

EPHRAIM MOGALE

LOCAL MUNICIPALITY

111
MARBLE HALL
0450
013-261 8400
013-261 2985



Leeuwfontein Office (013) 261 8509
Elandskraal Office (013) 261 8506
Zamenkomst Office (013) 973 9160
Traffic Section (013) 261 8400

EXTRACTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE 6TH SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING OF
EPHRAIM MOGALE LOCAL MUNICIPALITY HELD ON THURSDAY THE 25TH MAY 2017

FILE/S: 4/3/R

SC6/06/2017 PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT REPORT OF THE MUNICIPAL
MANAGER AND MANAGERS DIRECTLY REPORTING TO THE
MUNICIPAL MANAGER 4/3/R

RESOLVED

1. That Council note the report.
2. That Council note the performance assessment outcome of the municipal manager and the managers directly reporting to the municipal manager.
3. That Council note that the municipality is gradually improving from 54.4% - 61.5%, however no performance bonus will be paid for 2015/16.
4. That Council note that the panel was seriously concerned about the competency level of the Director as far as service delivery is concerned.
5. That Council note that managers will be subjected to compulsory trainings to capacitate them on areas needing improvements.
6. That Council note that any grievance/s by senior managers must be dealt with in accordance with the applicable provisions in the signed Performance Agreements of individual managers.
7. That the Municipal Manager implements the decision accordingly.

M.D. MOTHOGWANE
SPEAKER

25 May 2017

FINALISATION BY:

Referred to mm [pms official] by Municipal Manager

M.M. Mathebela
Municipal Manager

25/05/17
Date Received

SC6/06/2017 PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT REPORT OF THE MUNICIPAL MANAGER AND MANAGERS DIRECTLY REPORTING TO THE MUNICIPAL MANAGER

PURPOSE

To report to Council the 2015/16 annual, and 2016/17 Mid-year Performance Assessment outcomes of the Municipal Manager and the Managers (Directors) directly reporting to the Municipal Manager.

BACKGROUND

The Performance management assessments for the 2015/16 annual and 2016/17 mid-year were held on the 22nd March 2017 for the Municipal Manager and Managers (Directors) directly reporting to the Municipal Manager.

The Performance assessment was done in terms of the **LOCAL GOVERNMENT : MUNICIPAL PERFORMANCE REGULATIONS FOR MUNICIPAL MANAGERS DIRCTLY ACCOUNTABLE TO MUNICIPAL MANAGERS, 2006**, and clause 9.1.11 and 9.1.12 of Municipal Performance Management Framework, whereby quarterly reviews should culminate in a comprehensive annual review of individual managers and the report should be supported by 2015/16 Performance report, financial statement and Auditor General's 2015/16 audit report. The 2016/17 Mid- year performance report is based on the quarterly performance reports by EXCO Lekgotla as measured from implementation of the 2016/17 SDBIP.

The managers were assessed in accordance to the provided POEs (Portfolio of Evidence), and panel gave comments and recommendations to individual managers. However, the panel was not impressed by the performance of the Infrastructure Department in relation to service delivery, as assessment depicts poor planning which contributes to poor and late implementation of projects which has a negative impact on MIG spending, which flows from quarter to quarter, with no efforts to improve, and the POE was nor correctly prepared, and , for that reason the Mid-year assessment was then stopped.

