Table 19-1: Pikitup SDBIP 2018/19

Projectis	Linkage to Strategic Political Priorities	National	Indicator		P City of Johannesbur g IDP KPI	Pikitup Business Pian indicator (KPj)	Actual Performance 2019/17	Beseline	Ancion! Target	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Annual Target	Annual Target 2020/21	Source of information / Data Collection
		Treasury Circular 88 KPI;s	(Outcome or Output)	COGTA GP KPI's				2017/18	2018/18	2018/19	2018/19	2018/19	2018/19	2019/20		
					PRO	GRAMME 1: INTE	GRATED WASTE	E MANAGEMEN	IT, WASTE PREV	ENTION AND W	ASTE MINIMIS	ATION				
1.1.1. Wast e diverted from landfills through reduction, reuse, recycling and	Preserving our resources for future generations	Tonnes of municipal solid waste diverted from landfills per capita	Outcome	N/A	Percentage waste diverted from landfill	1. Tons of green waste diverted	48 978 Tons of green waste diverted	50 000	60.000 fons of green: weathr obserted:	10,000	15,000	20,000	15,000	65 000 Tons of green waste diverted	70 000 Tons of green waste diverted	Number of loads of green waste collected. Tonnages are calculated based on best industry practice (National Waste Information System) to convert volume to tonnage
recovery						2. Tons of builder's rubble diverted	62 032 Tons of builder's rubble diverted	40 000	50,000 Tells of buildings cubble disented	10,000	12,000	13,000	15,000	55 000 Tons of builder's rubble diverted	60 000 Tons of builder's rubble diverted	Number of loads of crushed builders' rubble stockpiled for use as cover and access road maintenance. Tonnages are calculated based on best industry practice (National Waste Information System) to convert volume to tonnage
						3. Tons of dry waste diverted through Pikitup interventions (paper, plastic, glass, cans)	38 296 Tons of dry waste diverted through Pikitup interventions	40 000	50 WG Topp of pry waste dispred inrough Phintip intervocations	10,000	12,000	14,000	14,000	55 000 Tons of dry waste diverted through Pikitup interventions	60 000 Tons of dry waste diverted through Pikitup interventions	Tonnage data sheets from Recycling SMMEs of tonnages of dry recyclables sold to buyers
	Preserving our resources for future generations	Tonnes of municipal solid waste sent to landfill per capita	Outcome	N/A	Tonnes of municipal solid waste sent to landfill per capita	4. Tonnes of waste disposed at the landfill sites	1 425 763 tons disposed at the landfill sites	To be determined at the end of 4th Quarter 2017/18 (New KPI)	To be determined if the and of eth Quarter 2017/58 (New NES)	Not to exceed 329 863 tons	Not to exceed 310 003 tons	Not to exceed 292 543 tons	To be determined at the end of 4th Quarter 2017/18 (New KPI)	Not to exceed the tonnages of waste disposed in the previous financial year, despite the City population growth	Not to exceed the tonnages of waste disposed in the previous financial year, despite the City population growth	Landfill weighbridge data
1.2.1. Conversion of garden sites into Integrated Waste Manageme nt Facilities	Preserving our resources for future generations	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5. Number of garden sites upgraded to Integrated Waste Management Facilities	0 garden sites upgraded	6	10 garcen miles cases en	2	2	3	3	10 garden sites upgraded	10 garden sites upgraded	Completion certificate

	Linkage to	National	Indicator			Pikitup		Baseline	Terget	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Annual Target	Annual Target	
Project/s	Strategic Political Priorities	Treasury Circular 88 KPf;s	type (Outcome or Output)	COGTA GP KPI's	City of Johannesbur g IDP KPI	Plan Plan Indicator (KPI)	Actual Performance 2016/17	2017/18	2018/16	2018/19	2018/19	2018/19	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Source of Information / Data Collection
1.2.3. Upgrade landfill sites to comply and to extend landfill airspace	Preserving our resources for future generations	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	6. % landfill compliance to GDARD regulations and permit conditions as issued by DEA and DWAF, related to: Robinson Deep Ennerdale Landfill Site Marie Louise Landfill Site	94.84% landfill compliance to GDARD regulations and permit conditions as issued by DEA and DWAF	95% landfill compliance to GDARD regulations and permit conditions as issued by DEA and DWAF	95% fundrin frimpsance to GDAPE significant and permit conditions in oscient by DEX and OWAF	N/A	N/A	N/A	95% landfill compliance to GDARD regulations and permit conditions as issued by DEA and DWAF	95% landfill compliance to GDARD regulations and permit conditions as issued by DEA and DWAF	95% landfill compliance to GDARD regulations and permit conditions as issued by DEA and DWAF	Independent Environmental Audit Report
2.1.2. Community Cleaning Programme (EPWP & CWP)	Ensure proport development that addresses inequality and poverty and provides meaningful redress.	N/A	Output	Number of job opportunities created though Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP)	Number of Expanded Public Works Programmes (EPWP) opportunities created	PROGRAME 2: 7. Number individual provided with Expanded Public Works Programmes (EPWP) work opportunities	5 395 individuals provided with EPWP work opportunities	1 718	UGHOUT THE I	1 000	2 000	1 000	1 000	5 000 (EPWP) opportunities created	5 000 (EPWP) opportunities created	EPWP Employment contract
						PROGRAMM	LE 3: EFFECTIVE	AMD PERICIPAL	WASTE SERV	UCES .						
3.1 Regular domestic waste collection	Create a culture of enhanced service delivery with pride	Percentage of households with basic refuse removal services or better	Outcome	Number and percentage (%) of formal households with access to refuse removal	Number and percentage (%) of formal households with access to refuse removal	8. Number of service points receiving weekly waste removal services	New KPI	864 185 as at 3rd quarter	Number of service points receiving western walls received in Latter all for Afformation System at 15, Baseline 1 854 VS	Number of service points receiving weekly waste removal services in Land Information System (LIS)	Number of service points receiving weekly waste removal services in Land Information System (LIS)	Number of service points receiving weekly waste removal services in Land Information System (LIS)	Number of service points receiving weekly waste removal services in Land Information System (LIS)	Number of service points receiving weekly waste removal services	Number of service points receiving weekly waste removal services	Refuse Collection Rounds (RCR) Completed

