

13. ADMINISTRATIEWE BURO – DIENSBURO EN FINANSIES
13. ADMINISTRATIVE BUREAU – SERVICE BUREAU AND FINANCES

13.1 RAPPORT 1 – BESTUUR VAN DIE ADMINISTRATIEWE BURO AAN DIE LEDE VAN DIE ADMINISTRATIEWE BURO – BESTUUR EN ADMINISTRASIE

13.1 REPORT 1 – MANAGEMENT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE BUREAU TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE BUREAU – ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT

<p>Oor die uitvoering van deurlopende en spesifieke opdragte wat deur die Ledevergadering/Algemene Sinode (2015) aan die Bestuur van die Administratiewe Buro gegee is, word soos volg gerapporteer:</p> <p>1. Deurlopende Opdragte</p> <p>1.1 Opdrag: <i>Registrasie van huweliksbevestigings deur die Administratiewe Buro Potchefstroom.</i> Uitvoering: Word deurlopend gedoen.</p> <p>1.2 Opdrag: <i>Aanwys van Bestuurslede op die Ouditkomitee (Art 5.3.2) Reglement van die Administratiewe Buro</i> Uitvoering: Die Bestuur wys op 5 Februarie 2015 vir brs AJ Kruger en LJ Kruger aan om as lede van die Ouditkomitee te dien.</p> <p>1.3 Opdrag: <i>Art 12.2.1 (Reglement) Die Bestuur van die Administratiewe Buro wys na elke Sinode 3 (drie) kundiges uit eie geledere aan om saam met 1 (een) afgevaardigde van elke Streeksinode as Deputate van die Sustentasiefonds te dien.</i> Uitvoering: Die Bestuur het di CA Jansen (v), PJ Nel en br LJ Kruger aangewys.</p> <p>1.4 Opdrag: <i>6.1.2 (Reglement) twee personeellede van die Administratiewe Buro, met bestuursopdrag, wat van tyd tot tyd deur die agt dienende bestuurslede aangewys word.</i> Uitvoering: Br Johan Coetzee (Finansiële Bestuurder) en dr Wymie du Plessis (Administratiewe Bestuurder) is aangewys en dien op die Bestuur.</p>	<p>The following is reported on the execution of standing and specific mandates by the Member Assembly/General Synod (2015) to the Management of the Administrative Bureau:</p> <p>1. Standing mandates</p> <p>1.1 Mandate: <i>Registration of marriage officers by the Administrative Bureau Potchefstroom.</i> Execution: Done on a continuous basis.</p> <p>1.2 Mandate: <i>Appointment of Management members to the Audit Committee (Art 5.3.2) Regulations of the Administrative Bureau</i> Execution: Management appointed Bros AJ Kruger and LJ Kruger, on 5 February 2015, to serve as members of the Audit Committee.</p> <p>1.3 Mandate: <i>Art 12.2.1 (Regulations) The Management of the Administrative Bureau is to appoint 3 (three) experts from within the fold, after every Synod, to serve with 1 (one) delegate of every Regional Synod as Deputies Sustentation Fund.</i> Execution: Management appointed Revs CA Jansen (c), PJ Nel and br LJ Kruger.</p> <p>1.4 Mandate: <i>6.1.2 (Regulations) Two staff members of the Administrative Bureau, with management mandates, are to be appointed by the eight serving members of management from time to time.</i> Execution: Br Johan Coetzee (Financial Manager) and dr Wymie du Plessis (Administrative Manager) were appointed to serve on the Management team.</p>
--	---

<p>1.5 Opdrag: “om betyds voor elke Algemene Sinode gemotiveerde voorstelle van moontlike Deputate by die kerke aan te vra” (Handelinge 1991:69, 3.3.12.2d; 1994:727, 1.2.1; 2000:536, 3).</p> <p>Uitvoering: Om hieraan uitvoering te gee, is:</p> <p>1.5.1 ‘n Skrywe op 12 Mei 2017 aan Kerkrade en al die Deputaatgroepe (2015) gerig met die versoek om name van persone aan die Administratiewe Buro deur te gee.</p> <p>1.5.2 Die volgende kriteria wat geld vir benoeming op ‘n Deputategroep, is ook in die skrywe aangehaal:</p> <p>1.5.2.1 <i>Nodige kundigheid, belangstelling, studierigting, beskikbaarheid, gesonde wisseling, kontinuïteit, inbring van jong kragte en afstande</i> (Handelinge 2000:536, 2.4).</p> <p>1.5.2.2 <i>Geen emeriti of emeritus-professore moet in ‘n Deputaat-groep benoem word nie. Diensdoende professore moet sover moontlik ook nie in Deputategroepe benoem word nie</i> (Handelinge 1979:179, 8.4; 1991:69, 3.3.12.2d; 1994:729, 1.2.4). Professore word wel as adviseurs tot Deputategroepe gevoeg.</p> <p>As in aanmerking geneem word dat die belydende lidmatetal met 1500 tot 2000 per jaar daal, is dit nodig om indringend te kyk na die aantal, sowel as grootte van Deputategroepe in lyn met KO, art 49, omdat dit ‘n al swaarder las (ramings) op die krimpemde getal belydende lidmate plaas. Onderstaande tabel som die aantal Deputategroepe (2015), sowel as getal lede per Deputategroep op:</p>	<p>1.5 Mandate: “Motivated suggestions of possible Deputies must be timeously requested from the churches before every General Synod” (Acta 1991:69, 3.3.12.2d; 1994:727, 1.2.1; 2000:536, 3).</p> <p>Execution: This instruction was executed as follows:</p> <p>1.5.1 A letter was sent to Church Councils and the Deputy groups (2015) on 12 May 2017 requesting they forward names to the Administrative Bureau.</p> <p>1.5.2 The following criteria, pertaining to nomination to a Deputy group, were set out in the letter:</p> <p>1.5.2.1 <i>Necessary knowledge, interest, education, availability, healthy alternating, continuity, providing of effort and distance</i> (Acta 2000:536, 2.4).</p> <p>1.5.2.2 <i>No emeriti or emeritus professors are to be nominated for a Deputy group. Serving professors are also, as far as possible, not to be nominated for a Deputy group</i> (Acta 1979:179, 8.4; 1991:69, 3.3.12.2d; 1994:729, 1.2.4). Professors may, however, serve as advisors to deputy groups.</p> <p>The 1500 to 2000 member decline per annum necessitates a review of the number of as well as size of Deputy groups, as per CO, art 49, due to the growing burden (“ramings”) on the shrinking number of confirmed members. The table below provides a summary of the number of Deputy groups (2015) as well as number of members per Deputy group:</p>
---	--

