

		<p>services are not providing expected benefits.</p> <p>It is our view that value for money, as a minimum standard test as per Policy, was not met.</p> <p>In fact, most of the services provided under this contract were rigged with carelessness and negligence on both parties, i.e. VUT (for failure to manage, monitor and assess the completion of work performed in order to vouch for final payment to be effected) and individual suppliers (for failure to provide a meticulous service.</p> <p>The suppliers who have provided sub-standard services should actually be blacklisted and never be allowed to do business with either the University or with government in general.</p> <p>The unintended consequences of these slovenly services will lead to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional suppliers would have to sourced at additional costs to complete the work that was not done or not done properly at all. • The initial cost which was recorded in VUT’s financial books as Capex will have to be discounted/impaired accordingly when a valuation test is performed at year end, which will result in VUT recording losses which will reduce the income/profits.
<p>Open and effective communication</p>	<p>This requires:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A framework of procurement laws, policies, practices and procedures that is transparent, i.e. they must be 	<p>A lot of suppliers potentially lost out in participating on this contract due to the fact that an open tender process was not considered as per Policy. As</p>