<u>Written Feedback:</u>

01. 2Fi.pdf
02. AECOM.pdf
03. Aisino.pdf
04. Anderson.pdf
05. ASL.pdf
06. Bityuan.pdf
07. C&T.pdf
08. ChinaMobile.pdf
09. ChinaTelecom.pdf
10. CSA.pdf
11. eWalker.pdf
12. HKIE.pdf
13. HKNETEA.pdf
14. HKPASEA.pdf
15. HKT.pdf
16. LiberalParty.pdf
17. Memorable.pdf
18. Nexify.pdf
19. OneConnect.pdf
20. OveArup.pdf
21. SystemAid.pdf
22. TopLevel.pdf
23. Votee.pdf

Consultation on the future arrangement of the SOA-QPS

<u>Feedback Form</u>

Part 1 : Basic Information

Name:	Dennis Wong
Name of organisation / company (if applicable):	2Fi Business Solutions Limited
Contact number:	3421 2472
Email address:	dennis.wong@2fi-solutions.com.hk

Part 2: Consultation

Please provide your comments/suggestions (may supplement with a separate sheet if necessary):

1. <u>In the course of specifying contractor experience requirements and staff requirements in preparing work assignment briefs, B/Ds should strike careful balance between promoting bid participation from wider spectrum of contractors and managing project delivery risk. B/Ds should avoid raising unnecessary entry bars against bid participation due to specification of unnecessarily stringent contractor experience or staff requirements. Instead, more focus should be put on contractors' past performance in assessing risk of projects to be delivered by respective contractors.</u>

2. <u>It is prudent and reasonable to proceed with project fee payment only upon Contractor's satisfactory delivery of services and associated deliverables. On the other hand, however, it is advisable that B/Ds should consider the circumstances of each project, and try the best to break project fee payment down into different smaller payment milestones, and include a down payment wherever possible. This could ease the pressure being faced by Contractors and Sub-Contractors in managing project cashflow, and could demonstrate the Government's caring on the financial well-beings of enterprises and practitioners in the industry.</u>

Please submit the feedback form by email to qps_consultation@digitalpolicy.gov.hk on or before **22 October 2024**.

Consultation on the future arrangement of the SOA-QPS

Feedback Form

Part 1 : Basic Information

Name:	Thomson Lai
Name of organization / company (if applicable):	AECOM Asia Company Limited
Contact number:	+852 3856 0045
Email address:	Thomson.lai@aecom.com

Part 2 : Consultation

Item:	1 – Tender Evaluation System for Unreasonable Low Bid
Comment / Suggestion:	Would SOA-QPS6 introduce an enhanced tender evaluation system to avoid unreasonable low bid and promote professional standards? There has been growing concern in the industry that there are contractors has submitted significant lower bid that affected the overall projects quality and schedule. What more worrying is the lower tender price often leads to a poor working environment (inadequate staff and long working hours) for the professionals, especially the younger ones. Weighting of fee-quality score is widely adopted in different B/Ds and oversea government procurement process.

Item:	2 – Criteria for Category D
Comment / Suggestion:	Could the bidder of the QPS6 know the criteria for participating the Category D in advance? For example, the requirement on the certifications, experience on the professional staff and experience on company project. It could facilitate more company to participate and offer higher quality of the professional service. Could DPO provide more details on the proposed certifications - 信息技術應用創新專業人員認證證書 (ITAIP)? Different certificates categories are found when browsing the website. Further to the question above, would the criteria mainly rely on the experience on the professional staff? It is suggested not limiting to company experience only, as bidder could employ experienced professional staff in advance if they are interested to participate different professional service category such as Category D.

Item:	3 – Business Entity
Comment / Suggestion:	If there is a business owner which have 2 different company entities, for example company A and company B, they might use one of the entities (e.g. Company A) as the sub-contractor for Category A Major group while could use another business entity (e.g. Company B) for Category A minor group, is that eligible even using the same CV? How DPO could control such situation?

Item:	4 – Contract Deposit
Comment / Suggestion:	Due to recent economy situation and high inflation rate, the environment has proposed issues in regards with contractor's financial standpoints, could the contract deposit been adjusted to improve contractor's resources and retainment? Or increase the frequency of Review Ceiling Rates to annually?

Item:	5 – Improve awareness of Work Assignment Brief template to B/Ds
Comment / Suggestion:	B/D staff are not aware that the WAB template can be modified. Suggest DPO to provide awareness (e.g. remarks / guidelines) in the template or other channels (e.g. briefing / video, etc).

Item:	6 – Additional Contact details of Tenderer
Comment / Suggestion:	Would DPO consider including more than One (1) contact details of Tenderer when awarded with QPS?

Consultation on the future arrangement of the SOA-QPS

Feedback Form

Part 1 : Basic Information

Name:	Raymond LEE
Name of organisation / company (if applicable):	Aisino Corporation Aisino International Limited
Contact number:	91731608
Email address:	raymond.lee@aisino.com.hk

Part 2: Consultation

I am writing on behalf of Aisino to express our concerns regarding the proposed changes in the government tender QPS requirements, particularly the P6 and P7 adjustments in raising the demarcation and financial limit for Category A Minor and Category A Major projects.

While we appreciate the increase in the budget limit for Category A Minor projects from 3m HKD to 5m HKD, the significant change in the budget range for Category A Major projects, from 5m to 25m HKD, poses a challenge for companies like ours.

As a company currently operating in the Category A Major segment, this adjustment will impact on the number of projects we can actively pursue. With the new threshold, a considerable number of projects fall outside of our typical project scope. This change directly affects our ability to compete effectively in the QPS projects, especially considering the scarcity of projects exceeding 3m HKD in recent times.

We believe that these adjustments may unintentionally hinder the participation of capable companies like Aisino in the QPS projects. We kindly request a reconsideration of the proposed changes to ensure fair opportunities for all eligible companies and to maintain a competitive landscape that encourages innovation and quality in project delivery.

Thank you for considering our perspective on this matter. We are open to further discussions and collaboration to find solutions that benefit both the government's objectives and the industry for a win-win consequence.

Consultation on the future arrangement of the SOA-QPS

Feedback Form

Part 1 : Basic Information

Name: **Peter Chan**

Name of organisation /
company (if applicable): **Anderson Multimedia Communications (HK) Limited**

Contact number: **2877 3331**

Email address: **info@amcl.com.hk**

Part 2: Consultation

Please provide your comments/suggestions (may supplement with a separate sheet if necessary):

Proposal P1:

Comments: It is better to add equivalent qualification certificates, instead of only 信息技術應用創新專業人員認證證書 for the key project staff and list out some equivalent certificates for the companies to follow.

Similarly, it is better to add some equivalent sources of experience for technologies of the key project staff, instead of only based on technologies published at website of the China Information Technology Security Evaluation Center (中國信息安全測評中心).

In (D) "it is desirable that the tenderer be one of the Technical Support Unit (TSU) of the China National Vulnerability Database of Information Security (CNNVD) within the past twelve months." Please reconsider this requirement, It is difficult to fulfill this requirement.

Proposal P2 to P7: no comments

Note: A copy of organization details attached

Please submit the feedback form by email to qps_consultation@digitalpolicy.gov.hk on or before **22 October 2024**.

Consultation on the future arrangement of the SOA-QPS

<u>Feedback Form</u>

Part 1 : Basic Information

Name:	Irene Chung
Name of organisation / company (if applicable):	Automated Systems (H.K.) Limited
Contact number:	2608 6286
Email address:	ichung2@asl.com.hk

Part 2: Consultation

Please provide your comments/suggestions (may supplement with a separate sheet if necessary):

With regards to the SOA-QPS6 Consultation Paper (Consultation on the Future Arrangement), we would like to express our comments/suggestions as below:

<u>About P1 - Introducing a new Category for IT systems adopting diversified secure and reliable technologies</u>

Item P1.1: Would DPO provide the detailed grade / level, types & roles of "信息技術應用創新專業人員認證證書"?

Item P1.2: Would DPO provide a list of certified examination / assessment organizations for the "信息技術應用創新專業人員認證證書" located in HK?

<u>About P2 - Enhancing the regulating and monitoring procedures of contractor's performance</u>

Item P2.1: Concerning the conditions of "Poor performance in individual work assignments", would DPO consider to use "ratio" (a certain percentage of poor performance projects of total projects) instead of absolute number of projects, i.e. 2 projects per current proposal?

About P6 - Raising the Demarcation Limit from HK$3 million to HK$5 million

Item P6.1: From data.gov.hk, only ~5% (in terms of number of WAB invitation) of SM&S invitation exceeds the awarded amount HK$5M or above. That implies in general SM&S services are mostly less that HK$5M per invitation. In case the demarcation limit is lifted from HK$3M to HK$5M, most contracts under Major group would fall into Minor group, which means the current contractors may not be able to bid the same SM&S service again in QPS6. This may lead to lack of system continuity for corresponding user departments.

