

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

**QUESTION FOR WRITTEN REPLY**

# QUESTION NO. 3795

**Mr A M Figlan (DA) to ask the Minister of Home Affairs:**

What specifically was irregular about the expenditure of R146 million on her department’s security contract? NW4293E

**REPLY:**

The security contract (DHA07-2014) was held to be irregular because of the following:

1. Non-adherence to the Supply Chain Management (SCM) administrative procedures

* The tender was advertised for a period shorter (18 days) than the prescribed period without a clear approval to deviate from the SCM policy.
* Bidders were disqualified for non-submission of bid requirements which are deemed to be administrative in nature e.g. non- submission of a valid tax clearance certificate.
* There were inconsistencies in the verification of compliance with bid requirements.

1. Bid Evaluation process

* One of the bid evaluation criteria was a site inspection to determine the adequacy of the infrastructure and resources. However, the Bid Evaluation Committee (BEC) changed the criterion and evaluated on the bid documents submitted by the bidders.
* The introduction of the Private Security Industry Regulatory Authority (PRISA) requirements which were not communicated to bidders and resulted in the disqualification of some bidders unfairly prejudiced other bidders.
* The BEC was not consistent during the evaluation specifically on the site inspection in that not all BEC members visited the sites. However, all members scored the bidders on the site visits based on the outcomes of those members who conducted the site visit.
* The functional evaluation score sheets were apparently discussed and agreed upon contrary to the National Treasury SCM Guide for Accounting Officers that requires individual assessment without discussing any aspect of the bid with any of the other members prior to the award of an individual score.
* Scoresheets and B-BBEE score were not captured correctly as they differed to what was captured on the BEC report.

1. Bid Adjudication process

* There is no evidence to substantiate that a quorum of 60% was met before the Bid Adjudication Committee convened to adjudicate the bid.