Deputategroep/Deputy Groups	Aantal lede/ No of members	Adviseurs/ Advisors
Ekumenisiteit/Ecumenicity:	18	8
(Binnelands) (National)	7	2
(Buitelands) (International)	11	6
Owerheid/Authorities	8	1
Publikasies/Publications	25	2
Kerklike Tydskrifte/Church Journals	6+4 Redakteurs/Editors	

Almanak/Almanac	6	
Gereformeerde Publikasies/Reformed Publications	9	2
Historiese Sake/Historical Affairs	11	4
Liturgiese Sake/Liturgical Affairs	33	9
Afrikaanse Psalms, Skrifberymings, Liedere Afrikaans Psalms, Hymns, Songs	10	2
Sesotho	4	1
Thsivenda	3	2
Xitsonga	2	2
Setswana	3	1
Sepedi	1	1
Xhosa	2	
isiZulu	2	
Engelse Liedere/English Songs	4	
Christelike Onderwys/Christian Education	10	2
Jeugsorg/Youth Care	11	2
Katkisasie/Catechism	12	2
Regsdeputate/Law	8	
Diakonale Sake/Diaconal Affairs	12	1
Algemene Sinode/General Synod:	25	1
Uitgee Handelinge/Publication of Acta	5	1
Agenda, Korrespondensie, Programmering Agenda, Correspondence, Programming	5+1/Streeksinode/ Regional Synod	
Appéldeputate Alg Sinode/Appeals – General Synod	6	
Beoordeling ontvanklikheid beswaarskrifte Review of admissibility of petitions of protest	2+1/Streeksinode/ Regional Synod	
Pre-advies Finansies/Pre-advice Finances	12	
Bybel/Bible	4	2
Dep evaluering isiZulu Bybelvertaling Dep evaluation of isiZulu Bible translation	4	2
Dep direkte Afrikaanse vertaling Dep direct Afrikaans translation	6	1
Deputate toepassing art 66 KO Application of CO, art 66	Klassis/Classis	Potch
Media, Radio en TV/Media, Radio and TV	7	
Kerkgroeibediening/Church Growth Ministry	10	3
Kerkorde beginsels/Church Order principles	5	1
Ekologie/Ecology	4	1
Saaiers van die Woord/Sowers of the Word	4	
Bevordering van eenheid in meerdere vergaderings Promotion of unity in major assemblies	7	2
Leerstellige Sake/Doctrinal Affairs	7	1
Sendingdeputate/Mission	5	3
Regsaangeleenthede Soutpansberg Legal Affairs Soutpansberg	7	1
Finansiële Hulpbetoning Soutpansberg Financial Aid Soutpansberg	5	
Hervertaling Belydenisskrifte en Formuliere Retranslation Confessions and Formularies	4	2
Kuratorium/Curatorium	22	
Breë Kuratorium/Broad Curatorium	22	

