

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
1.	COLA (Cost of Living Adjustment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12% Across the Board (ATB) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Demand for a 12% salary increases across the board is not affordable, and therefore not supported. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labour rejects the 3% offer from employer as it is way below the CPI/Inflation. • The scope of PSCBC is from salary 1-12 • Salary level 13-16 should not form part of employer's response to our demands. • Employer's revised offer should be reflective of purchasing power and contribute towards pensionable earning • Household spending is still highly under immense pressure, due to tight monetary policies, low consumer confidence, continuous high living costs. • Household spending has grown by a staggering 13% since the year 2015, and yet public sector wage

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR’S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour’s Position
				<p>increase have not come anywhere close to that percentage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The employer cannot continue to complain about the high cost of servicing debt, whilst continuing to bail out SoEs at a cost of R283 billion. • Wage increases were negative from 2020. This indicates that real wages have been declining over time and is worsening. • State Owned Entities (SOEs) that get funding from the national fiscus are proving to be better employers, with the Eskom wage negotiations having yielded an above inflation rate of a 7% salary increase on average for its employees.

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst the public service continues to be the worst employer with an average increase of 4.27% and a zero (0) percent increment in 2020 meaning, while inflation was sitting at 3.3%, essential services and other frontline workers in healthcare, social development, police etc., did not get properly compensated during the COVID-19 pandemic, whilst employees in SoEs were given an above inflation salary increase. • The same argument translates for local government employees who are guaranteed to receive a 6% salary increase across the board, for the next 5 years, and yet municipalities are performing

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
				<p>dismally, as indicated by the recent Auditor-Generals report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SOEs and Local Government Departments have received inflation linked (and above) increases over the past four years and do not face the historical losses that public servants have experienced. In contrast, public service wage increases have been declining since 2020. • The demand for a 12% wage increase remains for further negotiations
2.	Term	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single term agreement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government budgets on a three-year cycle, therefore concluding a multi-term wage agreement provides stability and certainty, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labour rejects multi-term and maintains its position on concluding a single term agreement.

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
			<p>thus contributing to the credibility of the budget process. Single term impacts the planning process of government.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The three-year agreement also affords the government space to work on other deliverables related to service delivery mandate. • The multi-term agreement inspires investor confidence, thus creating a conducive environment for economic growth. Economic growth in return will lead to creation of sustainable jobs and poverty alleviation. • The employer would like to conclude a three-year agreement for the financial 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The employer still maintains the implementation of austerity measures and we therefore cannot consider a multi-term agreement.

PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR’S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour’s Position
			<p>years 2025/26, 2026/27 and 2027/28.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The demand is not supported. 	
3.	Housing/GEHS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R2500 housing allowance increment ATB Review of the PSCBC Resolution 7 of 2015. Clause 4.5.6.5.3. The Employer must standardise a guarantee letter across the public sector. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resolution 7 of 2015 provides for an annual increase of the housing allowance by the value of the CPI, thereby decreasing the adverse financial impact on employees over a period. To that effect, increasing the current subsidy to R2500.00 would disrupt the fiscal framework. Clause 4.5.6.5.3 of Resolution 7 of 2015 does not provide for the withdrawal from the Individual Savings Facility (ILSF), due to death or retirement while the employee is not enrolled with the GEHS. To mitigate the anomaly related to employees who pass on or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labour maintains the demand of R2500 on housing across board. (The effect of Repo Rate to our members over time has impacted on the cost of living). To mitigate the anomaly related to employees who pass on or retire prior to enrolling with the GEHS, the PSCBC Resolution 7 of 2015 should be amended to make provision for such. The amendment should extend the benefit to employees who resign or get dismissed. The demand for the housing allowance by employees to be

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR’S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour’s Position
			<p>retire prior to enrolling with the GEHS, the employer is currently reviewing the current directive on GEHS to make provision for such withdrawals because of death or retirement, irrespective of whether the employee was enrolled or not with the GEHS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2018 the Department of Public Service and Administration issued a Directive “Determination and Directive on the Housing Allowance for Employees in the Public Service” The Directive sought to standardize the application of the State Guarantee Scheme for the Public Service. • In respect of other GEHS related matters, the employer is 	<p>increased was tabled in the previous wage negotiations and taken to secondary processes, and those secondary processes did not address the demand, inclusive of demand of reviewing clause 4.5.6.5.3 of the PSCBC Resolution 7 of 2015.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labour, therefore, maintains the demand of R2500 on housing across the board, and the amendment of the PSCBC Resolution 7 of 2015. • The employer should speed the process of registering employees onto the GEHS, in order to further amplify our demand for employees who have been dismissed or have resigned to be allowed to access their savings.