The table below is a summarised version of the 2015/16 institutional performance assessment scorecard:

Ref No	KPA	2015/16 FY			
		Total Number of KPI's Assessed	Total Number of KPI's Achieved	Total Number of KPI's Not Achieved	Total % Target Achieved
1	Spatial Rationale	9	4	5	44,4%
2	Basic Service Delivery and Infrastructure Development	54	26	28	48,1%
3	Local Economic Development	6	5	1	83,3%

4	Municipal Transformation and Institutional Development	39	21	18	53,8%
5	Municipal Financial Viability and Management	8	7	01	87,5%
6	Good Governance and Public Participation	20	11	09	55,0%
	TOTAL	136	74	62	54.4%

The table below is a summarised version of the 2016/17 institutional performance assessment scorecard:

Ref No	KPA	2016/17 FY			
		Total Number of KPI's Assessed	Total Number of KPI's Achieved	Total Number of KPI's Not Achieved	Total % Target Achieved
1	Spatial Rationale	10	5	5	50%
2	Basic Service Delivery and Infrastructure Development	13	09	04	69.2%
3	Local Economic Development	5	3	2	60%
4	Municipal Transformation and Institutional Development	13	09	04	69.2%
5	Municipal Financial Viability and Management	15	10	05	66.6%
6	Good Governance and Public Participation	22	12	10	54.5%
	TOTAL	78	48	30	61.5%

SCORING SYSTEM

The following table below is the scores that range from 5-1 with clear definition as outlined in the performance regulation 2001:

Level	Description	Rating	Assessment Score	Performance bonus ratios
Level 5: outstanding performance	Performance far exceeds the standard expected for the job in all areas of the manager.	5	75-100	Maximum bonus allowed into. Regulations are between 10% and 14% of person's

	The manager has achieved exceptional results against all performance criteria and indicators specified in the Performance Plan and maintained this in all areas of responsibility throughout the year.			inclusive annual remuneration package. The % are as follows: 75%-76% = 10% 77%-78% = 11% 79%-80% = 12% 81%-84% = 13% 85%-100% = 14%
Level 4: performance significantly above expectations	Performance is significantly higher than the standard expected for the job in all areas. The manager has achieved above fully effective results against more than half of the performance criteria and indicators specified in the Performance Plan and fully achieved all others throughout the year.	4	65-74	Maximum bonus allowed into. Regulations are between 5% and 9% of person's inclusive annual remuneration package. The % are as follows: 65%-66% = 5% 67%-68% = 6% 71%-72% = 8% 73%-74% = 9%
Level 3: fully effective	Performance fully meets the standard expected for the job in all areas. The manager has achieved effective results against all significant performance criteria and indicators	3	51-64	No bonus

	specified in the performance plan and may have achieved results significantly above expectations in one or two less significant areas throughout the year.			
Level 2: performance not fully satisfactory	Performance is below the standard required for the job in key areas. The manager has achieved adequate results against many key performance criteria and indicators specified in the Performance Plan but did not fully achieved adequate results against others during the course of the year. Improvement in these areas is necessary to bring performance up to the standard expected.	2	31-50	No bonus
Level 1: unacceptable performance	Performance does not meet the standard required for the job. The manager has not met one or more fundamental	1	Less than 30	No bonus

	<p>requirements and /or in achieving results that are well below the performance criteria and indicators in a number of significant areas of responsibility. The manager has failed demonstrate the commitment or ability to bring performance up to the level expected despite efforts to encourage improvement.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

SUMMARY OF ACTUAL PERFORMANCE FOR 2016/17 (MID-YEAR)

No	Name of Director	Financial Year	KPAs scores	CCR Scores	Overall scores	Performance Ratings
1	Mathebela M.M	2016/17	36	18	54	3
2	Ramosibi K.A.	2015/16	39	12	51	3
3	Radingwana M.E.	2015/16	32	13	45	2
4	Phaahla M.H.	2015/16	NOT DUE FOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT			

SUMMARY OF ACTUAL PERFORMANCE FOR 2015/16 (ANNUAL)

No	Name of Director	Financial Year	KPAs scores	CCR Scores	Overall scores	Performance Ratings
1	Mathebela M.M	2016/17	45	10	54	3
2	Ramosibi K.A.	2016/17	35	15	50	2

3	Radingwana M.E.	2016/ 17	ASSESSMENT STOPPED
4	Phaahla M.H.	2016/ 17	NOT DUE FOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