<p>1.5.2.3 Getal lede van die Bestuur van die Administratiewe Buro is geregle- menteer en bestaan uit 8 benoemde lede en 2 personeel- lede.</p> <p>1.5.2.4 Die Trustees van die Emeritaats- versorgingskombinasie wys die Trustees aan en bestaan uit 10 lede en 1 adviseur.</p> <p>Aanbeveling: Dat die Kommissie Benoeming van Deputate, met as riglyn KO, art 49 hierdie aange- leentheid indringend beoordeel, met spesifieke fokus op vermindering/- samevoeging/verkleining van Deputategroepe en die Sinode daaroor adviseer.</p>	<p>1.5.2.3 The number of members of Management for the Administrative Bureau is regulated and comes to 8 nominated members and 2 staff members.</p> <p>1.5.2.4 The Trustees of the “Emeritaatsver- sorgingskombinasie” appoint the Trustees, consisting of 10 members and 1 advisor.</p> <p>Recommendation: The Commission for Nominating Deputies is to urgently review this matter, as per CO, art 49, specifically in relation to the reduction/addition/shrinking of Deputy groups and advise the Synod accordingly.</p>
<p>2. Opdragte rakende SDDS</p> <p>2.1 <i>Inleiding</i></p> <p>2.1.1 Die toenemende werkslading op die finansiële afdeling van die Administratiewe Buro, en spesifiek op die Finansiële Bestuurder, het die Bestuur verplig tot kritiese evaluering en moontlike aanpassings.</p> <p>2.1.2 Die finansiële administrasie van SDDS is geïdentifiseer as een aspek wat heelwat tyd (werksure) in beslag neem.</p> <p>2.1.3 Hierdie opdragte is aan die Administratiewe Buro en die SDDS gesamentlik opgedra.</p> <p>2.1.4 Voorts dateer onderstaande opdrag, wat met opeenvolgende Ledever- gaderings/Algemene Sinodes sonder enige wysigings gekontunier word, al sover terug as 2003: “3. Finansiële State Finansiële State vir die periode Maart 2000 tot Maart 2002 word aan die Sinode voorgehou. Besluit: Die Sinode neem met sorg kennis van die negatiewe finansiële resultate van die afgelope drie jaar. Aanbevelings 3.1 <i>Dat die finansiële beheer van alle skemas onder beheer van die SDDS voortaan sal setel onder die Bestuur van die Administratiewe Buro.</i> 3.2 <i>Dat geouditeerde state jaarliks aan die Bestuur van die</i></p>	<p>2. Mandates regarding the SDDS</p> <p>2.1 <i>Introduction</i></p> <p>2.1.1 The increasing work load of the financial section of the Administrative Bureau and specifically the Financial Manager, forced management to seriously reflect on possible changes.</p> <p>2.1.2 The financial administration of the SDDS was identified as a time- consuming (work hours) aspect.</p> <p>2.1.3 These mandates were given to the Administrative Bureau and SDDS collectively.</p> <p>2.1.4 Furthermore, the following mandates date as far back as 2003 and are simply continued unchanged from one Member Meeting/General Synod to the next: “3. Financial Statements Financial Statements for the period March 2000 to March 2002 are to be tabled to the Synod. Decision: The Synod takes note with concern of the negative financial figures of the past three years. Recommendations 3.1 <i>The financial management of all schemes handled by the SDDS are to reside with the Management of the Administrative Bureau.</i> 3.2 <i>The audited statements are to be tabled to the Management of the</i></p>

<p><i>Administratiewe Buro voorgelê moet word asook aan die Ouditkomitee van die Ledevergadering.</i></p>	<p><i>Administrative Bureau and the Audit Committee of the Members Meeting every year.</i></p>
<p>3.3 Besluit: Goedgekeur (Handelinge 2003:149).</p>	<p>3.3 Decision: Approved (Acta 2003:149).</p>
<p>2.1.5 <u>Interpretering en bespreking van bogenoemde Sinodebesluit</u></p>	<p>2.1.5 <u>Interpretation and discussion of above Synod decision</u></p>
<p>2.1.5.1 Die vraag is nou: Is die situasie en omstandighede steeds soos wat dit in 2003 was, of tot watter mate het dit verander wat wysiging van die opdrag, of selfs herroeping daarvan verg?</p>	<p>2.1.5.1 The question is: Are conditions the same as in 2003 or to what degree have they changed that would require revision of the mandate or even recalling it?</p>
<p>2.1.5.2 Is hierdie opdrag aan twee afsonderlike “Deputate” versoenbaar met die bepalings van KO, art 49?</p>	<p>2.1.5.2 Is this mandate to two separate “Deputies” in accordance with the stipulations of CO, art 49?</p>
<p>2.1.5.3 Ten einde aan hierdie gesamentlike opdragte die nodige oorweging te skenk, is ‘n besprekingsdokument met die Bestuursvergadering van 25 Februarie 2016 ter tafel geneem; met as uitkoms dat dit ook aan die SDDS beskikbaar gestel en met hulle bespreek moet word.</p>	<p>2.1.5.3 A working document was tabled to the Management Meeting of 25 February 2016 to consider this collective mandate, with the aim of forwarding it to and discussing it with the SDDS.</p>
<p>2.1.5.4 Die skribaats van die Bestuur kry opdrag om met SDDS te vergader waartydens al die sake soos in die besprekingsdokument vervat, bespreek kan word en terug te rapporteer. ‘n Telefoniese gesprek met die voorsitter van SDDS word opgevolg met ‘n e-pos waarby die besprekingsdokument ingesluit is vir vooraf verspreiding aan al die lede. Die voorsitter van SDDS meld dat ‘n vergadering vir DV einde Maart 2016 te Kroonstad beplan word en dat die skribaats verder hieroor ingelig sal word – dit het egter nie gebeur nie. Na SDDS se vergadering wat wel plaasgevind het, deel br HSJ Vorster (Skakeldeputaat SDDS) br MC Erasmus (lid van die Skribaats) mondelings mee dat SDDS dit nie nodig geag het om die skribaats te woord te staan nie, en dat hy dit met ‘n e-pos sou bevestig – wat ook nie ontvang is nie. Die skribaats volg dit met ‘n e-pos aan die voorsitter van SDDS op waarin versoek word om ‘n uittreksel uit</p>	<p>2.1.5.4 The secretariat of Management was mandated to meet with the SDDS to discuss all the items contained in the working document and report back. A telephonic call with the chairman of the SDDS was followed up by an e-mail, annexing the working document for distribution to all the members in advance. The chairman of the SDDS mentioned a meeting planned for DV end of March 2016 in Kroonstad and the secretariat would receive further information, but this did not occur. Subsequent to the SDDS’ meeting Br HSJ Vorster (contact deputy for the SDDS) verbally informed br MC Erasmus (member of the secretariat) that the SDDS did not deem it necessary to communicate with the secretariat, which he would confirm via e-mail – which also did not occur. The secretariat followed it up with an e-mail to the chairman of the SDDS requesting an excerpt of the relevant minutes and no response was received to this either.</p>