We therefore suggest:

a) For budgeted SM&S services between HK$3M and HK$5M, allow both Major and Minor groups to bid; or

b) Add a new Category of QPS6 services for SM&S services only, without grouping in terms of contract values.

Other Comments/Suggestions:

Item O.1: How does DPO define the involvement of "mother" or "sister" company in bidding the upcoming QPS6 contract?

Item O.2: Would DPO consider extending the Bank Guarantee submission time to 21 working days or 28 calendar days?

Item O.3: Would DPO waive the debarment terms under Feasibility Study or Technical Study projects in QPS6?

Please submit the feedback form by email to qps_consultation@digitalpolicy.gov.hk on or before **22 October 2024**.

SOA-QPS 未來安排諮詢

回饋意見表格

第一部分：基本信息

姓名：	
機構／公司名稱（如適用）：	BITYUAN FOUNDATION LTD
聯絡電話：	8615373868229
電郵地址：	360518474@qq.com

第二部分：諮詢

請提供你的意見／建議（如有需要可另加紙填寫）：

請於 2024 年 10 月 22 日或之前將回饋意見表格透過電郵發送至 qps_consultation@digitalpolicy.gov.hk。

Consultant on the future arrangement of the SOA-QPS

Feedback Form

Part 1: Basic Information

Name: Deric Wong

Name of organization /

Company (if applicable):   Computer And Technologies Solutions Limited

Contact number: 25038115

Email address: deric_wong@ctil.com

Part 2: Consultation

P1: Introducing a new Category for IT systems adopting diversified secure and reliable technologies

Comment:

1. Local company is difficult to get the Mainland TSU of the China National Vulnerability Database of Information Security (CNNVD) within past 12 months which will affect the local company getting into the potential Cat D contractor lists.

2. There is no difference between Cat A/B and Cat D1/D2 in terms of service scope except more stringent admission requirement, it is a concern how department / bureau will choose the category for the project and may shift to new Cat D1/D2.

P2: Enhancing the regulating and monitoring procedures of contractor's performance

Comment:

Agreed but need review the effectiveness of current CPS mechanism by evaluating how many contractors were suspended throughout the current and previous SOA-QPS contract.

P3: Taking into account contractors' past performance in government IT contracts not awarded under the SOA-QPS scheme and the immediate preceding round of SOA-QPS contracts that are still active

Comment:

Agreed

P4: Setting up the Contract Administrative Matters Monitoring Mechanism

Comment:

This point deduction scheme is welcomed and points will be deducted according to a set of rules on administrative activities. It is understood that the points of contractors will be reviewed every 6 months. However, please advise if there is any actions from contractors that can gain back the points before the reviewing cycle.

P5: Merging Minor and Major Groups of Category C into one Group

Comment:

1. No comment on merging.
2. It is recommended to list detail of the service scope of this Category as so far it only list 'Electronic Record Keeping System' and 'Centrally Managed Message Platform' or Cat C just only include these two service scopes.

P6: Raising the Demarcation Limit from HK$3 million to HK$5 million

Comment:

No comment

P6: Raising the Financial Limit from HK$20 million to HK$25 million

Comment:

No comment

Other Comments:

1. Payment milestones of current WABs could not reflect the actual effort spent in each milestone. E.g. some WABs have milestones 4x% on SI&I which spans more than 10 months while 30% on 3 months nursing.

2. It is recommended to have standard tender preparation period for the contractors throughout the SOA period. E.g. some WABs only allow 1x days for preparation.

3. For the technical score calculation formula, the contractor experience outside government should also be considered instead of focus on experience on government, which will affect the new comers in the market. Contractors will less experience should be considered with other success factors.

4. For the project team member experience in technical score calculation formula, the current calculation favours those having experience on a particular role e.g. 10 years of AP got the highest score. However, based on the dynamic of IT industry, AP will be promoted to SA or more senior role after several years of experience. The current calculation discourage the uplift the skill of IT professionals.

Consultation on the future arrangement of the SOA-QPS

<u>Feedback Form</u>

Part 1 : Basic Information

Name:	SAMUEL CHEUNG
Name of organisation / company (if applicable):	CHINA MOBILE HONG KONG COMPANY LIMITED
Contact number:	92046569
Email address:	SAMUELCHEUNG@HK.CHINAMOBILE.COM

Part 2: Consultation

Please provide your comments/suggestions (may supplement with a separate sheet if necessary):

1. 建議加入相關的投標公司資質：

   （i） 認可投標的母公司、控股公司或子公司的相關經驗
   （experience of holding company or subsidiary）
   （ii） 認可投標公司供自己使用的相關經驗
   （experience provided for the Tenderer's own use， i.e. in-house）
   （iii） 認可國內與ISO相等的標準
   （iv） 認可公司體系相關認證
   （如ISO 37001反賄賂管理、ISO 37301合規管理系統）
   作 desirable requirement 增加技術得分。

2. 建議開一個全新有關5G範疇的大分類
   （如5G 切片， MDM， 低空經濟等）

Please submit the feedback form by email to qps_consultation@digitalpolicy.gov.hk on or before **22 October 2024**.

Consultation on the future arrangement of the SOA-QPS
Feedback Form

Part 1 : Basic Information

Name:	Nelson, Zhang Nan
Name of organisation /company (if applicable):	China Telecom Global Limited
Contact number:	852-8494 0785
Email address:	zhangnan@chinatelecomglobal.com

Part 2: Consultation

Please provide your comments/suggestions (may supplement with a separate sheet if necessary):

In Proposal 1: Introducing a new Category for IT systems adopting diversified secure and reliable technologies

1. The proposed key project staff must have the following certificate(s): • 信息技術應用創新專業人員認證證書，Please specify the issuing authority for this certificate for us to facilitate a combined study at a later stage. Additionally, please clarify if there are any equivalent personnel certifications that can substitute for this certificate.

2. It is desirable that the tenderer be one of the Technical Support Unit (TSU) of the China National Vulnerability Database of Information Security (CNNVD) within the past twelve months. CNNVD's TSU is divided into three levels. In this newly added requirement, several subsidiaries of our group are recognized as different levels of TSU under CNNVD. Please clarify the selection criteria for each level of TSU in the evaluation process. Moreover, if one of our mainland subsidiaries holds TSU qualifications, would our Hong Kong-based subsidiary be considered as equally qualified by virtue of being part of the same group?

In Proposals 5: Merging Minor and Major Groups of Category C into one Group.

1. We foresee that if merging the Minor and Major Groups of Category C into one Group, the workload of the quality control for the project would be significantly increased by the Government. For example, some SMEs may bid the existing Major Group project, which they may not have such manpower to do so. Therefore, the project may risk end up with delay schedule or even cannot be completed.

2. Meanwhile for the mid-large corporates they may also bid the existing Minor Group project with advantages such as better cost efficiency, as a result it may lower the winning chance of the existing SMEs in the Minor Group. The competition in this category may be out of control.

3. For the above concerns, we suggested to maintain the existing Minor

and Major Groups of Category C

In Proposals 6: Raising the Demarcation Limit from HK$3 million to HK$5 million.
1. Therefore, we do not recommend raising the HK$3 million demarcation limit. Due to the adjustment, minor suppliers will be eligible to participate in projects within the HK$3 million to HK$5 million range. Since most minor suppliers are small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), there may be concerns regarding their financial capacity to front-fund projects or their insufficient staffing. The risk of project delays or failure to deliver due to the supplier's lack of capability could increase.
2. Therefore, we do not recommend raising the HK$3 million demarcation limit.

Please submit the feedback form by email to
qps_consultation@digitalpolicy.gov.hk on or before 22 October 2024.

Consultation on the future arrangement of the SOA-QPS

Feedback Form

Part 1 : Basic Information

Name:	Claudius Lam
Name of organization / company (if applicable):	Cloud Security Alliance (HK & Macau Chapter)
Contact number:	+852 90220876
Email address:	chairman@csahkm.org

Part 2: Consultation

#	Questions and Comments
P1	**Introducing a new Category for IT systems adopting diversified secure and reliable technologies**
	1. We acknowledge the concerns of the HKSAR Government regarding economic issues and protectionism. However, we believe that creating a new category within QPS without a clear definition is not appropriate.
	2. Is this specifically related to the implementation of Category A projects? It's important to note that this solution will also impact both Category B and Category C projects.
	3. The process for conducting integrity checks needs to be clearly defined.
	4. The reference list for technologies currently only includes www.itsec.gov.cn/aqkkcp/cpgg/. Should we also propose locally developed products and solutions from Hong Kong? Many SMEs have created their own solutions. Given that Hong Kong requires multilingual support and traditional Chinese character support, careful consideration should be given to adopting the China Information Technology Security Evaluation Center's scheme.
	5. The Hong Kong Government, which promotes local SMEs, should also help all local product vendors meet relevant local technology standards.
	6. Before mandating that key project staff obtain specific certifications, the HKSAR Government should ensure that a localized version of the certification scheme and the necessary training is available in Hong Kong.
	7. Additionally, a bridging scheme should be established to map international certifications to those based in China.

