

Dear Directors & Members,

21st October, 2013

Re: Employment Policy & Org Structure: COC recommendations for adoption at the October 2013 AGM

Following the 1st August meeting, the COC developed and provided Directors and Members with various proposed policy and org structure changes in a written letter on 7th September. Following Director and Member review these policies and Directors counter-proposals were discussed in depth at an AB org policy meeting on 8th October.

Following the 8th October meeting, the COC and Directors propose that the following amendments and additions be made to the 7th Sept policy letter:

- 1) That the AB technical working month for a full time employee (upon which AB monthly pay is calculated) is agreed to be 21 days and not 20 days.
- 2) The maximum number of days a full time AB employee may work at AB is 21 days per month. A person employed full time outside of AB may only work a maximum of 6 days per month at AB. This effectively means that a part-time employee at AB may only work a maximum of 27 days per month at all his/her combined jobs.

However, it is important to note that working more than 21 days per month (irrespective of where/how it is done) is strongly discouraged. It is important that AB staff try to lead balanced lives and don't suffer burn-out.

- 3) All AB employment contracts need to include clauses which request that employees please give the Directors at least two months written notice of their intention to resign; and commit the employee to volunteer time to provide reasonable induction, training and assistance to their replacement.
- 4) Once Directors and/or Portfolio Leads become aware that a position will become vacant, they are required to immediately advertise the position (including job description, experience/qualifications required, and pay) within a dedicated soon-to-be-created "Jobs Section" of the AB web site, monthly AB newsletters, and AB's facebook page.
- 5) The tiered pay structure based on length of service was amended as follows:
 - a. R500 per 8 hour day for those working for the AB org for the first time in paid or volunteer role.
 - b. R750 per 8 hour day for those working for the AB org for their second or third year in a paid or volunteer role.
 - c. R1000 per 8 hour day for those working for AB in their fourth year or more.
- 6) Paid holiday/leave days per year will be 20 days per year for all staff. Paid leave will be provided to staff working part time on a pro-rata basis.

- 7) If seven Directors are appointed at the AGM, then at least four of the seven must not fulfill Portfolio Lead or Ops/Event Manger Roles. If five Directors are appointed then at least three of the five may not fulfill Portfolio Lead roles.
- 8) AB is a flexible working hour's environment. That being said, paid staff are required to work 70% of their time within the AB offices, unless their role is specifically event related.
- 9) Departures from employment policy are within the Directors remit provided that all Directors vote unanimously in favor of the proposed departure at a duly constituted Directors meeting.
- 10) Employees are only eligible for pay once employment contracts (clearly detailing the roles and all responsibilities, deliverables and key timelines) are completed and signed by the employee and AB Director authorized to do so. The first pay date for the new roles and pay packages will be 30th November 2013. No back-pay will be permitted.
- 11) As a reminder: Over the past few years AfrikaBurn has shifted from being primarily a volunteer run organization to being a paid staff run organization. This is because AfrikaBurn recognizes that certain key roles need to be fulfilled by people who may need to receive remuneration in order to earn a living and support themselves and their families. AfrikaBurn makes reasonable yet modest non-profit sector-related salaries available to people who fulfill necessary key roles within the company.

The roles that receive salaries are critical to the core functioning and long term sustainability of the organization, events and movement and operate year round on a full time or part time basis. They are also generally roles which require continuity of knowledge and experience. These paid roles often involve finding, inspiring and coordinating many volunteers who work to fulfill various functions very necessary to AfrikaBurn. It is important to note that large numbers of inspired and respectfully managed volunteers are critical to making AfrikaBurn happen; and volunteerism must be invested in, stimulated and grow with AfrikaBurn.

Furthermore stipends will continue to be made available to volunteer staff who need to devote large amounts of time to AfrikaBurn at the event and therefore would not be able to take on much other work (during the same period) to earn a basic living. The stipend is a cash allowance which makes a a modest contribution to the workers rent and utility bills while away.

PLEASE NOTE: The balance of this policy letter is almost identical to the 7th September policy letter with a few amendments to take account of the above 11 changes.

