

ADDENDUM 5
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO POLICY

Email from directors sent on 25 October

In the interests of expediting discussion at the AGM, the directors would like to formally respond to some of the comments raised by Richard and Bassie around the organisational structure the directors have put forward, and note some comments around the proposed policy points.

Please read through these points and formulate your thoughts or questions, and then let's have the discussion as a group at the AGM (rather than by email please).

But first to thank Bassie and Richard, who have spent considerable time putting the proposal together, considering the directors' comments and concerns, and formulating their own careful commentary.

Point 2 :

The directors and ops team absolutely support this point.

To this end, in the 8th October meeting we also put forward that any role that regularly requires more than 23 working days per month should automatically be reviewed (at review time, and ahead of annual budget preparation) to reduce the workload to a more manageable one. A particular area of responsibility / function would be removed from the role in question and allocated to a second role within the portfolio.

(this was agreed to in principle in the AGM, based on a 76% majority approval by directors rather than unanimity)

Point 5 :

The directors support these levels as proposed.

However, the current employment policy proposal as written does not reflect two additional points of discussion that were put forward.

Although the directors have not achieved consensus on the following, these proposal options have support from a number of directors.

1) That we include a fourth salary tier for those actively engaged in operational work for AfrikaBurn for a period of seven years or more.

(tier proposed at around R1 200).

This proposal, while not supported by all directors, is in line with the motivation behind the pay tiers, as summed up in the policy document :

"it fairly benefits those that have more AB organizational experience, and rewards length of service and past efforts"

(not carried by vote at AGM)

and / or

2) That we offer an additional "booster" for those engaged in year-round full time employment (21 days per month) at AfrikaBurn.

(booster proposed at around R2 000)

This proposal recognises that the earnings potential of those engaged full time with AfrikaBurn work is capped at a maximum of 21 days, whereas this is not the case for

others, who may be employed cumulatively up to 27 days a month in a full time role elsewhere and a part-time role within AfrikaBurn.

(not carried at AGM)

And / or

3) That AfrikaBurn employees working 21 days for the organisation be allowed to work up to 6 days a month elsewhere.

(carried at AGM)

Point 8 :

We recognise that some portfolio work simply cannot take place in the office, and that the part-time portfolio roles will most likely take place after hours.

To this end, the directors propose modifying this clause to something along these lines :

"Recognising that face to face human interaction can aid the functioning of the organisation and the flow of information... paid staff working 11 or more days per month for AfrikaBurn should aim to spend at minimum 50% and preferably an average of 70 % of their time in the AB offices. Staff working less than 11 days per month for the organisation are encouraged to do the same."

(carried at the AGM)

In relation to the COC recommendations around the structure / organogram :

Clustering of the organisation

The "clustering" within the overall organisation structure, as outlined by the COC, is pretty much in line with the way the operational structure will function.

This is in line with the recommended ICS (Incident Command System) that the City of Cape Town suggests all large events organisations employ, in order to meet national health and safety standards.

We fully intend to adopt this as the AB *event* operational system.

it is not contradictory to the organogram the directors have put forward.

The director organogram outlines the various portfolios / sub portfolios and roles within them.

The ICS defines the clustering and chain of command that would happen around functioning for and at the event.

One point of contention is the positioning of DMV within the Creative Portfolio. Much like it makes sense to cluster DPW, H&S, and G&T under the event umbrella, it makes sense to consolidate DMV, theme camp, art, performance, San Clan, grants, burns, etc under one umbrella when viewing the overall operations of the organisation.

All but one of the directors see this as semantics, or an "on paper" scenario, rather than an actual structural change - DMV will, as the COC proposal says, continue to function as an independent portfolio within the organisation, and will always have (and need) it's own portfolio lead.

For Robert, and the DMV team, the "paper position" IS important, and we feel this then warrants further discussion.

New Projects

The majority of directors do not agree with the COC thinking around New Projects. We recognise that the oversight and input these kind of projects can require is considerable, and we do not feel confident that portfolio leads or individuals within the directorship will have the capacity to deal with such when the event critical path is underway.

We believe that this is a portfolio requiring dedicated administrative input and oversight from a portfolio lead, and this need will increase over time. As the movement grows, so too will the kind of opportunities New Projects was formulated to capture and explore.

It is not unusual for an organisation to have a "development manager" or "new initiatives" lead.

For this reason we feel it is important we keep it's place marked in the "consciousness" of the organisation.

And to this end we have retained it as a function in our organogram, although there is no salary associated with it for the next cycle, and there will be no appointment of a portfolio lead in this position, so no dedicated driver of the portfolio.

The directors recognise that budgetary constraints and re-organisation within portfolios dictate that the New Projects portfolio must take a backseat at this stage in AfrikaBurn's evolution.

So, we will give the COC proposed methodology our best effort for this cycle and review how it's worked ahead of the 2015 AGM.

