TRACC

TSHWANE RESIDENTS' ALLIANCE FOR CIVIC COORDINATION

RECORD OF THE DISCUSSION WITH ACTIONSA: THE 2026 MANIFESTO AND TSHWANE

Thursday 15 October 2026 • Moot Region, Tshwane

1. Nature of the meeting

TRACC met ActionSA to discuss the party's municipal election manifesto and the questions that arise from it for Tshwane and the Moot. Each theme below begins with a quotation from the party's own manifesto, sets it against the position in Tshwane as TRACC understands it, puts the questions sent to the party in advance, and records the party's response.

This was a discussion, not a debate. TRACC is a non-political civic body and does not argue for or against any policy. It asks, records the answers, and publishes them. Every party contesting the Moot's wards is invited on the same terms and questioned on the same ten themes, each on the basis of its own manifesto, so that residents can compare the answers. The records of the sessions with the Freedom Front Plus (30 September 2026) and the Democratic Alliance (7 October 2026) are published alongside this one.

How to read this record

Several of the questions put to the party contained more than one part. Each part is set out separately below and marked *Answered*, *Answered in part* or *Not explicitly answered*, according to what was said on the night. The marking is a record of coverage, not an assessment of the merits of any answer, and the same method is applied to every party. The party's response to the theme as a whole follows the questions.

The ten themes and the questions under them are identical for every party. Only the manifesto quotation changes. Question references such as **(A-Q1.)** are TRACC's and are used so that a reader can line this record up against the records of the other parties.

No read-back was taken at the close of this session. With five minutes remaining, the moderator proposed that instead of reading his notes back, TRACC would send the party what it intended to publish, for the party's approval before publication. The party agreed. The commitments recorded under each theme are therefore TRACC's record of what the party undertook, drawn from the recording and from the moderator's answer sheets, and are subject to the party's correction.

This record was compiled from the recording and transcript of the session and from the moderator's answer sheets. It is a summary and not a verbatim transcript. Themes C and D were taken out of order on the night, at the party's request, and theme C was returned to at the end; they are set out here in the standard order. Figures and factual statements put forward by the party, which TRACC has not independently verified, are listed separately in section 6.

Manifesto quotations are from the ActionSA Local Government Election Manifesto 2026. The Tshwane figures are drawn from published sources: the City of Tshwane 2024/25 Annual Report, including the report of the Auditor-General contained in it, and the City's 2026/27 budget and tariff schedule, all published by the City at www.tshwane.gov.za. The non-revenue water figure is reflected in the City's Water Balance Scorecard and relates to the period of the Annual Report; TRACC will gladly share the underlying analysis and welcomes correction of any figure. The party disputed the currency of those figures, and that objection is recorded in full at section 3.

Corrections of fact submitted by ActionSA in writing on 26 October 2026, after the session and before publication, appear in square brackets and are marked as party corrections. The words spoken on the night are left in place and can be heard on the recording.

2. The session

Date and venue	Thursday 15 October 2026. Van den Berg Hall, Herfsblaar Retirement Village, 1244 Webb Road, Queenswood.
Party representative	Councillor Henriette Fröhlich, proportional representation councillor for ActionSA in the City of Tshwane, accompanied by Petronella Rieger. The Executive Mayor Nasiphi Moya was invited but she did not attend.
Moderator	Adrianus Coertze, Chairperson of TRACC, who put the questions and kept time.
Ground rules	The session was held under TRACC format: TRACC set the questions and ran the clock. It was not a debate. The party was given ten minutes to speak without interruption, after which the ten themes were put, with follow-up questions from TRACC members.
Audience	Delegates of TRACC's affiliated resident associations and sectoral bodies. Eleven people signed the attendance register, which is held by the secretariat and is not reproduced here.
Record and publication	The session was recorded and transcribed. This record is sent to the party for approval before publication and is then published on www.tracc.org.za with the recording and alongside the records of sessions with other parties.

3. Opening statement by ActionSA

Delivered by Councillor Henriette Fröhlich. Summarised; the full statement can be heard on the recording.

ActionSA is a new party, formed six years ago during the COVID period, which is why much of its early presence was built on social media and why it still has grassroots organisation to build. It contested local government elections for the first time in 2021, in six municipalities, and emerged as the sixth largest party nationally on that basis. In 2024 it contested every municipality in the country and, on the party's own assessment, overstretched itself. This year it is contesting only where it believes it can win seats it can govern with.

In Tshwane the party holds 19 of the 214 seats. Those seats are proportional representation seats, so its councillors work across the whole city rather than in particular wards. After the 2021 election the party entered a coalition led by the Democratic Alliance, under a written and published coalition agreement. Over the following years it concluded that it was not obtaining the leverage its voters had given it, and in October 2024 that arrangement ended and Dr Nasiphi Moya became Executive Mayor in the current coalition with the ANC and EFF.

On the state of the City's finances in October 2024, as the party described it: four successive unfunded budgets, meaning the City had planned to spend more than it would receive; accumulated debt of more than R13 billion, of which R6.6 billion was owed to Eskom, having grown from R1.1 billion in eighteen months; limited cash reserves; almost no capital investment; a moratorium on filling critical vacancies, with the resulting loss of skills as staff retired; outdated administrative systems; economic growth in Tshwane down from 6% in 2011 to 0.3% by 2023; and unemployment at roughly one in three working-age adults.

