

Report of the Subcommittee Established to Enquire into the Tensions in the City of Cape Town



*Democratic Alliance
Federal Executive, Cape Town*

10 December 2017

ENQUIRY INTO TENSIONS THAT HAVE DEVELOPED IN THE CITY OF CAPE TOWN AND RECOMMENDATIONS ABOUT WAYS TO RESOLVE THESE TENSIONS IN THE INTERESTS OF THE PARTY AND GOOD GOVERNANCE AND TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ABOUT ANY OTHER MATTER THAT HAS ARISEN IN THE COURSE OF THE ENQUIRY WHICH WILL ENSURE THE EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT AND OPTIMAL FUNCTIONING OF THAT CAUCUS.

1. INTRODUCTION

This report is tabled in terms of the Federal Executive resolution which resolved to establish a sub-committee to enquire into the tensions that had developed in the city of Cape Town caucus and which had spilled over into the public arena.

On the 01 August 2017 a letter was received indicating the formal tasking of a sub-committee of the Federal Executive. The terms of reference for the committee were as follows:

“To enquire into tensions that have developed in the city of Cape Town caucus and recommendations about ways to resolve these tensions in the interest of the party and good governance and to make recommendations about any other matter that may arise in the course of the enquiry which will ensure the efficient management and optimal functioning of that caucus”.

The sub-committee was also provided, under separate cover, a complaint from Alderman JP Smith and was further referred to Mayor De Lille’s progress report tabled at the previous Federal Executive meeting.

The sub-committee consisted of the following members:

John Steenhuisen MP
John Moodey MPL
Patricia Kopane MP
Councillor Karen Smith

The sub-committee was professionally assisted by Ms. Una Christians, the personal assistant to the Chief Whip.

2. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE CITY OF CAPE TOWN (COCT)

The City of Cape Town is the DA's flagship municipal government. It is the genesis of our good governance model that provided us with a platform to establish ourselves as a party of government. It is this model that has undoubtedly provided the momentum for us to take government, not only in the province of the Western Cape but also in other municipalities and more significantly the Metropolitan cities of Nelson Mandela Bay, Johannesburg and Tshwane. Our success and track record in the COCT as a strong, stable and focussed government that delivers in was used relentlessly in the last local government elections.

It is the trust that was built up through this model that ensured our growth in voter numbers in the COCT as more voters entrusted their votes to the DA. The COCT underpins our offer and any threat to the governance, cohesion and credibility in the city has the potential to cause significant harm to our electoral prospects in 2019.

3. NEGATIVE MEDIA REPORTING

Prior to the commencement of the work of the sub-committee, internal tensions that had been brewing within the caucus of the COCT spilt over into the public arena. The media were casting the tensions as a fight between Mayor De Lille and Ald. JP Smith. Whilst the party leadership placed both individuals on "special leave" and forbade them from dealing with the media, it was clear from an analysis of the ongoing media reports that these were being stoked by insiders, either councillors in the caucus or in the city or administration/political staff. This coverage continued during the course of the sub-committee's work and continues unabated. This coverage, coupled with the negative reports relating to the drought and now several other matters of concern, have cast the DA in an extremely poor light and continues to cause significant brand damage to the party.

4. THE ENQUIRY

4.1 Methodology

On the 20 September 2017, the committee sent a notification to Councillors of the Democratic Alliance in the City of Cape Town inviting any member of the caucus who wished to appear before the commission in person and raise matters relating to the enquiry.

The commission further invited members of the caucus to make written submissions should they not wish to appear before the commission in person.

The enquiry adopted an informal, inquisitorial approach. This approach was adopted to afford any member of caucus the peace of mind to be able to speak freely without fear, favor or prejudice.

The committee further resolved that any submissions, documents, information or concerns would be treated in a confidential manner as there appear to be, as will emerge further in this report, a climate of fear of reprisal amongst members of the caucus.

5. THE CAUCUS

The COCT caucus is made up of over 150 Councillors, making it the largest DA caucus in the country. As the party has grown it has attracted a wide diversity of Councillors from within all communities of the city, each with their own life perspectives and representing communities with a wide diversity of needs and challenges.

The importance of, as well as the role and responsibilities of Caucuses are recognized and set out in Chapter Nine of the Federal Constitution of the Democratic Alliance which states that *inter alia*:

“Caucuses are responsible for the proper functioning of the Party in the relevant forum and may subject to this constitution and subject to the relevant party formations, formulate policy and oversee policy formulation by spokespersons”

And

“Members must at all times perform their duties in the relevant forum, their duties towards the voters and particularly their duties towards Party supporters diligently and to the level and standard required by the Party as set out in the applicable code”

There is little doubt that managing a caucus of this size will offer significant challenges and would require a variety of role-players to act in concert to ensure its smooth running. The caucus, however, has become an arena of massive contestation, acrimony and abuse and many councillors do not feel that they should raise their heads above the parapet for fear of being cut down to size by either the Mayor or the Chairperson and that they do not have sufficient faith in either the Chief Whip or the Speaker to address their concerns.

5.1 The Caucus Chairperson

It is clear that the chairperson has an extremely difficult task on her hands, balancing the need to ensure discussion on matters within the caucus but also being mindful of the time restraints on such discussions. However, there is a concern that the Chairperson does not sufficiently protect members of caucus from abuse that far exceeds the bounds of robust debate. Caucus members complain of being belittled, humiliated and set upon if they ask a question that is not to the Mayor's liking and which she considers a criticism of her view. Some have indicated that their contributions are labelled as "stupid". Caucus members further indicate that this has caused a situation where the majority of caucus members now simply disengage from debate or discussion on most items.

The Mayor in her submission reflects that caucus debates may become "heated" and that "strong words may be spoken between Councillors" and that this is "part of the political arena". However it is precisely the role of the chair to reign these in and manage the debate and, most importantly, to jealously protect the rights of all councillors in the caucus to express themselves, even if such expressions offer a differing opinion to that of the caucus leadership. A number of Councillors feel that the chairperson sides with the Mayor and fails to call her to order, especially when she makes comments that are outside the bounds of what should be normal caucus discussions.

5.2 The Chief Whip

The Chief Whip has a unique role in the caucus, not only is he required to control the discipline of the caucus, but it is also essential that he pays particular attention to the political climate within the caucus and tries to manage internal conflicts in a manner that de-escalates tensions and leads to more harmonious working relationships.

