

ERRATUM SHEET FOR AFFIDAVIT OF EVIDENCE-IN-CHIEF OF PRITAM SINGH

S/No.	Para No.	Amendments
1.	8	As such, the <u>Town Council ("TC")</u> was known as " AHTC " from 27 May 2011 to 21 February 2013 and " AHPETC " from 22 February 2013 to 30 September 2015, and again as AHTC from 1 October 2015 to present.
2.	16	As such, the MPs-elect had to spring into action to prepare for the contingency which was anticipated. Of the 6 MPs-elect, Mr Low and Sylvia were more involved in this process given their previous experience with township management as Town Councillors back in <u>Hougang Town Council ("HTC")</u> . I was aware that Mr Low and Sylvia were in discussions with Ms How and Mr Danny Loh (" Mr Loh "), Ms How's late husband, about setting up a MA company. I knew that some of these preparatory steps included meetings with Mr Loh and Ms How, one of which took place in early June 2011. All the MP-elects were invited to this meeting but I was not present then as I was unable to make it for reasons I cannot now recall. Eventually, only Mr Low, Sylvia and Mr Mohammad Faisal Manap (" Faisal ") met with FMSS in early June 2011 for a presentation of whether FMSS would be capable of taking on the role of MA for AHTC. Copies of the powerpoint presentation slides that FMSS gave out at this meeting were circulated to the MP-elects after the meeting.
3.	23	Subsequently, in her email sent on 16 September 2011 to all the Town Councillors, Sylvia informed us that: <i>"This week, EM Services has <u>stood firm</u> that they will not extend beyond 30 Sep. However, CPG FM informed us on 14 Sep (in writing and orally) that they too are not extending – it seems that they have been 'spoken to' about not helping us and have made a business decision. This means that we must make immediate provision to have continuity of EMSU services beyond 30 Sep for all Divs in Aljunied GRC." (emphasis added)</i>

S/No.	Para No.	Amendments
4.	29	<p>At the 10th AHTC Meeting held on 12 April 2012, a standing T&C Committee comprising of Sylvia, Faisal, Anthony, Kenneth, <u>David Chua</u> and myself was formed to evaluate and award tenders. <u>A copy of the Minutes of the 10th AHTC Meeting held on 12 April 2012 can be found at S/No. 886 of the CB.</u></p>
5.	31	<p>Generally, the T&C Committee's scope of work entailed assisting the Committee in evaluating tenders and deciding on the award of contracts. In this regard, Sylvia sent an e-mail on 7 May 2012 to me and other members of the then standing T&C Committee (both the standing T&C Committee referred to in paragraph [] <u>29</u> above and the T&C Committee that was eventually formed on 14 June 2012 referred to at paragraph [] <u>30</u> above) to inform us of what is expected of the T&C Committee under the TCFR: <i>"According to the Town Council Financial Rule 76(1), tender specifications which are drafted by managing agents "shall be approved by a Tender Committee comprising members of the Town Council". Tenders are being drafted by our MA and called all year round."</i> A copy of Sylvia's e-mail of 7 May 2012 can be found at S/No. 467 of the CB.</p>
6.	34	<p>Whenever the T&C Committee had to evaluate tender bids, we were conscious of the need to ensure fairness in its assessment of all tenderers even while prioritizing the interests of maintaining efficiency in AHTC's operations and the welfare of AHTC's residents while taking into consideration of how this would impact the elected members' and the Workers' Party's electoral fortunes in future general elections given the ecology of the TC and the <u>Town Councils Act ("TCA")</u>. In making such assessments of tender bids, the T&C Committee worked on the basis that appointing the lowest tenderer and thereby securing short-term costs savings may not necessarily give rise to the best outcome for the Town Council in the long-term. This approach towards awarding tenders is in fact in line with the spirit of the TCA as seen in a newspaper report entitled</p>