ATTACHMENT

Minutes/Summary of discussions during the performance assessment of section 56 Managers held on the 28th April 2017 @ 10H00 in the council chamber

PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That Council note the report.
2. That Council note the performance assessment outcome of the municipal manager and the managers directly reporting to the municipal manager.
3. That Council note that the municipality is gradually improving from 54.4% - 61.5%, however no performance bonus will be paid for 2015/16.
4. That Council note that the panel was seriously concerned about the competency level of the Director as far as service delivery is concerned.
5. That Council note that managers will be subjected to compulsory trainings to capacitate them on areas needing improvements.
6. That Council note that any grievance/s by senior managers must be dealt with in accordance with the applicable provisions in the signed Performance Agreements of individual managers.
7. That the Municipal Manager implements the decision accordingly.

Minutes/ Summary of discussions during the Performance assessment of section 56 Managers held on the 28th April 2017(10h00) in the Council Chamber.

Prepared by: Chief Internal Auditor

Circulated amongst: The Mayor, Municipal Manager, Panel Members.

The abovementioned meeting bears reference.

I write to summaries our discussions in the above mentioned meeting as follows:

1. OPENNING OF PROCEEDINGS:

- The Honorable Mayor declared the session opened at 10h00. She outlined the purpose of the session as to conduct performance assessments for the section 56 Managers in respect of their 2015/16 annual performance and the 2016/17 midyear performance.
- She then tendered an apology and indicated that she will not be part of the session due to work engagements at Polokwane.
- She requested the EXCO to formally discharge/delegate the powers to the panel to conduct the assessments. The panel comprised of the following:
 - Municipal Manager: to chair the proceedings when Directors are assessed.
 - Mr M Letsela - Audit Committee Member : To chair the proceedings when the MM is assessed
 - Ms Maredi – Municipal Manager at Elias Motsoaledi Local Municipality
 - Ms M Motsepe – Member of Mayoral Committee finance portfolio
 - Ms L Madisha- Ward Committee member
- The Mayor and other members of EXCO not forming part of the panel were excused.

2. APPROACH

- The panel agreed on the following approach:
- Incumbent will read out the KPA, the KPI and the target for quarter under review; and then read out the self-score.
- The panel will peruse the Portfolio of Evidence, and then based on the evidence indicate their score.
- If the Panel's score agrees to the incumbent's self-score, the same score will be agreed as final score For the KPA

- If the Panel's score differs to the incumbent's self-score, the panel will indicate what informs their score, And then the incumbent will be given a chance to substantiate his/her self-score; and if through
- Deliberations the incumbent manages to convince the panel, the final score will be recorded
- Accordingly (Same as the incumbent's self-score)
- However, if the incumbent's further motivation does not convince the panel and thus the panel's score
- Continues to differ with the incumbent's self-score; the final score will be recorded accordingly (Same as the panel's score).

3. Assessment

a. Director Community Services

The panel resolved not to assess the incumbent has only been in service for two months.

b. Chief financial officer

The incumbent took the panel through the self-assessment performance report reading out the self-score, and then the panel would interrogate the score corroborating against the Performance Agreement. The outcomes were as follows:

2015/16 Annual Performance Assessment

KPA	Self-score	Panel score	Agreed final score	Panel's remarks/comments
1	4	4	4	
2	1	1	1	
3	3	3	3	
4	3	3	3	
5	3	3	3	
6	4	4	4	
7	3	3	3	
8	3	3	3	

2016/17 Mid-year assessment

KPA	Self-score	Panel score	Agreed final score	Panel's remarks/comments
1	4	4	4	
2	2	2	2	
3	3	3	3	
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	