<p>die betrokke notule aan hulle beskikbaar te stel – ook hierop is nie reaksie ontvang nie.</p> <p>2.1.5.5 Die Bestuur vind hierdie verloop van sake baie jammerenswaardig omdat, anders as wat die bedoeling was, hierdie nou 'n eensydige Rapport is wat, indien daar gesprek gevoer is, dalk heel anders sou wees.</p> <p>2.2 <i>Historiese verloop</i> Sedert voornoemde besluit in 2003 en latere besluite wat in 2009 geneem is, het sake soos volg verloop:</p> <p>2.2.1 Ten einde hierdie bykomende opdrag aan die Bestuur van die Admin Buro na wense uit te voer, word ds P Fanoy as SDDS verteenwoordiger vir 'n volle termyn op die Bestuur gekoöpteer.</p> <p>2.2.2 Aansluitend by voornoemde, het die voormalige Direkteur van die Admin Buro, br HSJ Vorster, tot en met sy uitdienstrede (31 Maart 2013), in sy hoedanigheid as Skakeldeputaat vir SDDS, meegehelp in die bestuur se poging om sy opdrag uit te voer.</p> <p>2.2.3 Ter uitvoering van die Sinodale opdrag rakende Glenzicht, raak die Admin Buro direk by die ontwikkeling betrokke deur 'n lid van die Bestuur, br MC Erasmus, te taak om een dag per week op die terrein te wees en deurlopende terugvoering aan die Bestuur te gee.</p> <p>2.2.4 Die Admin Buro en die SDDS besluit gesamentlik om SDDS se kantoor te Linmeyer te sluit Drie van die vier personeellede het vrywillige uitdienstredingspakkette aanvaar terwyl die vierde deur die bestuurskomitee van Glenzicht Aftree-oord in diens geneem is.</p> <p>2.2.5 Die totale inhoud van die kantoor is dan ook na die Admin Buro oorgeplaas. Die <i>domicilium citandi et executandi</i> van die SDDS het gevolglik ook dieselfde as dié van die Admin Buro geword.</p> <p>2.2.6 Die Admin Buro se direkte betrokkenheid by Glenzicht het met die voltooiing van die projek tot 'n einde gekom.</p> <p>2.3 <i>Finansiële Administrasie</i></p>	<p>2.1.5.5 Management finds this a regrettable course of events, since this has now become a one-sided Report that could have been decidedly different if discussion had taken place.</p> <p>2.2 <i>Historical background</i> Since mentioned decision of 2003 and further decisions of 2009 were made, the following occurred:</p> <p>2.2.1 Rev P Fanoy was co-opted to serve a full term on the Management of the Administrative Bureau, as the SDDS representative, in order to execute the additional mandate of the Management of the Administrative Bureau effectively.</p> <p>2.2.2 The former Director of the Administrative Bureau, br HSJ Vorster, also aided management in executing its mandate in his capacity as contact deputy of the SDDS, until he stepped down (31 March 2013).</p> <p>2.2.3 Regarding the execution of the Synod mandate related to Glenzicht, the Administrative Bureau became directly involved by tasking a member of management, br MC Erasmus, to be on site one day a week and provide continuous feedback to Management.</p> <p>2.2.4 The Administrative Bureau and the SDDS decided collectively to close the SDDS office in Linmeyer. Three of the four staff members voluntarily accepted financial packages, while the fourth was employed by the management committee of Glenzicht Retirement Village.</p> <p>2.2.5 The entire content of the office was transferred to the Administrative Bureau and thus the <i>domicilium citandi et executandi</i> of the SDDS became that of the Administrative Bureau.</p> <p>2.2.6 The Administrative Bureau's direct involvement with Glenzicht came to an end upon completion of the project.</p> <p>2.3 <i>Financial administration</i></p>
--	--