The party emphasised the timing of the municipal financial year, which runs from 1 July to 30 June. A mayor taking office in October inherits a budget approved the previous June and can first change it at the adjustment budget in March. On the party's account, the March 2025 adjustment budget was the first it was able to make funded, the 2025/26 budget was the first full funded budget, and 2026/27 is the second.

On coalitions generally, the party's position was that the era of single-party government is over, that South Africa's diversity makes coalitions the normal condition, and that parties must now learn to be better coalition partners. It asked voters for five more years on the basis that two years is not enough to repair a city of this size, and that the finances have been stabilised rather than fixed.

4. Questions arising from the manifesto, and the party's responses

A. Rates and tariffs

Manifesto: *"Setting fair and sustainable rates and tariffs: We will limit annual municipal rates and tariff increases to no more than the prevailing rate of inflation, unless a higher increase is demonstrably necessary to protect essential services and is transparently justified through the municipal budget process."*

Tshwane: The 2026/27 increases are 8.8% for electricity, 10% for water, 5% for sanitation, 5% for property rates and 4.1% for refuse, against CPI of roughly 3 to 4%. The City's budget is reported as unfunded.

(A-Q1.) Is an inflation cap a commitment for every year of the term, including in a coalition? *[Answered]*

(A-Q2.) Will your councillors vote against a budget that breaches it? *[Not put]*

(A-Q3.) If the City's revenue cannot sustain services at CPI increases, what gives way first: the increase, the service, or the cost base? *[Answered]*

ACTIONSA RESPONSE

The party first disputed the currency of TRACC's figures. Its position is that the 2024/25 Annual Report figures describe the budget of the previous administration and cannot be set against the 2026/27 tariff schedule, because the City's finances have moved materially since then. The party stated that the 2026/27 budget, published on the City's website, is a funded budget; that the last financial year closed funded; and that the budget had been unfunded for four years from 2021/22. It cited page 39 of the 2024/25 Auditor-General report, on its reading, as recording total expenditure of R50.3 billion, growth of 14% exceeding revenue growth, and an underestimation of R4 billion in the financial statements.

On an inflation cap (A-Q1.): "Not at all. No, that we have no control over national." NERSA approved a 9.01% increase in bulk electricity tariffs to municipalities for 2026/27; the City set its own increase at 8.8% and absorbs the difference. Rand Water increased its bulk water charge by 10%, which passes through at 10%. Sanitation is charged on water consumption and was set at 5%. The increase in property rates were set at 5%, following the five-yearly valuation required by law. The one tariff over which local government has real freedom is refuse removal, set at 4.1%. The party could therefore give no commitment to cap increases to inflation, and said the place to raise the national price increases is with Members of Parliament.

The party set affordability against its indigent programme instead: properties valued at R250,000 or less receive a 100% rates rebate, 12 kilolitres of water, 100 kilowatt-hours of electricity, 9 kilolitres of sanitation and weekly refuse removal. It said the programme is open to everyone who qualifies, that some communities are too proud to come forward, and that residents in difficulty should approach credit control for a payment plan and ask about the programme. The funding comes from National Treasury rather than from the City's own rates income.

On what gives way first (A-Q3.): the cost base. The party's account is that it did not receive more money when it moved from an unfunded to a funded budget; it had to manage the same money better. Its focus is on becoming leaner, on real consequence management rather than talk about it, and on changing the relationship with the City's own staff, on the view that the

officials remain when the politicians change and that service delivery depends on them. Essential services the City is constitutionally bound to provide are to be maintained while, in the party's words, cutting away the things that would be good to have but cannot be afforded.

COMMITMENT RECORDED

An inflation cap was not committed to, and the reason given is that the City is a price taker: electricity is set by NERSA and water by Rand Water, with only refuse removal genuinely within the City's discretion.

The party recorded that it sets the electricity tariff below the NERSA-approved bulk increase and absorbs the difference.

Where revenue cannot sustain services, the cost base gives way first, through a leaner administration, consequence management, reduced contractor spending and the protection of services the City is legally bound to provide.

Question A-Q2. was withdrawn by the moderator once the party had established that an annual cap is not within the City's control.

B. Ward-based reinvestment

Manifesto: *"The manifesto does not address ward-based reinvestment."*

Tshwane: The Moot's wards have among the higher collection rates in the City and, on our analysis, receive a small fraction of the capital budget.

(B-Q1.) What portion of the rates collected in a ward should be reinvested in that ward, as a percentage, and how would it be shown in the budget? *[Answered]*

(B-Q2.) Would you support publishing, per ward, the rates collected and the capital and maintenance spent? *[Answered]*

(B-Q3.) What would the Moot's wards receive under this principle in your first budget? *[Answered]*

ACTIONSA RESPONSE

On a percentage returned to the ward (B-Q1.): the party answered in the negative, and was direct about it. "Within the context of South Africa, people, this is not happening." Its reasoning is that the areas with the strongest rates bases are those whose infrastructure was built up over decades, and that it cannot be right for them to retain their own revenue while areas that were never serviced cannot access anything. Rates revenue goes into a single pot that funds the whole city, including everything that raises no revenue of its own: roads, clinics, libraries and emergency services.

TRACC members pressed the question twice. They made clear that TRACC was not asking whether a ward should keep all of its rates, only what share should come back to it. One member put it plainly: a resident pays for street lights every month, so what share of those rates is spent in that resident's ward, and where can the resident see it? The party maintained that it cannot be broken down to a percentage, because not everyone is in a position to pay rates. It added that the budget is broken down by region rather than by ward, except where a named item such as a substation happens to fall in a ward, and that the Moot falls in Region 3, which

extends to Atteridgeville.

