = 1 dub als a bub ou be dub ou be dub ou be dub studin = 2 con studin = 2 dub als a consistent of the dub ou beviseed 3 deb ou beviseen bevond beviseen	۷/۷	۷/N	∀/N		bne ygeleste = .1 aribo ubo eth selfa en de the selfa ben eth selfa ben eygelesta = .2 eyeb £ besternt neig eyeb £ besternt neig bester en de selfa ben eygelesta = .2 bostlent neig bester en de selfa neig bester en de selfa neig bester en de selfa neigh en de selfa bester en de selfa neigh en bester en de selfa neigh	Meu	%>	OTB to nothogra? \% enail of bre vgelat2 entil on bevorger entreves! bra finemenonfra! finemunonfs digelat2 to hodgen if vgelat of nothudistnon tiert ent of allower eff of steller	Strategies in respect of at notituditinos rient	Cnitrus Excelleuce Zeuvice Whuicipal High	99	Strategic Financial Planning
Al srobario IIA	Custruly Audits of schools achieved	Budget allocation and expenditive Analysis Reports	draft available			2		1 = c not even ne de manable de manable de manable de l'est dreif availle de l'est dreif availle de l'est dreif availle de l'est dreif availle de l'est de la supprivate de la submitte de l'est de la contraction de l'est de la contraction de l'est	MGU		pien to cater for Strategic Session resolutions (Develop tem Financial Long term Financial temperature the pien to cater for the	TL SDBIP plans that focus on attention on beat sort seles and and sort seles	Corpro Dejivery Service Jean Wandelse Mara Kell Mara Kel		AMAZONEE IIII DIIB É LEARING SOUR RECO LO MITE ERMONY

Al Dredon	A Decotors	Community Services Director	Community Services Director	Coegnatory Pertura ergogat sell. GFO and Tertrinal Directors	
Audited Reports	Audited Reports	Audited Reports Signed - off by expective freedoms.	Auditod Indigent	Actonieugement leizer by National Treesury	
1. Counting Passodium consideration consider	1. Council Resolution consideration consideration consideration consideration consideration consideration councilian councilian councilian councilian	Besic Servico Defivery Financing 9 Reports	Reports on poor / Infigent in the common in	MAR Persenting on Indicators in restricts in restricts in restricts in restricts application application and the restrict of t	
1 c not even a 2 - Fret den 2 - Fret den 3 - schembb but not yet septowed 3 - schembb for 3 - schembb for 6		1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 66% - 77% 4 = 76% - 69% 5 = 90% -	1 - 4.2% 1 - 4.2% 2 - 4.2% - 59% 3 - 60% - 59% 5 - 50% - 50%	1 - < 2% 2 - 42% - 59% 3 - 60% - 77% 5 - 50% -	
<u>-6~6~668383388</u>	1. * c tot owen a charl NAN That chair overlable but That chair overlable but The chair overlable The chair over	1 = < 42% 2 1 1 2 1 2 1 2 2 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2	1 < 42% 2 11 < 42% 2 12	on for reporting this 2.1	
	WW.	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 76% - 89% 5 = 50% -	1 = < 42% 1 = < 42% 2 = 50% 5 = 50% +	nd for reporting this quarter	
	\$	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 69% 5 = 80% -	1 - < 42% 2 - 62% - 55% 2 - 62% - 55% 4 - 75% - 55% 5 - 50%	not for reporting this model responding this quarter quarter.	
1. * c not even a entre estable better estable	1. * c tot even e data neckabo 2 * Fres dest approved 3 * submitted for approved to this stock debt: 4 4 to debt and approved with mixer approved with mixer expected with mixer approved with mixer	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 80%+	1 = < 42% 1 = 64% - 55% 2 = 64% - 55% 4 = 75% - 55% 5 = 50% -	1 * - 624 2 - 624 - 334 3 - 634 - 734 4 - 735 - 834 5 - 895 -	
<u>B</u>	8802	MOU	New	800U	
_					25%
4% beet of error 4% beet of error 4% beet of error 4% beet of error 50 kWy 523	% level of organization of % level of organization of acceptable 19:23 February 2023 February 2023	% of households with 4% access to fee bestic services for electricity	% of households who 3% central gates of the general processes of the general processes of the general processes of the factor of the best services (Indigent Report) (Indigent Report) section from the best of the general winder freezy, CAAT sections by entire the service of the general winders of the general processes of	Now externed (No. 1) now furnted expects (no	Ad
Ensure the completion of 14 and of enrual the Arrange (Layer traited and May 222 and accepted by 30 May Adjustment Badget by 28 2023 February 2022	FASE	Working with Community W Services when Esting or indigents	16 0 0 E D W C E B S H S	Chempton infrastrukter vom Deben beestment vom Deben vom	Sub-Total Weighting for this KPA
DEFINERA			bail 1 1009 to morque?		Sub-Total
	Service Delivery related infrastructure investment				