	Linkage to	National	Indicator		City of Johannesbur g IDP KPI	Pikitua		Baseline	Annual Yargel	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Annual Target	/Innust	
Projectis	Strategic Political Priorities	Treasury Circular 88 KPI;s	type (Quicome or Quiput)	COGTA GP KPI's		Plan Indicator (KPI)	Actual Performance 2046/17	2017/18	2018/16	2018/19	2018/19	2018/19	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Source of Information / Data Collection
3.1.2 Cleaning of Informal Settlements	Create a culture of enhanced service delivery with pride	Percentage of known informal settlernents receiving integrated waste handling services	Output	Number and percentage (%) of informal settlements with access to refuse removal	Percentage of all City proclaimed informal settlement households provided with integrated waste management services	9. Number of proclaimed informal settlements with access to integrated waste management services	New KPI	165	(8)	184	184	184	184	184	184	Service trip sheet
3.1.3. City cleanliness Level	Create a culture of enhanced service delivery with pride	N/A	Output	N/A	N/A	10. Improved city cleanliness levels in targeted areas city-wide	New KPI	0	Level 2 dispollment Nevol on targettal: armos (thy- wide	Level 2 city cleanliness level in targeted areas city- wide	Level 2 cleanliness level in targeted areas city- wide	Level 2 cleanliness level in targeted areas city- wide	Level 2 cleanliness level in targeted areas city- wide	Level 1 cleanliness level in targeted areas city- wide	Level 1 cleanliness level in targeted areas city-wide	Photometric evidence
3.1.5. Eradication of Illegal Dumping Spots	Create a culture of enhanced service delivery with pride	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	11. Number of illegal dumping spots eradicated	New KPI	Eradicate 10% of 2 066 known spots. Baseline as at end of 3rd Quarter = 114	äΠ	50	54	53	50	30% of illegal dumping spots to be eradicated	20% of illegal dumping spots to be eradicated	Photometric evidence / GIS co-ordinates
						PROGR	AMME 4: PARTN	EBSHID AND S	TAKEHOI DER II	V/OI VEMENT	1	- 1				
4.1.1. Consumer Behavioural Change	Create a City that responds to the needs of citizens, customers and stakeholders	N/A	N/A	N/A	Bi-annual customer satisfaction survey and quality of life survey	12. Stakeholder & Behavioural Change Impact Assessment	New KPI	N/A	Amelii Project Austrophyl Survey Results (Coyol 4/5)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Annual Impact Assessment Survey Results	Annual Impact Assessment Survey Results	Annual Impact Assessment Survey Results
						PROGRA	AMME 5: BUILDIN	G AN EFFICIEN	IT, EFFECTIVE A	AND VIABLE WA	STE MANAGE	MENT COMPA	NY			