	8. Since product vendors must be part of the Technical Support Unit (TSU) for the China National Vulnerability Database of Information Security (CNNVD), they should ensure the continuous provision of vulnerability and patch lists directly to B/Ds and SRAA contractors. Because CNNVD operates differently than NVD and CVE, many vulnerabilities and patches may not be publicly disclosed, which could lead to inaccuracies in existing vulnerability scanning tools during the SRAA.
P2	**Enhancing the regulating and monitoring procedures of contractor's performance**
	1. The current Contractor Performance Appraisal Report (CPAR) primarily emphasizes project delivery and time management, which is more relevant for Categories A and C. However, the specialized skill requirements for Category B projects have not been adequately addressed.
	2. Staff quality should also be taken into account. For example, in penetration testing, can the staff effectively explain the requirements, the risks involved, and their ability to communicate findings to the relevant B/D? We propose that the CPAR be updated to specifically include these essential criteria to maintain the quality of various Category projects, which will ultimately enhance the overall quality of the projects.
	3. Should the SOA-QPS contractor's performance be evaluated down to the level of individual project team members? Some issues may not solely stem from the company itself, but rather from the quality of its staff. While a company might resolve issues by replacing team members, should the quality of those individuals also be considered?
	4. Lastly, we recommend that the scoring system be adjusted to a numerical scale of 1 to 10. The current rating system limits companies to a narrow range of scores.
P3	**Taking into account contractors' past performance in government IT contracts not awarded under the SOA-QPS scheme and the immediate preceding round of SOA-QPS contracts that are still active**
	1. We conceptually agree with the proposal, emphasizing that the performance of all HKSAR government entities should be assessed collectively.
	2. However, the SOA-QPS team needs to determine how this can be effectively quantified. Many companies have participated in QPS both as subcontractors and prime contractors, and some have used different names when engaging as subcontractors and prime contractors under a single entity.

P4	**Setting up the Contract Administrative Matters Monitoring Mechanism**
	1. We agree that it is essential to establish a monitoring mechanism for contract administration, but it should be automated and user-friendly.
	2. Most prime and subcontractor companies are already involved in projects. If additional administrative tasks are introduced to the monitoring scheme, it will primarily serve to oversee administrative work, which would waste both the Government team's and the project team's time.
	3. Regarding acknowledgment tasks, could the e-PS system be simplified to include clear instructions and a straightforward acknowledgment button, rather than requiring responses through separate channels?
	4. Can the e-PS provide a standard proposal template? This would allow all project teams to fill out forms directly in the e-PS, making it easier for the Procurement team to review and compare proposals.
	5. Additionally, could the e-PS be equipped with a language model function to extract project team members from proposals, enabling continuous monitoring of changes to key personnel through the system?
	6. Contract management systems should offer a centralized and user-friendly management solution. Furthermore, could the contract management system be linked to the CR system to request the latest BR forms? If a company has already approved direct collection of the BR forms from the CR system, these could be updated automatically. Given that the HKSAR government is becoming increasingly digitalized, this should be part of the "automatic government" initiative.
P5	**Merging Minor and Major Groups of Category C into one Group**
	1. We have no objections to the merging of Category C
P6	**Raising the Demarcation Limit from HK$3 million to HK$5 million**
	1. Concerning CyberSecurity Services (Category B), there has been no distinction between minor and major group projects since QPS3. However, in the new QPS arrangement, we recommend that the HKSAR Government consider reintroducing requirements for the project group in Category B.
	2. Category B projects should be classified by departments according to tiers. For Tier 2 and Tier 3 systems, project requirements should be elevated, and the corresponding project man-days should also be increased. It is unrealistic to expect a company to conduct security assessments for these projects using the same standards applied to Tier 1 systems.
	3. Additionally, for Tier 1 systems, there should be a similar distinction based on the implementation costs of the IT projects. In fact, it is common for IT security expenditures to account for approximately 8-10% of the overall implementation cost.

P7	**Raising the Financial Limit from HK$20 million to HK$25 million**
	There are no objections to this proposed idea.
C1	**Additional comment on requirement including Security Requirement into Cat A projects**
	1. When defining an IT project, all departments should include the tier requirements of the system in the tender document, as this will impact the security requirements that need to be implemented. 2. If an IT project is to be executed using DevOps or Agile methodologies, an additional threat modelling scheme should be specified as part of the requirements for Category A implementation projects.
C2	**Ensure the WAB should be updated periodically**
	1. Currently, most B/Ds simply adopt the standard WAB and incorporate it into their WABs for QPS project cases. However, upon examining the technical details of the projects, as well as the project and staff requirements, we often find misalignments between the technical specifications and the staffing needs. 2. Additionally, project timelines are often overly tight, without a thorough evaluation of whether the project team has adequate time to complete the necessary tasks. 3. Furthermore, with the recent updates to security policies and practice guides, these changes should be taken into account as part of the environmental updates. The WAB and project requirements should also be revised accordingly. Otherwise, B/Ds and contractors may continue to rely on outdated requirements as the standard.
C3	**Ceiling Rate scheme**
	1. According to the "Ceiling Rate Scheme," contractors can propose staff charging rates lower than the corresponding ceiling rate to offer more competitive prices to the Government. However, this expectation is unreasonable. As noted in the P7 proposal, the HKSAR Government is already aware that salaries have increased by approximately 26%, so the ceiling rate should be raised by at least that same percentage. 2. Therefore, during the qualification round of QPS6, the ceiling rate should be adjusted upwards. 3. Additionally, if a company drastically reduces its bidding price, it may indicate underlying issues with the pricing strategy. 4. We recommend that the HKSAR Government consider implementing a "remove lowest" and "remove highest" pricing scheme in both the qualification and bidding rounds. 5. The HKSAR Government has a responsibility to ensure quality, price fairness, and the regulation of IT service quality. As such, the pricing marking scheme should be carefully evaluated.

C4	**Bidding requirement in SQA-QPS WAB**
	1. In the past, we have noticed that some Category B tenders attempt to combine SRAA, PIA, and Load/Stress Testing projects into a single package. However, a company that is capable of conducting SRAA or PIA may not necessarily have the expertise to perform Load/Stress Testing. 2. Therefore, we propose that the WAB should allow companies the option to participate in just one aspect of the project, rather than requiring them to offer all services, without penalizing them in the proposal evaluation process.
C5	**Standard Marking Scheme under the SOA-QPS5**
	1. Regarding the marking scheme for Category B cybersecurity services, we believe that the evaluation methodology and the technology-related criteria are quite limited, resulting in an unhealthy comparison overall. 2. First, the technical marks for Category B should include more specific comparisons related to the nature of the system being tested. For instance, if a container-based system is to be evaluated, team members should possess knowledge of container security. Similarly, if the system involves government cloud or virtualization technologies, the security testers should have expertise in cloud computing or virtualization security. A general CISSP certification does not necessarily indicate that the assessor has this specialized knowledge. 3. Second, the assessment methodology and the tools used should also be factored into the evaluation marks. 4. In the Category B marking scheme, one criterion that is consistently included but is not particularly relevant is A.4. Innovative Suggestions. This criterion is better suited for Category A implementation projects. In assessments, audits, and compliance reviews, methodologies tend to be quite similar, making many so-called innovative suggestions merely standard practices included to avoid losing marks. Furthermore, these suggestions are often not applicable to most projects. 5. Additionally, since Category B services rely heavily on the skills and technical knowledge of the project team, we propose that the marking scheme allocate at least 70% of the total marks to technical criteria.

Consultation on the future arrangement of the SOA-QPS

Feedback Form

Part 1 : Basic Information

Name:	Dr. Ricci IEONG
Name of organization / company (if applicable):	eWalker Consulting (HK) Ltd.
Contact number:	3499 1870
Email address:	info@ewalker.com.hk

Part 2: Consultation

#	Questions and Comments
P1	**Introducing a new Category for IT systems adopting diversified secure and reliable technologies**
	1. We understand that HKSAR Government have concern about the economic and protectionism. However, can we understand the criteria to allocate projects to this category? It is difficult for us, a local SME, to acquire the requested certifications. Will government provide any assistance, any graceful period allow before we are accredited?
	2. In implementing the new category, how to ensure that the interest of Hong Kong vendors not be sacrificed, products marginalized?
	3. Is this related to just implementation project Cat A? However, this solution will also affect both Cat B and Cat C projects.
	4. For integrity check, how integrity check will be performed should be defined clearly.
	5. For reference list of technologies, only www.itsec.gov.cn/aqkkcp/cpgg/ has been listed. Should Hong Kong self-developed products and solution be proposed. Many SME has their solution developed locally. Hong Kong is a unique place where Multi-lingual support, traditional Chinese character supports are required, so adopting China Information Technology Security Evaluation Center scheme may have to be carefully considered.
	6. Hong Kong Government that supports local SME business should also assist all local product vendor gain local relevant technology standard.
	7. Before requiring key project staff to have certain certification, HKSAR Government should ensure localized version of certification scheme and corresponding training should be made available in Hong Kong.

