

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project management process was poorly conducted yet the contracted project manager was paid in full. The absence of a signed SLA has rendered VUT being unable to exercise any recourse whatsoever. The Procurement Policy was not adhered to in terms of payment terms to the suppliers as suppliers were paid outside approved timelines. This transaction was therefore invalid, incomplete and inaccurate. The transaction should not have been considered as that of an emergency. The transaction is incomplete because some of the work was not completed. The transaction was inaccurate as the supplier was paid for the work not completed satisfactorily.
--	--

8.1.3.8 Analysis of contract 9: Upgrading of the residence main gate

9. VBX Investments R1 878 283.50 (Full payment)							
Scope of work: Residence entrance upgrading main gate							
RFQ Number and Description: QR 17/2018 – Residence entrance upgrading							
Subcontractors:							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fani Buwa Projects 							
Approval date	Date of quotation	Date of order	Date work commenced	Scheduled completion date	Actual completion date	Final assessment date	Payment date
29/06/18	N/A	12/07/18	13/07/18	03/08/18	11/09/18	13/09/18	14/09/18
Reason for not completing on time	3 weeks was not sufficient						
Final assessment	Good (i.e. Work was good and met all specified standards within the expected timeframe)						
Detailed Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The service provider awarded the contract relied on 1 subcontractor to perform the work. This subcontractor was not validated by VUT and the Procurement Policy is silent in terms of management of sub-contractors. The order was issued a day before approval was granted. The contracted project manager cited that 3 weeks was not sufficient as the reason for the work not completed on time. VUT did not have any recourse since there was no signed SLA, e.g. penalising the said contractor for not meeting said deadlines or for work not performed according to agreed specifications. The project manager assessed the work as good (i.e. work was good and met all specified standards within the expected timeframe) which is contradicting the statement he made under <i>the reasons for not completing on time</i>. It was noted in some residences that the gates were left open and the biometric system appeared to be non-functional. Hence it defeats the purpose of safety which was cited as an emergency. The project management process was poorly conducted yet the contracted project manager was paid in full. The work was performed in a sloppy manner and yet full payment was made. Payment was effected three (3) days from the supplier's statement date which was contrary to the Procurement Policy, which clearly states that payment can only be effected 30 days from supplier's statement date, upon which satisfactory quality checks had been performed No motivation to the EMC was attached on the payment pack that we received. Statement sent reflects the details for VOX yet the banking details reflect VBX Investments. 						
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reasons provided to motivate for an emergency procurement did not meet the definition of "emergency procurement" as outlined in the Procurement Policy. It would have been impractical and impossible for the work to be completed before the students came back from recess as the sourcing of quotations and approvals took place a week or two before the students could come back from recess. 						