The policy adopted in October 2012 combined with the policy outlined herein will form the binding AB employment policy once adopted at the October 2013 AGM. Most of the 2012 policy will still be valid going forward. The two documents must be read in conjunction to establish total employment policy. Where there is conflict between the two, then the 2013 policy document supersedes the 2012.

PLEASE ALSO NOTE: We have made some specific observations regarding the Director proposed (on 21st Oct) org chart at the end of this document ... which we request you please read.

High level COC observations and recommendations flowing from 1st August meeting

1. The Directors struggled to manage the staggered employment cycle this year and were unable to timeously manage the re-signing or transition of the portfolio positions; but a reprieve makes sense to all concerned, and we expect all to be sorted out around the AGM.

It seems that there were various causes including: a lack of a budgetary forecast for the coming year from Fincom, a lack of focus and energy from Directors to lead and implement the HR process, and a lack of clarity amongst Directors about how the organization should be structured and remunerated going forward. These are mostly understandable causes and the postponement (until the AGM) makes sense to us.

We propose the following solutions:

- a) We feel that Fincom must rapidly get into the habit of providing Directors and Portfolio Managers with decent functional rolling three year forecast budgets (for the whole organization and all its activities) on an ongoing basis. We recommend that these 3 year budgets should be updated (to reflect budget vs actual and any changes in projected future income and expenditure) on a quarterly basis. Without budgets, very little quality decision making (in relation to future employment or any other costs/investments) can ever be made by the organizations leaders. Of course, the various portfolio managers do have an important role to play in providing component information ... but Fincom must lead, manage, hound and achieve this process.
- b) In our first cycle of pan-organizational employment we elected to provide staff with one year contracts which would be terminated, renewed or amended depending upon what the organization learned during this first cycle, what the relevant employee wanted to do, what is needed going forward, and what can be afforded. Going forward, we feel that full time employees (see more about this below) and part-time employees working throughout the year should effectively be given permanent positions. This would mean that their contracts would not have a termination date, and they would be employed in the position on the same/similar legal basis as any employee working in any organization. All employees' performance should be thoroughly reviewed at least once per year; and of course Directors could change the terms of their employment (assuming the employee is in agreement).
- c) Even though it didn't work out so well in 2013, we are of the view that the staggered cycle should still largely remain in place ... especially for staff that do contract-oriented or limited period work. For people who are permanently employed (either part-time or full-time) who wish to resign from their jobs ... we would hope that they would resign after wrapping up their post event duties ... which would mean that various vacancies will still become available around July/August each year and have to be filled by Directors during that period.

Directors are appointed at the AGM and thus employed starting mid-October. The core reason for maintaining the staggered cycle is because Directors are responsible for HR and employment, and directors need to be in place, and in a position, to be

able to advertise, interview, and appoint great replacement staff while they are experienced rather than new to their position (or on their way out).

2. From feedback and discussions with Directors and AB staff over the last few months it seems that Directors are still too focused on day-to-day operational issues arising within various portfolios. The Director's roles and responsibilities are very clearly laid out in the current employment policy and more importantly very clearly detailed in their individual employment contracts; however, it seems there is still uncertainty amongst the current Directors as to what their role/involvement should be. Directors are there to perform a company management and oversight function and are effectively collectively responsible for managing the senior staff of the organization, and taking the organization forward. They are there to solve problems and to guide the implementation of new ideas, projects and change within the organization. They need to trust that the managers of the various portfolios/departments are effectively fulfilling their roles and responsibilities as per their individual employment contracts, and are primarily there to ensure that these are being implemented correctly. Only the managers of the various portfolios/departments report directly to the Directors. All Directors should be familiar with the content of all employment contracts and the obligations of that specific role ... and hold senior staff accountable for their work commitments.

The COC would like to see the organization continue to move toward the separation of directorship and management. Directors should not get involved in the actual operations of the various departments unless it is on a voluntary basis or unless they happen to manage a portfolio or work within a portfolio But in these cases they need to keep those functions out of Directors meetings. In so doing it would enable directors to manage/revue the various roles more objectively/effectively and focus on accountability and getting portfolio managers to perform well within their roles rather than being pulled into portfolio specific operations. Currently Directors find it difficult to wear the most appropriate hat at the relevant meeting. We understand that presently, due to financial reasons, some of the Directors are involved in the management of a department, but in the long run it would be preferential to separate these two functions (for at least the majority of Directors).

