

EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND TRAINING

SENATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE - QUESTIONS ON NOTICE 2005-2006 BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING

Outcome: All
Output Group: All

DEST Question No. E004_06

Senator Carr asked on 1 June 2005, EWRE Hansard page 12.

Question:

Senator CARR—So that takes you to \$15,000, which is \$5,000 above the limit. I can follow that line of argument. Why then in the table you have provided me with are the exemption grounds not applicable? Why is it recorded in that manner?

Mr McDonald—I would have to investigate it. My initial view would be that when Dupont were engaged the contract was envisaged to be less than \$10,000 and therefore there was no requirement for exemption. When the contract was in place and the consultant was undertaking work in relation to that contract then more investigative work was required which then pushed the cost of the contract up, so there was no need for an exemption.

Answer:

Grounds of exemption

Contract Number: 75357
Consultant: Dupont and Associates

Dupont and Associates were engaged by the Department to conduct an independent review under the DEST Review of Actions Policy.

The original contract value was estimated to be \$6,000 and therefore, being under \$10,000, did not require an exemption under the Department's procurement guidelines. Due to additional complexities in the investigation, the contract value was increased by \$3,000. This increased the total contract value to \$9,000.

The total expenditure was \$8,050.

The recorded contract value of \$15,000 is an error arising from human error in the data input to the Department's electronic procurement system (BUYiT). The entry into BUYiT has been corrected.

The contract documents were accurate.