The route the party offered instead is the Integrated Development Plan. Residents should write individually to publicparticipation@tshwane.gov.za in March, because requests are recorded against a ward number and volume counts: in the party's words, if three thousand members each send the same request it appears three thousand times, and what enters the IDP is likely to stay there for the five-year term. It stressed that a residents' association has no account with the City and therefore no voice of its own, whereas each individual ratepayer does. It gave Region 4 as an example where this route secured capital investment.

On publishing per ward (B-Q2.): "100%. It needs to be transparent." The party's position is that the information already exists: quarterly finance committee reports are public, go to council, and can be downloaded from the City's website or obtained through a ward councillor or ward committee. It undertook to send TRACC the links. *[Party correction, 26 October 2026: it would not be possible to publish rates collected by ward. The Protection of Personal Information Act (POPIA) forbids access to personal information. Rates paid are between the homeowner and the City, and are based on property value and zoning.]*

On the Moot in a first budget (B-Q3.): not applicable, on the party's B-Q1 answer. The route is to motivate through the IDP.

COMMITMENT RECORDED

No percentage of a ward's rates to be returned to that ward was committed to, and the party answered the principle in the negative: rates revenue is pooled citywide, and allocation is by region rather than by ward.

The party committed to publishing, per ward, the rates collected and the capital and maintenance spent, stating that the information is already public through quarterly finance committee reports and that it must be transparent. *[Party correction, 26 October 2026: it would not be possible to publish rates collected by ward, because POPIA forbids access to personal information. See the party's correction under B-Q2 above.]*

The party undertook to send TRACC the links to the budget, the SDBIP, the Section 79 committee reports and the other documents it referred to during the session.

For the Moot in a first budget, no allocation was offered. The party's advice is that residents motivate individually through the IDP process in March, by ward.

C. Maintenance floor

Manifesto: *"Maintaining before it breaks: We will prioritise preventative maintenance and progressively repair, refurbish and replace ageing infrastructure according to its condition and the consequences of failure. Protecting infrastructure budgets: We will provide adequate funding for repairs and maintenance and ensure that money budgeted for this purpose is spent as intended."*

Tshwane: Tshwane spent 2.1% in 2024/25 on our analysis, against a National Treasury norm of 8%. The gap since 2015 is estimated at R24.4 billion.

(C-Q1.) Over how many years would you move Tshwane from 2.1% to 8%, and what is the target for year one? *[Answered in part]*

(C-Q2.) Would you support ring-fencing the maintenance budget so that it cannot be diverted in-year? *[Answered]*

(C-Q3.) Where does the money come from while the City cannot borrow? *[Answered]*

ACTIONSA RESPONSE

This theme was deferred on the night and returned to at the end of the session, at the party's request.

On the timeline to 8% (C-Q1.): no number of years and no year-one target were given. The party again placed the 2.1% in the 2024/25 year and described it as three years dated. Its explanation of the underlying problem is that maintenance is a very small fraction of the City's operating expenditure: on the 2024/25 figures it cited, of a R50.6 billion budget only R2.3 billion was capital, and of the operating expenditure only about R1.2 billion was maintenance, against bulk electricity purchases at 32%, employee costs at 27%, contracted services at 9.3%, interest at 3.8% and councillor remuneration at 3%.

The party's stated route to raising maintenance is indirect: cut contractor costs by insourcing and buying the City's own equipment, fill the artisan-level vacancies that were left empty while senior management posts remained filled, reduce bulk electricity costs by cutting illegal connections, and reduce interest by paying down debt. On its account R2.5 billion of the R6.6 billion Eskom debt has been repaid, with a corresponding fall in interest. The party expects the maintenance share to rise as a consequence rather than as a target in its own right. It attempted to give a current percentage from its printed figures but did not settle on one.

On ring-fencing (C-Q2.): yes, and the party's position is that it is already happening. Electricity and water have been constituted as business units on National Treasury's instruction, with revenue generated by a service retained in that service: electricity revenue builds substations, water revenue builds reservoirs. Waste and roads followed from July of this year. The party contrasted this with the position before 2016, when revenue from one service could be spent on another. *[Party correction, 26 October 2026: revenue from the different departments was ring-fenced and centralised before 2016. After 2016, seven regional operation centres were introduced "to bring services closer to the people"; departments were decentralised and revenue flowed into one pot. In July 2025 the Energy and Water business units were established to centralise the departments again and to ensure that funds are ring-fenced. Business units for waste and roads were established in July 2026. The work of ring-fencing is ongoing.]*

On where the money comes from (C-Q3.): from running a funded budget and spending it

strategically rather than from new borrowing. The things that would be good to have are on hold. Capital spending is being concentrated on projects already at about 95% completion, so that something is finished rather than everything stalled. The party referred to seventeen strategic urban development plans, and to a programme of bylaw enforcement, electricity and water stabilisation intended to attract investment, widen the revenue base and so fund further infrastructure.

The party gave one example of the pressure on this approach: a backdated salary increase that had not been budgeted for, which it said would have cost R489 million had it been paid in 2021 and which a labour court order has now set at R1.6 billion.

COMMITMENT RECORDED

No commitment to an increased maintenance budget was provided. No number of years was committed to for reaching 8%, and no year-one target was given. The party disputed the currency of the 2.1% figure and did not offer a current one.