<p>Hoewel die opdrag van die Sinode (2003) lui: “<i>Dat die finansiële beheer van alle skemas onder beheer van die SDDS voortaan sal setel onder die Bestuur van die Admin Buro</i>”, doen die Admin Buro tans slegs die finansiële administrasie vir SDDS volgens ‘n vergoedingsooreenkoms en is daar, soos hiernaas uiteengesit, nie sprake van finansiële beheer oor enige finansies of skemas van die SDDS nie.</p>	<p>Although the mandate of the Synod (2003) stated: “<i>The financial management of all schemes of the SDDS would forthwith reside with the Management of the Administrative Bureau</i>”, the Administrative Bureau only conducts the financial administration of the SDDS at present according to a remuneration agreement and, as set out below, there is no financial management over any of the SDDS’ finances or schemes.</p>
<p>2.3.1 Die SDDS en 2 kinderhuise stel hul eie begrotings op, keur dit goed en voorsien dit dan aan die Admin Buro as bestuurshulpmiddel in die finansiële administrasie vir bv die maandelikse opstel van bestuurstate.</p>	<p>2.3.1 The SDDS and 2 orphanages draft and approve their own budgets for tabling to the Administration Bureau, as management aid in the financial administration of e.g. the monthly drafting of management statements.</p>
<p>2.3.2 Die 2 kinderhuise skryf self hulle eie kasboek op, met die uitsondering van hul salarisse, en prosessee hul eie bankbetalings.</p>	<p>2.3.2 The 2 orphanages compile their cashbook, excluding salaries, and process their own bank deposits.</p>
<p>2.3.3 SDDS (2 kinderhuise ingesluit), stuur maandeliks salarisinligting deur wat dan deur die Admin Buro op VIP Payroll geprosessee word vir betalings via ABSA Business Integrator.</p>	<p>2.3.3 SDDS (2 orphanages included) forward their monthly salary data, which the Administrative Bureau then processes on VIP Payroll for payment via ABSA Business Integrator.</p>
<p>2.3.4 Die SDDS het nie toegang tot die GKSA Business Integrator se groep rekeninge nie, maar die 2 kinderhuise wel.</p>	<p>2.3.4 The SDDS does not have access to the group accounts of the GKSA Business Integrator, but the 2 orphanages do.</p>
<p>2.3.5 Die Admin Buro stuur deurlopend regstellende joernale aan die 2 kinderhuise deur.</p>	<p>2.3.5 The Administrative Bureau continuously forwards revised journals to the 2 orphanages.</p>
<p>2.3.6 Die opgawe vir die Vergoedings-kommissaris van SDDS en die 2 kinderhuise word jaarliks deur die Admin Buro opgestel vir deursending aan die kommissaris.</p>	<p>2.3.6 The Administrative Bureau drafts the return for the Commissioner of Remuneration of the SDDS and the 2 orphanages every year for submission to the commissioner.</p>
<p>2.3.7 LBS rekonsiliasiestaats en uitreiking van IRP 5-sertifikate word 2X per jaar vir SDDS gedoen.</p>	<p>2.3.7 The Administrative Bureau drafts the SDDS’s LBS reconciliation statement and issues its IRP 5 certificates twice a year.</p>
<p>2.3.8 Die Admin Buro verleen tweemaandeliks hulp aan Pretoria kinderhuis met die indiening van hul BTW opgawes.</p>	<p>2.3.8 The Administrative Bureau assists Pretoria Children’s Home every two months with the submission of their VAT returns.</p>
<p>2.3.9 Voer beleggingsinstruksies in samewerking met SDDS uit.</p>	<p>2.3.9 Investment instructions are executed in cooperation with the SDDS.</p>
<p>2.3.10 Prosessee maandelikse kollekte en donasies vir SDDS en kinderhuise.</p>	<p>2.3.10 Monthly collections and donations to the SDDS and children’s homes are processed.</p>
<p>2.3.11 Jaarliks voorbereiding van</p>	<p>2.3.11 Financial statements are prepared to</p>