5	3	3	3	Make use of route form to accurately track time frame
6	3	3	3	
7	3	3	3	
8	3	3	3	
9	4	4	4	Actual % attained should be split per quarter
10	3	3	3	
11	2	3	3	
12	N/A	N/A	N/A	
13	3	3	3	
14	3	3	3	
15	3	3	3	
16	N/A	N/A	N/A	
17	N/A	N/A	N/A	
18	N/A	N/A	N/A	
19	N/A	N/A	N/A	
20	2	2	2	Going forward the KPA should be assessed by bench-making the bid committee meetings against the procurement plan
21	3	3	3	
22	3	3	3	
23	3	3	3	

The Panel recommended that going forward the national financial KPI (Financial ratios) should be included in the CFO's performance plan

The CFO was advised to complete her CCR and then meet with the Municipal

Manager for evaluation so that the final assessment score can be computed accordingly.

c. Director Infrastructure

The incumbent took the panel through the self-assessment performance report reading out the self-score, and then the panel would interrogate the score corroborating against the Performance Agreement. The outcomes were as follows:

2015/16 Annual Performance Assessment

KPA	Self-score	Panel score	Agreed final score	Panel's remarks/comments
1	1	1	1	
2	1	1	1	
3	1	1	1	

4	1	2	2	
5	3	3	3	
6	3	3	3	
7	3	3	3	
8	3	3	3	
9	1	1	1	
10	3	3	3	
11	1	1	1	
12	1	1	1	
13	1	1	1	
14	1	1	1	
15	1	1	1	
16	1	2	2	
17	1	2	2	
18	2	3	3	
19	2	3	3	
20	1	1	1	
21	1	1	1	
22	1	1	1	
23	3	3	3	
24	2	3	3	
25	1	1	1	
26	2	3	3	
27	2	3	3	
28	2	3	3	
29	1	1	1	
30	2	4	4	
31	3	3	3	
32	3	3	3	
33	1	1	1	

2016/17 Midyear Performance Assessments

KPA	Self-score	Panel score	Agreed final score	Panel's remarks/comments
1	2	3	3	
2	2	3	3	
3	2	3	3	
4	2	2	2	
5	2	2	2	
6	N/A	N/A	N/A	
7	2	2	2	
8	1	1	1	
9	3	1	1	
10	1	1	1	

11	N/A	1	1	The panel could not agree that capital projects could not have targets from quarter 1 –quarter 3 as that implies that the director plans not to implement MIG projects; and any work done on such projects in those quarter will be interpreted as outstanding performance whereas there is no service delivery
12	N/A	1	1	The panel could not agree that capital projects could not have targets from quarter 1 –quarter 3 as that implies that the director plans not to implement MIG projects; and any work done on such projects in those quarter will be interpreted as outstanding performance whereas there is no service delivery
13	N/A	1	1	The panel could not agree that capital projects could not have targets from quarter 1 –quarter 3 as that implies that the director plans not to implement MIG projects; and any work done on such projects in those quarter will be interpreted as outstanding performance whereas there is no service delivery
14	N/A	1	1	The panel could not agree that capital projects could not have targets from quarter 1 –quarter 3 as that implies that the director plans not to implement MIG projects; and any work done on such projects in those quarter will be interpreted as outstanding performance whereas

				there is no service delivery
15	N/A	1	1	The panel could not agree that capital projects could not have targets from quarter 1 –quarter 3 as that implies that the director plans not to implement MIG projects; and any work done on such projects in those quarter will be interpreted as outstanding performance whereas there is no service delivery
16	N/A	1	1	The panel could not agree that capital projects could not have targets from quarter 1 –quarter 3 as that implies that the director plans not to implement MIG projects; and any work done on such projects in those quarter will be interpreted as outstanding performance whereas there is no service delivery
17	1	1	1	
18	3	1	1	
19	N/A	1	1	The panel could not agree that capital projects could not have targets from quarter 1 –quarter 3 as that implies that the director plans not to implement MIG projects; and any work done on such projects in those quarter will be interpreted as outstanding performance whereas there is no service delivery
20	N/A	1	1	The panel could not agree that capital projects could not have targets from quarter 1 –quarter 3 as that implies that the director plans not to implement MIG projects;