The Chief Whip should be the person caucus members, regardless of their views, go to in order to express their concerns. Members of caucus, however, feel that Shaun August is too closely linked to the Mayor and that when differing viewpoints are expressed or frustrations are shared, there is always an implication that there will be political consequences for members who share different viewpoints or positions to that of the Mayor and her team. Such views are deemed "career limiting" and could well block advancement of these councillors. This further inhibits the ability of caucus members to express themselves without fear and favor and significantly feed the narrative that Cllr. Shaun August is part of a "cabal" around the Mayor and would therefore not provide a fair hearing to members of the caucus.

This was exacerbated by the lead up to the internal caucus elections where the Chief Whip was actively involved in campaigning for a slate of candidates to be elected.

Another matter of great unease that arose during the course of the work of the subcommittee is the allegation that the Chief Whip colluded with the ANC whip to target and potentially unseat Cllr. Grant Twigg as the Subcouncil 2 chairperson through a motion of no-confidence. These allegations were made by the ANC whip in a televised interview on ENCA. The clip of this interview was widely shared on social media and was the subject of newspaper reports. This obviously further fueled the embarrassment of the ongoing negative reporting of the COCT tensions. The subcommittee put these allegations to Cllr. August when he participated in the process via telephone. However, he vehemently denied the allegation. The subcommittee feels that this allegation is extremely serious and we recommend that it must be further investigated by the FLC through a formal process.

5.3 The Speaker

It would appear that the Speaker too is regarded by many as being aligned to the Mayor and her team and this inhibits his role as an independent arbiter in caucus disputes. Councilors have indicated that the Speaker refers to various members of the caucus as “die liberales”. If this is indeed the case then it is deeply inappropriate, especially as the Speaker should be taking steps to ensure that all Councillors, regardless of affiliation are afforded protection and both protected and heard. This must apply to members of his own caucus too.

The subcommittee was also informed that recently a role of a “Deputy Speaker” was essentially created for Cllr. Benedicta Van Minnen and that she has taken over large parts of the Speaker’s role in terms of presiding at council meetings and developing of rulings. Although the position of Deputy Speaker is not provided for in the legislation, Cllr. Van Minnen’s role is formally that of chairperson of the rules committee. Councillor Van Minnen is a very able individual and does possess great knowledge and skill. However, the creation of this position and its associated status, without caucus consultation or buy-in, has caused some tensions within the caucus. Caucus members we interacted with regard this as once again another top-down decision by the Mayor and her team and that the creation of this role and the duties as well as the person to fill this position, should have been discussed and debated within the caucus. The subcommittee notes further that the Mayor herself has submitted a number of complaints to the Speaker, particularly as these relate to the conduct of Ald. JP Smith. It remains unclear whether these have ever been resolved and if so how they have been resolved.

The role of the Speaker is an important one and is essential for the smooth functioning of the council. If the current Speaker is not able to fulfill the full range of duties that are required of the post, then the subcommittee must ask the obvious question as to why he is being retained in this position?

5.4 The Metro Regional Chairperson

The subcommittee flagged another potential case of conflict within the caucus environment and that involves the role of the Metro Region Chair. Both the previous chairperson of the Metro region and the current incumbent are members of the caucus. Every effort must be made to ensure that issues relating to the Metro region do not amalgamate with caucus issues. The Metro region elections were fiercely contested and were characterized by massive acrimony. Issues pertaining to these separate structures must not be conflated into each other as this will only serve to deepen the conflict.

6. THE ID/DA NARRATIVE

This matter featured prominently during the course of the interactions with various of the caucus members. This is also a matter that has found expression during the course of the media reportage on the tensions and differences. Undoubtable there are some residual tensions that exist in this space, however they are vastly overplayed and over-emphasized. Rather than being a genuine division within the caucus this narrative appears to be deployed as a weapon to refute or reinforce arguments or for the purposes of internal campaigning. The proof that no real divide exists is evidenced by the fact that both former DP/DA and former ID members find themselves on different sides in the current tensions, with some former DA members supporting the Mayor and with some former ID members not in support of her actions.

It is not helpful that this matter is brought up or used to agitate in the caucus and internal elections either by the way of direct reference or to the reference of so-called “tendencies” as it only causes resentment and creates artificial divides. The guidelines for internal campaigning should be amended to specifically incorporate this type of behavior in the category of negative campaigning.

In a similar vein it should also not be deployed by the Mayor, Chief Whip and others as a trump card to try and silence criticism or dissenting views on the basis that this is only being said or done because the person is so-called “former ID”.

7. THE “BLACK CAUCUS”

Several references were made to the existence of a so-called “black caucus” within the caucus. It does appear from several interactions that there have indeed been meetings at various locations of black members of the caucus. Proponents have styled these meetings to the sub-committee as “non-DA ward” meetings ostensibly to discuss strategy of the party in these wards and communities. This however is not borne out by the fact that several white councillors are allocated to “non-DA” wards in the city. However, invitations to attend these meetings have not been extended to these members.

It also appears that the frequency of these meetings increased in the run up to both the Metro regional electoral contest and the Western Cape provincial congress and that on at least two occasions that the sub-committee has been able to determine, provincial figures, including leadership figures, outside the caucus were present at these meetings. Such outside mobilisation by persons who are not members of the caucus should cease as these meetings are sowing resentment and suspicion within the caucus environment and are not helpful for building caucus cohesion.

8. THE KRAAIFONTEIN 5 ISSUE

There is little doubt that this issue was a major cause of tensions with the caucus and the fallout from this still manifests itself within the caucus today. One of the consequences of this was the recent by-election in ward 92 where the incumbent DA Councillor, Carin Brynard, resigned and fought the election under the banner of the CAPE party which saw the DA vote significantly reduced and has caused considerable reputational harm to the party.

It appears that the tensions arose when the sub-council chairs were selected with no input from either the sub-council caucuses or the full DA caucus. The names of a pool of candidates who would be sub-council chairs was simply announced at the caucus meeting. On 11 November 2016 an e-mail was sent by the Chief Whip indicating to caucus members which candidates in the respective sub-councils were expected to be voted in. The sub-council concerned expressed concerns that a candidate, Clive Justus, who had not been part of the pool of candidates originally announced by the Mayor, was to be imposed on them and raised objections. This resulted in an intervention by the Chief Whip whereby he informed members that this had been a decision of

the FEDEX and that there would be consequences for them if they did not vote for Clive Justus.

