

Twitter Thread by tolu ogunlesi

**tolu ogunlesi**[@toluogunlesi](#)

There's a recurring misunderstanding/misinterpretation of public procurement numbers/costs, that does no one any good. If there's going to be a debate let it at least be based on facts/reality not conjecture, not knee-jerk responses.

Another #thread ■

A few days ago I complained about a bad piece by [@GuardianNigeria](#), in which they were busied themselves dividing distance by cost and then proceeding to make wild comparisons between rail projects. While also getting cost wrong in some cases. <https://t.co/88X7hvyn51>

Just seen a very poor piece from [@GuardianNigeria](#). Trying to Compare rail projects while getting basic facts wrong & making embarrassingly pedestrian (no pun intended) points. [#LagosIbadanRail](#) = 156km distance but actual rail length close to 400km because DOUBLE-track\u2014not SINGLE pic.twitter.com/H6sgulUA1I

— tolu ogunlesi (@toluogunlesi) [January 19, 2021](#)

The nuances of procurement, whether public or private sector, can hardly be accurately conveyed in your typical news headline, especially when headlines are driven mostly by virality ambitions. Always good to try and understand full picture before jumping to conclusions.

Important point: It's very necessary for citizens to be able to assess public procurement projects for transparency & cost-efficiency. So I'm not saying don't ask questions. Far from it. I'm simply saying all assessments MUST be based on a full picture, not headlines / conjecture

Take example of Super Tucanos. You'd read somewhere that Nigeria signed an almost \$600m deal with the US Govt for 12 aircraft. Guess what our papers will do ■

They'll do their typical 'dividing' and say Nigeria paid \$50m per aircraft. (The plane is not that expensive btw).

The reality is of course different. Nigeria paid not just for 12 aircraft, but ALSO for (according to the agreement): "all associated training, spare parts, aviation and ground support equipment, and HANGAR, facilities, and INFRASTRUCTURE required to support the program."

If we already had a HANGAR for these planes (and other supporting infrastructure) it's very likely we would have paid less. It's that simple.

A simple analogy is this: I tell you I bought an iPhone for N600,000, and you immediately say I've been scammed or I inflated the cost, because you bought your own iPhone for N250,000. Without asking what model of iPhone I bought, and what the specs are. Did I also buy insurance?

It's the same thing with this Automated Fare System. You hear eTicketing and just assume it's 'app and website'. How much be app, lol. Not realizing it includes lots of hardware and devices, software licensing, as well as being for a TEN YEAR period of operation + maintenance.

It is only when you're aware of all this that any sensible debate can then be had, if we are being honest. There's no value in ignorance, unless that ignorance leads to a desire(that is acted upon) for information and facts. Knee jerk responses are always embarrassing + unhelpful