3. The COC would like to continue to see more people being involved in the organisation on a paid basis and in voluntary roles. Bringing more people into the organisation in 2012-13, in a structured manner, has proven very successful. It has increased the skills base, provided more depth, enabled quality succession, reduced politics, and generally increased enthusiasm and energy.
4. We have agreed to grow AB to 8500 in 2014, 10, 500 in 2015 and 12, 500 in 2016. If we are to have this very considerable 20% annual compound growth in our events, then we need to put excellent people in place to manage the physical impact of the growth. Members expect to see the additional funding from this growth (through ticket sales and other) to primarily go towards operationally focused and AB event execution-related roles. There is a general understanding that we need a very capable Event Manager, to oversee and take care of all event related operational matters and who works for the organisation on a full time basis. There is a need to invest in people in DPW (at coordinator and lower levels); there is a need to bulk out the Volunteers Portfolio (which could also act as a HR department for the organisation – more below about this), and Health & Safety needs much more management capability and paid staff at top and middle tiers. Gate & Ticketing will also need a shot in the arm.

Conversely, with a limited budget, Directors also need to appreciate that this also means that there will not be much money available to invest considerably in the remaining portfolios.

Key 2013 COC recommendations and changes to existing October 2012 policy

- 1) When creating the 2012 adopted policy the COC (and AB Directors and staff) did not have a clear idea of how much time managing each portfolio would take. Nor did we know how much time being a Director would take, or how much time various portfolio jobs would take. So, we used our best guestimates ... and we created minor and major portfolios (each with certain pay associated) and various other roles and estimated appropriate pay.

Now, of course many folk have worked in the various roles created and many folk have worked closely with people in the roles created. So now we have a much clearer idea of how much time the various roles take. And we think it's high time to change the system to one which more appropriately matches pay with time required for the job.

Directors will need to sit down with all portfolio managers, portfolio staff, and voluntary workers and realistically figure out roughly how much time each "old" role requires and figure out how much time each "new" role (flowing from final agreed new org structure) will require. Final time allocation decisions will have to be done by consensus between Directors; and all Directors will have to recuse themselves from involvement in final decisions relating to roles which they may possibly fulfill in the future.

When calculating time required for each job, all staff (and Directors when making final time requirement decisions) should be careful to allow time for leadership and management (as generally there will be more staff (paid & voluntary) across the board within a department). Further to this, all employees also need to factor in additional time for innovation, creating new ideas, creating new projects, and implementing new projects within their portfolios or beyond.

Furthermore, and underpinning the above system, the COC recommends a 3 tiered pay structure which is dependent on the amount of time an individual has actively been involved and worked within (any part) of the AB organization (whether on a voluntary or paid basis). If for some reason there is some disagreement, then evaluating the time contributed in the past would be determined by, and up to the final decision of the Directors.

The following tiers are an initial proposal which will need to be plugged into a three year budget and org chart; and may well need to be adjusted downward if they cannot be comfortably afforded following analysis:

Tier 1: 4 + years (R1000/8 hour day)

Tier 2: 2 - 3 years (R750/8 hour day)

Tier 3: first year (R500/8 hour day)

For directors we propose a set daily fee of R1000/8 hours work.

There are a few additional important elements to understand about this new proposed remuneration system:

- a) The first is that nobody can work more than 21 days per month. Various Directors and portfolio staff have expressed concerns around “burnout”. We need to create a system which prevents burnout and this limitation does just that. Of course if people want to volunteer for additional roles they may do so, but they cannot get paid for that work, and their voluntary work cannot negatively impact upon their effectiveness within their paid roles. And – of course - this also very effectively (and importantly) creates an across the board 2014/15 pre-tax remuneration maximum of R21,000 per person per month.
- b) This system also simplifies and standardizes annual pay increases (without having to issue new contracts). So – for example – we could increase all three pay tiers in October 2014 by say 5% if the average inflation of the prior year was indeed 5%.
- c) One of the challenges flowing from the prior system was that employees did not know how much time they ought to put into their work. And Directors and Portfolio Managers did not know how much time contribution they should expect from their staff. This is a critical flaw. Once time contributed is more closely matched with pay, then a much clearer expectation is created around how much time one ought to be working. If a staff member has a 21 day per month full time role which he/she is being paid for ... then he/she needs to be sure that they are indeed at work every day and are putting in the necessary eight hours per day (on average). This also prevents burnout And it prevents abuse and people getting paid for time they are not actually spending working. It makes the Directors and Portfolio task of managing all the organization staff performance and job time expectation much clearer and easier to measure and manage for employee and employer.
- d) Challenges flowing from this kind of system could possibly include “anal clock watching”, “time required exaggeration and exploitation”, and demanding more pay if time estimated pans out to be inaccurate. This kind of behavior cannot work in combination with the system we have proposed. The AB ethics of honesty,