	8. How to map the various certification schemes in Mainland, the world, and locally in Hong Kong? 9. How ensure that products enlisted on CNNVD will cover both the vulnerabilities within and outside of Mainland China? 10. As the product vendor should be one of the Technical Support Unit (TSU) of the China National Vulnerability Database of Information Security (CNNVD), the product vendor should ensure that they will be able to continuously provide vulnerability list and patch list to B/Ds directly and SRAA contractor. Because CNNVD are not performing the same way as NVD and CVE publicly and openly, many of the vulnerabilities, patches would not be published. So vulnerability may not be reflected correctly through the existing vulnerability scanning tools during the SRAA.
P2	**Enhancing the regulating and monitoring procedures of contractor's performance**
	1. The Contractor Performance Appraisal Report (CPAR) currently used are focusing more on the Delivery of project, time management. That is more applicable to Cat A and C. But the specialized skills requirement in Cat B has not been considered. 2. The staff quality should be considered. For instance, for penetration test, have the staff been able to explain the requirement, risk of the penetration test and their capability to explain the findings to B/D being considered? So we suggest the CPAR should be revised specifically to reflect the necessary requirement to keep the quality of different Cat projects. This will also raise the overall quality of projects too. 3. Should SOA-QPS contractor be considered down to project team member? Actually, some of the issues are not just related to the company, but because of the quality of the staff? Company may immediately rectify by changing staff from the project team, but should that staff be also be considered with "quality" issue? 4. Finally, it is recommended that the marks should be changed to number scale between 1 – 10. Cause the current scheme will put companies to small rating scale only.
P3	**Taking into account contractors' past performance in government IT contracts not awarded under the SOA-QPS scheme and the immediate preceding round of SOA-QPS contracts that are still active**
	1. Conceptually agreed with the proposal. All HKSAR government performance should be considered together. 2. However, SOA-QPS team has to consider how this can be effectively calculated. Many companies have participated in QPS as subcon and prime

	contractor together. Also many companies used different names to participate in the subcon and prime contractor for as a single company.
P4	**Setting up the Contract Administrative Matters Monitoring Mechanism**
	1. Agreed that it is necessary to setup contract administrative matters monitoring mechanism, but it should be through automated and ease of use scheme.
	2. Most of the prime and subcontractors companies are already engaged in projects. If additional administrative matters were added to the monitoring scheme, then it is just aimed to be used for monitoring of administrative work. That will be wasting both Government team and project team time.
	3. For all the acknowledgement work. Can it be simplified in the e-PS system with a clear instruction with clear acknowledge button to click instead of answering through separate means?
	4. Can the e-PS provide standard proposal template. Then all project team fill in the forms into the e-PS. It will be easier for Procurement team to check and compare proposal
	5. Also can the e-PS be equipped with LLM function to extract project team members from the proposal, so change of key members can be continuously monitor and check through the system?
	6. Contract management systems should provide centralized ease of management scheme. Besides, for contract management system, can it be linked to CR and make request for the latest BR form. As long as company already approved the direct collection of the BR form from CR system, those could be automatically updated. As HKSAR government is already more digitalized, this should be part of the "automatic government" function.
	7. Response rate to eProcurement requests are low. Take us as an example, we always receive request not align with our business. If we have to respond to all requests we receive, there will be a strong burden to us as a SME.
P5	**Merging Minor and Major Groups of Category C into one Group**
	No objections to this Cat C merging
P6	**Raising the Demarcation Limit from HK$3 million to HK$5 million**
	1. Regarding CyberSecurity Services (Cat B), there is no separation of minor and major group project since QPS3. However, in the new QPS arrangement, it is recommended that, HKSAR Government should consider adding back requirements to the project group for Cat B.
	2. Cat B projects should be categorized by departments based on Tier. For Tier 2 and Tier 3 system, the project requirements should be raised and relevant project man days should also be increased. It is not possible for company to

	complete the security assessment project using the same standard as for Tier 1 system. 3. Also for Tier 1 system, similar demarcation for separating the projects based on the implementation cost of the IT project. In fact, it is an average that most IT security spending would be around 8 – 10% of the overall implementation cost of the project.
P7	**Raising the Financial Limit from HK\$20 million to HK\$25 million**
	There are no objections to this proposed idea.
C1	**Additional comment on requirement including Security Requirement into Cat A projects**
	1. When IT project is to be defined, all departments should put the Tier requirement of the system into the tender document. This should be affecting the security requirement to be implemented. 2. If IT project will be implemented using DevOps / Agile implementation method, addition threat modelling scheme should be defined as part of the requirement of the Cat A implementation project.
C2	**Ensure the WAB should be updated periodically**
	1. Currently, majority of the B/Ds simply took the standard WAB and put into their WAB and issued in the QPS project case. However, when we look into the project technical details, project requirement and staff requirements, we always observed that there are mis-alignments between the technical details and staff requirements. 2. Besides, the project time schedule are always too tight without careful evaluation whether the project team would have sufficient time to perform necessary tasks. 3. Also with the latest update on the security policies and practice guides, those should be considered as part of the updates of the environment, the WAB and project requirement should also be revised. Otherwise, B/D and contractor would use the previous requirement as standard requirement.
C3	**Ceiling Rate scheme**
	1. According to the "Ceiling Rate Scheme," contractors can propose staff charging rates that are lower than the corresponding ceiling rate in their service proposals to provide more competitive pricing for the Government. However, this expectation is unrealistic. As highlighted in the P7 proposal, the HKSAR Government recognizes that salaries have risen by approximately 26%, suggesting that the ceiling rate should also be increased by at least that amount. 2. Consequently, the ceiling rate should be raised in the qualification round of QPS6. 3. Moreover, if a company drastically reduces its bidding price, it may reflect underlying issues with its pricing strategy.

	4. We recommend that the HKSAR Government consider adopting a "remove lowest" and "remove highest" pricing scheme for both the qualification and bidding rounds.
	5. The HKSAR Government has a duty to ensure quality, price fairness, and the regulation of IT service standards. Therefore, the pricing marking scheme should be carefully assessed.
C4	**Bidding requirement in SQA-QPS WAB**
	1. Previously, we observed that some Cat B tender explore to combine SRAA, PIA and Load/Stress Testing projects together. However, company that able to perform SRAA/PIA may not be specialized in performing Load/Stress Testing.
	2. Consequently, we recommend that the WAB allow companies the option to participate in only one facet of the project, rather than mandating that they provide all services, without imposing penalties in the proposal evaluation process.
C5	**Standard Marking Scheme under the SOA-QPS5**
	1. Concerning the marking scheme for Category B cybersecurity services, we find that the evaluation methodology and the criteria for technology comparisons are quite limited, resulting in an inadequate overall assessment.
	2. First, the technical marks for Category B should incorporate more specific comparisons related to the nature of the system being tested. For example, if a container-based system is expected to be evaluated, team members should possess knowledge of container security. Similarly, if the system involves government cloud or virtualization technologies, security testers should have expertise in cloud computing or virtualization security. A general CISSP certification does not guarantee that the assessor possesses this specialized knowledge.
	3. Second, the assessment methodology and the tools utilized should also be included in the evaluation criteria.
	4. In the Category B marking scheme, one criterion that consistently appears but is not particularly relevant is A.4. Innovative Suggestions. This criterion is more applicable to Category A implementation projects. In assessments, audits, and compliance reviews, methodologies tend to be quite similar, meaning that many so-called innovative suggestions are not truly innovative but merely included to avoid losing marks. Furthermore, these suggestions are often not applicable to most projects.
	5. Additionally, since Category B services rely heavily on the skills and technical knowledge of the project team, we propose that the marking scheme allocate at least 70% of the total marks to technical criteria.

By post and by email at qps_consultation@digitalpolicy.gov.hk

17 October 2024

Common Services and Sourcing Division
Digital Policy Office
Units 807-808, 8/F
Shui On Centre
6-8 Harbour Road
Wan Chai, Hong Kong

Dear Sir/Madam

<div align="center">

**Consultation on the
Future Arrangement of the Standing Offer Agreement
for Quality Professional Services**

</div>

Thank you for inviting The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers (the Institution) for views regarding the future arrangement of the Standing Offer Agreement for Quality Professional Services.　Please be informed that the Institution does not have any specific views on the subject matter as stated in the invitation.

Thank you.