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
			<p>currently participating in the GEHS committee of the PSCBC where progress report is tabled for engagement with Labour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The latest progress report on the collaborative work between DPSA, DHS, GEPF and PIC was tabled in the committee meeting of the 26 August 2024, where it resolved that the employer would table quarterly progress report to the committee. • The Demand is supported in respect of: The withdrawal from the ILSF for those employees who pass on or retire prior to enrolling with the GEHS is supported. • The Demand is not supported in respect of: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We acknowledge the fact that a directive was issued, but we propose matter be taken to GEHS committee with defined timelines.

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
			<p>the increase of the housing allowance to R2500.00, as it is not affordable. The withdrawal from the ILSF by the dismissed employees and those that had resigned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	
4.	Medical Aid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12% plus MPI across all medical aid schemes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medical subsidies have already increased generously at MPI over the past financial years. However, such subsidies are negated by the tariff hikes that are primarily driven by the rising costs of medical goods, supplies, and services, which are influenced by inflation. • The introduction of the National Health Insurance (NHI) is expected to mitigate these 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labour rejects the futuristic arguments by the employer, about the NHI which has not been implemented yet. • Universal health coverage i.e., National Health Insurance (NHI) is not going to be implemented with immediate effect, therefore the employer's response, is not addressing labour demand. • The NHI will be implemented in two phases:

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
			<p>effects by streamlining healthcare delivery and financing. The NHI aims to create a more equitable healthcare system by pooling funds to provide comprehensive health services for all citizens. This could lead to more stable or reduced tariffs over time as the system becomes more efficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Therefore, the demand as it stands does not support the government's objectives of introducing universal health coverage that seeks to abolish the current two-tiered system that divides people along the socio-economic lines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase 1 commenced in 2023 and will continue for a period of three years until 2026. Phase 2 will commence in 2026 and will run for a period of another three years until 2028. Organised labour has never rejected the notion of a universal health coverage. Labour continued to form part of discussions in different forums. The demand, as tabled, is intended to address the medical aid challenges that employees in the public service are experiencing now, whilst waiting for the implementation of NHI. The employer has further failed to respond to the part of the demand regarding the subsidy to be paid for members who may wish to belong

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR’S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour’s Position
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lastly, government cannot support a proposal that seems to continue promoting inequalities in access to health services in the country. • The Demand is unaffordable, and therefore not supported. 	<p>to any other medical aid scheme besides GEMS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The continued medical aid scheme tariff increases harm public servants and make it increasingly difficult for them to afford medical aid. • GEMS effected a member contribution increase of 9.5% in 2023 while workers received 4.7% below the 5.3% inflation rate of March 2024. • Members are faced with post-retirement impacts, for those who earn around R27 324.00 per annum for them to afford post -retirement medical abilities they need to be saving R4 889.00 monthly for future capabilities and it is unattainable., and the employer has not even

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
				<p>responded to such challenges affecting employees in the public sector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medical schemes are pronouncing double digit increases • We still maintain a 12% plus MPI increase across all medical aid schemes.
5.	Danger Allowance and Special Danger Allowance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Danger allowance to be increased from R597 to R1000. • Special danger allowance to be increased from R894 to R1400 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In respect of this demand, the following is proposed: • That the Council should resuscitate negotiations on Danger Insurance as it would provide a better dispensation for the employees. • Sector Councils should continue to make assessment of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labour rejects the employer's response in this regard. • The demand is based on the danger allowance and special danger allowance, expanding the scope of categories and not on danger insurance as per employer's response. • The matter was referred to sector councils and it was referred to

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
			<p>categories of employees who could be included in the dispensation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Demand for an increase on both the Standard and Special Danger Allowance is unaffordable, and therefore not supported. 	<p>PSCBC for intervention it cannot now be referred to sector councils as per employer's response.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional categories were also submitted on the matter. • Danger allowance has always been a transversal matter, hence the conclusion of various collective agreements at the level of the PSCBC. • During the 2018 wage negotiations, organised labour tabled a draft collective agreement with all the additional categories. • PSCBC Resolution 4 of 2015 – (Annexure A) is transversal, however the SAPS was initially not part of the framework (see the PSCBC Resolution 3 of 1999).