The party committed to ring-fencing, on the basis that electricity and water revenue is already ring-fenced within business units under a National Treasury instruction, with waste and roads following from July 2026.

The route to raising maintenance spending is recorded as indirect: insourcing to cut contractor costs, filling artisan-level vacancies, cutting illegal connections to reduce bulk electricity costs, and paying down debt to reduce interest.

D. Conditional grants and capital

Manifesto: *"Building what we can maintain: New infrastructure investment will respond to service needs, population growth and economic development, while taking account of what municipalities can sustainably operate and maintain."*

Tshwane: Capital expenditure is 4.5% of the budget against a norm of 10 to 20%.

(D-Q1.) What capital share of the budget would you target by the end of the term? *[Answered]*

(D-Q2.) Would your councillors vote against any capital budget that funds non-critical projects while the water, sewer and electricity backlog remains? *[Answered]*

(D-Q3.) Would you support publishing every grant's allocation, spend and underspend quarterly? *[Answered]*

ACTIONSA RESPONSE

On the capital share (D-Q1.): the party gave figures and a target. In 2024/25 the capital budget was R2.3 billion, or 4.5% of a R50.6 billion budget. In 2026/27 it is R2.8 billion of a R58.5 billion budget, or 4.8%. The projection carried in this year's budget for the following year is 5.86%. The party described the intention as incremental improvement rather than a step change, and said it would like to commit to a higher percentage but that the City's financial position does not allow it.

The reasoning offered was circular in the party's own framing: broken infrastructure means no power and no water, which means no investment and no revenue, which means no money to fix

the infrastructure. Capital spending is therefore directed at making the City a place where revenue can be collected.

On voting against non-critical capital (D-Q2.): "There's no money for that" (Non-critical capital infrastructure). "Let's be honest." With only R2.8 billion of a R58.5 billion budget available for capital, the party's position is that everything in the capital budget is critical and that it would never have the luxury of voting for non-critical projects. Asked directly by the moderator whether that was a firm commitment not to vote for a budget funding non-critical projects, the answer was "Definitely." The party added that its manifesto directs capital to income-generating services.

On quarterly publication of grants (D-Q3.): the party's position is that this already happens and that it supports it. Section 79 oversight committee reports are published and available on the City's website; council meetings are streamed live; and MPAC meetings are also live and can be joined. Quarterly reports show grant allocations, and every political party sits on the Section 79 finance oversight committee, so any party's councillor can obtain the monthly report. The party said the City has no secrets and undertook to share the links that TRACC members could not find.

COMMITMENT RECORDED

The party committed to a capital share of 4.8% of the budget in 2026/27, rising to a projected 5.86% in the following year, as an incremental improvement from 4.5% in 2024/25. No end-of-term figure was given.

The party gave a firm commitment that its councillors would not vote for a capital budget funding non-critical projects while the water, sewer and electricity backlog remains, on the basis that nothing in the present capital budget is non-critical.

The party committed to quarterly publication of grant allocations, spend and underspend, stating that Section 79 reports, live council sittings and live MPAC meetings already provide this, and undertook to send TRACC the links.
Capital spending is to be concentrated on projects already at about 95% completion so that they are finished.

E. Water losses, electricity losses and billing

Manifesto: *"Stopping water losses: We will aggressively tackle leaks, illegal connections and failing infrastructure so that more treated water reaches residents instead of being lost from municipal networks… Accurate municipal bills: We will improve metering and billing systems so residents are charged accurately for the services they receive."*

Tshwane: Non-revenue water is 39% against a norm of 15 to 30%, about R1.3 billion a year. Electricity losses are 21.46% against a norm of 7 to 10%. Meters are widely estimated rather than read.

(E-Q1.) What non-revenue-water and electricity-loss percentages would you set as end-of-term targets? *[Answered in part]*

(E-Q2.) By when would every functioning meter be read monthly? *[Answered]*

(E-Q3.) What is your plan for the Moot's ageing substations, which the City has not published a condition assessment of? *[Answered]*

ACTIONSA RESPONSE

On end-of-term loss targets (E-Q1.): no percentages were given. The party said it was unsure whether it was working on percentages, while describing losses as wasting money the City does not have. What it set out instead were the mechanisms: an electricity stabilisation plan and a water stabilisation plan introduced this year, both reflected in the budget; a drive against large debtors and illegal connections, including in hijacked buildings, carried out with law enforcement; the installation of meters in communities that have no means of being billed and have asked for them; and pipe replacement, with a programme under way in Lyttelton to replace pipes about forty years old. The party put water losses across Gauteng at about 30% and described the problem as not unique to Tshwane.

On monthly meter reading (E-Q2.): "I don't think we'll ever have that." The party's answer was that a perfect reading rate is not achievable, and that on a February 2026 report to the Section 79 utilities oversight committee the reading rate is currently about 90%, with estimations at roughly 10%, which it regards as reasonable. It expects the rate to improve as better-quality meters are installed. It attributed part of the breakage to residents using the meter itself as a shut-off valve until it becomes brittle and fails, and said residents should install a valve ahead of the meter.

On the Moot's substations (E-Q3.): a condition assessment of substations across the city was commissioned roughly a year ago as part of the electricity stabilisation plan. The approach is to assess first, then prioritise by the number of people affected: substations feeding very large areas are stabilised first, then secondary ones. A report was due to council on 23 September 2026 but that meeting collapsed; the continuation meeting on 30 September had no quorum; and the council term has since ended, so the report was not finalised.