Supporting	ı	(Community and Technical Services Directors	Manager BTO s and Technical Services Director
	Means of Evidence Verification	Co-signed by MM, COGTA and Auditors	Audis to confirm signed by SMMEs
AUDITED	Evidence	Audited EPWP Reports	Audited Capital Budget Sub- contracts
		2 1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 4 3 = 60% - 77% 5 = 90% +	2 1 = < 42% 1 2 42% - 59% 4 3 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +
TARGETS	arr 3	1 = < 42% = 42% - 59% 5 = 90% +	1 = < 42% = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 17% = 73% - 89% 5 = 90% +
¥	OTR 2	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 4 = 76% - 59% 5 = 90% +	
	OTR 1	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 4 = 60% - 77% 5 = 90% +	
Additional Resources Needed			
Individual Annual Target		1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 4 = 50% - 77% 5 = 90% +	1 = < 42% 2.2% - 52% - 52% - 52% - 52% - 52% - 52% - 52% 5 = 50% +
Individual KPI Baseline (as at	June Auto	wev.	ием
Weighting in %		86	3%
Individual Key Performance	indicators (based on outcomes, strategic actions and outputs)	work Opportunities	% of the municipal capital project in capital project in capital project in allocated to SIAMEs allocated to SIAMEs frough ensuring tender documentation has a provision for subcontracting
Individual Strategic Actions		Stive to Mentain / Increase EPMP work increase EPMP work or poportunities within the Technical services and Community Services and Community Services and Community Services or Communities new job opportunities created even through capital projects	Ensure this policy is implemented fairly and leastly and leastly
OUTCOME		Ob Creation and reduced unamployment amunicipes the community of the commu	SIM/Es
1 V thoir	TL SDBIP KPI NU	LED 02-04	CED 05 - 02

Supporting		EM SCM (Demand & Managers (Demand & Acquisition); Other directors as line project directors	Parameter of Comments of Comme	n-off SCM Menegers		-ngis 19
ИСЕ	Means of Evidence Verification	Gounal or SE Approval	jjo-u8j≤-00	ngiS ratibuA	BID commit Char sign-o	bne lemetril tibuA lemetri3 soiliqqe as affo
AUDITED EVIDE	Evidence	Aporova Sourcing	SCM Manager Project Manager Reports	SCM Audited Reports	BID Committee Meeting Invites against minutes and resolution	Half tearly Financial Statements
	≯ ЯТ О	1, a c not even a definition of the service of the		%G'71 - %G1 = G %G'71 - %G1 = E %G'6 - %L = Z %L - %G'6 - %L = Z %L - %G'6 - %L = Z	%5! = 9 %6'7! - (%1) %6'7! - (%0) = 0 %6'7! - (%0) = 0 %6'6 - (%2) = 1 %6' - (%2) = 1	%1'6 <= 9 %6 * %9 = † %9 * %1'6 = E %0 - * %1' = Z %1 - > = 1
LY TARGETS	इ आफ	ΑΝ	= 60%+ = 5 %63 - 98/2 = 60,8 - 15 < 4 = 10,8	%\$1 = 9 %\$-17.60 \$1 - %\$1 = 2 %\$-21-60 \$1 = 2 %\$2 = 1	%51 = 9 %671 - %61 = 9 %671 - %01 = 0 %66 - %2 = 2 %62 = 1	
яэтяаль	s ятр	ΨN	2 = 60%+ = 1,8%-58% = 20%-13,% = 1 = 45,% = 45,% = 45,% = 45,% = 45,000 plan bes = 45,000 plan bes = 45,000 plan bes	%\$i = 9 %6'\$i - %\$i = \$ %6'Zi- %0i = \$ %6'6 - %L = Z %L> = 1	2 = 12% %6'9' - 1%'6' %6'2' - 5'0' %6'6' - 5'' %1' = 1	%1'6<= 9 %6 - %9 = p %1'8 - %1'8 - 6 %1'- %1' = 2 %1' - 3 %
	t ATD	ĀŅ	mponentable	%\$I = \$G\$ %6'\$I - %\$I = \$P\$ %6'ZI - %\$OI = \$E\$ %6'6 - %\$L = \$Z\$ %\$L> = \$I\$	2 = 12% 4=12% - 14'5% 5=10% - 15'5% 5=12% - 6'5% 6'5'5'	
Additional beniused Required						
IsunnA Isubivibrii JegisT		= c not even a chall even and and an even and an even inches and an even and even an	2 = 90.% + 15.8% - 85.%	%91 = 9 %6'71 - %81 = 7 %6'21- %01 = 8 %6'6 - %1 = 2 %6'6 - %1 = 3	2 = 12% 46'51-%6'6'% 5 = 16'6'%6'6'%6'6'%6'5'%6'5'%6'5'%6'5'%6'6'%6'%	%1.6 < = 9 %6 - %9 = † %5 - %1.5 = E %5 - %1. = Z %1. = Z
Individual KPI Baseline (as at	(SS0S enul	мэц	мои	wen	Mau	MeM
% ni gnitrigieW		%1	%£	%2	5%	%2
= 36%) Performance Performance	Indicators (based on outcomes, strategic actions and outputs)	Availability of Approved Sourioing/Procurement	perocurement plen	% reduction in tenders which collepse due to SCM errors	% reduction in tenders which colleges due to Bid Committes that fail to conclude their business on time (tenders to be adjudicated within 90 adjudicated within 90 days)	% increase of yearly and increase or revenue comparable time last financial year time last financial year
AGEMENT (WEIGHTING Individual Strategic Actions		Oversee plans to reduce nuncesseary outsourcing of good and service and delays in the procurement processess; Rendomly semple nunning contracts to ensure full to ensure full where in regularities and where in equal processes; Semily processes processe	volt b reduce of good services of good and services where services where services and services and services of good and services of good and service of the constantly delanced and updated leaving the best service providers, and completed be constantly demonstrate the constantly service providers, and completed services the service providers and completed the constantly demonstrates the service providers.	enforce compliant value - for -money service appointments. Apply corrective measures to the SCM Unit		Meep track on budget an abandaire a benchmen a benchmen by expensible controlling the controlling of the con
		"rboom? bna baeqs defining of bashustuo lagdinum lagsinum seuborq abuborq	flooms, flooms of the control of the	Cost- effective procurement and implementati to no services and	sponosid	Financially australiable municipality
Area	Priority / Focus	-	SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT (ADMINISTRATION AND REPORTING) - MENIVOT	SUP		rate bills for services rendered
KPA 3: FINA	TL SDBIP KPI NUMBER and I or MM JOB PROFILE	Financial Leadership	MENVOT-01		MFMV01-01	04

