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**2824. Mrs. M B Hicklin (DA) asked the Minister of Public Works and Infrastructure:**

(1) With reference to the service provider who was appointed by the Independent Development Trust (IDT) in 2017 to assist in driving the Organisational Development (OD) process, for which the service provider was contracted for around R4,2 million for the entire OD job, with payments to be staggered according to the project progress milestones, and in view of the fact that the appointment of the service provider was found by the Internal Audit report and the Interim Board in 2018 to be highly irregular as the service provider hurriedly left the OD job incomplete, but was paid the full contract amount, what are details of the findings of the Internal Audit Unit into the procurement of the OD service provider, in view of the fact that the IDT has again advertised an OD tender with exactly the same terms of reference as the one in question, who was found to be responsible for the irregular payment of the OD service provider;

(2) whether consequence management action was meted out to the specified person in terms of Public Finance Management Act, Act 1 of 1999; if not, why not; if so, what are the relevant details;

(3) what (a) is the reason that the IDT is advertising another OD tender with the same TORs as the previous one, (b) is this new OD tender intending to do that was not covered in the previous OD and (c) number of IDT officials were targeted for retrenchment in terms of the previous incomplete OD process;

(4) whether all of the officials were retrenched as planned; if not, (a) why not and (b) how does this impact on the officials who were already retrenched; if so, what are the relevant details;

(5) was there any litigation action filed against the IDT, challenging the OD-related retrenchment; if not, what is the position in this regard; if so, what are the latest relevant details? **NW3419E**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**REPLY:**

**The Minister of Public Works and Infrastructure**

(1) The Independent Development Trust (IDT) informed me that its Internal Audit did an audit on the Supply Chain Management process regarding this appointment; however, it was not substantive. There was no one found responsible. The report identified general weaknesses in the Supply Chain Management Processes.

(2) No consequences management was recommended, as no one was held liable. The report was inconclusive, and the Board at the time only noted the report and did not recommend any further action.

(3) The IDT advertised another tender, but it was withdrawn because the reconfiguration process needed to be approved first by Cabinet.

1. The reconfiguration process will result in a different organisational redesign, which will be dealt with once Cabinet approves.
2. 50 Officials were retrenched as an outcome of the then OD process.

(4)

a) All employees who participated in the Voluntary Severance Process were retrenched.

b) There is no discernible impact on the officials who left.

5. Yes, there is one case at Labour Court. IDT defended the matter and is awaiting court judgement.