



Nasionale Nuusbrieff / National Newsletter

06/2019

18/02/2019



REGSTELLING VAN DISKRIMINERENDE PENSIOENPRAKTYKE (SKBR Resolusie 2 van 2018)

THE REDRESS OF DISCRIMINATORY PENSION PRACTICES (PSCBC Resolution 2 of 2018)

1. Die partye in die Staatsdiens Koördinerende Bedingingsraad (SKBR) (PSCBC) het in Resolusie 7 van 1998 ooreengekom dat die Regeringsdienspensioenfonds die pensioenjare van diens moet verhoog of ander maatreëls instel vir daardie werknemers wat negatief geaffekteer was deur pre-1994 se ras en geslagsdiskriminerende praktyke.
2. Om aansoek te doen vir die regstelling, **moes applikante in diens gewees het** op 2 September 1998, die datum van ondertekening van die ooreenkoms en aansoek op die voorgeskrewe dokumente gedoen het.
3. Die SKBR het Resolusie 3 van 2012 onderteken om die sluiting van aansoeke te finaliseer, dws **31/7/2012**. Die onderneming is gegee dat teen Februarie/Maart 2019 die Fonds se administrateurs kwalifiserende persone formeel in kennis sal stel en dat een van die volgende regstellende stappe geïmplementeer sal word:
 - Kwalifiserende applikante wie steeds in diens is, se pensioendraende diensjare sal verleng word volgens bepaalde kriteria.
 - Werknemers wat reeds op pensioen is, sal 'n eenmalige betaling ontvang.
 - Werknemers wat bedank het, sal ook 'n eenmalige betaling ontvang.
 - Afgestorwe werknemers se begunstigdes, sal eenmalige betaling ontvang.

1. Parties agreed in PSCBC Resolution 7 of 1998 that the GEPF should increase the pensionable years of service or implement other measures for employees disadvantaged by specific pre-1994 racial or gender discrimination practices.
2. To apply for the redress, **applicants had to be in service** on the date of signing, i.e. 2 September 1998 and applied in terms of the prescribed forms.
3. Council signed PSCBC Resolution 3 of 2012 to conclude the application process. The cut-off date was **31/7/2012**. The undertaking is that GPAA will inform all qualifying applicants of the outcome by February/ March 2019 of the specific redress measure, i.e.:
 - Qualifying applicants who are still in service will receive additional pensionable service.
 - Pensioners will receive a once-off payment.
 - Resignees will receive a once-off payment.
 - Beneficiaries of ex-employees who are deceased will receive a once-off payment.



2019 Contribution Increases: GEMS Options

SAPPHIRE	6.0%	Average contribution increase of 7.1%
BERYL	6.5%	EVO increase before subsidy 4.3%
RUBY	6.8%	Emerald to EVO switch saving
EVO	4.3%	16% before subsidy
EMERALD	7.5%	25% after subsidy= R590 per member per month saving
ONYX	9.8%	

Opsies / Consolidation of options

2018	2019	2020 onwards
<i>Sapphire</i>	<i>Sapphire</i>	<i>1 New option + value</i>
<i>Beryl</i>	<i>Beryl</i>	<i>2 Ruby+ value</i>
<i>Ruby</i>	<i>Ruby</i>	<i>3 Emerald+ value</i>
<i>Emerald</i>	<i>Emerald</i>	
<i>Emerald Value</i>	<i>Emerald Value</i>	
<i>Onyx</i>	<i>Onyx Ring fenced</i>	<i>Onyx Ring fenced</i>

1. Vanaf 2019 - 2020 sal ONYX nie meer 'n opsie wees nie.
2. Vanaf 2020 sal sleg 6 opsies beskikbaar wees.
3. Huidige ONYX lede kan voortgaan op die ONYX opsie.

1. From 2019 - 2020 ONYX won't be an option.
2. From 2020 only 6 options will be available.
3. Current ONYX members may continue with ONYX.

**SAOU NATIONAL SURVEY OF SCHOOL INFRASTRUCTURE
70 SCHOOLS THAT HAVE SERIOUS PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED**

The Regulations Relating to Minimum Uniform Norms and Standards for Public School Infrastructure have the following objectives:

- a. To provide minimum uniform norms and standards for public school infrastructure;
- b. To ensure that there is compliance with the minimum uniform norms and standards in the design and construction of new schools and additions, alterations and improvements to schools which exist when these regulations are published; and
- c. To provide timeframes within which school infrastructure backlogs must be eradicated.