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therefore, sectors had to identify new categories to be added to Annexure A of Resolution 4 of 2015, and that is where there were deadlocks, and to date that process has not been finalised. • The employer should not avoid taking responsibility based on implementation of Resolution 4 of 2015. • The demand remains, for the employer to provide a comprehensive response considering the added categories, that are yet to be finalised, as well as allow for the increase of the danger allowance from R597 to R1000 and special danger allowance to be increased from R894 to R1400.

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
6.	Death Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standardise the death grant to R350 000 for all applicable categories. 	<p>SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE SERVICE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The circumstances under which the payment of a death grant to a dependent is governed by Policy No. 5 of 2016: Policy on Death Grant for employees of the South African Police Service. <p>The circumstances in which a death grant will be paid, may from time to time be reviewed by the National Commissioner.</p> <p>The following provisions regarding the payment of the death grant needs to be noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the payment of a death grant is not a benefit but a discretionary payment which is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Death grant must be standardised across provincial traffic inspectors as per Western Cape and Gauteng (Consistency) • The payment of the death grant is not an act of grace, and the employer takes up the tax liability regarding the death grant. • The payment of death grant is not de facto discretionary. It has always been paid in every eventuality. • The demand therefore remains, for the employer to standardise the implementation of the death grant across all provinces.

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
			<p style="text-align: center;">within the exclusive prerogative of the National Commissioner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the payment of a death grant is made as an act of grace and is taxable. • That the payment of the death grant is subject to the availability of funds and may, at the sole discretion of the National Commissioner, be increased or decreased after consultation with the Chief Financial Officer. <p style="text-align: center;">CORRECTIONAL SERVICES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Correctional Services Death Grant policy was adopted in 2008 as gesture of good will to the bereaved families. 	

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is therefore not a benefit but a discretionary payment which is within the exclusive prerogative of the National Commissioner. • Therefore, the amount payable is it at the discretion of the Executive Authority and the Accounting Officer subject to the provisions as laid down in the Death Grant policy. • The demand is therefore not supported for the following reasons: It is a department specific matter and not a transverse matter. 	

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is catered for in the departmental budget. • It infringes the powers of the Executive Authorities and or Accounting Officers of respective departments. 	
7.	Childcare and Breastfeeding Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of childcare and breastfeeding institutional facilities to all public sectors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Employee Health and Wellness Strategic Framework for the Public Service (2008), acknowledges the importance of creating a conducive work environment. • Providing childcare facilities can significantly improve employee well-being, productivity, and retention, especially for parents who face unique challenges in balancing professional and family responsibilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The employer's response to the demand is very lack lustre and does not provide any workable solution to addressing the concerns raised by employees as part of our demands. • Globally, women workers shoulder more childcare responsibilities than men due to persistent gender norms across all countries (ILO, 2018a). • There is growing awareness that investing in childcare services,

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR’S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour’s Position
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The employer supports the rights of breastfeeding employees and encourages departments to provide breastfeeding facilities (subject to the availability of financial and infrastructure resources) and breastfeeding breaks. • Government, through the National Treasury and Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities is currently engaged in a programme called “Gender Responsive Budgeting” (GRB) which amongst others, needs to respond to the reproductive health-related needs of women in their role in bearing children. • Given the complex nature and the intricacies associated with 	<p>including breastfeeding facilities for employees has more positives than, resulting in reduced absenteeism, lower turnover, and higher productivity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governments globally are adapting and expanding different forms of public childcare provision. • Quality childcare services should be available to all of those who need this service in the public service, while recognizing that some women and men will choose alternative childcare arrangements, however, key to the demand is for the employer to provide possible models of how this can be done.

