

Feedback on SOA-QPS Review

With reference to the specific points raised in the Consultation Paper, please find below our comments / suggestions.

Regards
 Suren Safaya
 Programme Manager,
 SOA-QPS Cat:1-4.

UNISYS
 GPS/GOIS - Hong Kong
 ☎: Switchboard: (852)-2879-3800
 ☎: Direct: (852)-2879-3057
 ☎: Fax: (852)-2827-5304
 ✉: suren.safaya@hk.unisys.com

THIS COMMUNICATION MAY CONTAIN CONFIDENTIAL AND/OR OTHERWISE PROPRIETARY MATERIAL and is thus for use only by the intended recipient. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the e-mail and its attachments from all computers.

Para #	Consultation Point
23	Categorisation of Services and Suppliers We welcome views from the industry on the categorization of services and contractors, and the grouping of contractors within service categories. Suggestions with supporting reasons will be most appreciated.
	Unisys Response: With reference to existing Category-3, some of the SM&S Services are bundled with the SA&D and SI&I and Nursing. Other times some B/Ds issue WABs for SM&S Service under the in existing Category-2 Services. Suggest that all SM&S Services requested should be procured through Category-2 Only. This may ease some of the financial implications for the Vendors bidding in Category-3.
28	Participation by Suppliers We welcome views on the number of contractors in various service categories-groups for participation by suppliers.
	Unisys Response: Should not be more than 3-4 in each category.
32	Length of Contracts We welcome views on the “duration” for the new arrangement to succeed the current SOA-QPS.
	Unisys Response: The current SOA-QPS duration of 36-months, with optional 6-months should be maintained. However, it should be noted that sometimes, some of the Work Assignments have requested for even 3 to 10-years Service from the Vendor, which puts it beyond the tenure of the SOA-QPS Programme life cycle. Criteria and definitions pertaining to the life of such WAB should be addressed in the SOA.
37	Selection of Contractors and Quality Consideration We welcome views from the industry on the subject of supplier selection and quality consideration in general and in particular the quality weighting in the selection of contractors to undertake work assignments.

	<p>Unisys Response: Weighing criteria – add more weight on quality and experience and less on price, which will reduce overall project risks and ensure higher quality delivery</p>
41	<p>Categorisation of Human Resources We welcome suggestions on ways to improve the service charging structure, the human resources categorisation structure and the supplier-specific staff categories in the new arrangement.</p>
	<p>Unisys Response: Loosen requirement for onsite resident resource – better leverage global expertise and capability while providing cost effective resource.</p>
44	<p>Sub-contracting: We welcome views on this subject.</p>
	<p>Unisys Response: The current arrangement for adding sub-contractors is satisfactory.</p>
50	<p>Contractor’s Liability: We would like to explore possible approaches of determining contractor’s liability under the two-stage procurement process of SOA-QPS. We welcome suggestions on this subject.</p>
	<p>Unisys Response: 1) Refund clause – suggest milestone driven acceptance. This will create a fair risk sharing structure that enforces user involvement throughout the project and create buy-in from the user. In other words, once the milestone deliverable is accepted, invoiced and paid for by the government, that portion of the Work Assignment payment should not be subject to any refund clause. This will also enable global corporation to more actively participate in the program. Otherwise, due SOX compliance, it puts severe financial constraints on the proposed Bid by the MNC Vendors. 2) Unlimited liability clause – suggest project specific liability cap to provide better risk management for vendors.</p>
53	<p>Timing for Proposal Submission: We welcome views in respect of the process and time window for preparing service proposals.</p>
	<p>Unisys Response: Proposal Submission window should be increased to 4-Weeks.</p>
57	<p>Payment for Services We would like to solicit views on ways to further improve the payment structure, if any.</p>
	<p>Unisys Response: Most of the payment schedule of the WABs are payable on completion of project. It will create cash-flow issues to most companies. Therefore "payment by milestone" will be a better approach for us.</p>
AOB	<p>Misc: Some processes or work-flow pertaining to co-ordination or administration of the SOA-QPS Programme appear to be redundant and unproductive for the participating Vendors or B/Ds. These processes need to be further simplified. Example:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">a) CPAR - submission of copies of the Staff Professional Certification Requirements.b) CRF - Clearer Guidelines should be given to B/Ds in managing the CRF process, so that they do not keep these overtly pending for B/Ds approval.c) SCI – Vendor required to submit the copy of Service Contract Information provided by the awarding B/D, who could directly provided it to the SOA-QPS Administrators.d) Monthly Return - Reporting Excel spreadsheet should provide option to input figures in US\$, instead of the vendor required to convert these into HK Dollars each time.
--	--