In relation to the organisational structure the directors have put forward, and the COC rejection of certain roles:

With great appreciation for thinking, I must highlight something Richard clearly states in the COC document - that the Compensation Committee is not best placed to evaluate how the organisation should be structured for optimal function.

The Directors are best placed to determine this, based on ongoing operational involvement and a process of full consultation and deep discussion with the various portfolio leads.

The roles we have identified in the organogram we presented are, we firmly believe, the important roles the organisation needs to function properly, and they map the developmental needs of the future.

The structure we have proposed is the one we firmly believe will stand the organisation in the best possible stead for the foreseeable future.

There was not much divergence, which is great. But there was specific divergence around the "admin seconds".

The directorship strongly supports these functions.

The **administrators / portfolio seconds** are in fact critical to the organisation.

Please don't get hung up on the name - we can call them something else if it makes people more comfortable, the title is of little consequence. But the function is essential.

In each instance, these "portfolio support roles" have clearly defined functions with distinctly separate responsibilities from the portfolio lead. There is certainly some overlap of engagement where we believe this will be of value to the organisation, ordinarily in the joint involvement in a specific responsibility best determined by a team rather one individual (e.g. art safety feedback, or art and theme camp placement). These are not "duplicate" roles, or "PA" roles. Nor are they positions that can comfortably be filled by a volunteer, as the responsibilities are too sensitive and time-critical.

Of added benefit, we believe these roles guarantee continuity in the event of sudden incapacity / unanticipated departure of the portfolio lead, by having a kind of up-skilled "understudy" (to some extent) already in place - they serve as a security measure for the organisation, as well as ensuring no one position is stretched beyond the 21 day maximum.

On a personal note, specifically as relates to the Creative Portfolio, this "admin second" is a role I have called for officially since the 2012 bosberaad. The absence of this kind of portfolio support was an important consideration in my decision to step down, and I would hope that my continued endorsement (despite the fact that I will not directly benefit from the introduction of the role) lends the weight of perspective to the weight of experience.

The Creative Portfolio has had a volunteer wrangler team in place for the last two event cycles, to assist with the processing of information and answering of questions around Theme Camps, Art works and Performance (exactly as proposed by the COC's). And we will be growing the team this cycle to take some of the pressure off these lovely volunteers. But the volunteer wranglers are not appropriate to handle the administration in higher level, more sensitive and critical matters like the grant contracting, the creative crew tickets, submitting claims for the Clan build, liaising for art structural safety, etc. For this level of responsibility you need a committed and contracted person, with specific and clearly defined responsibilities. The higher level aspects of these particular areas of activity would fall to the lead to execute. But the admin second can get the prep in place (transferring info from grant contracts to the spreadsheet, batch mailing the Creative Crews around ticket registrations and helping their inevitable questions, compiling project parameters based on engineer feedback, the considerable email traffic involved in co-ordinating activities between several different parties, volunteer wrangling support, identifying projects and artists for the media, etc) ... leaving the portfolio lead time to properly execute the higher level activities within the 21 working days allowed.

We have added a **Liaison** role to the organogram. This is a required function in terms of the Incident Command System, which we suggest adopting to be inline with H&S best practice for an event of our scale. We see this role as being a useful formalization of the organisation spokesperson role that has previously landed on

the communications lead. Communications is focused primarily on communicating to the participants, whereas this role explicitly engages with the default world.

Re regarding the proposed employment policy and the organisational structure as totally interlinked :

The directors don't believe the determination of functional roles (the structure of the org, the determining of critical functions, and of how many days a function takes) is a policy level decision, it is an operational matter.

The structure is also something that will need to be reviewed annually, as the needs of the organisation change.

The directors support the clear separation of the employment policy proposal from the operational structure, so that the operational structure may stand alone and can respond and adapt to changing circumstances without having to go through a time-consuming negotiation with the full membership.

The membership must of course determine policy level matters, but matters of function, such as the organisational structure, should realistically be in the hands of those tasked with the year-round functioning of the organisation.

We hope you understand the thinking behind this. And we hope you DO approve the structure as put forward in the directors' organogram.

A general comment of the perception of roles :

Since the inception of the organogram as proposed in the 2012 Bosberaad, we've had issue with the perception of "major" and "minor" roles.

These are just words... not a value judgement, even though they can easily be interpreted as such.

The fact is, there are no major or minor roles in the organogram.

Every role we've identified and named is a role around an essential function, and that is why we allocate remuneration to them where possible and where needed.

Within that there are levels of "criticalness", in that a portfolio can still function (albeit to a reduced capacity) without a supporting role within it, whereas it will be severely compromised without someone taking up the lead responsibility.

We've pretty much done the work this year and made a best calculation of the hours involved in the execution of each function for the year ahead. THAT is what determines the differing remunerations attached to each role, NOT a sense of one role being more important than the other.

Ok, more food for thought.

I hope this makes sense to everyone?