<div align="right">

Yours faithfully

Ir Peter SI
Director

</div>

AS/PS/SS

香港新興科技教育協會
「有關優質資訊科技專業服務常備承辦協議的未來安排」意見書
2024年10月

<u>前言</u>：

　　香港特區政府在內部運作和提供公共服務方面一直都有採用資訊科技，並透過採購安排，為政府資訊科技項目提供有效而快捷的解決方案，同時可讓業界參與政府資訊科技項目，從而促進本地資訊科技產業的發展。今次數字辦提出七項建議，以優化優質資訊科技專業服務常備承辦協議的未來安排，相信可維持服務效率，並引入承辦商之間的競爭，以提升服務質素。

　　香港新興科技教育協會經深入討論後，支持加強對承辦商表現的規管和監察程序，並設立合約管理事項監察機制，定期評核承辦商表現。惟評分基準可提供更具體指引，同時應把承辦商過往的非政府項目表現也納入考慮範圍。即使採用扣分制，亦應讓承辦商有改善機會，可以在每6個月審核周期前挽回之前被扣除的分數。為提升資訊科技服務質素，建議引進評估機制，嚴格審批承辦商履歷及財務狀況；決策局／部門亦需設立內部審核部門，自我檢視以進一步提升部門的項目管理能力。

<u>香港新興科技教育協會的意見</u>：

1 為採用安全可靠多元技術的資訊科技系統引進新類別

　　1.1 需具體列明丁一和丁二類別甄選條件

　　　　鑑於以往曾經的出錯，例如區議會選舉日全港票站電腦故障，以及教評

局「監考易」App發生故障，要改回以人手核對考生身份，因此本會同意需要提升及引進新類別──丁一和丁二類別，讓取錄要求更為嚴格。

惟建議新增的兩個子類別的服務範疇與《優質資訊科技專業服務常備承辦協議 5》目前甲類和乙類的服務範疇相同，而取錄要求會更為嚴格，令本會疑慮決策局／部門會如何甄選承辦商的服務範疇類別，以及基於何種具體條件下把承辦商列入新增的丁一和丁二類別。

1.2 審核誠信需具體說明

有關數字辦提出取錄要求更嚴格的建議內容，本會同意(a)投標人董事及建議的主要項目負責人員人選需要經過誠信審核，但認為當局需清楚列明是哪一方面的誠信、並會由什麼專業人士負責審核，建議當局提供更多相關訊息，解釋如何審核誠信，例如是否以信貸紀錄、公司過往業績等作為標準。

本會亦同意建議的(b)主要項目負責人員人選必須具有推行採用安全可靠多元技術資訊科技系統的相關經驗。

1.3 開放香港公司所符合的條件

對於建議的(c)主要項目負責人員人選必須已取得「信息技術應用創新專業人員認證證書」，本會雖然同意項目負責人必須具有有關經驗及證書，但這項證書只能於內地領取，而且即使是香港以至內地公眾對此證書的認知程度亦甚低，恐怕未來取得此證書的人數有限。

當局建議(d)投標者若在過去12個月內曾經是中國國家資訊安全漏洞資料庫(CNNVD)的其中一個技術支援單位(TSU)，在評分方面將更具優勢，本會認為香港企業難以符合上述條件，因為較少香港企業擁有相關經驗，此舉或影響香港企業被列作新增的丁一和丁二類別的機會。建議中的(c)及(d)項，亦容易令外界造成香港公司只能列為甲類和乙類；丁一及丁二類別是專門為內地公司及人員而設的錯誤觀念。

因此本會建議，必須讓本地從業員及公司可以符合上述條件的機會，例如需為香港專業人士考慮如何設法取得(c)項的證書，並允許香港公司與內地公司成為合夥投標者，讓香港公司更大機會符合(d)項的條件。

本會亦關注與「信息技術應用創新專業人員認證證書」相關的國家安全

問題，由於此證書或牽涉香港與內地的跨境數據傳輸，而內地對國家機密訊息的定義較為廣泛，因此香港特區政府處理相關問題或存在困難。

2 加強對承辦商表現的規管和監察程序

2.1 加強規管和監察程序做法合理

本會認同承辦商過去表現是重要，須要定期評核及加強對承辦商表現的規管和監察程序。因此同意在附合「整體表現較差」的條件中，把在目前評核周期中由 3 個或以上項目所計算出的承辦商表現評分低於15分，改為由2個或以上項目計算；及在被視為「個別項目表現較差」的條件中，把承辦商在目前評核周期內有3次或以上在承辦商表現評核報告中獲得評分低於 15分，改為2次或以上評核報告中獲得評分低於 15分。

2.2 評分基準可提供更具體指引

不過，現時承辦商表現評核報告（CPAR）及承辦商表現評分（CPS）中的評分基準未夠清晰，建議需要就有關評分的定義，提供更加清晰及具體的指引。

在承辦商表現評分(CPS)中, 現時項目人員經驗的評分準則有利於一些擁有豐富經驗的特定業界職位, 例如擁有**10**年經驗的系統分析/程序編製主任(AP)得分料最高, 但現時業界的職位動態是, AP僅需累積數年經驗後可晉升為系統分析師(SA), 甚或更高階的職位, 意味若想在投標中得分較高, 此舉會不利於IT專業人士的技能提升及職位晉升。

2.3 評估現行評分方式有效性

本會認為亦有需要審視數字辦根據各決策局／部門評核報告的評分所計算出承辦商表現評分(CPS)的有效性, 建議評估有多少承辦商在新一輪 SOA-QPS協議及上一輪SOA-QPS協議上, 就各類別／組別內個別項目的競投權會被中止。

目前決策局／部門就《協議5》下批出的項目完成承辦商表現評核報告(CPAR), 以及由數字辦根據各決策局／部門評核報告的評分為各類別／組別中的每個承辦商計算出承辦商表現評分(CPS)程序繁複, 建議簡化流程, 毋須就所有評分項目撰寫評核, 以加快評分流程。

2.4 加強部門項目管理能力

　　加強對承辦商規管和監察程序的同時，建議決策局／部門都需要自我檢視以進一步提升部門的項目管理能力。例如成立一個機制並設立內部審核部門，審視部門包括規管和監察承辦商的管理項目表現，例如審核工作是否仔細、評分是否正確根據指引，因此可就部門評核承辦商的表現設立獎罰制度。本會亦建議向負責為承辦商評核的部門員工提供適時培訓，讓他們清楚了解如何規管承辦商。

3 將承辦商過往履行合約表現及履行對上一輪批出而且仍然生效的合約表現納入考慮範疇

3.1 應注重標書質素及技術方案

　　本會同意在第一階段競投及現時的 SOA-QPS 協議生效期內（SOA 期間）透過承辦商表現評核報告（CPAR）考慮承辦商在兩類合約中的表現，包括根據對上一輪 SOA-QPS 協議所批出但在現行的SOA 期間仍然生效的合約；以及非根據 SOA-QPS 協議所批出的政府資訊科技合約，並在過去一年內曾有決策局／部門向數字辦投訴承辦商的表現，或在過去一年內曾發生影響政府形象的系統／安全事故。

不過, 除了要考慮承辦商過往履行政府合約的表現, 政府亦要注重標書質素及技術方案, 不能只是考慮價低者得。建議當局應使用多些本港/內地公司, 尤其要留意這些公司在政府對政府(G2G)交換機密訊息的應用方面的質素。

3.2 非政府項目也納入考慮

根據當局的建議, 目前僅考慮政府資訊科技合約及對上一輪 SOA-QPS 協議所批出兼仍然生效的合約。本會認為有需要把承辦商的非政府科技項目合約同樣納入考慮範圍之內, 此舉將可為政府帶來市場上新的承辦商夥伴, 即使他們的經驗較少, 也能考慮他們其他的成功因素。

3.3 設立承辦商上訴機制

對於若承辦商對評核作出澄清和／或表示異議, 決策局／部門應將個案提交更高級別人員(較承辦商表現評核報告的審批人員至少高一級)審核評級並作出最終決定, 本會對此予以同意。但建議當中應增設承辦商上訴機制, 讓承辦商有權及有渠道可以就決策局／部門的評分提出異議並給予上訴理由, 才交予更高級別人員審核評級。

4 設立合約管理事項監察機制

4.1 減省不必要的監察機制工序

本會認為設立合約管理事項監察機制做法合理, 亦認同採用扣分制, 但建議亦要同時考慮優化相關程序, 減省不必要工序, 以便降低投標成本。因為有些承辦商未必擁有足夠資金聘請行政人員, 以處理建議中 (a) 確認收妥決策局／部門所發出的項目簡介建議書邀請;(b) 應遵守合約文件中有關合約管理事項的規定, 例如必須在替換主要項目人員生效日期起計三個月內向合約管理辦公室提交替換請求;及(c) 及時回覆並準時提交證明文件等3項規則的行政工作。

4.2 每6個月審核周期前挽回被扣除分數

對於承辦商的分數會在匯報及檢討委員會報告周期中每 6 個月進行一次審核, 以及如果未有採取任何行動, 分數將會帶到下一個匯報及檢討委員會周期, 本會理解有關做法是無可厚非, 但建議清楚列明在每 6 個月進行審核的周期之前, 讓承辦商改善之前被扣分的表現, 當局可為成功改善的承辦商加回被扣減的分數, 以便讓已改善的分數帶到下一個匯報及檢討委員會周期。

5 將丙類的小型和大型項目組別合併為一組

本會同意基於《協議 5》中的使用情況統計和丙類服務未來業務需求的預測,

將丙類的小型和大型項目組別合併為一組。惟根據諮詢文件中提及《協議 5》中的丙類項目，是負責共用資訊科技應用系統推出及維修服務，例如電子檔案保管系統(ERKS)和中央管理通訊系統(CMMP)，建議當局列出除了ERKS和CMMP之外，還有哪些應用系統包括在內。