<p>finansiële state tot op proef-balansvlak vir ouditering.</p> <p>2.3.12 Voorbereiding van ouditbewyse en bystand aan ouditeur tydens die ouditproses.</p> <p>2.3.13 Die rekords van Glenzicht Aftree-Oord is op versoek van SDDS, na br HSJ Vorster se uitdienstrede, aan hom oorhandig en is daar dus by die Admin Buro nie meer rekord hiervan nie.</p> <p>2.3.14 Wat Glenzicht betref, word slegs betalingsinstruksies ten opsigte van herverkope uitgevoer.</p> <p>2.3.15 Soos by alle ander Deputate, word SDDS se reiskoste vir hulle sinodale opdrag ook uit die Sinodale Kas vergoed. Twee van SDDS se Deputate word egter vir ander reiskoste teen 'n heelwat hoër tarief vergoed, met as motivering dat hulle ook as amptenare van SDDS optree.</p> <p>2.4 Die wisselwerking tussen die Admin Buro en SDDS het, veral na br Vorster se uitdienstrede, merkbaar afgeneem.</p> <p>2.5 <i>Herbesinning oor Sinode 2003 se opdragte</i></p> <p>Opdragte:</p> <p>2.5.1 <u>“3.1 Dat die finansiële beheer van alle skemas onder beheer van die SDDS voortaan sal setel onder die Bestuur van die Administratiewe Buro” (Handelinge 2003:149, 3.1)</u></p> <p>Uitvoering</p> <p>Tydens die navorsing en opstel hiervan, is die eerste belangrike vraag: Wat word bedoel met “alle skemas”; tweedens, wat was die Sinode se bedoeling met die opdrag dat alle skemas van SDDS voortaan sal setel onder die Bestuur van die Admin Buro; en derdens, wat word verstaan onder “finansiële beheer”? Vervolgens die vraag of vernoemde opdrag versoenbaar is met die gees en bedoeling van KO, art 49?</p> <p>Die Administratiewe Buro beheer tans nie enige skemas wat onder SDDS val nie, en ook nie die finansies van die SDDS nie, maar behartig bloot die administrasie daarvan.</p>	<p>trial balance level for auditing on an annual basis.</p> <p>2.3.12 Supporting information for auditing is prepared and assistance offered to the auditor during the auditing process.</p> <p>2.3.13 The records of Glenzicht Retirement Village were handed to br HSJ Vorster subsequent to him stepping down, upon request of the SDDS, and the Administrative Bureau thus have no records in this regard.</p> <p>2.3.14 Only payment instructions on resales are executed in terms of Glenzicht.</p> <p>2.3.15 As with all the Deputy groups, the SDDS’ travelling expenses related to Synod mandates come from the Synod cashbook. Two SDDS Deputies are, however, compensated for their travelling expenses at a much higher rate, stating that they also act as SDDS officials.</p> <p>2.4 The interaction between the Administrative Bureau and SDDS has markedly declined, especially after br Vorster stepped down.</p> <p>2.5 <i>Review of the Synod 2003 mandates</i></p> <p>Mandates:</p> <p>2.5.1 <u>“3.1 The financial management of all SDDS schemes will forthwith reside with the Management of the Administrative Bureau” (Acta 2003:149, 3.1)</u></p> <p>Execution:</p> <p>The first important question, at the time of writing this report, is: What does “all schemes” mean? The second question is: Why did the Synod instruct that all SDDS schemes would forthwith reside with the Management of the Administrative Bureau? Thirdly, how is “financial management” defined? Then the question arises whether the mentioned mandate can be reconciled with the spirit and intention of CO, 49?</p> <p>The Administrative Bureau does not at present manage any SDDS schemes or the finances of the SDDS, but merely conduct the administrative work.</p>
--	---

<p>2.5.2 <u>“3.2 Dat geouditeerde state jaarliks aan die Bestuur van die Administratiewe Buro voorgelê moet word asook aan die Ouditkomitee van die Ledevergadering” (Handelinge 2003:149, 3.2)</u></p> <p>Uitvoering Die geouditeerde state (verwys na Sinodale opdrag 3.2 hierbo) word nie jaarliks aan die Bestuur van die Admin Buro voorgelê nie, maar wel aan die Ouditkomitee waarvan twee lede van die Bestuur van die Administratiewe Buro deur die Bestuur daarop benoem is.</p> <p>2.5.3 <u>“2. Glenzicht</u> <u>Aanbevelings</u></p> <p>2.1 <i>Dat Glenzicht as ‘n Art. 21 Maatskappy geregistreer word.</i> <i>Motivering: Dit is die verantwoordelike weg om die maksimum sekuriteit vir alle fasette van SDDS te verseker.</i></p> <p>2.2 <i>Die te benoemde Deputate kry opdrag om die administratiewe beheer en toesig van Glenzicht in die nouste samewerking met die Administratiewe Buro, wat die finansiële sake hanteer, uit te oefen.</i></p> <p>2.3 <i>Dat die ontwikkeling onder streng finansiële beheer en toesig voortgesit word.</i> Besluit: Goedgekeur” (Handelinge 2003:149).</p> <p>Uitvoering Dit blyk dat die Sinodale opdrag nl “Dat Glenzicht as ‘n Art 21 Maatskappy geregistreer word” nie tot uitvoer gebring is nie, en dat Glenzicht se finansies ‘n integrale deel vorm van SDDS s’n. In die finansiële state word SDDS se geregistreerde kantoor- sowel as besigheidsadres aangetoon as sou dit by die Admin Buro gesetel wees. Die <i>domicilium citandi et executandi</i> verskyn egter nie in die gewysigde oprigtingsakte van die SDDS as ‘n Nie-winsgewende Maatskappy nie (Handelinge 2015:124–131). Is dit ‘n oorsig of nie ‘n vereiste nie? Geen posstukke van SDDS word sedert die uitrede van br HSJ Vorster by die Admin Buro ontvang</p>	<p>2.5.2 <u>“3.2 Audited statements are to be tabled to the Management of the Administrative Bureau and the Audit Committee of the Member Meeting every year” (Acta 2003:149, 3.2, 149)</u></p> <p>Execution: The audited statements (see Synod mandate 3.2 above) are not tabled to the Management of the Administrative Bureau every year, but to the Audit Committee that includes two members of the management of the Administrative Bureau.</p> <p><u>“2. Glenzicht</u> <u>Recommendations</u></p> <p>2.1 <i>Glenzicht should be registered as an Art. 21 Company</i> <i>Motivation: It is the responsible way of ensuring maximum security for all facets of the SDDS.</i></p> <p>2.2 <i>The next deputies should receive the mandate to exercise the administrative management and supervision of Glenzicht, in close cooperation with the Administrative Bureau that attends to its financial affairs.</i></p> <p>2.3 <i>The development should proceed under strict financial management and supervision.</i> Decision: Approved” (Acta 2003:149).</p> <p>Execution: It seems that the Synod mandate, i.e. “Glenzicht is to be registered as an Art 21 Company” was not executed and that Glenzicht’s finances form an integral part of that of the SDDS.</p> <p>The financial statements indicate the SDDS’ registered office, as well as business address, as that of the Administrative Bureau. The <i>domicilium citandi et executandi</i> is, however, not indicated on the SDDS’ revised deed as a non-profit organisation (Acta 2015:124-131). Is this an oversight or not required?</p> <p>No SDDS post is delivered to the Administrative Bureau, since br HSJ Vorster stepping down, even though it</p>
---	--

