

**Swieqi Local Council at DLG**

**From:** Alfred Curmi [alfredcurmi@onvol.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 16, 2015 12:05  
**To:** Swieqi Local Council at DLG  
**Cc:** noel@noelmuscat.com; justfenech@gmail.com; keaneo@onvol.net; rrossignaud@gmail.com; maabela@onvol.net; alex.cheitcui01@gmail.com; paul.fenech@melita.com; said.carmen@gmail.com  
**Subject:** FW: Sch. 84 - Addition  
**Attachments:** 18 (patching various).xls; feb-2015 slc.docx; sch 84 (03.01.15-12.02.15).xls; \_Certification\_.htm

Thanks Clarissa,

I confirm that those additional invoices referred to have been taken into consideration although subsequent to the various undernoted corrections and observations, subtotals and totals need to be duly amended. No doubt, you will discuss with Mr. Zammit where appropriate:

- 02. Exec. Sec. (10978) – should read 109.76
  - 04. Road Servicing Ltd (47199.90) – Once this is being absorbed from UIF Funds, whatever expense will be reimbursed?
  - 07. Allied Newspapers (211.22) – a copy of the advert to be attached.
  - 15. WasteServ ( 10,020.99) – As had been queried in my previous reports, his particular overhead calls for clarification. I fail to understand why the corresponding figure featured in the Year End Accounts totals 84,863. Does this mean that the variance of 42,659 between the original allocation of 43,204, is yet to be reimbursed by the company. whichever the case, written confirmation to this effect is essential to say the least. This needs serious discussion during today's meeting.
  - 16. Gov. Prop. Dept. (2,557.50) – incorrect, should read 2,577.50
  - 24. N. Borg (4,000.00) – incorrect, should read 400.00
  - 42-44. Go pic (various) –why are Go's invoices still being addressed to our previous premises, surely they should have been notified. Likewise, why are various amounts relating to the latter address still being invoiced to us when the premises had been vacated long ago?
  - 71. Koperattiva Tabelli (4,640.74) – This amount includes 3,138.44 which relates to work undertaken between February/July of 2014. With every respect, had Works Orders been issued, such an unacceptable situation been avoided!
  - 68/9. Xnak Fruits & veg. (various) – in both instances, description to read: Hospitality & Cleaning Material
  - 77. Mica Med. Ltd (3.00) – incorrect, should read 33.00. Also Invoice N. 1130 d/ 31.12.14 for 154.10 omitted.
- Incidentally, Mica Med persist in ignoring their contractual obligations both in terms of inclusion of actual repairs dates as also late submission of invoices. This should not be tolerated and the only way of stopping this practice is for the council to withhold settlement.
- Please add Marlow's Invoice for 54.00 since received
- Before concluding, am glad to note that the numerical sequence recommended is facilitating reconciliation but would suggest that against each number is listed the respective Schedule of Payments document; hat is 01/84, 02/84 and so forth. Finally could the copies of any handwritten Works/Purchase Orders be more legible and in most instances, his is not so.

As usual, this e-mail to be attached to the corresponding minutes as an appendix. Thanks.