6 將分界金額由300萬港元提高至500萬港元

對於將小型與大型項目組別的分界金額由 300萬港元提高至 500萬港元，本會予以認同，但建議當局需要清楚知道300萬港元至 500萬港元間，實際上有多少份合約是屬於大型企業或是中小型企業，若大型企業所佔數目不多，相信有關改動所帶來的影響不大。

7 將財政限額由2,000萬港元提高至2,500萬港元

基於資訊科技專業人員的薪酬一直有所增長，為避免可獲採購的資訊科技項目規模可能因而縮減，本會同意將財政限額由 2,000 萬港元提高至 2,500 萬港元(+25%)，甚至可以考慮提高到3,000萬港元。

8 其他意見

8.1 嚴格審批承辦商履歷及財務狀況

建議當局在公開招標程序引進評估機制，更嚴謹審核承辦商的履歷及財務狀況，以甄選一定數目的供應商並與他們訂立常備承辦協議(SOAs)

，提升資訊科技專業服務的水平。

8.2 為承辦商設立標準標書準備期

按照現時的投標程序，決策局／部門可發出項目簡介以邀請相關服務類別／組別的承辦商提交建議書，該類別／組別的承辦商僅有**10至20個**工作天就項目簡介擬備和提交服務建議書。建議當局為承辦商設立一個標準標書準備期，以提供一個更長的招標週期予承辦商做好準備。

8.3 項目里程碑付款應按時支付

在根據項目進度分階段付款方面，承辦商以完成里程碑為依據，作為合約分段計劃目標和期中付款的時間控制點，惟有業界反映，政府的里程碑付款會出現滯後情況，未有依時根據里程碑節點付款，直至完成整個項目才支付一大筆合約金額給承辦商，建議政府改善有關狀況。

8.4 設定每名承辦商的投標百分比

競投過程中的第二階段，決策局／部門會在常備承辦協議的有效期內，就個別資訊科技項目邀請《協議 5》的承辦商提交技術和價格建議書，如承辦商未能確認收妥邀請書或不競投有關項目，每次將會被扣分。為避免扣分影響日後投標機會，建議設定每名承辦商的投標百分比，即清楚列出每

名承辦商需要競投的數量。

8.5 鼓勵業界創新

既然政府要推動創新，促進本地資訊科技產業，特別是資訊科技初創企業及中小型企業的發展，政府可考慮找一些香港本土自己研發科技的科創公司做承辦商，並採用加分制來考慮其表現，此舉亦可鼓勵本地創業的科創公司不斷創新。

結語：

資訊科技市場瞬息萬變，完善常備承辦協議計劃可有效協助政府應對資訊科技專業服務的龐大需求，並為資訊科技業界帶來莫大商機。因此本會認為有必要加強對承辦商的規管，讓他們引入更多創新和優質的資訊科技解決方案，共同推動新一代數碼政府的發展。

數字辦除了要考慮承辦商過往履行政府合約的表現，非政府項目表現也應納入考慮，並且須要嚴格審批承辦商履歷及財務狀況，及注重承辦商的標書質素及技術方案。亦建議即使採用扣分制，應讓承辦商有改善機會，可以在每6個月審核周期前挽回之前被扣除的分數。同時決策局／部門應設立內部審核部門，自我檢視以進一步提升部門的項目管理能力。

「優質資訊科技專業服務常備承辦協議未來安排」

意見書

2024 年 10 月

2024/2025 年度(第十八屆)理事會成員名單

會　　　長：	鄺正煒工程師, JP		
創 會 會 長：	容永祺先生, GBS, MH, JP	★理事會當然成員	
前　會　長：	胡曉明教授工程師, GBS, JP	★理事會當然成員	
	謝偉銓測量師, BBS, JP	★理事會當然成員	
	盧偉國議員, GBS, MH, JP	★理事會當然成員	
	陳紹雄議員工程師, JP	★理事會當然成員	
	李鏡波先生	★理事會當然成員	
	黃偉雄先生, MH, JP	★理事會當然成員	
上 屆 會 長：	潘燊昌博士, SBS	★理事會當然成員	
常 務 副 會 長：	吳長勝工程師		
副　會　長：	李惠光工程師, BBS, JP	伍翠瑤博士, JP	
	林義揚先生	史泰祖醫生, JP	
	陳鎮仁博士, GBS, JP	周伯展醫生, BBS, JP	
	黃錦輝教授, MH	梁廣灝工程師, SBS, OBE, JP	
	施家殷先生, MH	何建宗博士	
	吳宏偉講座教授	余秀珠女士, BBS, MH, JP	
	蔡淑蓮女士	杜珠聯律師	
	廖錦興博士, MH		
財　務　長：	吳德龍先生		
秘　書　長：	彭一邦博士工程師, JP		
副 秘 書 長：	鍾志斌先生		
理　　　事：	楊位醒先生, BBS, MH	楊素珊女士	
	林力山博士測量師	龐朝輝醫生博士, MH	
	黃家和先生, BBS, JP	龐寶林先生	
	李文輝博士	賴旭輝博士測量師, JP	
	龔永德先生	李漢祥先生	
	陳健平先生, BBS, JP	馮星航先生	
	梁偉強大律師, JP	范凱傑大律師, MH	
	丘培煥女士	林新強議員, JP	
	洪文正教授, MH	凌嘉勤教授, SBS	
	孫耀達博士工程師, MH	陸瀚民議員	
	陸耀宗律師	黃嗣輝先生	
	譚雪欣律師	呂家豪先生	
	黃建邦先生	黃進達先生, JP	
	楊松坤先生	管浩律師	
	劉鶴年先生	蔣東強先生	

註：依職位資歷及筆劃排序

香港專業及資深行政人員協會

科 技 創 新 委 員 會

主席：李惠光工程師, BBS, JP

副主席：黃錦輝教授, MH

副主席：廖錦興博士, MH

副主席：洪文正教授, MH

副主席：楊全盛先生, JP

討論：「有關優質資訊科技專業服務常備承辦協議未來安排」

成　　員：　吳長勝工程師　　孫耀達博士工程師, MH

沈培華博士　　江卓謙先生

朱琪森先生　　李嘉樂教授

許仁強博士工程師　梁毅翔律師

馮承業先生　　潘琪偉博士

香港專業及資深行政人員協會
「有關優質資訊科技專業服務常備承辦協議的未來安排」意見書
2024 年 10 月

前言：

　　香港特區政府在內部運作和提供公共服務方面一直都有採用資訊科技，並透過採購安排，為政府資訊科技項目提供有效而快捷的解決方案，同時可讓業界參與政府資訊科技項目，從而促進本地資訊科技產業的發展。今次數字辦提出七項建議，以優化優質資訊科技專業服務常備承辦協議的未來安排，相信可維持服務效率，並引入承辦商之間的競爭，以提升服務質素。

　　香港專業及資深行政人員協會經深入討論後，支持加強對承辦商表現的規管和監察程序，並設立合約管理事項監察機制，定期評核承辦商表現。惟評分基準可提供更具體指引，亦應讓承辦商有回應評分及改善機會。同時數字政策辦及相關決策局／部門亦應設立內部審核機制，自我檢視以進一步提升項目管理能力。為提升資訊科技服務質素，建議更嚴格審查承辦商提供的項目及人員履歷。

香港專業及資深行政人員協會的意見：

1 為採用安全可靠多元技術的資訊科技系統引進新類別

**　1.1 需具體列明丁一和丁二類別甄選條件**

　　　　本會同意需要提升及推行採用安全可靠多元技術的資訊科技系統及相關服務。

　　　　惟建議新增的兩個子類別的服務範疇與《優質資訊科技專業服務常備承辦協議 5》目前甲類和乙類的服務範疇相同，而取錄要求會更為嚴格，令本會疑慮決策局／部門會如何甄選承辦商的服務範疇類別，以及基於何種具體條件下把承辦商列入新增的丁一和丁二類別。

1.2 審核誠信需具體說明

有關數字辦提出取錄要求更嚴格的建議內容，本會同意(a)投標人董事及建議的主要項目負責人員人選需要經過誠信審核。

本會亦同意建議的(b)主要項目負責人員人選必須具有推行採用安全可靠多元技術資訊科技系統的相關經驗。但是中國信息安全測評中心的網站於 2023 年 12 月才開始發佈相關產品，在本地難以找到任何有相關經驗的人員。

1.3 開放香港公司所符合的條件

對於建議的(c)主要項目負責人員人選必須已取得「信息技術應用創新專業人員認證證書」，本會雖然同意項目負責人必須具有有關經驗及證書，但這項證書只能於內地領取，而且即使是香港以至內地公眾對此證書的認知程度亦甚低，恐怕未來取得此證書的人數有限。