<p>nie, wat oorspronklik as die amptelike posadres van SDDS aangedui was.</p> <p>2.5.4 <u>“2.4 Kollektes in die kerkverband vir SDDS</u> <u>Aanbeveling</u> <i>Kommissie behoort aangewys te word om alle kollektes wat in die kerkverband vir die SDDS ingesamel word, op ‘n billike grondslag oorhoofs te verdeel, soortgelyk aan die metode wat by die Sustentatiefonds gevolg word.</i> <i>Besluit: Goedgekeur soos gewysig. Die SDDS en die Administratiewe Buro moet self die taak uitvoer.”</i> Uitvoering: Met betrekking tot die aanwending/verdeling van kollektes wat in die kerkverband vir SDDS ingesamel word, besluit SDDS, waarskynlik alleen daarvoor.</p> <p>2.5.5 <u>“SDDS se finansiële administrasie</u> <i>Die finansiële state van SDDS se inrigtings dui aan dat sommige tehuise surplusfondse op hande het terwyl ander tehuise tekorte het. Dit word toegeskryf aan kollektes wat in kerkverband vir spesifieke tehuise gevorder en oorbetaal word.</i> <i>Besluit: Kennis geneem.</i> <u>Aanbeveling</u> <i>Dat goedkeuring verleen word aan die SDDS en Administratiewe Buro vir die aanwending van surplusfondse wat spruit uit kollektes van kerke by sommige tehuise ten opsigte van tekorte by ander tehuise.</i> Besluit: Goedgekeur – wysiging is reeds aangebring – Deputate Handeling” Handeling 2009:289, 2.3 en 2.4). Uitvoering: Die Administratiewe Buro word nie hierby betrek nie.</p> <p>3. Sake vir die Ledevergadering/Algemene Sinode se kennisname en/of besluit</p> <p>3.1 <i>Benoeming as Trustee op die Pro Reformando Trust (PRT)</i> Volgens die Reglement van die PRT (4.1.2) moet die Administratiewe Buro verteenwoordigers op die PRT benoem. Ds EJ Tiemensma het voorheen as Kurator van die TSP en</p>	<p>was originally given as the official postal address of the SDDS.</p> <p>2.5.4 <u>“2.4 Collections in the denomination for SDDS</u> <u>Recommendation</u> <i>A Commission should be appointed to generally distribute the collections taken up for the SDDS, in a reasonable manner, similar to the method followed with the Sustentation Fund.</i></p> <p><i>Decision: Approved, as amended. The SDDS and Administrative Bureau are to handle the process themselves.”</i> Execution: The SDDS is probably making all the decisions regarding the application/distribution of collections taken up for the SDDS in the denomination.</p> <p>2.5.5 <u>“SDDS” financial administration</u> <i>The financial statements of SDDS institutions indicate that some have surplus funds, while others show deficits. This is ascribed to the collections taken up in the GKSA for certain institutions.</i> <i>Decision: Note is taken.</i> <u>Recommendation</u> <i>Approval should be given for the SDDS and Administrative Bureau to apply the surplus funds of some institutions, obtained through collections in the GKSA, to those showing a shortfall.</i></p> <p>Decision: Approved – revision already made – Deputies Acta” (Acta 2009:289, 2.3 and 2.4). Execution: The Administrative Bureau is not involved in this.</p> <p>3. Matters for the Members’ Meeting/ General Synod’s information and/or decision</p> <p>3.1 <i>Nomination as Trustee on the Pro Reformando Trust (PRT)</i> According to PRT regulations (4.1.2), the Administrative Bureau is to nominate representatives to the PRT. Rev EJ Tiemensma previously served, as Curator of the TSP and member of the</p>
--	--

