

Gert Sibande District Municipality

2013/14 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

June 2014



*“A District Municipality Striving to Excel in Good Governance and
Quality Infrastructure”*

Table of Contents

1. Purpose	3
2. Executive Summary.....	4
3. Departmental Performance	5
3.1 Office of the Municipal Manager	6
3.2 Budget and Treasury	7
3.2 Corporate Services	8
3.3 Community and Social Services	9
3.4 Human Settlements	10
3.4 Infrastructure and Technical Services	11
3.5 Planning and Economic Development	12
4 Limitations of Evaluation	13
5 Challenges.....	13

Annexures:

Annexure A: 2013/14 IDP Scorecard

Annexure B: Office of the Municipal Manager - 2013/14 Annual Scorecard

Annexure C: Budget and Treasury - 2013/14 Annual Scorecard

Annexure D: Corporate Services - 2013/14 Annual Scorecard

Annexure E: Community and Social Services - 2013/14 Annual Scorecard

Annexure F: Human Settlements - 2013/14 Annual Scorecard

Annexure G: Infrastructure and Technical Services - 2013/14 Annual Scorecard

Annexure HI: Planning and Economic Development - 2013/14 Annual Scorecard

Annexure JK: Annual evaluation/status of procurement for Infrastructure Projects

1. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to give feedback regarding the performance of Gert Sibande District Municipality as required through The Municipal Systems Act No 32 of 2000 and Municipal Finance Management Act No 52 of 2003. The information included in this report is based on the IDP¹ and SDBIP² as developed for the financial year 2013/2014. The scorecards were developed to reflect **cumulative performance**, therefore the status of indicators are a reflection of the overall performance level achieved year to date. This report is based on information received from each department for assessment of performance ending June 2014. This is a high-level report based on scores obtained through a process whereby actual information per Key Performance Area (KPA), strategic objective, programme and the aligned Key Performance Indicators and projects are compared to the budget and initial planning included in the 2013/14 Integrated Development Plan.

Overall performance for Gert Sibande District Municipality is based on the Departmental Performance scorecard which is inclusive of all the IDP, SDBIP, TAS and General indicators. Sub-sections are included that discuss the progress made in achieving the targets as detailed in each scorecard in terms of the contribution made by each Department.

This report serves as a summary of results. The detail pertaining to the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and projects are included in a separate addendum document, due to the volume thereof. Results are presented in the form of scores as detailed below and were calculated using an automated system and based on the guidelines contained in the DPLG Regulation 805; Municipal Performance Regulations for Municipal Managers and Managers Directly Accountable to Municipal Managers, 2006. The scoring method utilised is as follows;

Rating	Colour code	Scoring	% Target achieved	
		Score	Low	High
Unsatisfactory		1-1.99	0.0%	66%
Below average		2 -2.99	66.6%	99.9%
Achieved target		3 -3.99	100%	132%
Achieved/ exceeded target		4 -4.99	133%	166.9%
Outstanding		5+	167.0%	+
NA – Not applicable for reporting in reporting period (excluded from performance measurement)				
OW – Set to zero weighting (excluded from performance measurement) by the Department				

¹ Integrated Development Plan

² Service Delivery and Budget Implementation Plan

2. Executive Summary

This report serves as the Annual Performance Report for the financial year 2013/2014 ending June 2014. It provides feedback on the performance level achieved to date against the targets as laid out in the IDP and SDBIP.

The overall performance for Gert Sibande District Municipality is based on the Departmental Performance Scorecard as this contains all of the indicators as included in the IDP, SDBIP and General Scorecards. At the end of the financial year, the overall accumulative performance level achieved was a below target score of **2.78**. A total of 181 KPI's encompassing the different scorecards contribute to the overall organisational score, 13 KPI's where zero weighted (excluded from performance measurement) and therefore do not carry a score. Of the remaining 168 KPI's, 105 (62.50%) achieved or exceeded target, 63 (37.50%) were below target. A summary of performance by scorecard is provided as per the table below;

Gert Sibande District Municipality	Sept 13	Dec 13	Mar 14	June 14
	Score	Score	Score	Score
Overall	2.76	2.44	2.59	2.78
IDP	2.16	2.05	2.65	2.70
SDBIP	2.84	2.48	2.58	2.80

Table: Overall Performance

The **IDP Scorecard** was below target with a score of **2.70**. A total of 41 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 4 were zero weighted, thus having no impact on the overall IDP score. Of the remaining 37 indicators, twenty-one (56.76%) achieved or exceeded target, sixteen (43.24%) were below target.

The **SDBIP Scorecard** was slightly below target with a score of **2.80**. A total of 140 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 9 zero weighted, thus having no impact on the overall SDBIP score. Of the remaining 131 indicators, eighty-four (64.12%) achieved or exceeded target, forty-seven (35.88%) were below target.