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR’S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour’s Position
			<p>the breastfeeding facilities and related needs, it proposed that the PSCBC establishes a Task Team that will study the current programme that is being explored by the National Treasury and the Department of Women, Youth and Persons with Disabilities. This will enable the PSCBC to make a joint submission that will explore the provision of breastfeeding facilities and related matters to the programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The demand is supported as outlined above, with the establishment of the PSCBC Task Team to explore the possibility of making inputs to the Gender Responsive Budgeting (GRB) process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A response by the employer that says departments are encouraged to, where financial and spatial infrastructure permit to consider establishing on-site childcare facilities, does not provide a coordinated and planned out approach in addressing the challenge. • We therefore demand the employer to do the necessary work and provide a properly outlined response on how all departments should be providing childcare and breastfeeding facilities to employees in all provinces. • Labour therefore agrees with the employer’s proposal of establishing a task team to do the

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR’S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour’s Position
				<p>required work on the demand and provide the necessary recommendations, inclusive of tabling a draft framework agreement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further to that, the draft framework agreement should be concluded with a firm commitment by the employer to establish the required facilities within 5 years (by 2029).
8.	Pay progression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of Pay progression beyond last notch. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introduction of pay progression beyond the maximum notch of a salary range would require a new remuneration model, which will increase the number of salary notches in the scales. • The demand will further influence the principle of equal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The employer in its own response indicated that “The introduction of pay progression beyond the maximum notch of a salary range would require a new remuneration model, which will increase the number of salary notches in the scales.”

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR’S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour’s Position
			<p>work for equal pay, in that it will result in several encroachments on other pay grades resulting in possible unfair labour practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The demand undermines the Remuneration Framework and will impact the balance of fair compensation with long-term fiscal sustainability. • The demand should be juxtaposed with PSCBC Resolution 3 of 2009 in respect of the grade progression and Job Evaluation exercise. • The Demand undermines the Remuneration Framework, is unaffordable, and therefore, not supported. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However, the employer did not indicate that development of a new remuneration model to increase the number of salary notches was totally impossible. • Pay progression according to our understanding was concluded via a collective agreement in the PSCBC, and therefore nothing precludes parties to the PSCBC to embark on negotiations to address the demand in ensuring that issues of unfair labour practice do not ensue. • The incentive policy framework for salaries level 1 to 12 by the DPSA is a guiding document that is also subject to review as an when issues of mutual interest inform parties to undergo a negotiations process at the PSCBC.

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labour further disputes the amount costed as per the employer's response. We should be provided with a breakdown for those employees who are affected on salary levels 1 to 12. • The employer previously increased the notches, in 2023, and therefore, the employer has shown that it has the competency to do it again for the cohort of employees as indicated in the response that was provided. • The Department of Correctional Services also increased the notches, and that is a further example of the employer's ability to accommodate the affected cohort of employees as per our demand.

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR’S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour’s Position
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The demand by labour demands for the introduction of Pay progression beyond last notch.
9.	Recruitment policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusion of a resolution to standardise and harmonise the application on recruitment and selection processes across all sectors and departments in the public service. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The processes of recruitment and selection are decentralised, and such powers are as per section 3(7) of the Public Service Act, 1994 under the relevant provisions related to the powers of the Executive Authorities. • The processes of recruitment and selection are also legislated under the Public Service Act and Public Service Regulations. • The Demand is not supported as it infringes the powers of the Executive Authorities as per the Public Service Act, 1994 and its Regulations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We demand that labour must have observer status in shortlisting and interview processes for salary levels 1 to 12. • Notwithstanding that a benchmarking process should be undertaken by provinces in ensuring that minimum standards are agreed upon regarding recruitment and selection processes. • Where discrepancies are identified policy review processes to be embarked on to make the necessary policy amendments with minimum standards that are inclusive of labour having observer status.

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR’S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour’s Position
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sector councils should enforce the demand by ensuring that recruitment and selection policies align with the minimum standards agreed upon. • Labour further demands the conclusion of a collective agreement at the level of the PSCBC, in ensuring standardisation of recruitment and selection across provinces.
10.	Bursary Scheme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bursary schemes for dependants of government employees. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following the Cabinet’s Directive that the Department of Higher Education and Training should develop a Comprehensive Funding Model, the department has been engaged in a series of consultations with various stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It must be clear that Labour’s demand is not about bursary loans where employees of the state are expected to pay back the loans. • Labour is demanding free bursaries for the dependents of employees in the public service who are considered the “missing middle”

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR’S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour’s Position
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department has so far consulted the following stakeholders, Universities South Africa (USAF), Banking Association of South Africa (BASA), BBBEE Commission, Public Investment Corporation (PIC) and National Treasury (NT). • Consultations also took place with the Department of Trade, Industry and Competition (DTIC), Business Unity South Africa (BUSA), NEDLAC, Ikusasa Student Financial Aid Programme (ISFAP), Public Protector, Trade Unions, South African, Union of Students (SAUS), COGTA, Chancellors Forum and South African 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parties must include a clause in the final 2025/26 PSCBC wage agreement to address the demand, given the fact that it’s a long-standing matter.