The FLC has already dealt with this matter in detail and has made findings. The sub-committee, however, was concerned that this incident was yet another example of the high-handed manner in which the caucus is run by the current leadership team, instead of operating on a consensual basis that brings members along with decisions. These are instead imposed upon them with threats of discipline for non-compliance with these instructions. The subcommittee is of the view that this is detrimental to the establishment of harmonious working relationships and appears to typify the command culture that has been established in the management of the caucus by the Mayor and her leadership team.

This is further aggravated by the fact that even after the Federal Council chairperson, Mr. James Selfe, was required to attend the caucus to explain the FLC findings in this matter, the Mayor still refused to accept the findings and informed the caucus at a subsequent caucus meeting that she would be obtaining her own legal opinion on her powers to appoint sub-council chairs. This clearly undermines the authority and role of the federal structure.

9. THE ROLE OF MR. LOYISO NKHOLA

The sub-committee was disturbed to hear of the increasingly central role being played by Mr. Loyiso Nkhola in the DA administration of the COCT. It remains unclear how Mr. Nkhola was employed in the city, but what is beyond dispute is that his entry into the city administration was facilitated by the Mayor. After some initial concerns expressed by the Federal Leader after concerns from the public and from within the party were raised with him, it appears that Mr. Nkhola was moved to Cllr. Xanthea Limberg's offices ostensibly in the position of a "Community Liaison Officer". The Mayor indicates in her submission that this was "approved by Cllr Limberg". This does not however seem likely as Cllr. Limberg has indicated to the subcommittee that she was in fact most uneasy about this arrangement and that in reality, she has very little control over Mr. Nkhola and often does not even know where he is or what activities he is undertaking.

It further appears from various inputs that Mr. Nkhola enjoys a special status within the city. He has repeatedly been heard to have used the phrase "I act with the mandate of the Mayor" on several occasions both in public meetings and in meetings with offi-

cials. This is done particularly when he does not appear to be getting his way with officials in the council. This serves to create resentment and tensions amongst officials and Councillors alike.

Mr Nkhola was also allocated a council vehicle for his use. Despite the city policy that employees may not take these vehicles home, this was ignored by Mr. Nkhola. Furthermore the vehicle was not returned back to the relevant department when it was due to be returned as per council policy, yet it does not appear that any action was taken against Mr. Nkhola.

Furthermore the subcommittee noted with concern the role played by Mr. Nkhola during the Imazamo Yethu (IY) matter where it appears his role was elevated above that of the local DA ward Councillor. Concerns were further raised about his close relationship and potential conflicts of interest with the so-called “landlords” in IY who have vested interests in how the IY situation relating to super-blocking and redevelopment of that community by the city unfolds.

The sub-committee also received evidence in the form of a lease which indicates that Mr. Nkhola resides in a property rented out in the name of a housing developer based in KwaZulu-Natal. It is unclear why this arrangement exists, but given Mr. Nkhola’s proximity to the housing function in the city it may well constitute a potential conflict of interest and warrants further investigation.

Mr. Nkhola’s ever expanding influence within the city is a cause for concern by Councillors. The sub-committee was of the view that his continued role in the city is problematic. It remains unclear why he is allowed to wield so much influence within the city and why he appears to enjoy the ongoing patronage and protection of the Mayor.

10. THE ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION PLAN (ODTP)

The wide-scale restructuring of any organization is a major effort and presents significant advantages but also offers up significant risks. The ambitious scale and reach of the ODTP embarked upon has not been immune to either. Whilst there have been some achievements, not all is well with the ODTP process and some of the implications of the rollout around this are causing unease and unhappiness amongst members of the caucus as well as the staff structure.

It appears that the restructuring was used as an opportunity to retrench or sideline experienced and competent officials who were not seen as completely loyal to the

Mayor. A good example would be Mrs Catherine Stone, who ironically had actually served on the ODTP task team, yet was dismissed at its conclusion. However there are several other cases where it appears that competent and valuable staff members have been lost to the city. A city that wants to remain on the cutting edge and progress, should be doing all it can to retain staff, especially officials with institutional knowledge and experience.

It does not appear that the cost saving realizations of the ODTP, particularly in phase 1 have materialized and in several instances have actually increased the salary bill.

That being said, the sub-committee is of the view that it would be folly to reverse the system as great political capital has been expended on the process to date. Instead, the sub-committee believes that a wholesale review of the ODTP must be undertaken before further rollout of phase 2. The system must be comprehensively re-examined and an honest assessment must be conducted by the DA caucus and the MAYCO, of the areas where problems have been experienced. Where required, these must be redesigned or amended to improve functionality and ensure that they are designed to truly meet the development and service delivery goals of the city.

This process should also include a full review of the size and scale of the Transport and Urban Development Authority. Whilst it may well have been adopted by the caucus as the Mayor indicates in her submission, the sub-committee is of the view that in practice the TDA is far too big for a single MAYCO member to exercise oversight and control over, but also that far too much power and authority appears to be vested in one person in the form of Commissioner Melissa Whitehead.

11. DELEGATIONS

The delegations of the council are another key cause of tension within the council and are the cause of significant unhappiness amongst Councillors. It is most unfortunate that the delegations, a very important matter for any council to engage with, were rushed through the council with undue haste.

Councillors complained of the fact that this important matter was brought as a so-called “late item” to the caucus for discussion in December 2016. In the caucus, when Councillors started to question the changes that had been made to the delegations, they were shut down. Instead they were told to just pass the item and were promised a workshop to follow in January 2017 where the delegations would be able to be further discussed and reviewed. Needless to say that workshop never in fact took place in the

time frame agreed and this has caused significant resentment in the caucus. The subcommittee notes that the Mayor's submission indicates that a workshop has subsequently been held on the 16 November 2017. However, the impression is that this appears to have been a rearguard action after it became apparent that this was significant cause of dissent and concerns were being shared with the subcommittee. The Mayor further omits to mention that this workshop was only held after a motion within the caucus for its convening was passed.

The inordinate delay of almost a full year in the convening of this promised workshop is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs and the subcommittee takes a particularly dim view of this situation. This is especially so when the tensions and unhappiness that have resulted and festered over the course of the year from this blunder by the Mayor and her caucus management team is assessed.

Delegations are an integral and vitally important mechanism in balancing any council's responsibility, accountability and consequent frameworks. The caucus should have, at the very least, been given sufficient time to study the document and then to provide input and comments. This would have ensured a far more consultative process and the DA caucus members could have expressed concerns, offered advice and had a discussion on whether these delegations were in fact in the best interests of the city.