simply getting the job done, gifting, civic participation and volunteerism have to prevail for paid staff for this to work. The Directors must make good time required estimates and then close the book on the subject. If Directors allow staff to constantly watch the clock and adjust pay to actual hours spent this thing will be a management nightmare and result in all sorts of ill will. At the end of the day, when someone signs up for a job at AB, they just simply have to work the hours to get the job done and their pay will not be adjusted following contract.

We believe that this is a transparent, fair, and delightfully socialist way to remunerate people within the AB organization. And it fairly benefits those that have more AB organizational experience, and rewards length of service and past efforts. It also places a maximum on pay and distributes fairer pay to ALL working within the AB organization. It does not value one form of work over another.

A few examples to illustrate how this system would work:

- a) Say for example, it is determined by Directors and Fincom Portfolio staff that the Financial Manager role required 6 days on average per month over the course of the whole year. Then if Financial Manager has worked within the AB organization for 2 years (within the past 7 years) then his/her role would be remunerated as follows $R750 \times 6 = R4,500$ pre-tax per month.
 - b) If for example it is determined that managing the Creative/Art Portfolio will actually take on average 21 days per month and if for example someone who had worked meaningfully within AB for 4 or more years out of the past seven years, then his/her role would receive $R1,000 \times 21 = R21,000$ pre-tax per month. However, if this person was a director he/she would have to step down as a Director as he/she would not be able to do that job as he/she has no extra time available to him/her to do it.
 - c) If for example we created an Electricity & Power Manager role reporting to Head of DPW for the 2014 event. And say it was determined that this role required 5 days of meetings and planning prior to the event, 5 days set-up, 7 days during the event, and 2 days breakdown; giving a total of 19 days. And if for example this role was filled by someone who is an electrician who made two sculptures over the past two years but hasn't actually worked (in a meaningful paid or volunteer) position for AB, then he/she would get paid $19 \times R500 = R9,500$ pre-tax for this short term contract period.
- 2) Whether the employee is employed on a full or part time basis will depend on the amount of days they work per month. We recommend that a full time employee will be required to work 21 days per month and a part time employee would work 20 days or less per month. If, for example, a Director works 7 days a month, then he/she cannot work more than 14 days in

another paid role. By using this kind of pay structure we are creating a much more egalitarian work environment where everyone is respected similarly and remunerated for their time as opposed to their position. It also recognizes those that have been involved for longer, are more experienced, and have contributed more to the organization. Secondly, it will prevent people from taking on too much work and thus resulting in burnout. This system would also eliminate the portfolio/role stacking problem that was born of the prior system.

- 3) So – while on the subject of full time employment, it's also sensible to address holiday. All staff need to rest and take time off. We think AB should provide 20 days paid holiday per year to full-time staff. Obviously this leave cannot be taken before, during or immediately after the AB event. If someone worked a year-round part time job, then they would get corresponding pro-rata paid leave. For example, if there was a role which was 10 days per month, then the employee working within that role would receive 9 days paid leave per year. And – of course – any leave (pre-agreed with Directors and Managers) over and above the paid leave would be unpaid.
- 4) We want to remind Directors that Human Resources management (HR) is core to Directors responsibilities as per their employment contracts. The core responsibility in this regard is leadership and people management. Leadership is about inspiring and motivating staff, it's about assisting staff with poor performance, and it's about solving challenges with staff. It's about actively holding people accountable for their contracted work commitments.