Company Comp		al service definery, reversue manager	Revenue Meneger	treckens	See and See an	so _Q	8 x z		5
				ž	Mens	is de	Service Directs		2045 PR
Continued Cont		Audi Revious /	Audited Vehistion Reports		5	Standary Committee substrainties	Audited Financial Statements Signed by NAM		itemal and itemal Audi eign- fit as applicable
Second Column	Artitus, consum and Arrupal Francial Statements	Monthy, Querterly and Annual Francial Statements	Quarterly Verteefon Updatos	Approved velucecon roll			MG Project Francial Reports	N Grant Expenditure	Worthy and Duarterly Financial Statements
A comparison A co			1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 75% - 69% 5 = 90% -	1=>5,77% 2=5,03%-5,77% 3=3,87-5% 4=2,71%-3,83% 5=<2,71%	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 60% -		1 = < 42% 2 - 42% - 55% 3 = 60% - 77% 6 = 78% - 69% 5 = 50% -	ļ	1 = > 0 - 60 decrease 2 = 61 - 60% 8 = 1-90% 4 = 91 - 89% 5 = 100% decrease
2 - 15 - 15 - 15 - 15 - 15 - 15 - 15 -	10	1 = < - 2% 2 = -1%2% 3 = 0% - 0,5% 4 = 0.6% - 1,0% 5 = > 1%	i	▼			~ , 4	~~	
	NO.		"	1 = >5,77% 2 = 5,00% - 5,77% 3 = 3,87 - 5% 4 = 2,71% - 3,83% 5 = < 2,71%					
Toroneous for comparing the comparing to				1 = ×5,77% 2 = 5,03% - 5,77% 3 = 3,87 - 5% 4 = 2,71% - 3,83% 5 = < 2,71%				1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 69% 5 = 90% -	•
s of consocion response in the consocion res	2 - 1.38 - 38 2 - 1.38 - 38 3 - 3.18 - 58 4 - 656 - 95 6 - 7 - 9.18	1=<-2% 2=-1%-0% 3=1%-15% 4=16%-19% 5=2%	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 55% 2 = 62% - 77% 4 = 75% - 65% 5 = 90% -	1=5,77% 2=5,00%-5,77% 3=3,61-5,5% 4=2,71%-3,63% 5=<2,71%	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 75% - 89% 5 = 80% -	1 + < 42% 2 - 42% - 59% 3 - 60% - 77% 4 - 70% - 60% 5 - 90% -	1 + < 42% 5 - 42% - 55% 5 - 60% - 77% 4 - 75% - 55% 5 - 50% -	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% -	1 + > 0 + 50 decreas 2 - 61 - 80% 3 - 61 - 80% 5 - 100% decrease
set year Set ye		800	мен	MOCI	NO.	AA0CL	anou;	MOC	800
increases for competeb periods they year competeb periods they year competeb periods they year they will be t					ž	%	**	*	*S
Keep track of francial performance against MT required performance against MT reducing the bad down performance and procedures and CTO work to again the bad down manipulation of CTO work to again the performance and the performance and were forced and performance and were forced and reward devolutions and performance and reward devolutions and sentences are requirements and reward devolutions.	increases for comparable periods test year	% of cornect billing for comparable periods last year	% charges in Propert Velues due to updeted in expelementary vahations updated on the francial system	% budget Both CAPE and OPEQ: expenditure deviations for Finance Projects	Defined Number of Gezetbel Frencial Veskity and Management Ratios estitured at NT recommended lavets	% of municipal assets that thei are reflected correctly in the asset register	% of MG Projects swarded as per approved procuremen plan within relevant finalizanes	% Grant spending complance to all finance related grant conditions	% instances decreases that fail into the UIPN (Unauthorised, Fulfaces unwested). I a (non-compleant spending) across the municipality
HH HH managed open land of controlled controlle					Keep track of francial serformance against NT required performance ratios	Fraue that there is proper drawfoodin, recording, updating of seasts and frauestrant contribut to the bird down with the bird down cookies and procedures.	Check and track MiG project implementation capacity, ensure Corthool Dracks and CFO work together to norcess efficient spend an MiG projects;	\$ E	Track each deviation to restablish care, caufon to scholar care, caufon and when to and when the consequence memogeneral ectors to consederate and several schools.
							hteatudate foursed and efficient municipality	5	Level of municipal compliance with financial management legislative requirements by each drectorate
206 galibbrorq Vd eard somewes texplaimm edt hestorq bas brasqua of stortino D bas notistäge al islonsaff of sensitymo D effort dot.	ne Bugykoud Aq ese	d eanswer leafairmm ed	3 belong has basque of	stotn	oO bas acitalaged laboranii of s				
compliance compliance compliance compliance compliance participated by the properties of the propertie									countrace