當局建議(d)投標者若在過去 12 個月內曾經是中國國家資訊安全漏洞資料庫(CNNVD)的其中一個技術支援單位(TSU)，在評分方面將更具優勢，本會認為香港企業難以符合上述條件，因為較少香港企業擁有相關經驗，此舉或影響香港企業被列作新增的丁一和丁二類別的機會。建議中的(c)及(d)項，亦容易令外界造成香港公司只能列為甲類和乙類；丁一及丁二類別是專門為內地公司及人員而設的錯誤觀念。

因此本會建議，必須讓本地從業員及公司可以符合上述條件的機會，例如協助香港專業人士取得(c)項的證書，並允許香港公司使用其內地分公司或合作伙伴的證書，讓本地公司更大機會符合(d)項的條件。

2 加強對承辦商表現的規管和監察程序

2.1 加強規管和監察程序做法合理

本會認同承辦商過去表現是重要，須要定期評核及加強對承辦商表現的規管和監察程序。因此同意在附合「整體表現較差」的條件中，把在目前評核周期中由 3 個或以上項目所計算出的承辦商表現評分低於 15 分，改為由 2 個或以上項目計算；及在被視為「個別項目表現較差」的條件中，把承辦商在目前評核周期內有 3 次或以上在承辦商表現評核報告中獲得評分低於 15 分，改為 2 次或以上評核報告中獲得評分低於 15 分。

2.2 評分基準可提供更具體指引

建議就現時承辦商表現評核報告（CPAR）及承辦商表現評分（CPS）中的基準提供更加清晰及具體的指引。

2.3 評估現行評分方式有效性及決策局／部門項目管理能力

本會認為亦有需要審視數字辦根據各決策局／部門評核報告的評分所計算出承辦商表現評分（CPS）的有效性。加強對承辦商規管和監察的同時，建議數字辦及相關決策局／部門亦設立內部審核機制，自我檢視內部執行項目的狀況以進一步提升部門的項目管理能力。本會亦建議向負責為承辦商評核的部門員工提供適時培訓，讓他們清楚了解如何規管承辦商。

3 將承辦商過往履行合約表現及履行對上一輪批出而且仍然生效的合約表現納入考慮範疇

3.1 應注重標書質素及技術方案

鑑於以往曾經的出錯，例如區議會選舉日全港票站電腦故障，以及教評局「監考易」App 發生故障，要改回以人手核對考生身份，因此本會同意在第一階段競投及現時的 SOA-QPS 協議生效期內(SOA 期間)透過承辦商表現評核報告(CPAR)

考慮承辦商在兩類合約中的表現，包括根據對上一輪 SOA-QPS 協議所批出但在現行的 SOA 期間仍然生效的合約；以及非根據 SOA-QPS 協議所批出的政府資訊科技合約，並在過去一年內曾有決策局／部門向數字辦投訴承辦商的表現，或在過去一年內曾發生影響政府形象的系統／安全事故。

3.2 設立承辦商上訴機制

對於若承辦商對評核作出澄清和／或表示異議，決策局／部門應將個案提交更高級別人員（較承辦商表現評核報告的審批人員至少高一級）審核評級並作出最終決定，本會對此予以同意。但建議當中應增設承辦商上訴機制，讓承辦商有權及有渠道可以就決策局／部門的評分向數字辦提出異議並給予上訴理由。

4 設立合約管理事項監察機制
4.1 減省不必要的監察機制工序

本會認為設立合約管理事項監察機制做法合理，亦認同採用扣分制，但建議亦要同時考慮優化相關程序，減省不必要工序，以便降低投標成本。例如是否需要承辦商確認收妥每一個決策局／部門所發出的項目簡介建議書邀請。

競投過程中的第二階段，決策局／部門會在常備承辦協議的有效期內，就個別資訊科技項目邀請《協議 5》的承辦商提交技術和價格建議書，如承辦商未能確認收妥邀請書或不競投有關項目，每次將會被扣分。為避免扣分影響日後投標機會，建議設定承辦商的最低確認收妥邀請書或不競投有關項目投標百分比，低於該百分比才扣分。

4.2 每 6 個月審核周期前挽回被扣除分數

對於承辦商的分數會在匯報及檢討委員會報告周期中每

6 個月進行一次審核，以及如果未有採取任何行動，分數將會帶到下一個匯報及檢討委員會周期，本會理解有關做法是無可厚非，但建議清楚列明在每 6 個月進行審核的周期之前，讓承辦商改善之前被扣分的表現，當局可為成功改善的承辦商加回被扣減的分數，以便讓已改善的分數帶到下一個匯報及檢討委員會周期。

5 將丙類的小型和大型項目組別合併為一組

本會同意基於《協議 5》中的使用情況統計和丙類服務未來業務需求的預測，將丙類的小型和大型項目組別合併為一組。惟根據諮詢文件中提及《協議 5》中的丙類項目，是負責共用資訊科技應用系統推出及維修服務，例如電子檔案保管系統（ERKS）和中央管理通訊系統（CMMP），建議當局列出除了 ERKS 和 CMMP 之外，還有哪些應用系統包括在內。

6 將分界金額由 300 萬港元提高至 500 萬港元

對於將小型與大型項目組別的分界金額由 300 萬港元提高至 500 萬港元，理據為可讓中小型企業提供足夠的商機及可讓中小型企業參與合約金額較高的政府項目，對於這點本會有以下疑惑，首先政府並沒有規定小型項目類別只有中小企才能參與，假若有這個規定也是不合理。提高金額至 500 萬會令部分原本屬於大型項目的承辦商轉投小型項目類別增加競爭。

另外政府對中小企的定義是 50 人以下的企業，50 人以下的公司一年能承接多少個 300-500 萬的項目？他們是否有足夠的人力資源及財政力量去承接更多的政府項目？

本會建議可以考慮將大型項目定位為 300-3000 萬，小型項目定位在 500 萬以上，300-500 萬的項目決策局／部門可根據項目的複雜及重要性自行決定放進大型或小型工程或同時放進兩個類別競

投，數字辦日後可以根據項目執行情況在下一輪 SOA／QPS 對金額作調整。

7 將財政限額由 2,000 萬港元提高至 2,500 萬港元

基於資訊科技專業人員的薪酬一直有所增長，為避免可獲採購的資訊科技項目規模可能因而縮減，本會同意將財政限額由 2,000 萬港元提高至 2,500 萬港元（+25%），甚至可以考慮提高到 3,000 萬港元。

8 其他意見

8.1 嚴格審查承辦商履歷

建議當局在審查過程中，更嚴謹核實承辦商提供的履歷，另外現時項目人員經驗的評分準則有利於一些擁有豐富經驗的特定業界職位，例如擁有 10 年經驗的系統分析/程序編製主任（AP）得分高於 3 年經驗，但現時業界的職位動態是 AP 僅需累積數年經驗後可晉升為系統分析師（SA），甚或更高階的職位。

8.2 為承辦商設立標準標書準備期

有業界反映按照現時的投標程序，決策局／部門可發出項目簡介以邀請相關服務類別／組別的承辦商提交建議書，個別案例中承辦商僅有數個工作天就項目簡介擬備和提交服務建議書。建議當局為承辦商設立一個適當的標書準備期，可讓承辦商有足夠時間應標。

8.3 項目里程碑付款應按時支付

在根據項目進度分階段付款方面，承辦商以完成里程碑為依據，作為合約分段計劃目標和期中付款的時間控制點，惟有業界反映，商業項目中供應商會先收到部分訂金，而政府項目非但沒有訂金，而且資金回籠與承辦商的資源投入出現嚴重滯

後情況，甚至項目驗收或上線後還要有幾個月的 nursing period 才能收到全款，建議政府改善有關狀況。

8.5 非政府項目也納入考慮

本會認為有需要把承辦商在非政府科技項目的經驗納入考慮範圍之內，即使他們在政府相關項目的經驗較少，也能考慮他們其他的成功因素。

8.6 鼓勵業界創新

既然政府要推動創新，促進本地資訊科技產業，特別是香港本土自己研發科技和軟件產品的公司的發展，政府可考慮採用加分制鼓勵本地研發和軟件產品開發，此舉亦可鼓勵本地科創公司加大研發及軟件開發的投資。

結語：

資訊科技市場瞬息萬變，完善常備承辦協議計劃可有效協助政府應對資訊科技專業服務的龐大需求，並為資訊科技業界帶來莫大商機。因此本會認為有必要加強對承辦商的規管，讓他們引入更多創新和優質的資訊科技解決方案，共同推動新一代數碼政府的發展。

數字辦除了要考慮承辦商過往履行政府合約的表現，非政府項目表現也應納入考慮，並且須要嚴格審批承辦商履歷及財務狀況，及注重承辦商的標書質素及技術方案。亦建議即使採用扣分制，應讓承辦商有改善機會，可以在每 6 個月審核周期前挽回之前被扣除的分數。同時決策局／部門應設立內部審核部門，自我檢視以進一步提升部門的項目管理能力。

Consultation on the future arrangement of the SOA-QPS

<u>Feedback Form</u>

Part 1 : Basic Information

Name: Name of organisation / company (if applicable):	Hong Kong Telecommunications (HKT) Ltd.
Contact number:	2888 3078 (Mr. Zeno Wong)
Email address:	sheung-pun.wong@pccw.com

Part 2: Consultation

Please provide your comments/suggestions (may supplement with a separate sheet if necessary):

P1 (new Cat D)

1. As this is a new category with specific certifications needed, we propose to include subcontractors' certificates in case prime contractor do not have.