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
			<p>Human Rights Commission (SAHRC).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Employer supports the principle of a Comprehensive Funding Model that is currently receiving attention. Therefore, the PSCBC needs to track and receive progress reports from time to time from the Department of Higher Education and Training. 	
11.	Decent Work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permanent employment of all contract employees, e.g. Education Assistants, Community Health Workers, and Reservists. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the government is committed to programmes that seeks to promote permanent employment and poverty alleviation, the provision of temporary employment and other forms of employment should be seen within the concept of progressive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Posts like those of education assistants, community health workers, EPWPs and reservists etc., which are a dire need that are up for annual renewal are an indication that the posts exist and should therefore be considered for permanency.

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR’S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour’s Position
			<p>realization of socio-economic rights, taking into consideration availability of resources and financial constraints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It also needs to be noted that not all posts are intended to be full time beyond a particular point in time. Such posts are usually designed to address a particular project or a need at that time. • It is therefore important that we draw a clear distinction and need for temporary, contract, permanent and any other form of employment or poverty alleviation programmes. • It is therefore important to revisit the intent, the need and the objectives of developing certain programmes, such as Community Health Workers, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is through stability in employment that employees can enjoy job security. Job security is a sense of knowing that your job is safe from being cut. It’s an assurance that you will be able to work in your current employment for the foreseeable future. This cannot be attained in casualisation. • The employer asserts that there are collective agreements that have been concluded for Community Health Workers: Regulated in terms of Policy Framework and Strategy for Ward Based Primary Healthcare Outreach Teams, read together with PHSDSBC Resolution 1 of 2018 and 3 of 2022. • What the employer fails to provide contextually, in terms of the

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR’S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour’s Position
			<p>Teacher Assistants and Reserve Police Service, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Health Workers: Regulated in terms of Policy Framework and Strategy for Ward Based Primary Healthcare Outreach Teams, read together with PHSDSBC Resolution 1 of 2018 and 3 of 2022. • Teacher Assistants: Regulated in terms of Presidential Youth Employment Initiative. • Reserve Police Service: Regulated in terms of National Instruction 3 of 2014. • The Demand is not supported in so far as converting Community Health Workers, Teacher Assistants and Reservists into permanent posts. 	<p>Community Health Workers (CHWs), is the fact the organised labour has been consistently negotiating for the permanent employment of the CHWs, including the review process of the WBCHOT policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further, a comprehensive review for the WHO and Global Health Workforce Alliance identified a wide range of services offered by community-based health workers, from counselling on birth preparedness, breastfeeding and postnatal care, management of uncomplicated childhood illnesses, preventive health education and in some settings, treatment for infectious diseases and chronic illness, as well as

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However, nothing precludes incumbents of such programmes from applying for permanent posts if available, subject to the requirements of such posts. 	<p>support for addressing common mental health problems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CHWs have a long history of existence in this country and have been an integral part of the South African Healthcare system and to simply say they are a temporary function is not true. • Various legislative frameworks and policies, currently guide the work done by CHWs. • The draft NHI white paper that was released for public comment in December 2015 after the NHI green paper was published in August 2011, in terms of Section 3 of the National Health Act and Section 85 of the Constitution provides for a comprehensive package of care underpinned by a re-engineered PHC system with a focus mainly on

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR’S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour’s Position
				<p>community outreach services, and those services are carried out largely by CHWs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The demand by labour has therefore been to ensure that CHWs are permanently employed and are correctly integrated into the Department of Health, across the different provinces. • The employer has not provided a standardised approach in ensuring that CHWs are skill developed, that they are provided the correct benefits, uniform and tools of trade. • CHWs continue to be exploited in the rationale by the employer of “noting that not all posts are intended to be full time beyond a particular point in time. Such posts are usually designed to address a

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR’S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour’s Position
				<p>particular project or a need at that time”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The services as provided by CHWs is not to address a particular project or need at that time, CHWs are a very important and required function for the provincial departments of health, and with the NHI still to be implemented, the need for them in various communities will be ever so imperative in achieving the scope of universal health coverage. • The PSCBC wage negotiations is the correct forum to address the challenges and permanent appointment of CHWs in ensuring that CHWs are not exploited further. • In June of 2020, 8,500 Community Healthcare Workers (CHW) in the