.

									%8		A9X eidt tof gr	nitdgiaW IstoT-du2		
Corporate Services Divisional Divisional Mgrs.	Proof of submission	Committee Committee	+%06 = \$ %69 *%82 = \$ %69 * %92 = 2 %65 * %27 = 2 %27 > = 1	%68 - %8 <i>L</i> = 7 %68 - %8 <i>L</i> = 8 68 - %8 <i>L</i> = 7 %68 - %8 <i>L</i> =	+%06 = 9 %69 -%94 = 1 %69 - %27 = 2 %69 - %27 = 2 %27 > = 1	+%06 = 9 %68 * %82 = y %12 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	%68 - %84 = \$ \%24 - \%09 = \$ \%69 - \%7 =	fo nodstnamelom of TOI oigelst/2 b ert ni sevtlebini SSOS/SOS	%E	ent la notinoproy & 170 ent la nondativemelemi 202 enul. 05 Vd (gestata 05 to tuo & (%001) seigefata	Ensure improved and Secured Systems and Network Accessbillity		Leading for Optimal Resource Utilisation	
Manager Legal and Manager BTO	Proof of submission	Guarterly Reports Committee Committee	+%06 = \$ %68 * %84 = \$ %69 = \$ %69 = \$ %57 - %27 = 2 %27 > = \$ %27 > = \$	= 42% - 59% 3	+%06 = 9 %63 * %2! = 9 %12 * %9 = £ %65 * %27 = 2 %27 > = 1	+%06 = 9 %68 - %8.2 = y %424 - %09 = E %65 - %7 = 2 %7 > = 1	e 42% - 69% 3	Mad	967	ho nothogon % for bring of % for the transpose of the section of the section of the transpose of tr	Ensure appropriate iepsielate structures	noßsteinlimbA eldst2	People Management	
All Directors and Manager DTO	Council resolution	Proof of funding of the furnaround plan	+%06 = 9 %69 - %92 = b %65 - %27 = 2 %65 - %27 = 2 %7 > = 1	%68 - %81 = 7 %69 - %81 = 8 %69 - %87 =	+ %06 = 5 %68 - %82 = \$ %42 - \$409 = \$ \$459 - \$27 = 5 \$27 = 2	+%06 = 9 %62 - %82 = 9 %27 - 309 = 8 %28 - 25 = 2 %28 - 2 = 1	£ %59 - %7¢ =	меи	%1			readiness to bounce back after institutional setbacks (like COVID, economic down turns, natural disaster and municipal wide performance)	ility - Chan	
Supporting	Means of Evidence Verification	EAIGEUCE	≯ ЯТО	Е ЯТО				Maceline (as at June 2022)			individual Strategic Actions			TL SDBIP KPI NUMBER S

	Means of Evidence Verification	Director Corporate Services	CAE	CFO and ICT Manager(respo nsible for IT)	IT Manager	CFO (as in charge of ICT)	CFO (as in charge of ICT)	CFO (as in charge of ICT)
ICE	Means of Evidence Verification	Signature by Council witnessed by Responsible Director / Mgr	Signature by ARC CAE Chair witnessed by Responsible Director / Mgr		Audited Masterplen and Operational plans	Sign-off by Manager Governance	Sign-off by Manager Governance	IT Resolution CFO (as in Register signed off charge of ICT) by the ICT Steering Committee
AUDITED EVIDENCE	Evidence	Register	Register Register	IT Master Plan and Reports	IT Mester Plan and Audited Reports Mesterp Operation	ICT Report to the Standing Committee	IT Security Audit	IT Resolution Register signed off by the ICT Steering
	QTR 4	2 1 = < 42% 3 2 = 42% - 59% 4 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +	2 1 = < 42% 3 2 = 42% - 59% 4 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 76% - 69% 5 = 50% +	2 1 = < 42% 3 2 = 42% - 59% 4 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	2 1 = < 42% 3 2 = 42% - 59% 4 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 69% 5 = 90% +	2 = < 42% 4 3	2 1 = < 42% 3 2 = 42% - 59% 4 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +	2 1 = < 42% 3 2 = 42% - 59% 4 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +
ETS	QTR 3	1 = < 42% = 42% - 59% = 60% - 77% = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +	1 = < 42% = 42% - 59% = 60% - 77% = 76% - 69% 5 = 90% +	1 = < 42% = 42% - 59% = 60% - 77% = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% = 42% - 59% = 60% - 77% = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +	1 = < 42% = 42% - 59% = 60% - 77% = 78% - 69% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% = 42% - 59% = 60% - 77% = 76% - 89% 5 = 90% +	1 = < 42% = 42% - 59% = 60% - 77% = 78% - 89% 6 - 00% -
QUARTERLY TARG	arr.2 al	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 76% - 69% 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% 4 = 78% - 69% 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% +
QTR 1		2 1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 4 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +	2 1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 4 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 76% - 89% 5 = 90% +	2 1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 4 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +	2 1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 4 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +	2 1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 4 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +	2 1 = < 42% 3 2 = 42% - 59% 4 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +	2 1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 4 3 = 60% - 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 6 - 00%
Annual Target		1 = < 42% 2 = 42% 59% 3 = 42% 59% 3 = 60% 77% 4 = 78% 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = 42% = 42% - 59% 3 = 60% - 77% 5 = 90% +	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% 59% 3 = 60% 77% 4 = 78% - 89% 5 = 90%+	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% 2 = 42% 5 = 90% 3 = 60% 77% 4 = 78% 6 = 90% 5 = 90%	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% - 59% 3 = 42% - 59% 4 = 12% - 89% 4 5 = 90% +	1 = < 42% = 42% - 59% = 60% - 77% = 78% - 89% 5 = 90% +	1 = < 42% 2 = 42% 59% 3 = 60% 77% 4 = 78% 89% 6
Individual KPI		пем	ием	пем	меч	пем	пем	пем
Weighting in the	whole Performance Agreement	3%	5%	3%	% 6	%c	%6	3%
Individual Key	Performance indicators (based on outcomes, strategic actions and outputs)	% of Overall Council Financial Resolutions implemented on time as intended per quarter	% of Combined ARC, MPAC, Top Mgt, and Senior Executive Mgt Resolutions financially arralysed and thereafter implemented on time as intended per quarter	cumulative % of mantainance, monitoring and management of IT systems	% of ICT projects and polarined milestones paramed milestones the municipality (ICT Syspens and Applications Monitoring)	% 4 ICT Strategic Plan priorities which will address aging ICT address aging ICT address aging ICT address aging ICT address incompatible sub outages, incompatible sub system and imfled financial resources implemented	% of system downtime resolved within the stpulated time in any given quarter	& ICT Steering Committee Resolutions implemented
Individual Stratagic	4	ri >	(recolution by category (recolution by category (Recurdin ARC, (Recurdin ARC, ARC)). Record Mgt). Record resident statementation stages reached for each resolution; Emphassise speed-up fareas where unacceptable delays are emergined.	project d / or ng some m IT finding	reports that show reduction in security risks that have been curtailed as a result of the IT Security audit	,		
Name of Columns of Col		ere all	implementation. by fast implementation of By fast implementation of By fast implementation of Studied resolutions It immed by mandated it structures.	A safer / more secure municipal IT operating environment				
BK INITIONE		icipal Structures			Ol bns notistnemelqml TO	1		
Ч.	J.F 2DBIb KbI MOWBEI	90°£0dd000						