Instead it appears that the matter was simply rushed through as the Mayor wanted it passed by the council in undue haste and with as little discussion or consultation with her caucus as possible. When one examines the delegations, it is easy to understand the reason for the unhappiness by caucus members.

The delegations have essentially concentrated an overwhelmingly large amount of the delegated authority in the directorate of the Mayor. This over centralization of power in the Mayor's office is the exact antithesis of the DA model of decentralization of power. This is an extremely unhealthy situation for any organization, least of all a democratic institution such as a municipal council. This is both from an oversight perspective as well as from an operational perspective. Because so many powers are now vested in the Mayor, the burden of decision making has increased dramatically and could lead to bottlenecks as well as rushed decisions being made.

Of serious concern to the subcommittee is that the probity function of the COCT in the form of the Probity Department has been located in, and delegated to, the Directorate of the Mayor. This is completely inappropriate state of affairs and poses a significant risk to the important oversight work this function should be conducting. It

opens the door for political interference and could undermine the credibility and integrity of this unit which should operate completely independently of the Mayor and her directorate. Recent events within the city have borne this concern out.

Another example of the unhealthy nature of the delegations, and which is flagged as a concern, is that the Mayor is able to exercise the exclusive decision on what legal matters proceed to court, or are to be defended in court. These decisions should, at the very least, serve before the MAYCO for report and input from the other MAYCO members to ensure that decisions of this nature are made in the best interests of the city.

The delegations have created a situation where the Mayor clearly believes that she holds all the power in the city and does not need to take the views and opinions of certain MAYCO members, officials or indeed members of her own caucus seriously as they are merely there to advise her and that she can choose to disregard such advice.

This is not the way a DA administration should be operating. Indeed the Mayor is not the first DA Executive Mayor of the City of Cape Town. Her predecessors included current Premier, Helen Zille and current MEC, Dan Plato. Both these former Mayors, despite enjoying the same Executive Powers as the current Mayor, chose to exercise these in a largely consensual and consultative manner both with their MAYCO and their party caucuses. This does not however appear to be the approach of the current incumbent who operates in a manner that does not bring her caucus along with her. As a result significant resentment and unhappiness exists.

11.1 Sub-councils

The DA was one of the pioneers of the sub-council systems in South Africa. The DA governance principles recognize that devolution of power and localized decision making are key mechanisms to bring government closer to the people. It was for this reason that the sub-council system was developed.

Under the current system of delegations however the sub councils have been significantly stripped of their powers in what is an overweening effort to centralize power in the office of the Mayor. The Mayor in her submission to the sub-committee lists the following items as the responsibility of the subcouncils currently:

- Receiving and responding to residents' complaints and queries.
- Making recommendations to council on matters affecting their area.
- Commenting on liquor license applications.

- Monitoring the city's service delivery effort.
- Supervising the expenditure of ward allocation budgets.
- Ensuring that by-laws and policy matters are referred to the community for comment.
- Maintaining an up-to date database of community organizations.

However when this is compared to the functions that have been removed from sub-councils:

1. Comment on National and Provincial legislation, etc
2. Make recommendations on operational matters
3. Develop a SC business plan
4. Approve, refuse or revoke decisions by officials regarding sale of liquor
5. Liquor licenses
 - a. To lodge complaints
 - b. Report contraventions
 - c. Recommend removal
 - d. Give notice to neighbours of applications
6. Recommend on tariffs levies taxes and duties
7. Name streets
8. Approve leases under R200 000 for under 10 years
9. Recommend on leases over R200 000 or over 10 years
10. Establish and maintain a database of organizations
11. Undertake public participation including IDP
12. Facilitate liaison between civics and SC
13. Facilitate celebrations of important events
14. Undertake SC's on public participation
15. All planning delegations due to change in legislation including

- a. Use rights
 - b. Departures
 - c. Rezoning
 - d. Subdivisions
 - e. Home Owners association
 - f. Consent
16. Decide on environmental applications
 17. Decide on heritage applications
 18. Decide on impact assessments
 19. Removal of restrictions and related delegations
 20. Prepare, name, number and approve subdivisional overlay zones
 21. Recommend on SDF and local SDF in the area of SC
 22. Prepare a contextual framework for development
 23. Identify Heritage places
 24. Make recommendations on outdoor signage and areas of control
 25. Monitor and enforce air pollution by laws and related delegations
 26. Permission to undertake controlled burning.

It becomes clear that the powers and functions of sub-councils have been significantly reduced and that the scope of their work has been considerably narrowed under the new system of delegations.

11.2 Committees of the council

A similar situation exists in terms of the council's section 79 and section 80 committees. The new system of delegations has centralized significant aspects of the work

previously done by these committees. Councillors that appeared before the sub-committee, particularly those that are in their second term or more, noted that committee meeting agendas and content has significantly reduced since the new system of delegations has been put in place.

Of particular concern was the role that was previously played by these committees and the councillors in the development of policy. The sub-committee was informed that this function has now been delegated to a policy unit located in the Directorate of the Mayor which is now primarily responsible for the development of policy.

Council committee meetings are now significantly shorter and a number of the councillors that appeared before the sub-committee expressed frustration that they consisted mainly of presentations. Committees, particularly in an Executive Mayoral system, perform an extremely important function and they should be the “engine-rooms” of a well functioning council. They should be busy and vibrant arenas where ideas, policies and reports are interrogated and debated and officials and members of the MAYCO are held accountable. Instead it appears to the sub-committee that these committees have, through the delegation process, had their teeth considerably pulled and have become victims of a centralization project that have stripped them of their ability to function effectively and fully.

12. THE APPOINTMENT OF MS LIMIA ESSOP TO THE STADIUM MANAGEMENT BOARD

The sub-committee was appraised of the circumstances relating to the shortlisting and subsequent recommendation for appointment to the board of the Stadium Management Board (a municipal entity to manage the Cape Town stadium) of Ms. Limia Essop.

The timeline of this as the subcommittee has been able to determine is this:

- a. The Treasury Department summarized the list of all 155 candidates received and identified candidates for potential shortlisting based on their respective areas of expertise.
- b. A meeting was held with the interview panel whereby the potential candidates for shortlisting was discussed and 12 candidates were shortlisted.
- c. Councillor van der Merwe then presented the 12 shortlisted candidates to the Mayor and a further process of shortlisting between Councillor van der Merwe and the Mayor took place.