<p>lid van die Administratiewe Buro, op die PRT as Trustee gedien. Weens sy ervaring as Trustee van die fonds, het die Trustees versoek dat hy steeds op die PRT dien, as die Bestuur van die Administratiewe Buro dit goedkeur. Op grond van voornoemde, word toestemming verleen vir die voortsetting van ds Tiemensma se betrokkenheid as Trustee op die PRT.</p>	<p>Administrative Bureau, on the PRT as Trustee. Given his experience as Trustee of the fund, the Trustees requested he continue to serve on the PRT provided the Management of the Administrative Bureau agrees. Due to the above, it was agreed that Rev Tiemensma continue to serve as trustee on the PRT.</p>
<p>3.2 <i>Aanwys van Bestuurslid om op die Kommissie Finansiële Ondersteuning (KFO) van die TSP te dien</i> Ds CA Jansen word aangewys om die Bestuur op die KFO te verteenwoordig.</p>	<p>3.2 <i>Appointment of Management member to the Commission Financial Support (CFS) of the TSP</i> Rev CA Jansen was appointed to represent Management on the CFS.</p>
<p>3.3 <i>Bedanking van ds W Vogel en oproep van sekundus</i> Met die Bestuursvergadering van 25 Februarie 2016 bedank ds W Vogel skriftelik as lid van die Bestuur van die Administratiewe Buro.</p>	<p>3.3 <i>Resignation of Rev W Vogel and call up of secundus</i> Rev W Vogel resigned in writing as member of the Management of the Administrative Bureau at the Management meeting of 25 February 2016.</p>
<p>Die bedanking word aanvaar en sy sekundus, ds PJ Nel, word opgeroep.</p> <p>3.4 <i>Benoeming van verteenwoordiger van die Administratiewe Buro: Personeel Pensioenfonds</i> Met die bedanking van ds W Vogel, word dr JA Kruger in sy plek as werkgewervertteenwoordiger aangewys.</p>	<p>The resignation is accepted and his second, Rev PJ Nel, was called up.</p> <p>3.4 <i>Nomination of representative of the Administrative Bureau: Personnel Pension Fund</i> Upon the resignation of Rev W Vogel, dr JA Kruger was appointed as employer representative.</p>
<p>3.5 <i>Benoeming van NWU-Raadslede</i> Ingevolge huidige wetgewing en kragtens die Statuut, is dit nie meer moontlik dat die Universiteit 'n instansie of liggaam (soos die GKSA of Kuratore) kan vra om iemand aan te wys om op die Raad te dien nie. Raadslede word deur 'n oop nominasieproses en met beoordeling van die Uitgebreide Bestuurskomitee, genomineer om as NWU-Raadslid aangewys te word.</p> <p>Ooreenkomstig die Reëls, is dit wel moontlik om by twee van die kategorieë waaruit die Raad saamgestel word, inspraak te lewer met die oog op moontlike benoeming op die Raad. Eerstens word vier persone uit die geledere van die Universiteit se gemeenskapsleiers aangewys; en tweedens vier persone uit die Raad van Donateurs van die NWU aangewys.</p>	<p>3.5 <i>Nomination of NWU Council Members</i> According to current legislation and the statute, it is no longer possible for the NWU to request an institution or body (like the GKSA or Curators) to appoint a representative to serve on the Council. Council members are nominated for appointment by means of an open nomination process and upon review of the Extended Management Committee.</p> <p>Regulations do, however, allow offering input on two categories from which the Council is constituted, for possible nomination to the Council. Firstly, four members are appointed from the NWU's community leaders and secondly, four from the NWU's Council of Donors.</p>

<p>Op grond van voornoemde, en met inspraak deur die Kuratore, is dr SJ van der Walt in die kategorie “Gemeenskapsleiers” op die NWU-Raad benoem. Insgelyks is ds W Vogel deur bemiddeling van die Bestuur van die Administratiewe Buro in die kategorie “Donateurs” deur die Raad van Donateurs ook op die Raad benoem. Met die afsterwe van ds W Vogel, is dr D Lartz in sy plek deur die Bestuur in sy plek op die Raad van Donateurs benoem.</p> <p>Besluit:</p> <p>3.5.1 Dat die Kuratore voortgaan om op gepaste wyse en tyd inspraak te lewer met betrekking tot die nominasie van ‘n persoon in die kategorie “Gemeenskapsleiers” om op die NWU-Raad te dien.</p> <p>3.5.2 Opdrag aan die Bestuur van die Administratiewe Buro om op gepaste wyse en tyd inspraak te lewer met die aanwys van ‘n persoon op die Raad van Donateurs wat dan moontlik deur die genoemde Raad in die kategorie “Donateurs” genomineer kan word om op die NWU-Raad te dien.</p>	<p>Based on the above and with input from the Curators, dr SJ van der Walt was nominated in the category of “community leaders” to the NWU Council. Similarly Rev W Vogel was nominated in the category “Donors” to the Council by the Board of Donors, upon intercession by the Management of the Administrative Bureau. Dr D Lartz was nominated by Management to replace Rev W Vogel, with his passing, on the Board of Donors.</p> <p>Decision:</p> <p>3.5.1 The Curators are to continue offering input on nominations in the category “community leader” for serving on the NWU Council, at the suitable time and in the suitable manner.</p> <p>3.5.2 The Management of the Administrators are mandated to offer input on appointments to the Board of Donors for possible nomination in the category “Donors” for serving on the NWU Council, at the suitable time and in the suitable manner.</p>
--	---

Rapporteur:

Reporter: