

Please find our comments:

*1. The difference in the ceiling project prices (1.3 million vs 10 million) for minor and major groups in Cat 3 is too large. The ceiling project price for minor group should be increased (say to 3 - 5 million) so that the gap, in terms of project sum, between two groups can be narrowed.*

*2. Although 7:3 "technical to pricing ratio" was used in the marking scheme for selecting contractors for SOA-QPS, 3:7 technical to pricing ratio is used in marking scheme for individual assignment brief. It is suggested to align the marking scheme for individual assignment brief with that for SOA in order to encourage the contractors to put more emphasis on technical merit instead of price cutting.*

*3. Payment term is still the biggest challenge to the contractors in SOA-QPS, especially for minor group. Although there is guideline on fair payment terms in SOA, the Bureax and Departments seldom follow. It is suggested that regular payment (monthly, bi-monthly or quarterly) should be enforced by default for projects longer than certain period.*

*4. More and more projects remove the payment milestone for project initiation and the first payment is usually delayed to after completion of SA&D. This would have impact to the cash flow and hence the motivation for getting award of projects, espc for minor group contractors*

Regards

ESRI CHINA(HK) Limited