- d. The Mayor then identified the final 9 candidates for shortlisting (6 of the 12 candidates originally identified for shortlisting was included in the Mayor's final list).
- e. At this stage Ms. Limia Essop's name appears to have been inserted onto the shortlist by the Mayor through this interaction with Cllr. Van Der Merwe.
- f. An interviews team consisted of Councillors Van Der Merwe, Little, Limberg and officials Valentine, Fortune and Scholtz was formed:
- g. At the end of the interview process the interview panel discussed and agreed on the final 6 candidates to be recommended for appointment.

The Mayor's role in this matter is problematic. This is chiefly because Ms. Limia Essop appears to be the daughter of a close friend of the Mayor of long standing. Ms. Essop is also involved with a company that does/has done work for the city in a contracting or subcontracting role.

Furthermore the motivation for Ms. Essop's inclusion in the shortlisting and proposal for her inclusion in the board was her so-called "legal experience" is farcical as at the time of the interviews Ms. Essop was still completing her legal qualification. She has therefore not been in a position to have experience of offering legal advice. The other reasons advanced for Ms. Essop's inclusion of experience in "finance and property" could well have been filled by other applicants with significantly more experience in all these fields. The sub-committee was further appraised that during the interview, Ms. Essop was not able to answer crucial questions around the corporate governance function. This further demonstrated her unsuitability for a role where this would be a key component.

The appointment of Ms. Essop was halted when the Deputy Mayor, who was the acting Mayor at the time, refused to finalize the appointment, precisely because he was uncomfortable about the concerns listed above. When the Mayor confronted Neilson about this she indicated that she would be expanding the board, this appears to have been done specifically to accommodate Ms. Essop.

The subcommittee is of the view that there is a great deal to be concerned about in relation to this process and it remains inexplicable why there appears to be a concerted drive by the Mayor for Ms. Essop to obtain a position on this board. Married to the fact that Ms. Essop and her family clearly enjoy a close relationship with the Mayor, the sub-committee views this process with grave suspicion and the Mayor's involvement deeply inappropriate. It is our recommendation that a full and proper FLC process is embarked upon in relation to this matter.

13. THE SPECIAL INVESTIGATIVE UNIT

The issue surrounding the SIU and its operations and continued role is complex. It is concerning for the sub-committee that this important unit has been the victim of vicious turf war between the Mayor, Ald. JP Smith and the Speaker.

It appears from the submissions that were received by the committee that the SIU had operated effectively and with great success for a number of years prior to the conflict between the Mayor and Ald. JP Smith. The unit had achieved some notable successes in a number of key callings facing the COCT, including dealing with gang violence, taxi violence, housing fraud, land invasions, corruption, licensing fraud and a 92% success rate of the watching brief cases they monitor.

It is unclear what triggered the initiation of an investigation to what the Mayor describes as “to determine and clarify what exactly the mandate and scope of the SIU was, in terms of the law”. It is also unclear who initiated this investigation and it certainly appears that Neither the MAYCO, nor the MAYCO member responsible for the SIU was consulted on the investigation or the purposes thereof.

What is clear however is that the Speaker appears to have become somewhat agitated about what he felt were investigations being undertaken by the SIU against Councillors. This appears to stem from his reading of the acts relating to local government, more specifically the code of conduct for Municipal Councillors. It is his view that he is the only person who can investigate Councillors. This may well be true for code of conduct violations set out in the legislation, however he surely cannot argue this single jurisdiction for him when it comes to criminal matters or any other investigation that the council may wish to undertake.

In any event, these concerns of the Speaker appear moot as a communication from the Executive Director: Safety and Security, Mr. RG Bosman to the City Manager dated 04 August 2017, and included in the submission by the Mayor, states clearly that:

“I wish to reiterate that the unit has never conducted investigations against any Councillors as I confirmed with the office of the Speaker”

Additionally accusations were made that SIU was used to gather “background information” on council candidates relating to criminal records. This allegation was put to Ald. JP Smith who indicated that although he had indeed sought this information this was done through the SAPS and not in fact the SIU. He furthermore indicated to the

sub-committee that he sought this information based on a PEC resolution that purported to agree to conducting background probity checks on candidates prior to their election. Smith indicated that there had been at least one recent case where a candidate had not indicated a previous criminal conviction and that it resulted in an embarrassing situation for the Party when it was subsequently exposed whilst the individual was sitting DA Councillor.

It seems a shame to the sub-committee that in the current environment of increased gang related violence and a lethargy from the SAPS leadership to properly resource the policing function in the COCT and the province, that a team that appeared to have success in fighting crime and exposing corruption and criminality has been radically curtailed to only now focus on an internal function.

The argument that the SIU was never meant to have an aspect of external investigation is not borne out by the ODTP itself. The sub-committee was informed that not only is the SIU specifically recognized in the ODTP, but it in fact went further to create a specific new head post in order to allow a Mr. Talmakkies, the former head, to focus on the external investigation. In addition to this, the SIU is specifically identified in the IDP and the Annual Policing Plan of the COCT.

To argue the narrow interpretation of the provision of the South African Police Service Act for “the prevention of crime” in order to negate the work of this unit does not make sense. Naturally the prevention of crime would inevitably involve some form of investigation as the prevention aspect would not be possible unless the various forms of crime and *modus operandi* would be able to be determined. In any event if the DA are to deliver “The Safe City” component of our commitment to the voters, surely the COCT should be exploring every possible way to expand its ability to do so?

The SIU and the citizens of Cape Town, have clearly become the victims of a “turf war” between the Mayor, Speaker and Ald. JP Smith. The subcommittee is of the view that the decision to alter the mandate and scope of the SIU needs to be re-considered by the full MAYCO as well as the DA caucus in order to establish whether the decision to curtail their activities and functions has actually been made in the best interest of the COCT and whether such decision is in fact aligned with the IDP and the ODTP and the policing plan for the city.

14. THE V&A PAYMENT MATTER

The issue relating to the payment of R9 million to the V&A Waterfront served as another example of a lack of proper consultation with the caucus. Regrettably the item

served as another “late item”. Appreciation of the Mayor’s submission setting out why this was urgent aside, it still does not negate the unfortunate fallout within the caucus that has ensued over this item.

The sub-committee is also somewhat wary of the motivation provided of urgency set out in the Mayor’s submission, especially as the item was, as the Mayor admits in her submission, referred back. To our knowledge it was not brought back to following council meeting.

It is clear that there were vastly different views and opinions in the caucus about this matter. Concerns around this item were led by the Deputy Mayor, Ald. Ian Neilson. It was Neilson’s view that the approach set out in the recommendation to the council to pay over a large sum of money to the V&A was incorrect. He further maintains that not all the information was provided to the caucus in order for them to apply their minds correctly and that once again the caucus was being rushed to make a decision by the Mayor who wanted the matter disposed of.