The party noted that electricity and water have been recentralised as business units. Regional offices created in 2016 decentralised service delivery but, on the party's assessment, created parallel administrative structures with regional heads and too few staff on the ground, weakening delivery. Budget and personnel are now pooled centrally and directed where the need is, with waste and roads following from July. The Moot's substations therefore fall under the citywide electricity stabilisation plan rather than a regional programme.

COMMITMENT RECORDED

No end-of-term percentage target was given for either non-revenue water or electricity losses. The party was not certain whether it is working to percentages.

No date was given for every functioning meter to be read monthly, and the party stated that full monthly reading is not achievable. The position recorded is that the rate is currently about 90%, which the party regards as reasonable, improving as better meters are installed.

A condition assessment of the City's substations was commissioned about a year ago under the electricity stabilisation plan, with prioritisation by the number of residents affected. The report did not reach council before the term ended. It is not clear whether the report was at least submitted to the City Manager.

The party committed to continued action on illegal connections, meter installation in unmetered communities, and pipe replacement where the need is motivated through the IDP.

F. Government debt and collection

Manifesto: *"Municipalities cannot provide services without collecting the revenue needed to pay for them. ActionSA will distinguish between residents who cannot pay and those who will not pay. Those who genuinely cannot afford basic services deserve support. Those who have the means to pay must pay their fair share."*

Tshwane: The collection rate fell from 90% to 85.6% against a norm of 95%; R2.18 billion was not collected in 2024/25.

(F-Q1.) What collection rate would you target and by when? *[Answered in part]*

(F-Q2.) What specifically would your councillors do about government departments in arrears, which the City has been unable to compel for years? *[Answered]*

(F-Q3.) What is your position on councillors and officials who are themselves in arrears? *[Answered]*

ACTIONSA RESPONSE

On a collection target (F-Q1.): no rate of collection and no date were given. Asked directly whether the party had a specific collection percentage, the answer was that there is probably a target in the SDBIP, that the party was not able to state it from memory, and that it would find it and send it to TRACC afterwards. What the party described instead were measures to make payment easier: improved customer care, mobile customer care officers, and payment channels by SMS and WhatsApp for residents without email or internet access.

On relief, the party cited a debt relief scheme in its first hundred days that wrote off over R4.3 billion for about 85,000 indigent households, and a parallel scheme for businesses directed at accrued interest rather than overdue accounts for use. Its argument is that where a household can never realistically repay, cleaning the slate and restarting regular payment serves the City better, and that unaffordable arrears are what drive residents to bypass the system through illegal connections and tampering.

On government departments in arrears (F-Q2.): the party's position is that this is a matter of demanding payment, and that it is being done. Its framing is that a provincial or national department's arrears are not that department's money but the taxpayer's, and that the budget

for those accounts exists. On the party's account, when the Executive Mayor pressed provincial and national government, billions *[Party correction, 26 October 2026: millions]* appeared in the City's account within twenty-four hours. It said the same standard must apply to business and to individuals: a consumer of electricity or water must pay, because the municipality is itself being charged.

On councillors and officials in arrears (F-Q3.): they must go to credit control like any resident and arrange a payment plan. Credit control assesses income against what is owed and sets what is reasonable, and the arrangement must then be honoured, with penalties on default. The party's framing was that councillors and officials are real people whose circumstances can change, but that large arrears cannot simply be carried.

COMMITMENT RECORDED

No collection rate target and no date were committed to. The party undertook to locate the target in the SDBIP and send it to TRACC.

The party committed to pressing provincial and national departments for payment, on the basis that the budget for those accounts exists, and cited recovery within twenty-four hours of the Executive Mayor doing so.

On councillors and officials in arrears, the position recorded is that they must arrange a payment plan through credit control on the same terms as any resident, and face penalties on default.

Measures recorded to improve collection: expanded payment channels including SMS and WhatsApp, mobile customer care, debt relief for indigent households and interest relief for businesses, and action against illegal connections and tampering.

G. Financial accountability and MPAC

Manifesto: *"Opening up procurement: We will make municipal procurement more transparent by publishing appropriate information on tenders, bidders, awards, contract values, variations and supplier performance, so residents can see how their money is being spent… Improving audit outcomes: We will strengthen financial controls, act on audit findings and work progressively towards clean audits."*

Tshwane: Only 56% of targets were met; the Auditor-General could not verify some results; two oversight committees held no meetings; MPAC has recorded resistance to consequence management.

(G-Q1.) What three actions would your councillors take in the first 12 months to make oversight work, and how would residents see that they happened? *[Answered]*

(G-Q2.) Would you support splitting the Utilities oversight portfolio into dedicated committees with independent technical support? *[Answered]*

(G-Q3.) Would you support a published quarterly register of Auditor-General and MPAC findings showing who is responsible and whether the deadline was met? *[Answered]*

ACTIONSA RESPONSE

Three actions (G-Q1.): first, attend the Section 79 oversight committee meetings, which are monthly and on which every councillor sits; second, call for the reports specific to that portfolio and read and understand them, rather than attending only to vote as instructed by the political parties; third, communicate what those reports contain back to the community. The party's view is that every councillor has the same access to information and need only request it, after which the officials must present it, it goes to council, and it becomes public.