That being said, we think the Volunteers Portfolio should take on additional HR responsibilities which have previously resided with Directors ... we see the Volunteers Portfolio as already serving a HR placement function within the organisation. So, we think that the Volunteers Portfolio should take on responsibility for advertising a newly vacant paid position, forwarding applicants to Directors and Portfolio Managers, and handling contract drafting for employees. Of course the contracts content, job duties, work time required, would have to be decided by Directors and the contracts would have to be signed by a Director and the employee.

- 5) We recommend that AB starts investing in its employee's skills development, where necessary. So, if for example, a key (long term) staff member could improve their job performance by increasing their skills, then we believe that AB should consider assisting such employees with increasing their skills and pay for a part (or all) of their training. Examples could include: Putting rangers and H&S staff on a short practical firefighting course, putting the Financial Director on a short excel course and/or practical budgeting course etc. We are certainly not talking about funding long courses, or paying for obtuse academic studies. But we are talking about short, highly relevant and impactful practical/skills orientated training (when it is warranted, when the organization will see a direct benefit for the organization, and when the organization can afford it).
- 6) It's a minor issue ... but seriously ... the silly word "stipend" has got to go from our vocabulary. This word is no longer relevant to our organisation. For a number of years now, we have been, and are formerly employing people, whether it's on a full time or part time contract basis. These people are the company's employees and they earn monthly "salaries" (in most cases) or weekly "wages" in some cases. Quite a few employees have been earning R10-20k per month for a long time and these are decent middle-income salaries in any SA commercial environment. They do not earn "stipends" ... who are we trying to fool???

- 7) It's also a minor issue ... as per the current employment policy and the governance document, the COC believes that there should be a minimum of 5 and a maximum of 7 directors leading the organization at any given time. We don't see a need to always employ 7 Directors. Of course, if there are 7 great Directors who make themselves available at the October AGM and they do indeed get voted in by Members – great – no problem - but if we only end up with 6 or 5 – then that's just fine.

Our recommendations around the structure/organogram of paid positions (not including volunteers) are as follows:

We have reviewed and considered the various ideas and organization structure proposals put forward by Directors at our 1st August meeting. We have the following ideas and commentary for Directors and Members consideration:

- 1) As far as org structure is concerned, we think AB should simply – only have 6 primary departments (or portfolios). These are: 1. Events, 2. Creative Arts, 3. Communications (External & Internal), 4. Outreach, 5. Finance & Governance and 6. Volunteers & HR.
- 2) The largest portfolio (or department) with by far the largest responsibility is Events. We feel that DPW, H&S and Gate & Ticketing should be three sub-portfolios/departments within Events. The Events Manager would be a full-time position. The heads of DPW, H&S and Gate & Ticketing would report to the Events Manager.

In future, we envision that all the key staff within DPW and other Events portfolios would work within their roles during the full course of the AB event. There would be no “hand-over” from DPW to others. There would be one head office for the event. The DPW identity and ethos is fun (mostly) and should be cherished and preserved; but at the end of the day we need a totally collectively structured event execution team who see themselves as a team and live and camp together. For example ... there should not be a “DPW kitchen”, there should only be an “Events Team” kitchen.

We are of the opinion that Spec Com (or Special Events) has not worked out well as a portfolio. We recommend that AB considers terminating this portfolio and place its responsibilities with the Events Portfolio/Dept. With a full-time Events Manager running the Events Dept and experienced paid leadership running the sub-departments, the company will have the capacity to manage all its events. Examples of additional events that would have previously fallen within Spec Com or other portfolios but would now fall within Events include: Decompression, Equinox, Park Life, Thank-you Dinner, AGM, Members Bosberaad, Town Hall, Members/Directors Policy Meeting. Time required to execute additional events during the year should be figured in to Events portfolio employment contracts.

- 3) We feel that the DMV should no longer need to be a top tier Dept/Portfolio reporting to Directors on a regular basis. We see it lying within the Creative Arts department just like Performance, Theme camps and Art installations. To our minds DMV has a very important and growing role with AB and we think that (with the planned 20% annual compound growth of AB) allocating more people and other resources to DMV makes good sense. However, we see DMV as being primarily related to the main AB event. And we see it as having two primary functions.

