# REPLY BY THE MINISTER OF THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT TO QUESTIONS ASKED PURSUANT TO RULE 6 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE BY DEPUTY P GILLSON

### **Question 1**

Was it considered appropriate for any departmental specific standards/comparators to be used for benchmarking? If so, please detail by function, i.e. Estates, Financial. Procurement, HR-management and HR – recruitment.

#### Answer

The Department understands that the SAP Project Board did not consider it appropriate, for a variety of reasons, to attempt to use or create department specific standards and comparators for benchmarking.

# **Question 2**

If the answer to question 1 is yes, may I have an example of the departmental specific baseline data as well as confirmation of when it was collected and collated into baseline data?

#### **Answer**

Not applicable.

# **Question 3**

I appreciate that there may be valid reasons why departmental specific benchmarks are not appropriate. If the answer to question 1 was no, I would like to understand why it was thought appropriate not to have any departmental specific baseline assessments of pre-SAP service standards. Would you explain the reasoning?

#### Answer

A lack of common practices and standards across the various departments is the principal reason why benchmark data was not used. To be of benefit, benchmark data are only useful if the comparators have some relevance to one another and in this set of circumstances this was not felt to be the case.

### **Question 4**

As noted above, I assume that prior to the system change-over either departmental staff or the SAP project team would have produced, for the more generic comparators, some pre-SAP baseline data relating to your department:

- Was any such baseline data produced for your department?
- *If so may I have an example of the data?*
- If so please confirm when the data was collected and collated into baseline data?

### Answer

The answer to Question 1 explains why such data was not collated into baseline data.

**Date of Receipt of the Question:** 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2013

**Date of Reply:** 11<sup>th</sup> July 2013