On institutional measures, the party cited the SAP Ariba procurement portal, introduced in July, which it described as a digital platform that removes manual opportunities for interference and as a first for a South African municipality. It also described the City's standing response to an allegation as investigation on the merits, whatever the allegation and whoever it concerns. It referred to a media conference at which the City presented its own records on the water tanker expenditure, and offered to share that presentation with TRACC.

On how residents would see it (G-Q1.): the party put the onus substantially on residents, saying that council and MPAC proceedings are live and can be followed, that the reports are public, and that residents can and should demand facts, reports and figures from councillors. In its words, the more a resident pays in rates, the more they should hold the City to account, and democracy will only work if people participate.

On splitting the Utilities oversight portfolio (G-Q2.): the party answered in the negative. Pressed twice to distinguish the business units from the oversight committee, it said it did not see what the benefit would be, on the view that further decentralisation produces more meetings and more miscommunication, and that the City is cycling between centralised and decentralised models in search of what works. It offered instead the weekly service delivery war room hosted by the Executive Mayor on Fridays, at which every region reports against its targets, and a CSIR online platform to which seventeen departments have access, giving the executive and the officials the same information.

On a published register naming who is responsible (G-Q3.): the party supported publication but not naming individuals. Its reasoning is that MPAC investigates corruption, that those doing the investigating should not be identified because they may be targeted, and that identities need protecting where corruption is being dealt with. It noted that the membership of MPAC is public because its members are politicians, and that Tshwane was, on its account, the first municipality to put MPAC meetings online, where they are held monthly and can be followed.

COMMITMENT RECORDED

The party committed to three actions on oversight: attendance at Section 79 oversight committee meetings; calling for and reading the reports specific to the portfolio; and communicating their contents back to the community.

The party recorded the SAP Ariba procurement portal, introduced in July 2026, as its principal procurement transparency measure, and investigation on the merits as its standing response to any allegation.

The party did not support splitting the Utilities oversight portfolio and offered the weekly service delivery war room and the CSIR online platform as its alternative.

On a quarterly register of Auditor-General and MPAC findings, the party supported publication but not the naming of individuals, on the grounds of protecting those investigating corruption. It

recorded that MPAC meetings are live monthly and can be followed.

The party offered to share with TRACC the City's presentation on the water tanker expenditure.

H. Accountable officers

Manifesto: *"Ending cadre deployment: We will end the practice of using municipal jobs to reward political loyalty. Political connections will never be a qualification for employment in an ActionSA municipality… There will be no different standard for politicians, officials or service providers. Anyone who abuses public money must face the consequences."*

Tshwane: Council appoints the City Manager, holds him accountable, and can suspend or replace him. The MFMA makes the accounting officer personally liable for specified failures.

(H-Q1.) Short of prosecution, what would your councillors do when the City Manager or an MMC does not answer an oversight committee, does not implement a council resolution, or does not act on an audit finding? *[Answered]*

(H-Q2.) What is the sequence, and who initiates it? *[Answered in part]*

ACTIONSA RESPONSE

On acting against its own (H-Q1.): the party offered its own conduct as the answer. One of its members of the mayoral committee was named in the Madlanga Commission and her party membership was terminated within seven days, which removed her from the position by default. The party's stated standard is that everyone is treated equally, friend or not, without fear or favour, but that nobody can be removed without evidence.

On capacity, the party said the City's group audit and risk department had been understaffed and dysfunctional and has been strengthened, along with the fraud hotline, and that ongoing forensic investigations follow from that. It referred to a report listing implicated employees by rank and function rather than by name, extending to senior levels including within group audit and risk itself, and offered to share it. It emphasised that in local government dismissal requires a disciplinary process, failing which the City is exposed to litigation, so consequence management is slower than the party would like.

On the City Manager and the Chief Financial Officer: the party described a special council meeting convened to consider two reports, one on each official, arising from allegations brought by different parties. ActionSA was not the party that laid the allegations, but it brought recommendations on both reports: that the City Manager remain in office and that the Chief Financial Officer go. According to ActionSA the opposition parties did not attend that meeting, so the vote was carried against its recommendations, with the result that the City Manager was removed, took the matter to court and returned to office, while the Chief Financial Officer remains in post. The party's stated conclusion is that with nineteen seats there is a limit to what it can carry in a chamber of 214.

TRACC has not reproduced the names of the individuals concerned, or the party's characterisations of them. TRACC is not a party to those matters and takes no position on them. The full exchange is on the recording.

On the sequence and who initiates it (H-Q2.): "We just follow the legislation. We follow

processes." The party did not set out a sequence, and its position is that the applicable process differs according to the position held, with section 56 managers governed by different provisions, and that following the law is what makes the process fair and defensible.

COMMITMENT RECORDED

The party's recorded standard is that it acts against its own on the same terms as anyone else, and it cited the termination of a mayoral committee member's party membership within seven days of her being named in the Madlanga Commission.

The party recorded that the City's group audit and risk department and its fraud hotline have been strengthened, with ongoing forensic investigations following from that, and offered to share a report listing implicated employees by rank and function.

On the City Manager and the Chief Financial Officer, the party recorded that it brought recommendations to a special council meeting on both reports and that the vote went against those recommendations in the absence of the opposition.

No sequence and no initiating party were committed to. The position recorded is that the legislated process is followed and that it differs according to the position held.

I. Communities delivering where the City cannot

Manifesto: *"A functioning municipality is a partnership between government and the people it serves… communities must help protect public infrastructure and residents must hold their government accountable when it fails."*

Tshwane: The Moot's resident associations and Die Moot Projek already maintain parks and verges the City does not. TRACC is a federation of the kinds of bodies the manifesto names.

