

Dear colleagues

I support the draft response, including [REDACTED] additions, however I do feel that we are at risk on this issue.

Semantics and interpretation of the specific clause aside, the spirit in which we concluded the agreement with the EU was that they would not be compromised (being the first union to sign an agreement) if other unions were granted an outcome more favourable than theirs.

*I personally did not interpret this to only apply to a recurrent percentage increase, but rather the overall deal. Given the vagaries and varied interpretations, would a CCMA Commissioner not want to understand the so-called "spirit" of the agreement, and can we defend our stance as articulated in the revised draft in that regard?
Whatever actions we take from here, UCTs integrity in this process needs to be upheld and protected.*

Just some food for thought, and if I'm the only one concerned about this, I'm happy to go with the proverbial flow.

Regards

██████

The second email reads....

Dear colleagues

I have suggested and added a further sentence upfront confirming the 5.2% salary increase. I agree with ██████ concerns on how the EU have viewed the intention of the EU clause, but I am hoping we can persuade the EU (and CCMA if need be) that the EU clause applied to the salary increases component which we upheld when the AU adjustment was made and that this clause was a separate agreement/arrangement.

I am also hoping that once the home setup allowance is approved by the exec it will help diffuse the situation a little as some EU members will qualify for both allowances as they form part of the Coalition and the EU.

Kind regards

████████████████████