

Feedback to Consultation on the Standing Offer Agreement for Quality Professional Services 2 (SOA-QPS2) in the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region issued on 15 March, 2012

- by Kinetix Systems Limited on 11 April, 2012

(a) Categorisation of Services and Suppliers

1. Keep HK\$1.43M as a bidding ceiling but allow 100% Assignment Change Request.
2. There is no need to separate technology groups. The skill and experience shall be addressed in staff requirement.
3. "Independent Testing" service category should be introduced.

(b) Participation by Suppliers

1. Suggest using 6 contractors per category per group.

(c) Length of Contracts

1. 5-years term is suggested.

(d) Bidding Performance

1. Participation mark should be counted as full mark if participation reaches a percentage, say 50%.
2. Current CPAR allows contractor to "NOT Agree" B/D rating but there is no further process to follow. There should be an "Appeal Board" to determine the final rating if both B/D and contractors disagree with the rating in CPAR.
3. For general and technical sub-score, specific ranking, rather than 1/2/3 group ranking, should be used.

(e) Categorisation of Human Resources

1. Current use of Category 11 and 12 for consultant/specialist serves well for categorization of requirement of various technologies.
2. Staff requirements of some WABs were too specific to a particular expertise or is not generally available on market. Thus non-compliances are resulted for these assignments. It is suggested to use "desirable features", not mandatory staff requirements, for these situations.
3. Qualification for staff replacement should be compared with those listed in WAB, NOT those of the resigned staff.

4. PM and SA effort can NOT be denied in request of system enhancement.

(f) Sub-contracting

1. Current process for sub-contractor application is adequate.

(g) Timing for Proposal Submission

1. 2 weeks and 4 weeks for minor and major category proposal preparation is adequate.
2. It should be mandated that B/D to provide 'searchable' soft copy, preferably MS Word Copy, to contractors when the assignments are issued.
3. Submission of PDF via email should be considered.
4. Standardisation of skill summary template should be considered so that contractors need only 1 set of templates for proposal submission.

(h) Payment for Services

1. Regular interval of payment for implementation services should be clearly stated in guideline and allowed.
2. Stage payment of 10% PID, 30% SA&D, 40% UAT, 10% Production and 10% PER, should be recommended to B/D.
3. Hourly rate should not be allowed.

(i) Continuity of Project Staff

1. Staff continuity issue, if needed to be concerned, is already covered by CPAR. No marks shall be deducted if the overall service performance is not affected.

(j) Project Delay

1. Current use of CPAR plus proposed appeal board should serve well to make contractor accountable for project delay.

(k) Other feedback:

1. Recommend a standard marking scheme of 60% on quality and 40% on price for WAB evaluation.
2. Contractor Liability should be cap within 1.5 or 2 times the specific assignment's value.