(I-Q1.) What would this look like in practice: a formal agreement with a resident association, a budget contribution, or something else? *[Answered]*

(I-Q2.) Would you support a mechanism by which a community that maintains a City asset is credited for it? *[Answered]*

(I-Q3.) Would your councillors meet TRACC twice a year, in public, to report on the commitments made tonight? *[Answered]*

ACTIONSA RESPONSE

On what it looks like in practice (I-Q1.): the party was candid that it does not regard this arrangement as a good . Community Upliftment Partnerships were introduced at the end of 2023, after the strike action, when civil society was invited to do what the City was failing to do. In the party's words, ratepayers should not have to pay twice, the City should do the work, and what it needs is breathing space while it repairs itself. It will not stop residents acting, because it accepts that residents work to a different timeline from government.

The party set out its position on outsourcing plainly: it does not support it and has been insourcing instead, buying the City's own machinery and filling vacancies so that the City's own teams can do the work. It said the Adopt-a-Spot programme had, in its assessment, become a route to effectively hijacking public land, and that public spaces should remain public and

accessible as part of the wider urban planning framework.

The mechanism it recommended instead is the precinct plan. It cited Hatfield, where a plan initiated privately through the City Improvement District was subsequently adopted by the City, so that when the City invests capital it builds to that plan. The party suggested TRACC investigate whether a precinct plan would suit the Moot, noting that it does not necessarily require the community to fund the work, only to shape the plan.

On crediting a community that maintains a City asset (I-Q2.): the party answered in the negative on financial credit, while leaving the door open on practical support. Individual CUP arrangements already differ, with the City sometimes supplying material where a community supplies labour, or the reverse, and the City can meet residents halfway. But a financial award, whether a rates rebate or a refund, would in the party's view amount to privatising that space or that asset, and the City would over time lose assets that belong to the public. It extended the same reasoning to City property generally, saying the City should lease rather than sell its buildings, because they represent generational wealth that a five-year administration has no business disposing of.

On meeting TRACC twice a year (I-Q3.): "Any time, that's what we're here for. We can meet weekly." The party's position is that connecting with residents is what councillors are for.

COMMITMENT RECORDED

The party committed to its councillors meeting TRACC twice a year, in public, to report on the commitments recorded here, and stated it would be willing to meet more often than that.

The party does not support outsourcing City functions to residents and is insourcing instead. It will not obstruct communities that choose to act and accepts that residents work to a different timeline.

On crediting a community that maintains a City asset, no financial credit was committed to, on the stated ground that it would amount to privatising a public asset. Practical support through individually negotiated CUP arrangements, with the City supplying material or equipment, was left open.

The party recommended a precinct plan as the mechanism best suited to the Moot, on the Hatfield model, and recorded its view that the Adopt-a-Spot programme had become a route to effectively hijacking public land.

J. Coalitions

Manifesto: *"Put coalition agreements in writing: The responsibilities and commitments of coalition partners should be clearly documented and accessible to residents… Agree on a programme of government… Turn agreements into delivery: Coalition commitments must be reflected in municipal budgets, plans and measurable performance targets."*

Tshwane: Tshwane has been governed by coalitions since 2016.

(J-Q1.) Would you commit to publishing the coalition agreement in full? *[Answered]*

(J-Q2.) Which of tonight's commitments would you make non-negotiable in coalition talks? *[Answered in part]*

(J-Q3.) If a coalition partner tabled a budget that breached your inflation cap or the maintenance floor, how would your councillors vote? *[Answered]*

ACTIONSA RESPONSE

On publishing the agreement (J-Q1.): "Definitely." The party did so in 2021: the agreement was negotiated, signed and published on the parties' websites. It was open about the position since: the current coalition has several partners and, on the party's account, there is no written agreement. Its reflection was that a signed document did not prove binding, because counterparts did not treat it as such, and that it has in practice achieved more under the current unwritten arrangement than under the printed and signed one. It nonetheless accepted that parties must agree on the basics and on a plan for the term.

On non-negotiables (J-Q2.): the party did not adopt any of the evening's commitments as non-negotiable, and said it was not sure there had been many. What it set out instead were three standing conditions on which it will work with any party the voters return. First, it will act on corruption without fear or favour, including against a coalition partner. Second, it will serve all communities equally, whether they voted for the party or not. Third, in its own words, it will put South Africans first, a position it explained by reference to people in the country unlawfully rather than to foreign nationals generally, and which it tied to the high rate (60%) youth unemployment.

The party was explicit that it will no longer rule out any party as a coalition partner by name, having done so before the 2024 election and found the position untenable afterwards. Its stated approach is that the voters choose the composition of the council and the parties must then make government work.

On how its councillors would vote (J-Q3.): the party said the conversation would have been had with the partner beforehand, and that it would take a serious breach of what the party stands for to vote against a coalition partner on a budget. It drew a distinction between corruption, where it says it will vote against a partner and has done so, and a budget, where the issue is prioritisation and would have to be clear. It gave its own record as the illustration: in coalition with the Democratic Alliance it objected each year that the budget was unfunded and still voted for it each year, because it wanted a stable government and service delivery.

COMMITMENT RECORDED

The party committed to publishing a coalition agreement in full, as it did in 2021, and recorded that the current coalition has no written agreement.