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
				<p>Gauteng Department of Health (GDoH) were converted into level two permanent employees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was indicative that the work done by CHWs is not a temporary function, and if the employer in the GDoH was able to permanently appoint CHWs, that should be happening in all the other provinces. • Employer must align contract employee under the professionalization framework on recruitment. (as an induction program into the public service align training according to departmental needs). E.g. The program of reservists who were employed permanently and

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
				<p>underwent a short training of 3 month).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noting the shortage of skills in some of the critical areas, such as health, police, education, formalising the employment of CHWs, Reservists, EPWPs, and Education Assistants will address the capacity challenges, and ensure continuity. • The public service should lead by example in creating decent jobs and minimising casualisation of work. • Therefore, the demand should remain for further engagement.

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR’S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour’s Position
12.	Abolishment of levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abolish levels 1, 2, 3 in the public service. • Introduction of salary level 4 as entry level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain salary levels 1 –3 in the grading system of the Public Service to cater for the elementary occupations in line with the Occupation Classification System (OCS) custom developed for the Public Service as the National system used by the Department of Employment and Labour (DoEL) and the Codes of Remuneration (CORE’s). • Foundation of Workforce: The principles underpinning the grading system consists of six occupational competency levels. Salary levels 1 - 3 forms part of the Elementary positions within the occupational competency level. Removing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Occupational Classification System (OCS) simply classifies occupations, it’s a system issue, that from time to time gets revised. • What the employer should be providing data on, is how many of those employees on salary levels 1 to 3 have been career pathed upwards, in terms of monitoring skills development and skills demand, and prioritising the upskilling of employees on salary levels 1 to 3.

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
			<p>the Elementary level will skew the grading system utilized in the Public Service. Furthermore, these salary levels form the backbone of a department, handling essential tasks that support higher-level functions. These roles ensure that day-to-day operations run smoothly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills Development: These positions are typically entry-level and provide employees with the opportunity to develop basic skills and gain experience. This can be a stepping stone to more advanced roles within the department. • Grading Criteria: In terms of grading principles, elementary 	

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
			<p>positions are usually graded based on the complexity of tasks, required skills, and level of responsibility. The grading system ensures that these roles are appropriately classified and compensated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency and Fairness: Grading principles ensure that elementary positions are evaluated consistently and fairly across the departments. This helps in maintaining equity in compensation and career progression opportunities. • Domino effect: The unintended consequence of abolishing salary levels 1 – 3 and introducing salary level 4 as the entry level in the Public Service 	

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
			<p>will result in a domino effect where for example, employee who are currently occupying posts graded on salary level 4 will demand to be bumped-up to salary level 5 and those occupying posts graded on salary level 5 will demand to be bumped-up to salary level 6 etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Demand is not supported. 	
13.	Uniform policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standardisation of Uniform Policy across the public sector. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of Uniform policy is provided for in PSCBC Resolution 3 of 1999. Heads of Departments are required to approve or reimburse for uniform or clothing. It should be noted that some sectors such as Police and Health have a dispensation that 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Labour demands that a clear framework be developed (Public service framework on uniform), in alignment with the BCEA, s33 A. Currently sectors are applying their own uniform policies emanating from the PSCBC Resolution 3 of 1999. The demand by labour is to address proper standardisation

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR’S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour’s Position
			<p>provides for clothing policy and or clothing allowance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This element of work was left to the Accounting Officers to determine the need to have a uniform policy depending on the type of work each department provides. Therefore, it is linked to the departmental budget. • To this effect, • PHSDSBC Resolution 1 of 2023: Scrapped the uniform allowance in favour of the provision of uniform for nurses in the Public Health and Social Development. 	<p>approaches in providing employees with uniform, where there is an occupational requirement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The employer is not correct in saying that the PHSDSBC Resolution 1 of 2023: Scrapped the uniform allowance in favour of the provision of uniform for nurses in the Public Health and Social Development, currently employees in the health and social development sector have not been provided with uniform by the employer, as was envisaged by concluding the agreement. • Various challenges have been picked up in implementation of the PHSDSBC Resolution 1 of 2023, the decentralised approach by different provinces has led to non-alignment in terms of the uniform to