and CAE
Ounterly servi- errual and errual Support or of by francial reports respective directors directors
11 • c rot own a deal metable (earl earl earl earl earl earl earl earl
in a cross even a data 1 - s rost even a serable 2 - deal existible 3 - deal existence
the second secon
1 = c not even a 11 = c not even a dat describedo not per describedo not per describedo not per estado ha companda de companda
energies of each 1, s. c total even a energies 2 or and neargies 3
£
roduction % sources of francial 2% rotation in the control of the
increase to p of credible first cred
ососитерно в ображения по ососително ососит
gedfrorquest teleseard's noticestered bene gedrorlinoid

Auchs and Separates by ARC all discusses and part CAE francision reports as Responsible required by ten Discourt / May	
8 8	4
Te esse	
gradure services rector / /	
8 8	┪
day y	
Audis of particular of particu	
	7
	j
1 Obschmor 2 1 Obschmor 2 Unqualified by with marker of emphasis 4 = Unqualified by with Choose Companies of emphasis Choose Cho	
o County of the same of the sa	
- # D E 4 O	1
	-
	1
	┥
	_
_	
<u> </u>	-
xt.	š
scentes Love of Audi Opinion (3) ucebbe generally (16 for for audit to good Arrach francia to estimate the estimate the francia	
Opinion and the state of the st	- 1
# Audi # AG k Imand ent	11
Lovel og ben b statement of the statemen	Щ
brates describe o speed re o hends fevel of the	€
Evers et drechterte inpost d'en sacché information de page et et frui, eraus et d'occument in d'occument in d'occument in d'occument proposition d'en lord correptance et ma corrètance et ma corrètance et ma corrètance et ma	35
Ensure ad dract book of their authors of their and their	fart
Accurately and clean Ensure of directorists Love of Aucti Opinion 131 musticul administration in top and feet excitable grown by Gir for final auctic information up to spood Arrest franchis cannot a tel films, cannot a tel films, cannot a reduced by any level of actions in reduced by any level of auctions to management with a completion or non completion or non completion to be such	Sub-Total Weighting for this M
Accountable and clean municipal administration	Wei
A bed a second	Sub-Total
muni muni	Ser
enolniqO SibuA	
	\neg
1	- 1

Employee Signature:

Employer / Supervisor's Signature:

Corporate Services Mgt Unit Witness Name:

Date of Signing:

~)

Supporting Director(s) I	Evidence	Evidence of Performance				STEDRAT	1i) Jegbuß launnA ebnut lanobibbs	leubivibni JegnsTleunnA	Baseline for	In % KPI Welghang	Personal Key Performance Indicator (KPI) for listed actions	Personal Individual of nethonal individual of nethon to company in company	Outcome	Focus Area	Strategic
Manager(s)	Дещевдой		► RETFRAUD	£ RITHAUD	GUARTER 2	t RETRAUD	sbecify them here)					actileve outcome			Nr (CMC / Source Ref
No Serior Managene M AH regene M	Signed off letters with registray proof of submission (date (qmats	Departmental sign	9 = 81% + 9 = 91% - 80% 9 = 20% - 90% 5 = 46% 1800 1 = 46% 1800					2 = 61% + 4 = 81% - 60% 2 = 10% - 80% 5 = 46% - 66% 1 =<46% island	мац		y of departmental notification of the compliance with the termination full compliance with the termination to the second submitted on time and in the compliance with the termination to the contract of the c	ant ni MRH hogqu2 evitafle bna thacifle lie lo thamegenem bne znoibe isthamhegeb rbrink savitetini wen	gmisworm3 bns gnitevtom gnidene AH letnemtegeb Jmemnorivne	Human Resources (People) Management	
Nanagera and Alf hageneM		ogs Oebstuwursi sibu	2 = 31 # + 4 = 81 # - 30 # 2 = 10 # - 80 # 5 = 45 # - 65 # 1 =<45 # 180 U					2 = 31% + 7 = 81% - 30% 2 = 20% - 80% 5 = 46% - 86% 1 =<76% tsjud	Māu	%€	8 insmittens is transmission of 6 to the financial stransmission documents are set of First or shed betimuse a few first of First or first	supplex sources of the source source source on source on per source on present of the source of the	provisions municipal and public complying to all		
Yoine? IA bne sheeneM AH hegeneM	Standing Committee submission	Labour Relations Reports	+ %16 = 9 %08 - 18 = 9 %08 - 100 = 2 %08 - 100 = 2 %09 - 100 = 2 %09 - 100 = 2		2 = 61% - 4 = 81% - 80% 5 = 46% - 80% 1 =<46% tsptnd			+ %16 = 9 %06 - %19 = 9 %08 - %07 = 5 %09 - %07 = 2 %09 - %07 = 1	MBU	%E	Inemagenem consuperato to # to zysb č nidtw batešini savtežini scarlt to answs gnied DOH arti				