Councillors indicated that the Section 78(1) report was not included, so they were not in a position to debate its merits. Furthermore, the key study which would examine whether the V&A’s demand for a R9m payment was justified, had not been carried out. The Mayor seemed determined to make the payment despite lack of such assessment. She relied on another legal opinion, which had an insufficient brief, in that it only examined whether a payment could be made under the historical contract, but did not examine whether a payment was in fact due.

The subcommittee has heard evidence that the Mayor was particularly aggressive and attacking in this debate. The caucus fortunately held its ground and decided to refer the matter of the payment back for further investigation, a matter that the Deputy Mayor pursued with the relevant officials.

Unfortunately this was only after the conclusion of this extremely acrimonious debate which culminated in an extremely fractious calling of a “division” within the caucus, presided over by the caucus chairperson. The subcommittee was informed that caucus members were made to physically divide into groups that were cast by the chairperson as those “for the Mayor” and those “against the Mayor”. This is an extremely disturbing allegation. The sub-committee believes that the caucus chairperson needs to be instructed never to conduct this type of voting in the future as it only escalates tensions

and sows further divisions in an already acrimonious environment. It also serves to intimidate members of the caucus from expressing themselves on matters where the focus should be on the issue at hand rather than the personalities involved.

Subsequent reports have indicated that there may in fact be no justification for any payment, and in any case, if there was, it would only be R3m and not R9m. Given that the claim was for only one financial year, and that there would be ongoing claims annually into the future, it was surely essential that the basis for the claims was properly established and that councillors were fully apprised of the circumstances and information in order for them to make an informed decision.

Whilst it is true, as the Mayor asserts in her submission, that the V&A have rejected the R3m assessment, the sub-committee has been informed that it is in fact the Mayor who has decided to go to court to get a declaratory order, not the V&A. There is a fear amongst caucus members that she will give a limited brief to the City's legal team in this case to not fight the case strongly.

15. THE EMPLOYMENT OF RELATED PARTIES

The employment of family members of Councillors, particularly in the 6th floor executive suite environment, was raised as a concern by several of the persons who made submissions to the subcommittee. It is worth noting, however, that some of the appointments of these employees predate the election of the relevant Councillors, it would be wrong to somehow punish them just because family members have subsequently been elected as Councillors. Nevertheless some appointments made after the election of public office bearers have been a cause for concern. One of the key examples offered was the employment of Mr Benjamin Roussouw in the office of the Chief whip. Mr Roussouw is the son of one of the Councillors.

There appears to be a large amount of related party employment practices undertaken. This is an extremely unhealthy situation as it has the potential to expose the party to charges of nepotism and cadre deployment, something were extremely critical of the ANC for. Additionally it poses risks for conflicts of interest that may arise within the workplace. It is a practice that should be the glaring exception rather than the norm.

The sub-committee notes that Mayor in her submission states that staff members within the city are annually "required to declare whether they have any family members who work within the organization" and that "political appointees are not exempt from this process" The sub-committee believes that this information will be essential

to assess the nature and scale of this practice within the council. To this end we recommend that a full schedule of this information is provided to the FEDEX, indicating these declarations and including what recruitment processes were followed in each instance and whether the employees met the stipulated criteria for such appointments.

The inappropriateness of related party employment practices is recognized in the policy relating to politicians who are family members not being able to serve in the same caucuses. As we move increasingly into the realm of governments the sub-committee recommends that a party policy is developed on this matter that would clearly specify the terms under which such appointments can be made and criteria that should be followed prior to these appointments to specifically to prevent nepotism, favoritism and undue influence.

16. ALDERMAN JP SMITH

It has become clear that the divisions within the caucus are centered around two main personalities, the one being Ald. JP Smith and the other the Mayor. It is abundantly clear to the sub-committee that the relationship between these two individuals within the caucus has broken down irretrievably and it is unlikely that it can be repaired.

Ald. JP Smith is a long standing Councillor having served for around 17 years. Smith was instrumental in the turnaround of the DA fortunes and has become synonymous with crime fighting and has been at the forefront of the reduction of crime, grime and nuisances in the city. Policing and safety and security have clearly been Smith's passion and driving force within the city for his time as a Councillor. His zealotry towards his portfolio is recognized by his detractors and supporters alike. This has led to him becoming virtually indistinguishable from this portfolio.

To cast Smith as an innocent bystander to the conflicts in the city would be a mistake. His direct style and the intensity with which he makes his points and drives issues both internally and externally are a source of frustration for some of his caucus colleagues and it appears particularly the Mayor, Speaker and caucus chairperson. Even ardent supporters of Smith, under examination from the sub-committee, conceded that this is the case and that even though they may agree with a position he has taken that "sometimes JP goes too far" when dealing with matters which exercise him.

The sub-committee is also of the view that while Smith has done excellent work in the safety and security portfolio, he has perhaps occupied this same portfolio for too long and started to become "bigger than the job". The sub-committee believes that for both

Smiths personal growth and that of the portfolio, the time may have come for a new challenge or opportunity.

The existence of the Facebook page “Hands off Alderman JP Smith” is source of much unhappiness within the caucus as it regularly attacks caucus leadership figures including the Mayor. Smith denies any knowledge of who is behind this page and who drives its content, but it is very clear from an examination of the content that this page is curated by persons with intimate and up to date knowledge of various city and caucus issues.

The Mayor indicates that she has on several occasions lodged complaints with both the FLC as well as with the Speaker, The Mayor alleges that these are never dealt with and that Smith feels that he is protected, particularly after the decisions of the Fedex to overturn her attempt to make him an area-based MAYCO member.

The sub-committee recommends that any outstanding complaints lodged with the FLC are processed and finalized expeditiously as it is unfair for both the Mayor as well as for Smith to have these allegations/charges hanging over his head without resolution. If a disciplinary process is required arising from the complaints lodged by the Mayor, then this must follow due process.

The sub-committee further urges the Speaker of the council to conclude any outstanding investigations arising from complaints lodged against Smith.

The sub-committee would also like to recommend that the party consider approaching Smith to consider the option of a strategic swap either to the National Assembly caucus or the provincial legislature caucus. This will then remove him from the antagonism and conflict that has characterized the caucus. If this is not an option then the sub-committee recommends that Fedex further consider moving Smith to a different portfolio within the Mayco to enable him to embark on a new challenge.