3. Departmental Performance

The Departmental Performance Scorecard constitutes all of the KPI's and projects as contained in the IDP and SDBIP Scorecards. This section of the report provides information on the contribution made by each Department to the performance levels achieved for the different scorecards which in turn represents the overall³ performance level achieved by the Municipality. Gert Sibande District Municipality completed the financial year with an overall score of **2.78**. A summary of the overall performance level achieved by each Department is provided in the table below;

Departmental Performance Overall Scores	Sep 13	Dec 13	Mar 14	June 14
	Score	Score	Score	Score
Overall	2.76	2.44	2.59	2.78
Office of the Municipal Manager	2.84	2.40	2.61	3.02
Budget and Treasury	2.97	2.43	2.58	3.11
Corporate Services	2.24	2.06	2.27	2.62
Community and Social Services	3.07	2.98	2.99	3.13
Human Settlements	3.55	1.97	1.81	1.96
Infrastructure and Technical Services	2.84	2.72	2.93	2.79
Planning and Economic Development	2.38	2.26	2.56	2.36

Table: Departmental Performance Overall Scores

The following summary sheets contain a breakdown of the Departmental performance.

³ Overall performance is calculated by taking an average of ALL of the KPI and project scores applicable to GSDM
Overall departmental scores are calculated by taking an average of ALL of the KPI and project scores applicable to that department

3.1 Office of the Municipal Manager

The Office of the Municipal Manager is responsible for a total of 27 KPI's which contribute to the overall performance level for the IDP and SDBIP Scorecards. The statistics for the Department were as follows;

Key Performance Indicators						
Scorecard	Total KPIs	Applicable for Reporting:	Reporting Purposes Only	Set to zero weighting	Target Achieved	Under Target
IDP	7	6	-	1	4	2
SDBIP	20	20	-	-	14	6

The Department ended the financial year slightly under target with an overall score of **3.02**. A summary of performance by Key Performance Area is provided below;

Departmental Performance Office of the Municipal Manager	Sep 13	Dec 13	Mar 14	June 14
	Score	Score	Score	Score
Overall Performance	2.84	2.40	2.61	3.02
KPA 1: Municipal Transformation and Institutional Transformation	2.50	1.90	2.40	3.00
KPA 4: Municipal Financial Viability and Management	4.82	2.62	2.85	3.65
KPA 5: Intergovernmental Relations, Good Governance and Public Participation	2.56	2.60	2.65	2.91
KPA 6: Spatial Rationale				3.00

Table: Summary Performance – Office of the Municipal Manager

The **IDP Scorecard** exceeded target with a score of **3.46**. A total of 7 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 1 was zero-weighted for reporting at the end of the financial year. Of the remaining 6 KPI's, four (66.67%) achieved or exceeded target, and two (33.33%) were under target.

The **SDBIP Scorecard** was below target with a score of **2.89**. A total of 20 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which fourteen (70%) achieved or exceeded target, and six (30%) were below target.

PLEASE REFER TO ANNEXURE B FOR THE DEPARTMENTAL SCORECARD FOR THE OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL MANAGER.

3.2 Budget and Treasury

The Budget and Treasury Department is responsible for a total of 23 KPI's which contribute to the overall performance level for the IDP and SDBIP Scorecards. The statistics for the Department were as follows;

Key Performance Indicators						
Scorecard	Total KPIs	Applicable for Reporting:	Reporting Purposes Only	Set to zero weighting	Target Achieved	Under Target
IDP	4	3	-	1	2	1
SDBIP	19	18	-	1	15	3

The Department ended the financial year with an overall score of **3.11**. A summary of performance by Key Performance Area is provided below;

Departmental Performance Budget and Treasury	Sep 13	Dec 13	Mar 14	June 14
	Score	Score	Score	Score
Overall Performance	2.97	2.43	2.58	3.11
KPA 4: Municipal Financial Viability and Management	2.97	2.49	2.64	3.04
KPA 5: Intergovernmental Relations, Good Governance and Public Participation	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.50

Table: Summary Performance –Budget and Treasury

The **IDP Scorecard** exceeded target with a score of **3.33**. A total of 4 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 1 were zero weighted at the end of the financial year. Of the remaining 3 KPI's, two (66.67%) achieved or exceeded target, and one (33.33%) were below target.

The **SDBIP Scorecard** exceeded target with a score of **3.07**. A total of 19 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 1 were zero weighted at the end of the financial year. Of the remaining 18 KPI's, fifteen (83.33%) achieved or exceeded target, and three (16.67%) were below target.

PLEASE REFER TO ANNEXURE C FOR THE DEPARTMENTAL SCORECARD FOR THE BUDGET AND TREASURY OFFICE.

