

INTENSE - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INVESTIGATION RESULTS - BACKGROUND SEARCHES	
SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intense did not comply with the compulsory tender document requirements of the tender in that they did not submit some of the documents. 2. It was not within our scope to investigate where documentation is, or who is directly responsible for the delay in providing the documentation and data, or for misplacing / destroying / losing the documentation / data. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PRASA Board should investigate the root causes for the delay or omission in providing the required data / documentation; and act accordingly.

INVESTIGATION RESULTS - PROCUREMENT PROCESSES	
SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are a number of procurement documents on the tender process missing. 2. The tender submission documents of Tauboma are missing. 3. There are irregularities with the Compulsory Briefing Session form of Intense and Siyenza. 4. There were irregularities in the adjudication of the tender process when Siyenza was disqualified on the lack of technical requirements. 5. The appointment of Intense was irregular in terms of the SCM Policy in that it did not follow the relevant prescripts. 6. There was an irregularity with the award notification to Intense - terms of contract not discussed and contract not ready and signed. 7. The whole amount of the Intense tender is irregular. 8. The total price of Intense is R54 090 070.26 cheaper than Intense. 9. Dr Phungula misrepresented the CTPC's award to Intense, to the GCEO. 10. There are sufficient grounds to report the Intense contract to the SA Police Services, its section 34 of PRECCA. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Board should ensure that Procurement comply with the relevant prescripts of the SCM Policy regarding the retention of documents, evaluation of the tenders and adherence to the approval process and prescripts. 2. The Board should ensure that there is an effective Legal and Contracts process in place to ensure that contracts are negotiated and signed timeously with suppliers. 3. The Board should consider instituting disciplinary charges against the employees who were responsible and involved in the tender and contract for their failure to adhere to the relevant prescripts of the SCM Policy. 4. Disciplinary charges are preferred against the role player employees in terms of the award of the tender. 5. Fraud charges should be instituted against Dr Phungula. 6. The Board should consider complying with the reporting duty in terms of section 34 of PRECCA.

INVESTIGATION RESULTS - PAYMENT VERIFICATION

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Some invoices which were paid are missing. Some delivery notes are missing.2. Finance failed to supply us with all the invoices which were paid.3. Finance failed to supply us with the asset register regarding the equipment.4. There is no proper record keeping by Security (End User) when they received equipment from the supplier.5. Security could not supply an accurate stock record of the equipment received and equipment in stores from the supplier.6. A large number of the equipment are not distributed to the regions - motivation documents show that there is a greater need for the equipment at the regions.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. A surprise stock count should be performed on equipment in store and reconciled with stock distributed to the regions.2. A comprehensive review should be conducted of equipment received against equipment paid.3. Distribution of the stock to the regions should be prioritized.