17. MAYOR PATRICIA DE LILLE

The Mayor is tasked with the leadership of the caucus of the city of Cape Town. This is an extremely important role and requires a balancing of skills and abilities in order to ensure the success not only of the city, but of the party she leads in the municipality.

It became clear that whilst the Mayor is extremely hard working and dedicated to the city, her leadership style since the last election has become extremely problematic for the successful functioning of both the administration and her caucus.

The Mayor's response to the submissions put to her reflect an irritation and impatience with the concerns that have been expressed therein. Instead of attempting to process these and, through examination thereof, understand why there are such deep divisions among unhappy members in her caucus, she chooses to simply dismiss or deny them.

It would appear that since the electoral success of the last DA campaign, that the Mayor believes that she, rather than the DA is the driving force behind the success. This phenomenon is reflected perfectly in one of her outbursts in the caucus. Obviously unhappy and frustrated that Ald. JP Smith had successfully been elected as the deputy leader of the COCT caucus in a legitimate and fair caucus election. She berated the caucus indicating that she refused to work with Smith in the leadership team, furthermore she went on to indicate that none of the Councillors would have been there if it wasn't for her "brand" and the work of Shaun August and Brett Herron.

This is a remarkably unfair and unacceptable comment to make before a caucus. No matter their frustrations, leaders are expected to rise above petty differences and accept the outcome of legitimate electoral processes within the party. For the Mayor to indicate that she would not work with a person that she does not like sowed even further division in an already fractured caucus. This is a remarkably poor show of leadership.

Furthermore to make a statement like that negates and discredits the incredibly hard work of every DA leader, candidate, volunteer and activist who worked so incredibly hard in the Cape Town campaign. The subcommittee can only imagine how this has made members of the caucus who worked hard feel, it is therefore little wonder that this outburst has had such significant fallout within the caucus and led to further division.

The same approach is evident in her approach to the work of the subcommittee. The subcommittee notes with extreme disappointment the completely adversarial approach adopted by the Mayor to its work. Since the inception of its work the subcommittee has been met with hostility, lack of cooperation and demands for the submissions of other members. The motives of the subcommittee have been called into question and serious aspersions and accusations, including unfounded allegations of leaking to the media have been cast on the subcommittee.

In addition, instead of engaging with the subcommittee (made up of her own Fedex peers) in a collegial and professional manner the Mayor chose instead to lawyer up. The subcommittee has been treated to a barrage of lawyers letters which have been most unpleasant and unhelpful in what was essentially an internal process to establish areas of concern. This is not the behavior of a leader who genuinely wants to get to the heart of the conflicts in the arena where she leads and attempt to establish how to resolve these. Instead the impression is distinctly drawn that the Mayor seeks copies of the submissions in order to effect retribution against those who have chosen to share their concerns with the subcommittee.

The subcommittee is most disappointed that the Mayor chose not to appear before it and that she has adopted such an adversarial approach. It would have been extremely helpful to the work of the subcommittee if the Mayor had participated fully in a collegial manner and interacted with the subcommittee.

It would have been an important engagement as it could have served as an opportunity to fully unpack the Mayors concerns and frustrations as well as engage her, as the leader of the COCT caucus, on her assessment of the problems in her own caucus and her vision to improve the situation. Instead the subcommittee is left with the distinct impression that the Mayor clearly has something to hide.

Unfortunately the submission by the Mayor also demonstrates a remarkable lack of concern for the view and opinions of those who have expressed their feelings and frustrations. Despite the fact that Caucus members have complained about the Mayors adversarial approach in caucus meetings. As well as her routine belittling and humiliation of her council colleagues, she dismisses this by essentially saying that they should toughen up and be more alive to the “rough and tumble of the arena that they perform in”. Whilst it is undoubtably so that politics is a tough arena, the one place where public representatives should feel free to express themselves without fear of retribution or attack, should be their caucus meeting. The one person they should count on to have their backs and protect them should be their caucus leader.

The sidelining by the Mayor of her own caucus member, Cllr. Quintas in the hugely difficult Imizamo Yethu matter is also a cause for concern. The subcommittee has noted the Mayors reasons for requesting Cllr Quintas to recuse himself from a stakeholder meeting. However it should not happen that a member of the Mayors own party caucus should have been treated in this way. Quintas is the democratically elected ward councillor for the ward concerned and the Mayor should not have bowed to the

wishes of the ANC aligned members to exclude him from such an important engagement, that included his own leader, on the council.

This is also not the way in which a leader engenders trust, team building and a cohesive working environment. The reality is that the Mayor appears to take any dissenting view as personal attack on herself and her leadership and she responds accordingly. This adversarial and bullying approach to those in her caucus who do not share her view on matters has stifled and shut down debate in her own caucus. Councillors do not feel that they can speak up on matters or offer a differing opinion for fear of a verbal tirade. Many Councillors just feel it is simply not worth their while to raise their point of view and that it is just safer to keep their heads down. This stifling of debate is not a healthy situation and will have longer term consequences for the city unless it is addressed urgently.

It also became clear that the Mayors confrontational and adversarial style also extends to officials. Councillors and members of staff have described how officials are shouted at in front of other councillors and officials. They are told that they are incompetent, not up to the job and that they are lying to the Mayor. This is not conducive to the creation of a cohesive and professional working environment. The Mayor in her submission attempts to wave this away as a HR function, however the tone really is set from the top and the Mayors behaviour and style can set the tone for the entire organization. The COCT undoubtedly runs the real and genuine risk of losing more experienced and professional staff should this climate of fear and reprisal continue.

It is also clear that the Mayor does not recognize the fact that she is in reality a DA Mayor, heading a DA administration. As a result of such she is accountable to the Democratic Alliance party structures for what happens in the city administration. This accountability is especially important as South Africa does not have directly elected mayors, Mayors are elected on a party ticket, after a party selection process. For the Mayor to somehow divorce her role or administration beyond the reaches of the Federal structures or the responsibility to her party caucus is not acceptable. To cast this type of oversight as “Luthuli House style” management is not only wrong but detrimental to the smooth operation of both the caucus and the party. The COCT represents a large part of the DA brand nationally and any threat to this brand must be dealt with by the party. The brand focus should also be on “Brand DA” and not on “Brand De Lille”. This brand displacement approach is evidenced by recent public utterances by the Mayor that she is being dealt with because of her project of transformation. This cannot be the case because such transformation programmes form part of the DA

manifesto and program of action and are the responsibility of every DA caucus member regardless of who is in the Mayors seat.