	Linkage to	National	indicator			Pikitup		Baseline	Annual Terget	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Annuar Target	Annual Target	
Projectis	Strategic Political Priorities	Treasury Circular 88 KPI;s	(Outcome or Output)	COGTA GP KPI's	City of Johannesbur g IDP KPI	Plan Plan Indicator (KPI)	Actual Performance 2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2018/19	2018/19	2018/19	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	Source of Information / Data Collection
5.1.1. Commercial Revenue Collection	Enhancing our financial sustainability	N/A	Outcome	N/A	Percentage collection of revenue in respect to service billings	13. % collection from Pikitup's commercial customers	67% collection rate from Pikitup's commercial customers	70% - 75%	80% 85% coffection rate from Pikitips a commercial continuers	80% - 85% collection rate from Pikitup's commercial customers	90 - 95% collection rate from Pikitup's commercial customers	95% - 100% collection rate from Pikitup's commercial customers	SAP Report			
5.1.2.Capita I Budget Expenditure	Enhancing our financial sustainability	Expenditure of Capital Budget	Outcome	N/A	Percentage spend of capital budget	14. % Capital Budget spent	55% Capital Budget spent	Spend 100% of the adjusted budget	95% Capita Butper scent	10% Capital Budget spent	30% Capital Budget spent	70% Capital Budget spent	95% Capital Budget spent	95% Capital Budget spent	95% Capital Budget spent	SAP Report
5.1.3. Procureme nt spent on BEE and Women owned companies as a % of total	Enhancing our financial sustainability	N/A	Outcome	Number, value and percentage of goods and services procured from local suppliers	Percentage procurement spend on SMMEs	15. % BEE spend	98% BEE spend	75% BEE spend	75% BEE 100000	75% BEE spend	75% BEE spend	75% BEE spend	75% BEE spend	75% BEE spend	75% BEE spend	BEE Certificates of Awarded Bidders
procuremen t				Number, Value and percentage (%) of contracts awarded to designated groups (women, people with disabilities, youth and historically disadvantage d individuals)	New	16. % women owned companies	67% Women owned companies	25% Women owned companies	26/14 Women: 2007/09/16/1	25% Women owned companies	25% Women owned companies	25% Women owned companies	25% Women owned companies	25% Women owned companies	25% Women owned companies	BEE Certificates of Awarded Bidders
		N/A	Outcome	Number, value and percentage of goods and services procured from local suppliers	Percentage procurement spend on SMMEs	17. % SMME procurement spend	0	New KPI	Star of SMARE (ROCUPERWIN) Applied	5% of SMME procurement spend	5% of SMME procuremen t spend	5% of SMME procureme nt spend	5% of SMME procureme nt spend	5% of SMME procurement spend	5% of SMME procurement spend	BEE Certificates of Awarded Bidders

	Unkage to Strategic Political Priorities	National	Indicator		City of	Pikitup Business Plan Indicator (KPI)	Actual Performance 2016/17	Baseline	Annual Target	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Annual Target	Annual Target	
Project/s		Circular 88 KPks	type (Outcome or Output)	COGTA GP	Johannesbur g IDP KPI			2017/18	2018/15	2018/19	2018/19	2018/19	2018/19	2019/76	2020/21	Source of Information : Data Collection
5.1.4.Ensur e sound financial state of company related to all aspects	Enhancing our financial sustainability	Audit Opinion	Outcome	Audit Opinion	Audit opinion	18. Audit opinion obtained from Auditor General (AG)	Unqualified Audit opinion obtained from Auditor General (AG) with findings	Unqualified Audit	Crean Audit comon stra S from - Audito Gamarai (AG)	N/A	N/A	N/A	Clean Audit opinion obtained from Auditor General (AG)	Clean Audit opinion obtained from Auditor General (AG)	Clean Audit opinion obtained from Auditor General (AG)	AG Final Report
5.2.1.Query Resolution	Create a City that responds to the needs of citizens, customers and stakeholders	N/A	Outcome	Number and percentage (%) of community complaints received and resolved (excluding petitions).	Number and percentage (%) of community complaints received and resolved (excluding petitions).	19. % Queries Received Resolved in 7 days	82.16% queries resolved in 7 days	80% - 85% queries resolved within 7 days	ments received associated in Electronic Communication Comm	90% - 95% queries received resolved in 5 days	90% - 95% queries received resolved in 5 days	90% - 95% queries received resolved in 5 days	90% - 95% queries received resolved in 5 days	95% - 100% queries received resolved in 5 days	100% queries received resolved in 5 days	SAP Report
5.3.1. Compliance to the Integrated SHE System (ISO 14001 and OHSAS 18001)	Create a culture of enhanced service delivery with pride and dignity	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20. Number of SHE audits completed quarterly per site	137 quarterly SHE audits completed	4 quarterly SHE audits conducted per site	€ quanerry, SHE audif complement pair sde	1 quarterly SHE audits conducted per site	1 quarterly SHE audits completed	1 quarterly SHE audits completed	1 quarterly SHE audits completed	4 quarterly SHE audits conducted per site	4 quarterly SHE audits conducted per site	SHE Audits
5.3.2. Reduced number of accidents	Create a culture of enhanced service delivery with pride and dignity	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	21. Reduction in Disabling Injury Frequency Rate Ratio (DIFR)	0.04 Disabling Injury Frequency Rate Ratio (DIFR)	2.5 Disabling Injury Frequency Rate Ratio (DIFR)	2.5 Deptiling Injury Presupency Rate Rate (D#R)	2.5 Disabling Injury Frequency Rate Ratio (DIFR)	2.5 Disabling Injury Frequency Rate Ratio (DIFR)	2.5 Disabling Injury Frequency Rate Ratio (DIFR)	2.5 Disabling Injury Frequency Rate Ratio (DIFR)	2.5 Disabling Injury Frequency Rate Ratio (DIFR)	2.5 Disabling Injury Frequency Rate Ratio (DIFR)	DIFR Calculation