The first is the assessment, reviewing, approval and assistance (with creative design and engineering) of mutant vehicle proposals. There is also an art grant review/funding element to the first function. The second primary function is the on-site (creative, engineering & safety) reviewing and final licensing of successful applicant mutant vehicles at the AB event. When one considers these two primary functions, they leap out at one as being almost identical to the functions/processes that are managed and executed by the Creative Arts portfolio in relation to Theme Camps, Performances and Art Installations. In many cases the relationships are with the same creative contributors.

In relation to this, we believe that the monitoring of mutant vehicles safety (licensed or not) at the event is the sole responsibility of H&S Specifically Rangers ... and failing rangers' successful intervention ... it would fall to security. And – no surprise – this applies to all artworks, theme camps, performances and installations.

We believe that the DMV will continue to need its own Manager and staff on a part-time basis and mainly related to the principle event. We are not suggesting that DMV needs to become less significant, but rather that 95% of what it does and the way in which it is managed is totally common to, and interrelated with, Creative Arts.

- 4) We have re-considered the thinking behind the “New Projects” portfolio and we feel the portfolio does not make sense. We feel that any organization (and AB in particular) should strive to innovate, develop and change. Ideally speaking the AB organization should strive to create an environment where all paid and volunteer staff are empowered to drive change, champion new ideas, foster innovation, manifest new projects and live creatively within their roles. Also – ideally speaking – AB should strive to create openness and be welcoming so that it continually receives “inbound” ideas for change and innovation and “new projects” from members of our greater community or people beyond our greater community ... and that it responds timeously and with clear intent to these opportunities.

Typically, the person championing a new project, new opportunity, or new innovation could be thought of as a “New Project Champion”.

We feel that all roles within AB (from Directors, to full time employees, to part time employees, to part time volunteers) should be structured (and remunerated) so that time to innovate, create, conceive new projects and drive new projects is mandatory.

The ultimate arbiter of new projects/ideas/innovation should be the Directors. Choices around what new projects the organization does should never reside with one role/portfolio/person ... it's not democratic, the decision making is too insular, it slows everything down, and bottlenecks exciting change and opportunity for all once again. The Directors are the year-round leaders of the organization and together/collectively they must make decisions about what the organization does. Directors are effectively the custodians of the near-term future choices of the organization.

The Directors have to collectively make decisions about how to apply limited resources to collective opportunity. These Director-driven decisions require leadership, they require figuring out if the new project is worth pursuing, if it's something AB wants to fund or participate in, and if it should happen soon or if it should be pushed out to the future etc.

The Directors have the tough task of determining AB's core focus, and have to review inbound and home-grown opportunities through their focus lens. Director inaction and procrastination is not acceptable. Either an opportunity is a go, or it's not appropriate, or more information/fleshing out is needed, or it's a go later (once certain conditions have been met).

We feel it should be (very clearly understood) public information that anyone can put forward a (written and clearly motivated) proposal to the Directors at any time. How a proposal should be submitted should be placed on the AB web site. And that the Directors should acknowledge receipt of that proposal, and be required to make decisions (with clear written response) about all new opportunities and new projects (home-grown or inbound) within a reasonable yet precise period of time. We suggest within the next two Directors meetings (or say 3 months).

And – because we have pre-allocated new project time to paid roles at all levels (detailed in point of 1 of this section) – a New Project Champion is already paid to implement a project which they have conceived or a new project which has been allocated to them (and in agreement with them).

Furthermore, we don't think Directors should have to wait for Member approval to pay New Project Champions (who are not currently working for the organization) to get their projects underway, or to create new paid employment roles for that matter. The important caveat is that AB must (without a shadow of a doubt) definitely have the resources and budget to do it.

If an "external" or "internal" New Project Champion needs a shepherd or an ongoing contact person within the organization, then the Directors will simply need to ask/appoint the most appropriate existing staff member (Director, Portfolio Manager or Portfolio Staff member) to be that contact point.

Our view on org structure:

We want to make it very clear that the COC is not in a great position to make recommendations about specific roles within portfolios and sub-portfolios. We haven't worked within these portfolios. We encourage Directors, Portfolio Managers and Portfolio Staff to come together to figure out what paid staff and voluntary staff will be essential within each portfolio.

