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**228. Mr A R McLoughlin (DA) to ask the Minister of Basic Education:**

(1) Whether, with regard to her reply to question 2686 on 4 January 2017, (a) the appointment of a new service provider for the remainder of the campaign was costed; if not, why not; if so, what are the relevant details;

(2) what was the nature of the disagreement between her department and the Auditor-General on a technical point in the procurement process? NW241E

1. **Response:**

No, it was not costed. The appointment of the new service provider for the remainder of the campaign was not an ideal approach, considering that the new service provider would have to take over the campaign in the last part of its existence, the new service provider would have to provide systems to be used to administer the project; it would take time to test the new system, integrate it with the current system and thereafter hand over to the new service provider while the campaign was continuing.

(2) **Response:**

The disagreement was around the interpretation of the Terms of Reference, the evaluation criteria. (a) The Bid Evaluation Committee (BEC) evaluated all responsive bids on functionality and calculated the minimum required points. Site visits were conducted to bidders which scored the minimum points. This was because site visits would be conducted to verify the information that was stated in the bid documents. (b) The Office of the Auditor-General felt that site visits should have been conducted to all responsive bidders, and thus form part of the functionality score. The Department disagreed with this, however the Auditor-General ruled against the Department.