The spectacular and very public, falling out with her most senior official in her office, Mr. Craig Kesson and the suspension of the most senior black female employee in the city, Lindiwe Ndaba, is further proof that all is not well in the city administration. This has dominated the media space for the past few weeks and unless urgent intervention is undertaken the unravelling of the COCT administration will continue causing further harm to the City and the reputation of the DA in government.

18. MR JOSH JORDAAN

The Fedex brief required the subcommittee to probe the matter relating to Mr. Josh Jordaan. A submission was made to Mayor and her response is that Mr. Jordaan is not a political employee but was appointed to a position in the Strategic Policy Unit. As he is no longer a member of the Democratic Alliance he is beyond the reach of the party disciplinary process. However Jordaan was heavily implicated in a series of leaks to the media about internal party matters. It is worth noting that the incidence of leaks from within the city on the recent tensions has continued unabated. The subcommittee is unsure about what recommendations can be made in this regard, suffice to say that more carefully oversight should be exercised over how political appointments are made and perhaps Fedex should apply its mind to some form of oversight mechanism, probably through the governance unit reporting, in this regard.

19. ADDITIONAL MATTERS

19.1 Allegations

A number of matters arose in the Course of the subcommittees work of traversing the various tensions and matters within the caucus that were a cause for some alarm. Chief amongst these were the allegations relating to the procurement of MyCiti buses, the advertising contract for the MyCiti bus stations and of course the Foreshore Freeway Precinct allegations. The subcommittee received information and testimony relating to all these matters. It is noted however that the COCT council has made several resolutions on this and an independent investigation is underway into these matters. The subcommittee will therefore withhold opinions and recommendations on these matters at this stage. Suffice to say that the revelations have been extremely damaging to the image of the COCT and appear to have imperiled our reputation as a

clean transparent administration and could also potentially place the COCT audit status at significant risk.

19.2 Signage policy

The subcommittee is extremely concerned about the development and amendment of a new signage policy for the COCT and in particular the outdoor advertising policy. It would appear that experienced and qualified officials who have been part of the development and transformation of the outdoor advertising regulations have been sidelined. The subcommittee is particularly concerned about the unhealthy interference in this process by the CEO of one of the outdoor advertising companies, Mr. Brent Dyssel, who appears to have unfettered access to senior Councillors and officials in the city. Mr. Dyssel regularly send emails to officials and councillors in which he intimates that he has had personal interactions with the Mayor and city leadership relating to his own signage predicament (an illegal sign in Long Street) and he is attempting to have the bylaws tailor-made to ensure his own interest are served. The subcommittee recommends that the new signage and outdoor advertising policy be properly scrutinized by the full MAYCO and caucus, as well as the relevant committee of the council before it is proceeded with.

19.3 Water devices

The subcommittee was appraised of numerous problems being experienced with the provisions of water management devices. Councillors have experienced exceptionally high volumes of complaints arising from them. As a result of these failures the company providing these devices has been precluded from re-tendering for this contract. It has been alleged that significant pressure is being placed on the city to remind this decision. The subcommittee received the allegation that Mrs. Sarah Paulse, the Mayor's sister, was working or acting for the company. This allegation was put to the Mayor but she has denied that this is the case. The subcommittee recommends that further investigation into this matter is conducted by an appropriate body.

19.4 Unwarranted interference in appointment process of City Manager

The Mayor in her response deals with the matter of the allegation raised that she had instructed a member of the interview panel to score her preferred City Manager candidate highest in order to ensure that he was selected. The subcommittee is in possession

of a copy of the electronic message which was sent to one of the interview panel members on the 28 September which reads as follows:

“I want to keep Achmat so score him highest. Thanks”

This message was sent from the Mayors cellular number and is a clear reference to the interview of Mr. Achmat Ebrahim for the position of City Manager of the COCT.

The Mayor indicates in her submission that Ebrahim was “in fact the candidate who achieved the highest scores” it is little wonder that he was able to obtain the highest scores when it was clear that an instruction to score him the highest was being circulated by the Mayor.

This is a most irregular and cynical manipulation of the interview processes and flies in the face of accountable government. If decisions around appointments such as this are open to such blatant instruction by the Mayor the subcommittee can only wonder how many other employment interview processes are similarly manipulated by individuals being instructed on how to score candidates.

Given this manipulation, the Mayors statement that “the fact that the present incumbent achieved the best score of all the candidates is proof that he was the most qualified person to fill the position” rings somewhat hollow. The Mayor had clearly decided before the interview process even began who she was going to employ in this position.

19.5 Improper use of council resources for internal campaigning

The subcommittee was provided with a schedule of SMS messages that were sent out using the councils internal sms notification system. This system is often used to notify consumers about relevant council information. It would appear from this schedule that on the 15 September 2017 Councillor Gregchan Barnardo used this system to send out a bulk SMS for the purposes of his internal DA campaign to be elected as an additional member. The SMS sent out on the council system reads as follows:

“Dear Democrats please VOTE Greg Barnardo for additional member nr.1. Your vote will make history tomorrow #FitForPurpose #BetterTogether #AsijikiTu”

This is clearly a wholly inappropriate use of council resources for party political campaigning. The subcommittee recommends that the matter is referred to the Speaker of

the council for a code of conduct violation and that the cost of sending these SMS messages out is recovered from the Councillor.

20. CONCLUSION

The City of Cape Town is in state of crisis and turmoil, both politically and administratively. Open warfare has broken out amongst councillors in the DA caucus, with some even threatening to move motions of no confidence against the Mayor. There is also division and conflict which now exists between key MAYCO members. Additionally senior staff members within the administration have turned on each other with accusations and counter accusations. This is a completely unsustainable situation and unless actions taken urgently to resolve these the negative fallout and effects will continue to manifest themselves both internally and in the public arena.

The subcommittee was heartened by the fact that the majority of Councillors that appeared before the subcommittee just wanted to do their jobs and serve their residents and communities. They are resentful of the divisions and the constant state of conflict that exists within the caucus as they find this disheartening and discouraging with some indicating that they were seeking alternative work opportunities as the tension had become too stressful.

The instability in the COCT poses a clear and present danger to our electoral prospects in 2019 and unless the party takes decisive action to reverse the current situation we face the very real prospect of losing significant votes in the next election. We have already witnessed this in the ward 102 by-election result but this instability in the political and administrative arenas coupled with the effects of the drought could present a toxic mix that causes a massive electoral blowout at the polls in 2019. We must act and we must act now.