The lesson learnt from the recent Hoërskool Driehoek tragedy is that school infrastructure in South Africa falls far short of the above objectives. As a result, the SAOU launched a national survey to obtain a more informed picture of the degree of compliance with The Regulations Relating to Minimum Uniform Norms and Standards by the Public School Infrastructure. Hoërskool Roodepoort for example, is just one other instance where the school must operate without 18 classes due to the deteriorated condition of the building.

Arising from the survey to date, the SAOU has identified more than 70 schools with infrastructure problems that can be categorised as requiring urgent and serious attention to parts of the buildings. Significantly, the average age of the schools that participated in this survey is 68 years.

Quintiles

Schools categorised from quintile 1 to 5 participated in the survey. This means that schools in the poorest communities (classified as Quintile 1) and schools serving the more affluent communities (classified as Quintile 5) are represented in the survey. This fact is important as "poorer" schools receive more generous financial allocations from the government than the more affluent schools, but regardless of the quantum of the allocation, the SAOU is of the view that the provision for school maintenance is woefully inadequate.

Analysis of the survey

- The survey revealed that 85% of the respondent schools received financial allocations. 91,7% indicated that only a percentage of the allocation made provision for maintenance issues. The 8,3% of schools that did not receive an allocated percentage of the allocation for maintenance were schools in the quintile 5 category.
- 51,7 % of the schools were classified as quintile 5 schools (wealthier schools). The average allocation per learner per annum in the quintile 5 schools is between R215 – R360 per child.
- 36.7% of the schools were classified as quintile 4 schools. The average allocation per learner per annum in the quintile 4 schools is between R 623 – R 900 per child
- 4,9% of the schools were classified as quintile 2 and 3 schools. The average allocation per learner per annum in the quintile 2 and 3 schools is between R 955 – R 1200 per child
- 6,7% of the schools were classified as quintile 1 schools. The average allocation per learner per annum in the quintile 1 schools is between R 1200 – R 1450 per child.

Percentage of financial allocation allocated for the maintenance of the school building and other infrastructure

- 91,7 % of the schools received an allocation for the maintenance of the school building and other infrastructure.
- 8,3% of the schools did not receive an allocation.

Percentages of infrastructure problems reported to the DBE

- 68,3% of the infrastructure problems were reported to the DBE.
- 31,7% of the infrastructure problems were not reported to the DBE.

Did the school receive any feedback from the DBE?

- 71,7% of the schools did not receive any feedback.
- 28,3% of the schools received feedback.

Is there a paper trail as proof of the reportage and departmental response and was it noted in the minutes of the school governing body?

- 61,7% of the schools have a comprehensive paper trail of correspondence/ communication requesting assistance from the DBE.
- 38,3% of the schools did not keep any paper trail.

What was the average expenditure on maintenance to the building and other infrastructure at the school over the last 3 years?

- The average amount spent by schools on maintenance of buildings over a period of 3 years R986 559,15.
- The individual school amounts varied from R30 000 up to R2 000 000. (The quintile in which the school operates is an important factor in this regard.)

Is there infrastructure that could be classified as very dangerous and requires immediate attention?

Infrastructure that schools deemed to be very dangerous included the following:

- Roof structures/Roofs
- Corridors
- Staircases
- Serious cracks in walls
- Asbestos classes
- Sewage problems

Were these problems reported to the DBE?

- 68,3% of the problems were reported to the DBE.
- 31,7% of the problems were not reported to the DBE.

When were these structural problems reported for the first time?

The survey gave varied responses regarding time frames. The shortest period is 1 month and the longest 10 – 12 years ago (these schools have a paper trail to support the time frame).

What was the nature of the feedback?

- Some schools indicate that they received no feedback at all.
- Some school received visits but had no follow-up responses after that.
- Some schools had visits from the department two years ago, but did not receive any communication after the visit.
- Some schools indicated that some but not all reported structures were repaired.

The SAOU will monitor the situation closely and where possible pay site visits to the affected schools in order to assist with the submission of complaints/requests for maintenance by the Department.