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSSBC Agreement 1/2017: Uniform is supplied in full at commencement of employment in SAPS. Thereafter, clothing credit becomes applicable. • Correctional Services: Full uniform supplied at commencement of employment. Thereafter, requisition can be placed on annual basis before the end of the financial year. No provision is made for uniform allowance. • The Demand is not supported, as it is regulated by collective agreements/resolutions or policies of various departments. 	<p>be provided, there are issues of substandard quality, non-standardised designs and incorrect specifications for the uniforms to be provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process has also opened leeway for corruption as different service providers are being appointed in provinces to provide the uniform. Project deadlines are not the same across provinces, which hampers on proper uniform provision for employees. • The employer by its own admission in the sector bargaining council negotiations on the issue, has indicated that there is no money to provide uniform, therefore it is incorrect for us to be told that uniform allowance was scrapped in

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
				<p>the health and social development sector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The employer 's response in terms of the SSSBC Resolution 1 of 2017 – uniform provision for the Police is misguided. The clothing credit application is not in line with the BCEA. • Where the employer requires employees to wear uniform, the employer must provide it without applying clothing credit.
14.	Long service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employees who have concluded 10 years in the public service should be awarded R6500. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to PSCBC Resolution 1 of 2012, employees with 10 years of service receive 8 days annual leave i.e. from 22 days to 30 days and a certificate. • It needs to be appreciated that the provision of these additional 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The employer included the costing of the increased value of the extra eight days into its overall bottom line as to how much our demands would cost. • This is not a new cost. With or without our demands, this is an existing benefit that has already been budgeted for.

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
			<p>leave days is a cost to the employer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of awarding the long service is embedded in PSCBC Resolution 1 of 2012 and would therefore require an amendment to such a Resolution. • The Demand is unaffordable and requires an amendment to an existing Resolution. It is therefore not supported. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labour demands that employees who have served 10 years must be awarded a monetary amount of R6500.
15.	Performance Bonus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The employer to reinstate the performance bonus across the public sector. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of performance bonuses is not a matter of mutual interest for purposes of collective bargaining. • However, the government is currently in the process to review the provision to reward 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labour welcomes the opening response of the employer that states, 'the government is currently in the process to review the provision to reward good performers.

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
			<p>good performers. It needs to be noted that such provision must not have a significant burden on the national fiscus.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This work is in line with the Personnel Expenditure Review report conducted by the DPSA, including the Remuneration Policy for the Public Service that will be consulted with Organised Labour. • Proper costs will be conducted upon the finalization of the provisions to be included in the Incentive Policy Framework, as reinstating bonuses without thorough financial justification would be financially imprudent and a violation of this constitutional principle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The demand is a matter of mutual interest, contrary to the employer's response. • Labours demand is therefore very clear, for the employer to reinstate cash bonuses for well performing employees.

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will further ensure that public funds are used effectively, and rewards are provided on merit, thereby reinforcing public trust in the entire value system. • The Demand is not supported. 	
16.	GEPF Annual Pension Increase for Public Servants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendment of Rule 23.2.1 of the GEPF Rules and Laws to allow the increase from the current 75% of the CPI to 100%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over the past 11 years, the GEPF has consistently granted pension increases that match or exceed 100% of inflation in 10 of those years. • This reflects the Fund's commitment to protecting the purchasing power of pensioners whenever investment returns have allowed. • While the performance of the PIC has been commendable over the years, pension 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labour's demand remains with the understanding that the employer retains the norm of keeping the pension increase at a 100%, CPI increase to be a standard provision. • For the above to be a consistent application, therefore requires an amendment of Rule 23.2.1 of the GEPF Rules and Laws.

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR’S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour’s Position
			<p>increases must remain aligned with affordability and supported by the GEPF’s investment returns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any permanent adjustment to the pension increases formula must consider the long-term sustainability of the GEPF and the potential impact on contributions that both the Employer and the Employee would need to fund. • It is therefore prudent that Labour indicates its willingness to jointly fund the possible increase should it be agreed upon. This will be subject to the mandate that will be sought once Labour has given their willingness or no willingness to jointly fund. 	

**PSCBC 2025/26 WAGE NEGOTIATIONS
ORGANISED LABOUR'S RESPONSES TO EMPLOYERS REJECTED DEMANDS – 01 OCTOBER 2024**

	ITEM	CONSOLIDATED DEMAND(S)	Employers Position	Labour's Position
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to Labour response, Employer will subject the matter for mandating. 	