				and any work done on such projects in those quarter will be interpreted as outstanding performance whereas there is no service delivery
21	N/A	1	1	The panel could not agree that capital projects could not have targets from quarter 1 –quarter 3 as that implies that the director plans not to implement MIG projects; and any work done on such projects in those quarter will be interpreted as outstanding performance whereas there is no service delivery
22	N/A	1	1	The panel could not agree that capital projects could not have targets from quarter 1 –quarter 3 as that implies that the director plans not to implement MIG projects; and any work done on such projects in those quarter will be interpreted as outstanding performance whereas there is no service delivery
23	1	1	1	

The panel resolved to stop assessing the director due to the fact that the performance report was poorly prepared. Amongst others, the following material discrepancies were noted:

- That the director included KPA related to financial viability in her performance plan and report. The director submitted to the panel that the KPA's were erroneously included and can just be deleted. But the panel indicated that the only time an SDBIP can be amended is during the adjustment period which has already passed, and if such mistakes were not corrected then, it cannot be allowed that they be corrected during the assessment session.
- The panel also raised concern that, in the 2015/16 annual assessment, the incumbent recorded an underperformance in that they failed to produce approved road master plan, but indicated that they have the draft road master plan in place. However, they continue to set targets of developing the master plan in the 2016/17 financial year.

- The panel noted with great concern that the director has planned no activities on MIG projects for quarter one and quarter two; activities are only planned for third quarter and fourth. The panel is of the view that the director actually planned not to perform.

The panel recommended that the Municipal Manager's report should clearly outline all the concerns raised by the panel and further report to council that the panel found the director's competencies doubtful and as such recommend that council consider setting up an independent process to ascertain the director's competencies in relation to her responsibilities.

D. Municipal Manager's assessment

The incumbent took the panel through the self-assessment performance report reading out the self-score, and then the panel would interrogate the score corroborating against the Performance Agreement. The outcomes were as follows:

2015/16 Annual Performance Assessment

KPA	Self-score	Panel score	Agreed final score	Panel's remarks/comments
1	3	3	3	
2	3	3	3	
3	1	2	2	MM's 2015/16 assessment not done due to the mayor's non-availability
4	3	3	3	
5	4	3	2	Measure the KPI with quarterly timeframes and not number of findings resolved
6	3	3	3	
7	3	3	3	
8	4	4	4	
9	3	3	3	
10	2	2	2	
11	3	3	3	
12	1	2	2	
13	3	3	3	
14	4	4	4	
15	3	3	3	

2016/17 Mid-year performance assessment

KPA	Self-score	Panel score	Agreed final score	Panel's remarks/comments
1	n/a	n/a	n/a	Not for this quarter
2	2	2	2	

3	3	3	3	
4	3	3	3	
5	n/a	n/a	n/a	Not for this quarter
6	3	3	3	
7	3	3	3	
8	3	3	3	
9	3	3	3	
10	3	3	3	
11	3	3	3	
12	3	3	3	
13	3	3	3	
14	2	3	3	
15	2	3	3	
16	n/a	n/a	n/a	Not for this quarter
17	3	3	3	
18	3	3	3	
19	2	2	2	
20	3	3	3	
21	3	3	3	
22	n/a	n/a	n/a	Not for this quarter
23	n/a	n/a	n/a	Not for this quarter
24	3	3	3	
25	n/a	n/a	n/a	Not for this quarter
26	1	2	2	
27	n/a	n/a	n/a	Not for this quarter
28	n/a	n/a	n/a	Not for this quarter
29	4	4	4	
30	n/a	n/a	n/a	Not for this quarter
31	n/a	n/a	n/a	Not for this quarter

The incumbent was requested to prepare the CCR and then schedule the meeting with the Mayor so that computation of scores may be finalized.

.....End