We are of the opinion that the proposed org chart present at our 1st August meeting was much too complicated and created too many roles.

The org chart/roles below are just to illustrate our (less informed somewhat removed) thinking on how we would like to see the paid-role org structure:

1) Events Manager.

DPW Manager

- 1) Assistant Production Manager
- 2) Power & Electricity
- 3) Toilets & Sanitation
- 4) Signage

- 5) Construction
- 6) Camp & Camp Kitchen
- 7) MOOP

Health & Safety Manager

- 1) Head Ranger
- 2) Senior Rangers x 6
- 3) Fire
- 4) Medics
- 5) Security

Gate & Ticketing Manager

- 1) Ticketing Systems/Tech

- 2) Creative Arts Manager
 - 1) Theme Camps
 - 2) DMV
 - 3) Art Installations
 - 4) Performances
- 3) Communications (External & Internal) Manager
 - 1) Social Media & Web (Content)
 - 2) Web & IT (Technology)
 - 3) Photography & Video
- 4) Outreach Manager
 - 1) Outreach 2nd
- 5) Finance & Governance Manager
 - 1) Financial Manager
- 6) Volunteers & Human Resources Manager
 - 1) Employee legal/contracts

PLEASE NOTE: The Directors have reviewed the above org structure proposal and have subsequently presented a revised org chart to COC on Monday 20th October. The COC does not support the org chart presented. In particular we have the following observations:

- a) **We don't think there should be "Admin Seconds" in paid positions serving under Portfolio Leads. We think this is hierarchical and unnecessary. All Portfolio Lead positions are administrative to a large degree. We recommend rather that more staff are employed to work lessor more clearly defined specialist part-time roles within the portfolios rather than having one large paid "second" admin role. Having a second whose role is largely the same as the lead is creating bureaucracy which AB can't afford to pay for, and reducing accountability at the Portfolio Lead level.**

- b) **We feel there are far too many portfolios. The structure is unwieldy and time-consuming for Directors. We think DPW, Gate & Ticketing, Rangers & EMS should be sub-departments of an Events portfolio which should be managed by an Events Manager.**

The above being noted, we do feel it's up to the current Directors to finalize the org chart; and make sure that AB can afford it without taking any undue financial risk. After all it is the Directors who will have to directly manage and run the complex structure they create; and it is the Directors and Portfolio Managers who will have to draft and conclude all the employment contracts making up the total structure.

Where do we go from here

This kind of work is never easy, it's taken a lot of time, we've given this a lot of thought, and the proposals above are "our best shot". We don't think it's perfect and you can't please everyone. We have tried to produce the optimal system to take our treasured AB organization forward. We have considered the shortcomings of 2012 policies, and the needs, hopes and aspirations of those involved ... and we hope what we have presented is met with appreciation.

The next step is for Directors (and any interested Members and community participants) to clearly and intelligently communicate their response. We are genuinely open to other workable ideas and counter-proposals ... but they must please be well thought through, put in writing, and be explained from a systemic, workable and pan-organizational perspective ... rather than the isolated (or even selfish) needs/perspectives of an individual.

IMPORTANT: We request that Directors please review the employment proposed policy changes and proposed org structure as totally interlinked. We hope and anticipate that staff numbers will grow – particularly in the operational parts of AB. And we expect that future budgets can handle staff growth and the new pay structure; but a massive growth in org structure and paid staff will probably not be simultaneously affordable. So – the balancing act (for all business and organization managers) is to increase staff and implement the pay structures to manage the event/org growth well; and be able to pay for it at the same time. Directors have to plug the numbers into realistic and technically accurate three year forecast budgets and see what the picture looks like. Paid staff numbers, or pay levels may have to be amended depending upon the outcome. We have not yet budget tested our numbers because the org structure is required to do that.

That being said ... if these proposals are generally received positively then we hope we can with Directors move towards adopting these new policies at the upcoming AGM. Please feel free to call us to discuss any/all elements of our proposals in greater depth.

Yours in flames,

Richard Bowsher & Sebastian Prinz

Voluntary AfrikaBurn Compensation Oversight Committee (COC)