

23 May 2018

Dear Ms Van Wyk

1. Thanks for meeting yesterday. Thanks too for the KPMG minute of the meeting of 7 August 2015 sent to me after our meeting.
2. I would urgently request you to publish my answer to your questions together with the entire KPMG minute you sent me. To only publish selected excerpts from the minute will create a skewed and inaccurate impression of my conduct.
3. The general thrust of the minute appears accurate according to my recollection.
4. The minute confirms what I told you yesterday, namely that I attended the KPMG meeting, together with Mr Bonga Mokoena, with a mandate from the ministerial advisory committee chaired by retired Judge Kroon. What was conveyed were not my own views but that of the committee, which appears to have met the day before.
5. The committee was established and tasked by Minister Nene to perform the function it performed. I attended the KPMG meeting as member of the committee, within the mandate of the committee, as per the instruction of the committee that had met the day before.
6. I do not know what the "steercom" is you refer to. All I can speak to is the committee on which I served. I was not part of a separate structure with a different mandate or scope of work.
7. As for the meeting itself, there was, in my view nothing, untoward about it taking place, its purpose, or the contents of what conveyed by the members of the committee.
8. Neither myself, nor the committee, "directed" the KPMG investigation. The purpose of the engagement was to convey the views of the committee on a preliminary report it had seen and discussed the day before. The committee was of the view, and hence recommended by means of the minuted meeting, that an executive summary be compiled with a list of conclusions and recommendations.
9. Neither the committee nor any of its members dictated the content of the recommendations and conclusions. We simply expressed the view that the report will be enhanced if its authors stated their own conclusions and recommendations.
10. This included the findings and documents relating to the establishment of the unit. From the documentation collected by KPMG it appeared at face value as if the executive leadership of SARS had acted in a manner contrary to what was proposed to and approved by the then Minister of Finance. The committee's recommendation was that the authors of the report consider the implications of this possibility and state, directly, what their conclusions were as regards such conduct.
11. As regards your questions about my comment about "politics", I simply advised that the report being drafted involved senior officials and political figures, and that there were bound to be repercussions of sorts.
12. I am not in a position to make any comments about Lombaard, or SARS' attorneys or KPMG's subsequent decisions as regards the report.
13. I trust you find this in order.

Kind regards



Rudolf Mastenbroek