Feedback on SOA-QPS2 Review from Integrated Enterprise Solutions Ltd. (IES) (April 11, 2012)

Below are our comments on the Consultation paper :

(a) Categorisation of Services and Suppliers

1. It should be technology neutral. It encourages the vendors to keep on developing and enhancing its service delivery capability. With the current setup of sub-contractor, it would allow more participants to get involved and help the HK IT industry with a healthy growth.

2. We agree it is possible to have a service request purely for independent testing. However, it is not necessary to have a separate service category. Testing is part of quality software deliverable. Including this item in the existing service category would encourage the vendor to put more focus on developing their testing management and procedure. It helps the growth of the HK IT industry.

3. We suggest an upward adjustment on the limit of contract value of Service Category 2's and Service Category 3's Minor Group from HK$1.3 million to some higher value, say HK$2.5 million. It aligns with the professional certification recognized in China such as the "中國計算機技術與軟件專業技術資格 (水平)–信息系統項目管理師(高級資格)" that the project manager should have at least 2 projects with total project value over 5 million RMB. It also affects these companies to achieve high levels of 工業和信息化部計算機系統集成資質認証. If we keep on maintaining this level, the HK IT SMEs would never have the chance to achieve higher qualification and would never help them to penetrate into mainland China market.

    To prevent larger companies from entering into minor group market, we can limit the number of projects with this budget value to a certain number per year, say 10.

(b) Participation by Suppliers

1. We agree with the current arrangement on the number of contractors in each service category and the assignment of the tenders on random basis.

(c) Length of Contract

1. We agree with the current arrangement to maintain the duration of the contract to be 48 months. Technology change should not be a major factor to determine the contract duration. It would be the technology change that forces the companies to strengthen their service delivery capability that they need to keep up with the latest technology.

(d) Bidding Performance

1. We suggest the SOA-QPS Programme Office should disclose their bidding performance evaluation scheme so that we can determine what action we should take. On certain occasions, we do not have available resources with the required skill category. To maintain a bidding performance, we have to prepare a proposal but it does not propose any project team members. It may affect the quality of our proposal. However, we are not sure which option would help us get a better performance. The current ranking mechanism does not give the vendor sufficient information on their resources allocation to improve their bidding performance.

(e) Categorisation of Human Resources

1. We suggest OGCIO should review and allow vendors to propose new skills categories together with its service rates to reflect the latest emerging technologies and years of experience of the respective skill category on annual basis. It should be reflected to users' departments so that they would put down those new skills categories in their Work Assignment Brief.

(f) Sub-contracting

1. We agree with the current arrangement.

(g) Timing for Proposal submission

1. Normally, 2-week time is sufficient. However, for some projects that are relatively complex and a tender briefing is provided, it would be better to allow more time to prepare for the proposal submission. It is subject to B/D's decision on case-by-case basis and would not affect the required speed of procurement.

(h) Payment for Services

1. We hope that the payment installment should be arranged such that interval of payment milestone should not be more than 3 months.

(i) Continuity of Project Staff

1. It is likely and inevitable that the same person may be proposed in more than one assignment as we are uncertain our bid would be successful or not. To minimize the impact to the B/D, we would suggest B/D may confirm with the Contractor on staff's availability through clarification before awarding the contract.

(j) Project Delay

1. There are many factors contributing to project delay. If a penalty is involved, there would be a lot of disputes that damage the relationship with each other. Instead of imposing penalty, we think It would be more positive to reward those vendors which deliver the project on-time by increasing their technical score.