3.2 Corporate Services

The Corporate Services Department is responsible for a total of 31 KPI's which contribute to the overall performance level for the IDP and SDBIP Scorecards. The statistics for the Department were as follows;

Key Performance Indicators						
Scorecard	Total KPIs	Applicable for Reporting	Reporting Purposes Only	Set to zero weighting	Target Achieved	Under Target
IDP	5	5	-	-	3	2
SDBIP	26	26	-	-	14	12

The Department ended the financial year well below target with an overall score of **2.62**. A summary of performance by Key Performance Area is provided below;

Departmental Performance Corporate Services	Sep 13	Dec 13	Mar 14	June 14
	Score	Score	Score	Score
Overall Performance	2.24	2.06	2.27	2.62
KPA 1: Municipal Transformation and Institutional Transformation	2.21	1.98	2.72	2.70
KPA 4: Municipal Financial Viability and Management	2.90	3.83	2.36	2.95
KPA 5: Intergovernmental Relations, Good Governance and Public Participation	2.08	1.71	1.46	2.43

Table: Summary Performance –Corporate Services

The **IDP Scorecard** was slightly below target with a score of **2.96**. A total of 5 KPI's contribute to this scorecard of which 3 (60%) achieved or exceeded target, and 2 (40%) were under target.

The **SDBIP Scorecard** was well below target with a score of **2.55**. A total of 26 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 14 (53.85%) achieved or exceeded target, and 12 (46.15%) were below target.

PLEASE REFER TO ANNEXURE D FOR THE DEPARTMENTAL SCORECARD FOR THE CORPORATE SERVICES DEPARTMENT.

3.3 Community and Social Services

The Community and Social Services Department is responsible for a total of 36 KPI's which contribute to the overall performance level for IDP and SDBIP Scorecards. The statistics for the Department were as follows;

Key Performance Indicators						
Scorecard	Total KPIs	Applicable for Reporting	Reporting Purposes Only	Set to zero weighting	Target Achieved	Under Target
IDP	6	6	-	-	4	2
SDBIP	30	26	-	4	23	3

The Department ended the financial year exceeding target with an overall score of **3.13**. A summary of performance by Key Performance Area is provided below;

Departmental Performance Community and Social Services	Sep 13	Dec 13	Mar 14	June 14
	Score	Score	Score	Score
Overall Performance	3.07	2.98	2.99	3.13
KPA 2: Basic Service Delivery	2.94	2.99	3.08	3.08
KPA 4: Municipal Financial Viability and Management	3.79	2.11	2.09	2.80
KPA 5: Intergovernmental Relations, Good Governance and Public Participation	3.00	3.38	3.00	3.46

Table: Summary Performance –Community and Social Services

The **IDP Scorecard** was well below target with a score of **2.33**. A total of 6 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 4 (66.67%) achieved or exceeded target, and 2 (33.33%) were below target.

The **SDBIP Scorecard** exceeded target with a score of **3.32**. A total of 30 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 4 were zero weighted at the end of the financial year. Of the remaining 26 KPI's, twenty-three (88.46%) achieved or exceeded target, and three (11.54%) were below target.

PLEASE REFER TO ANNEXURE E FOR THE DEPARTMENTAL SCORECARD FOR THE COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT.

3.4 Human Settlements

The Human Settlements Department is responsible for a total of 17 KPI's which contribute to the overall performance level for IDP and SDBIP Scorecards. The statistics for the Department were as follows;

Key Performance Indicators						
Scorecard	Total KPIs	Applicable for Reporting	Reporting Purposes Only	Set to zero weighting	Target Achieved	Under Target
IDP	5	3	-	2	0	3
SDBIP	12	10	-	2	4	6

The Department ended the financial year well below target with an overall score of **1.96**. A summary of performance by Key Performance Area is provided below;

Departmental Performance	Sep 13	Dec 13	Mar 14	June 14
Community and Social Services	Score	Score	Score	Score
Overall Performance	3.55	1.97	1.81	1.96
KPA 2: Basic Service Delivery	3.00	1.63	2.20	2.06
KPA 4: Municipal Financial Viability and Management	4.65	2.87	1.82	2.26
KPA 5: Intergovernmental Relations, Good Governance and Public Participation	3.00	1.83	1.17	1.50

Table: Summary Performance –Human Settlements

The **IDP Scorecard** was below target with a score of **1.00**. A total of 5 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 2 were zero weighted at the end of the financial year. None of the KPI's applicable for reporting at the end of the financial year achieved target.

The **SDBIP Scorecard** was well below target with a score of **2.25**. A total of 12 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 2 were not applicable for reporting at the end of the financial year. Of the remaining 10 KPI's, four (40%) achieved or exceeded target, and six (60%) were below target.

