

11<sup>th</sup> April 2012

Office of the Government Chief Information Officer  
6/F., North Point Government Offices  
333 Java Road  
North Point  
Hong Kong

For the attention of Mr. Paul P.K. PANG

Dear Mr. Pang,

Re: Feedback on the Standing Offer Agreement for Quality Professional Services 2 Review

We acknowledge that the Office of the Government Chief Information Officer ("OGCIO") has adopted a procurement arrangement named the Standing Offer Agreement for Quality Professional Services 2 ("SOA-QPS2") since July 2009 and such arrangement will expire in July 2013.

The OGICO is welcome to hear comments from the market players to explore if there are any areas for further improvement prior to launching another replacement of the SOQ-QPS2. This letter is to offer the OGCIO comments from the perspective of a professional service firm in response to the consultation paper dated 15 March 2012, as follows:

### 1.1 Cateogrisation of Services and Suppliers

- Services categorisation should be technology independent – the focus should be put on enhancing the service delivery capabilities of providers;
- We are concerned about separating "Independent Testing" as a new service category. Testing forms core part of ensuring quality system development, therefore it should be one of the services in the existing service category instead. By including such new focus in the existing service category, it is a positive encouragement to service providers in Hong Kong upon establishing a more comprehensive testing approach, thus further enhancing the quality of deliverables / system development;
- It is also welcome to consider expanding business scope to cover privacy impact assessment as well as Information Systems Strategy Study;
- It is worth considering to enable service providers to apply for switching categories during the validity period; and

- For Category 4 Information Security Services, the skills and experience required for IT Security Monitoring and Incident Response Support Services is different from the remaining services which are on one-off basis, i.e. Security Risk Assessment and Audit Services; and Security Management Design and Implementation Services. Therefore, it is recommended to separate IT Security Monitoring and Incident Response Support Services to a separate sub-service category, say under Service Category 2.

## **1.2 Participation by Suppliers**

- Agreed with the current setup.

## **1.3 Length of Contracts**

- Agreed with the current setup.

## **1.4 Bidding Performance**

- It is expected to have a higher transparency for the bidding performance evaluation framework - the current ranking mechanism does not provide adequate information to service provider for specific improvement upon future bidding.

## **1.5 Categorisation of Human Resources**

- There exists mis-alignment of skills/years of experience/category for application development applying emerging technologies, e.g. mobile application development. When compared to other mature/developed skills, people with such “emerging” skills are of relative higher demand to the market, thus resulting in higher charge but with fewer years of experience – it is therefore recommended to establish mechanism of addressing/reviewing this "mis-alignment" aligning the “market” force on a regular basis;
- In view of aligning with the people requirement in China IT market, it is recommended to review and align with the professional certification in China, such as 中國計算機技術與軟件專業技術資格, enabling a comparable standard be applied/required upon our IT specialists/practitioners; and
- In substantiating Hong Kong as a global city, there should be mechanism to recognise people with overseas IT experiences.

## **1.6 Sub-contracting**

- Agreed with the current setup.

## **1.7 Timing for Proposal Submission**

- Agreed with the current arrangement provided that:
  - submission of proposal in pdf format is allowed
  - having standardised CV template across b/ds

## **1.8 Payment for Services**

- It is recommended that all b/ds should adopt a payment schedule proportional to the efforts contributed by the service provider.

### 1.9 Continuity of Project Staff


- We do not agree with the proposed “debarment” of core staff – subject to the complexity of the project, it is quite common that a project manager might be running a few projects in parallel; and
- It is recommended that b/ds should reconfirm with the service provider for staff availability as a mandatory step before awarding the contract.

### 1.10 Project Delay

- It is welcome to be awarded with marks for service providers completing projects on time instead of having any deduction mechanism; and
- In regards to the Contractor Performance Appraisal Report, it is recommended to have an “appeal” mechanism available to service vendors.

Should you expect any clarification, please contact me at (852) 2852-6562 or [karonwan@deloitte.com](mailto:karonwan@deloitte.com) at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,



Karon Wan  
Principal  
Deloitte Consulting (Hong Kong) Limited