WEIGHT OF PART C = 2004, of ENTINE 3 PART SCORECARDS OF THE PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT:

This weighting for all directors is the second higher than Performance by written of their positions as executive directors including the MML, they all schieves their positions and the properties of their positions and their positions and their positions are second by the performance of their positions and their positions are second by the performance of the performance of

Name of Employee: Current Job Title: Employee Supervisor:

PART C - CORE MANAGERIAL COMPETENCIES SCORECARD 2023/24

SENGU MUNICIPALITY

All Senior Managers and Manager HR	All Service Managers and Manager HR	All Senior Managers and Manager HR	All Senior Managers and Manager HR		
Signed	register register	Coaching and assessment reports	Sign of by HR		
Departmental sign offs	Prod of submission Submission Parale	Coaching and assessment sessions	Policy reviewal mrubes		
	1 = <45% rating 2 = 45% - 65% 3 = 75% - 80% 4 = 61% - 50% 5 = 91% +	1 =<49% rating 2 = 49% - 69% 3 = 70% - 80% 4 = 81% - 90% 5 = 91% +			
	17	1 =<49% rating 2 = 49% - 69% 3 = 70% - 80% 4 = 81% - 90% 5 = 91% -	1 = 4 root even a draft available. 2 = Frait draft available but not yet available but not yet appropriate to a sach mind to appropriate to draft. 4 = a draft. 4 = draft. 5 = supplieded of the appropriate of appropriate of		
1 =<49% rating 2 = 45% - 66% 3 = 70% - 80% 4 = 81% - 90% 5 = 91% +	1 = < 45% rating 2 = 45% - 65% 3 = 75% - 45% 4 = 61% - 5 = 61% -			-	
1					
1 =<45% c0% 2 = 45% c0% 3 = 70% s0% 4 = 81% - 90% 5 = 91% +	1 =<40% rating 2 = 40% - 80% 4 = 81% - 00% 5 = 91% +	1 =<49% rating 2 = 49% - 69% 3 = 70% - 80% 4 = 81% - 90% 5 = 91% -	1 = c not even a 2 = First che 2 = First che anable but not yet spoot on the yet spoot on the yet spoot on the yet spoot on the but of an 4 = abstrated but of an a che and conventions to be approved with 5 = abstrated to be a spoot on the but of an a che and conventions to be approved with the approved on the without conventions		
8	New	new	и	20%	20%
ž.	*6	3%	£	8	20
lead and we'fy that all "M Proportion of directorate staff more investment attractors whose accreameds are concluded and plans which align and with the prescribeding red upon feed no the soroceaths of transferred and which are aligned property in the property of transferred and which are aligned property.	A Proprien of directorite shall foodball and the experiments of the experiments of the prescribed similarities to the prescribed similarities to the prescribed similarities.	%Proportion of directorate staff (including director) who are receiving performance coaching & assessments(formal or informal)	Triuze has Desartmental SAP records report on departmental SAP records reviewed. Dolloes see reviewed. Dolloes reviewed. Dolloes reviewed. Part coordinators Rel as coordinators	WEIGTHING IN %	GRAND TOTAL - ALL KPAs
lead and verify that all obcurrental strategies and plans visibly align and feed into the scorecards of individuals within the contraction of individuals within the contraction of individuals within the contraction of individuals within the contraction.	Ensure that Departmental Finance that Departmental Foreign the Concession Finance of Finance Finance Concession Finance Fi		Energy the Oppartmental Colonies are vewed controlled and which the involvation of the colonies (He is coordinates)		
Development PMS aligned and supportive of people driven IDP and its subordinate plans					
Planning and Development			Policy Formulation	TOTAL	
		CSP: 2	1		

Date of Signing: Date of Signing: Employee Signature: Employer / Supervisor's Signature:



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

This Part of the Performance Agreement is about the development of the employee. Development here has been divided into three aspects in order to meet all the employee work and personal development needs as provided for by the Stills development legislation of South Africa. The focus is on ensuring every employee develope and grows every year since job demands and the broader environment is constantly changing. The competence development in this Part E has been made measurable to stop the habit of employees always fasting competence areas which they have no intention of practice of the state of the part of the state of t

A previous eitils aucit gainst competence area agreed between the employee and higher manager is assumed. If there has been no formal skills aucit done, anecdobal self and manager performance-based aucits will have the be used to hildse 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 (time, money, transport etc.) to afford the employee the desired development

 o To subsequency both out for work of the lighted set has been competed as

 o To extract that the competences desired and proximal by pall employees in her I has bearings and competed by with the municipal Workplace Solids Development Plan (WSP)

 of certain that the competences desired and proximal by pall employees in her I has bearings and competing and commenter extron taken just like all other sections of the Performance Scorecard. Somilarly that it is given its due weighting in calculating the overall performance ming of the employee.