PLEASE REFER TO ANNEXURE F FOR THE DEPARTMENTAL SCORECARD FOR THE COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT.

3.4 Infrastructure and Technical Services

The Infrastructure and Technical Services Department is responsible for a total of 22 KPI's which contribute to the overall performance level for the General, IDP and SDBIP Scorecards. The statistics for the Department were as follows;

Key Performance Indicators						
Scorecard	Total KPIs	Applicable for Reporting	Reporting Purposes Only	Set to zero weighting	Target Achieved	Under Target
IDP	6	6	-	-	4	2
SDBIP	16	16	-	-	6	10

The Department ended the financial year marginally behind target with an overall score of **2.79**. A summary of performance by Key Performance Area is provided below;

Departmental Performance Infrastructure and Technical Services	Sep 13	Dec 13	Mar 14	June 14
	Score	Score	Score	Score
Overall Performance	2.84	2.72	2.93	2.79
KPA 2: Basic Service Delivery	4.16	3.86	3.61	3.14
KPA 4: Municipal Financial Viability and Management	2.08	2.22	2.73	3.04
KPA 5: Intergovernmental Relations, Good Governance and Public Participation	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
KPA 6: Spatial Rationale	1.00	1.00	1.79	1.39

Table: Summary Performance –Infrastructure and Technical Services

The **IDP Scorecard** exceeded target with a score of **3.34**. A total of 6 KPI's contribute to this scorecard of which 4 (66.67%) achieved or exceeded target and 2 (33.33%) were below target.

The **SDBIP Scorecard** was well below target with a score of **2.58**. A total of 16 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 6 (37.50%) achieved target, and 10 (62.50%) were below target.

PLEASE REFER TO ANNEXURE G FOR THE DEPARTMENTAL SCORECARD FOR THE INFRASTRUCTURE AND TECHNICAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT.

3.5 Planning and Economic Development

The Planning and Economic Development Department is responsible for a total of 25 KPI's which contribute to the overall performance level for the IDP and SDBIP Scorecards. The statistics for the Department were as follows;

Key Performance Indicators						
Scorecard	Total KPIs	Applicable for Reporting	Reporting Purposes Only	Set to zero weighting	Target Achieved	Under Target
IDP	8	8	-	-	4	4
SDBIP	17	15	-	2	8	7

The Department ended the financial year well below target with an overall score of **2.36**. A summary of performance by Key Performance Area is provided below;

Departmental Performance Planning and Economic Development	Sep 13	Dec 13	Mar 14	June 14
	Score	Score	Score	Score
Overall Performance	2.38	2.26	2.56	2.36
KPA 3: Local Economic Development	1.52	2.33	2.38	2.31
KPA 4: Municipal Financial Viability and Management	3.73	2.28	2.86	2.77
KPA 5: Intergovernmental Relations, Good Governance and Public Participation	3.00	2.25	2.50	3.19
KPA 6: Spatial Rationale		1.63	3.09	1.86

Table: Summary Performance –Planning and Economic Development

The **IDP Scorecard** was well below target with a score of **2.18**. A total of 8 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 4 (50%) achieved or exceeded target, and 4 (50%) were below target.

The **SDBIP Scorecard** was well below target with a score of **2.46**. A total of 17 KPI's contribute to this scorecard, of which 2 were zero weighted at the end of the financial year. Of the remaining 15 KPI's, eight (53.33%) achieved or exceeded target, and seven (46.67%) were below target.

PLEASE REFER TO ANNEXURE HI FOR THE DEPARTMENTAL SCORECARD FOR THE PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT.

4 Limitations of Evaluation

1. The analysis contained in this report was based on information received until the 27th of August 2014. Where no information was supplied, a 1.00 score was attached.
2. The automated system designed for Gert Sibande District Municipality's Performance Management System requirements was used to capture and calculate scores. Any errors made in terms of incorrect data, formats or capturing into incorrect fields will have a direct impact on the final scores.
3. All budget related data must be verified against the Municipal Financial System. Values input into the Performance Management System should be cumulative expenditure figures to give a true reflection of the actual performance.
4. Achievements reported in this document reflect the input received from the respective departments and the supporting Portfolio of Evidence (POE) was acquired by the PMS department to substantiate the achievements reported on.
5. The scorecard remain the responsibility of the respective KPI owners and in no way does the PMS Unit accept responsibility for the adequacy and relevance of KPI Instructions and POE. The PMS Unit's functions are limited to coordination of the compilation of the Annual Performance Report and to calculate overall scores achieved in line with the approved rating scale applied by GSDM.

5 Challenges

1. Departments are not using the performance management system in the intended role that is one in which to make informed decisions in areas of underperformance.
2. Departmental input, although presently provided with respect to corrective intervention measures to be implemented, can still be further enhanced to ensure that they are effective.