S/No.	Para No.	Amendments
		<p><i>"Town Councils can be flexible in spending"</i> published in the Straits Times on 8 November 1988. An extract of the said report which can be found at S/No. 1134 of the CB is set out...</p>
7.	53	<p>After the T&C Committee's meeting on 7 November 2013 <u>2012</u>, its recommendation to appoint LST and DM to the Panel was presented to the Town Councillors at the 14th AHTC Meeting on 8 November 2012. The Town Councillors adopted the T&C Committee's recommendation. Accordingly, AHTC entered into separate Appointment Agreements with each consultant for the provision of certain services at pre-agreed rates for a period of 3 years. Copies of the Minutes of the 14th AHTC Meeting can be found at S/No. 907 of the CB and copies of the Appointment Agreements dated 1 December 2012 can be found at S/No. 55 to 58 of the CB.</p>
8.	73	<p>"In response to the Contracts Manager's email of 28 November 2014, Sylvia raised a further question in her 1 December 2014 e-mail to ask whether there were any cost differences to merge the contracts. In response, Philip confirmed that the costs were <i>"competitive with no significant differences as we have selected the contracts under AHPETC at 2012 price levels for item 1 & 3 and for item 2 the pricing levels from 2013 covers 5 divisions."</i> I also note that other TCs such as Bishan-Toa Payoh TC had also similarly constituted a panel of consultants for consultancy services for the implementation of projects in Bishan-Toa Payoh Town Council Estates for the period from 1 August 2017 to 31 October 2020. 4 consultants were appointed to this panel. A copy of this provisional tender result can be found at S/No. 88 of the CB. A copy of Sylvia's e-mail exchanges with the Contracts Manager can be found at S/No. 733 of the CB."</p> <p>[The deleted section above is found at paragraph 55 of the AEIC.]</p>

S/No.	Para No.	Amendments
9.	77	<p>On 22 August 2013, Rentokil was appointed by AHTC pursuant to a tender for pest control services called by AHTC on 12 July 2013. Tender bids were received from Rentokil and Pest-Pro and the tender was eventually awarded to Rentokil on 22 August 2013. The Tender Evaluation Report setting out the award of the contract to Rentokil can be found at S/No. 1794 1790 of the CB.</p>
10.	81 and 82	<p>As such, the PQM score is not entirely determinative and cannot be relied without more in the process of assessing the tenderers when awarding contracts. An assessment will still have to be made of other factors. Otherwise, there will be no utility in having committees such as the T&C Committee or conducting tender interviews of the tenderers. It is during such interviews that assessment of the contractor's ability can be made, such as whether they appear competent and hold themselves out to the qualifications that they or the company professes to have.</p> <p>(1) Conservancy and Cleaning Works Contract: Awarding Contract No. OT/0338/14 ("OT/0338/14") to Titan Facilities Management Pte Ltd ("Titan") through a fresh tender instead of extending the term of Contract No. PE 26 ("PE 26"); and,</p> <p>(2) Servicing and Maintenance of Fire Protection Systems Contract: Awarding Contract No. OT/0337/14 ("OT/0337/14") to J Keart Alliances Pte Ltd ("J Keart") through a fresh tender instead of extending the term of Contract No. PE 40 ("PE 40")</p> <p>Copies of the Tender Evaluation Report and the Minutes of the T&C Committee's Meeting on 17 August 2013 can be found at S/No. 1789 and 1790 of the CB. It is also clearly reflected in Paragraph 3 of the said Minutes that the members of the T&C Committee (all of whom were present at this meeting) gave its approval for the award of tender at this meeting. In this regard, Rule 74 of the TCFR does not require all members of the T&C Committee to sign off on the Tender Evaluation Report to approve the award of the tender.</p> <p>(1) <u>Conservancy and Cleaning Works Contract: Awarding Contract No. OT/0338/14 ("OT/0338/14") to Titan Facilities Management Pte Ltd ("Titan") through a fresh tender instead of extending the term of Contract No. PE 26 ("PE 26"); and,</u></p>

S/No.	Para No.	Amendments
		(2) <u>Servicing and Maintenance of Fire Protection Systems Contract: Awarding Contract No. OT/0337/14 (“OT/0337/14”) to J Keart Alliances Pte Ltd (“J Keart”) through a fresh tender instead of extending the term of Contract No. PE 40 (“PE 40”)</u>
11.	92	<p>PRPTC’s calculations in the above table at paragraph 103(c) of its SOC which form the basis of its claim that Titan’s rates of \$10.55 under OT/0338/14 were 67% higher than the rates of \$6.30 under PE 26 are based on the erroneous assumption that the number of equivalent dwelling units (“EDUs”) for zone SK2 decreased from 9,128 (under PE 26) to 8,297 (under OT/0338/14). This is not possible because Punggol East SMC is a young, growing town. The figure of 8,297 adopted by PRPTC in the above table also fails to take into account car park lots managed under OT/0338/14. A copy of the relevant pages from the contract documents of OT/0338/14 and PE 26 can be found at S/No. 1009 1010 of the CB (see Tab 7 and Tab 8 of the Bundle of Response). In fact, HDB’s property master list shows that the residential units in Punggol East SMC grew from 14,677 in May 2013 (i.e. when AHTC took over Punggol East SMC) to 14,949 in April 2015 (i.e. when the new Titan contract commenced) and to 15,629 in November 2015 (i.e. just before AHTC handed over control of Punggol East SMC to the Plaintiff). A copy of HDB’s property master list for May 2013, April 2015 and November 2015 can be found at S/No. 1419 of the CB.</p>