 To ensure that this is the supportable younded and corrective extron taken just like all other sections of the Performance of the Performance of the Performance of the Performance of the Competence of the Performance of

of being rated lowly in this area.

2. For the employee to;

Name of Employee: Kennith Fourie Curred, bob Rei Tiller, Department Where Employed: Finance Warne of Cultate (Department Where Employed: Finance Period Covered by this Part B of the Employee's Performance Plant: 1" July, 2021 to 30" June 2024

Dection 1. Job Specific Personal Development - OY of Part E for this financial year Limitess agreed to by MIX it is deemed there is a job compelence gap. For now take It as NUIL, This section would in reliated to Directorativ Lone Functions in Part B of the Scorecard).	% of Part E for this fina	ancial year (unless agreed to	o by MM it is deemed there is a	a job competence gap. F.	or now take it as NIA).	This section would is rela	led to Directorate's Core Fur.	inctions in Part B of the Scorecard):						
Number and		Weighting of the KPI /	Baseline (Current Competence Profile	ice Profile nossible C	Clevels)	ompetence caver (rick one of these two	Budget to achieve this	Method to be used to acquire this	Means of Evidence	Assessment of Comp.	Assessment of Competence Achievement / Individual Dev Levels Attained	ev Levels Attained		
Same of identified Arri		Competence	level e.g. Basic)			Advanced	competence	competence	Verification (MoVs)	Planned Target	Actual	Deviation	Rating score for Performance Purposes	mance Purposes
1														
NA. We'vel of competence on the 5 level scale used in the	e on the 5 level scale													
NA														
ub -Total		%0	Average of Competence level in selected		Targeted Competence	Average Targeted Competence level in selected # 77	u	Most Preferred Methods **	Most preferred MOVs =	Average Planned Target = C?	Average for Actuals in this Section a C7	Average for this Section *	Average Rating Score for this Section of Part E *	for this Section of
Section 2. General Managerial / Employee Personal Development - 100% of Part E for Year 2023/24 (these are related to Directorate's Core Functions in Part	d Development - 100%	6 of Part E for Year 2023/24	(these are related to Directoral	de's Core Functions in P.	art B of the Scorecard	B of the Scorecard - Taken from the Psychometric Assessment Report	netric Assessment Report							
umber and			Baseline (Current	Targeted Competence L	Level (Tick one of thes.	rargeted Competence Level (Tick one of these two possible C levels)	Budget to achieve this	Method to be used to acquire this	Means of Evidence		Assessment	Assessment of Competence Achievement I Individual Dev Levels Attained	dividual Dev Levels Attained	
Name of Identified Competence	tt ao ButtuBiaw	weigning of the KP17 Competence		Competent Level	Advanced		competence	competence	Verification (MoVs)	Planned Actual			Deviation from target (reflected at financial year end)	namig score to: Performance Purposes (at
2.1 Strategic Management		*400'05	Competent		Advanced		22	coaching, formal blended self-education with a service provider	Most preferred MOVe a	Advanced Competent	nent .			
2.2 Change Management % level of competence on the 5 level scale	004	\$0,00%	Competent	Competent Level	Advanced		и	coaching, formal blended self-education with a service provider	Certification by the same Accredited Pschometric	Advanced Competent	pert .			
		0.00%	Competent	Competent Level	Advanced		22		Service Providers	Advanced Competent	put.			
Sub-Total: Section 2		N001	Average of Selected Nanagerial Competences levels = Competent	Average of Selected Mana Competent	inagerial Targeted Con	sperial Targeted Competences levels =	u u	Most Preferred Methods * online or blended learning	Certified by the Accredited Psychometric Service Provider	Average Planned Target = Competent	Average for Actuals in this Section * Compotent		Average deviation for this Section =	Average Rating Score for Section 2 of Part E =
GRAND TOTAL (Sections 1 & 2)		100%	Average of Selected 100% Managerial Competences levels = Competent	Total of Selected Managerial Targeted Competences levels = Competent	gerial Targeted Compe	ntences levels =	u	Most Preferred Methods = online or blended learning	Most preferred MOVs = Re- test by Pyschometrilicist	Average Planned Target ** Competent	Average for Actuals in this Section = Compotent		Average for Section 2 ×	Average Rating Score for Section 2 of Part E *
Employee's Name:		Employee	Employee Signature				Date of Signing:			_				
Supervising Manager's Name and Title:) (22	Superviso	Supervisors Signature				Date of Signing:							

Date of Signing

Witness's Signature

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