None of the evening's commitments were made non-negotiable. The three standing non-negotiables recorded are: acting on corruption without fear or favour, including against a coalition partner; serving all communities equally; and the party's stated position of putting South Africans first.

The party recorded that it will not rule out any party by name in coalition talks.

On a budget that breached a commitment, the party would expect to have raised it with the partner first and would need a serious breach of its principles before voting against. It recorded that it voted for unfunded budgets in the previous coalition despite objecting to them, in the interest of stable government.

5. Questions from TRACC members

5.1 Responsibility for the unfunded budgets of the previous coalition

A TRACC executive member put it to the party that it had referred to the unfunded budgets as though they belonged to the previous mayor alone, when ActionSA was itself part of that coalition; and asked why the party does not take responsibility for decisions taken while it was in government, and what it would do differently.

ACTIONSA RESPONSE

The party answered that it takes responsibility and then set out why it considers its position was constrained. Of 214 seats a budget requires 108 votes. ActionSA held 19. In the coalition formed after 2021 the Democratic Alliance held 69 seats and took the mayoralty, finance, utilities, and corporate and shared services. ActionSA received human settlements, social development, and economic development and spatial planning MMC seats. On the party's account those portfolios carried little discretionary budget, and it had no sight of the finances or utilities portfolios.

The party said it raised the unfunded budgets in the coalition's own discussions before council and was told there was no money. Its position hardened around the 2023 strike action, which it regarded as the turning point, and it pressed its partner to negotiate with the workforce rather than to litigate against it, on the view that services cannot be delivered without the officials who deliver them.

What it says it would do differently is the lesson it drew when it negotiated the current arrangement: it would only co-govern on terms where it leads the government, rather than, in its words, waiting for a larger partner to decide and then carrying the consequences.

5.2 The ward-portion question, put again

Two TRACC members returned to question B-Q1. after the party's first answer, clarifying that TRACC was not suggesting a ward should retain all of its rates, and putting it directly that a resident paying every month wants to know what share of their rates is spent in their ward and where to find that out. The party's further answer is recorded under theme B above. The exchange is noted here because the question was put three times and no percentage was given.

6. Figures and statements recorded but not verified by TRACC

The party put forward the following figures and factual statements during the session. TRACC records them because they were given in answer to its questions but has not independently verified them and does not adopt them.

- The 2026/27 budget is a funded budget, total R58.4 to R58.5 billion, and the 2025/26 budget closed funded. The budget was unfunded for four years from 2021/22.
- The 2024/25 Auditor-General report records total expenditure of R50.3 billion, growth of 14% exceeding revenue growth, and an underestimation of R4 billion in the consolidated and separate financial statements.
- Capital budget: R2.3 billion in 2024/25 (4.5%), R2.8 billion in 2026/27 (4.8%), with 5.86% projected for the following year.
- NERSA approved a 9.01% bulk electricity increase to municipalities for 2026/27; the City set its own increase at 8.8% and absorbs the difference.
- Accumulated debt exceeded R13 billion, including R6.6 billion owed to Eskom, which grew from R1.1 billion in eighteen months. R2.5 billion of the Eskom debt has since been repaid.
- A debt relief scheme wrote off over R4.3 billion for approximately 85,000 indigent households, with a parallel interest-relief scheme for businesses. (The moderator's notes record R4.8 billion; the figure given on the recording is R4.3 billion.)
- Indigent benefits for properties valued at R250,000 or less: 100% rates rebate, 12 kilolitres of water, 100 kilowatt-hours of electricity, 9 kilolitres of sanitation and weekly refuse removal.
- Meter reading is currently at about 90%, with estimations at roughly 10%, on a February 2026 report to the Section 79 utilities oversight committee.
- Creditor payment turnaround moved from 23 days to 43 days. (The party described this as an improvement; TRACC reads the figures the other way and will ask the party to clarify.)
- Water tanker expenditure has been reduced by 79%.
- 2024/25 operating expenditure composition: bulk electricity purchases 32%, employee costs 27%, contracted services 9.3%, interest 3.8%, councillor remuneration 3%, with maintenance at about R1.2 billion.
- A backdated salary increase that would have cost R489 million in 2021 has been set at R1.6 billion by a labour court order.
- Economic growth in Tshwane fell from 6% in 2011 to 0.3% by 2023.
- Water losses across Gauteng are about 30%, and the problem is not unique to Tshwane.
- The SAP Ariba procurement portal was introduced in July 2026, the first in a South African municipality, and Tshwane was the first municipality to stream MPAC meetings online.
- A CSIR online service delivery platform gives seventeen departments shared access to the same information, alongside a weekly war room hosted by the Executive Mayor. It was not clear who has access to this CSIR platform.
- The City operates seventeen strategic urban development plans.
- The City of Tshwane is the third largest municipality in the world by geographic area.

Statements made by the party about named individuals, and about other political parties and their representatives, are not reproduced in this record. TRACC is not a party to those matters, takes no position on them, and the full exchange is available on the recording published alongside this record.

7. Confirmation by ActionSA

ActionSA confirms that this record is a fair and accurate summary of the party's responses at the TRACC session held on 15 October 2026, subject to any corrections of fact submitted to TRACC in writing, and consents to its publication by TRACC on www.tracc.org.za, together with the recording of the session and alongside the records of sessions with other parties.

	For ActionSA	For TRACC
Full name		
Position		
Signature		
Date		

Enquiries: secretariat@tracc.org.za.