2. In order to open this category to more bidders, we propose to have at least the same quantity of shortlisted vendors as Cat A & Cat B.

P3 (Performance Counting)

3. As new comer of QPS has no past performance for the performance counting, we propose to use the median of past performance marks of all contractors as new comer's marks.

(To be continued by separate sheet...)

Please submit the feedback form by email to qps_consultation@digitalpolicy.gov.hk on or before **22 October 2024**.

Feedback Form (Pg. 2)

Part 2: Consultation

P3 (Performance Counting)

4.   As stated in example of 3.21 (b), if the contract states change request for replacement of key Project Staff must be submitted within 3 months starting from the effective date of replacement, while contractor fails to do so, 3 points will be deducted.   As most companies HR policy is 1 month notice for resignation, it is suggested to deduct less marks.

P4 (Contract Administration)

5.   With the point deduction system introduced to improve contractor performance, we propose to suspend bidding for 6 months if the contractor point is deducted to zero (0).

Others

6.   As Cat B and Cat D2 category relates to IT security, it is suggested to add more marks on top in case the bidders have Security Operation Center which demonstrates the skills and methodology they have.

Submitted by : Hong Kong Telecommunications (HKT) Ltd.

Date: 22 Oct 2024

自由黨就優質資訊科技專業服務常備承辦協議（SOA-QPS6）未來安排意見書

2024 年 10 月 22 日

作為代表商界的政黨，我們高度讚賞政府在這個關鍵時刻進行 SOA-QPS6 未來安排的諮詢，積極應對新時代的安全和技術挑戰。我們認為，這次諮詢展示了政府前瞻性的視野和對提升資訊科技服務質素的承諾。

我們相信，在新的協議框架中，應充分考慮人工智能（AI）和其他新興技術的引入，從而推動政府服務的創新和效率提升。同時，我們也主張在引入這些技術的同時，確保對中小企業和初創企業的公平和包容，促進整個行業的健康發展。

以下我們針對文件中的「建議」（P1 至 P7），並加入有關 AI 和新興技術的意見與建議，供參考。

P1：為採用安全可靠多元技術的資訊科技系統引進新類別

意見與建議：

1. **支持推動安全可靠的多元技術**

   - 我們高度讚賞政府為應對地緣政治風險，致力於推廣安全可靠的多元技術，以確保政府資訊系統的穩定性和安全性。

2. **引入 AI 和新興技術及提供技術創新激勵**

   - 在新增的丁類中，加入對人工智能、機器學習、區塊鏈等新興技術的應用。

   - 制定明確的政策和措施，鼓勵承辦商在政府項目中採用 AI 和新興技術，推動科技創新。

   - 引入激勵機制，例如在評分中增加對創新技術應用的加分項，尤其是 AI 和新興技術的應用。這將鼓勵承辦商積極研發和引入新技術，提高政府服務的效率和質量。

3. **避免過高的技術門檻**

   - 在設定資格要求時，應考慮到新興技術領域的特點，避免過於嚴苛的要求排除具創新能力的中小企業。許多中小企業在 AI 和新興技術方面具有領先優勢，適當放寬門檻將有助於他們參與。

P2：加強對承辦商表現的規管和監察程序

意見與建議：

1. **理解監管必要性**

    ○ 我們理解並支持政府加強監管，以確保項目質量。

2. **設立警告機制**

    ○ 在中止競投權之前，可考慮設立警告和改進機制，特別是對於在新興技術方面有創新貢獻的中小企業。這將給予企業改進的機會，避免因初次適應新技術而導致的短期表現不佳。

P3：將過往履行非 SOA-QPS 合約的表現納入考慮範疇

意見與建議：

1. **全面評估的必要性**

    ○ 我們理解並支持政府希望全面評估承辦商的表現，以保障項目質量。

2. **鼓勵新興技術經驗**

    ○ 在評估過往表現時，特別重視承辦商在新興技術項目中的成功經驗。這將有助於甄選出在新技術領域有實績的企業，提升政府項目的技術水平。

P4：設立合約管理事項監察機制

意見與建議：

1. **簡化合約管理程序**

    ○ 利用新興技術優化合約管理，如引入智能合約管理系統，提高效率。自動化和智能化的合約管理有助於減少人為錯誤，提升管理效能。

2. **提供培訓和支援**

    ○ 為承辦商提供合約管理工具的培訓，讓他們熟悉新的系統和流程。這將協助企業更好地遵守合約要求，減少違規情況。

P5：將丙類的小型和大型項目組別合併為一組

意見與建議：

1. **考慮新興技術項目的特點**

- 在合併組別的同時，設立專門針對 AI 和新興技術的小型項目，鼓勵中小企業參與。確保中小企業有機會在其專長領域參與政府項目，促進創新。

2. **維持多元化的項目規模**

- 合理分配不同規模的項目，滿足各類企業的參與需要。這有助於建立健康的生態系統，推動技術進步。

P6：將分界金額由 300 萬港元提高至 500 萬港元

意見與建議：

1. **中立但傾向維持現行金額**

- 我們對提高分界金額持中立態度，但傾向於維持現行的 300 萬港元分界金額。雖然我們認同通貨膨脹和開發成本的上升，但在現實情況下，項目資源不僅限於香港，還可來自成本較低的地區，如中國內地。

2. **保障初創企業利益**

- 維持 300 萬港元的分界金額，可防止大型承辦商對較低金額的項目產生更大興趣，從而保持初創企業的競爭優勢。如果分界金額提高，可能導致大型企業進入原本適合初創企業的項目範疇，加劇競爭，對初創企業不利。

- 保持現行金額，有助於維持市場的多元化和競爭性，讓不同規模的企業都有適合的參與機會。這將有助於初創企業的生存和發展，促進整個資訊科技行業的健康運作。

P7：將財政限額由 2,000 萬港元提高至 2,500 萬港元

意見與建議：

1. 反映成本上升

- 我們認同提高財政限額，以應對人力和技術成本的上升。

2. 支持大型 AI 項目

- 提高財政限額將允許更複雜的 AI 和新興技術項目得以實施，提升政府服務水平。

- 這將為承辦商提供更大的發揮空間，也吸引更多優秀企業參與。

新增建議：納入 **AI** 和新興技術的應用

意見與建議：

1. **制定 AI 與新興技術採用的明確政策**

   o 在 SOA-QPS6 框架中，明確鼓勵採用 AI、機器學習、區塊鏈等新興技術的政策。這將引導承辦商投入資源開發和提供相關技術解決方案。

2. **設立創新項目專項**

   o 設立專門的創新項目類別，針對 AI 和新興技術，並提供相應的資金和資源支持。鼓勵企業積極參與政府的創新項目，推動公共服務的數字化轉型。

3. **引入倫理和透明度指南**

   o 制定 AI 倫理和透明度指引，確保技術使用符合道德標準，保護數據隱私和安全。這將增強公眾對政府採用 AI 技術的信任，確保決策過程公平公正。

結語

我們相信，透過以上建議，SOA-QPS6 將成為一個更具前瞻性和包容性的框架，推動 AI 和新興技術在政府服務中的應用，並促進中小企業和初創企業的發展。我們期待政府能考慮這些建議，共同打造更高效、創新和公正的公共服務體系。

Consultation on the future arrangement of the SOA-QPS

Feedback Form

Part 1 : Basic Information

Name:	Jason Chow
Name of Company:	Memorable Consulting Limited
Contact Number:	61064114
Email:	Jason.chow@memorableconsulting.com

Part 2: Consultation

Proposal Referring	Feedback from MCL
P1	- In Category D2, a tenderer to be considered as one of the Technical Support Units (TSU) of CNNVD, they must be a registered company in China that meets specific criteria, therefore, we think the competition may not be considered fair since Hong Kong companies currently working for QPS are not eligible to register in CNNVD. - We agree that professional certifications can be added as a mandatory requirement across all categories during the initial stage of bidding. However, the requirement for CNNVD affiliation should be considered during the second stage, based on actual business needs. This approach is advised because the specific business requirements for Category D2 are not yet determined at the first bidding stage.
P2	- We recommend a thorough review of the existing Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting (CPAR) content, including clarifying the definitions of performance ratings and differentiating the understanding of the rating items. - For the Quality Performance System (QPS) tender, since our services have a defined scope, we believe that the criterion to "exceed the service scope" for a "very good" rating is inappropriate. A "very good" rating should reflect exceptional services provided within the established scope, rather than exceeding it. - Given that some content in the CPAR may not be relevant to the services provided, we suggest introducing an option to mark these as "not applicable."
P3	- We propose offering incentives to encourage contractors who actively engage with the electronic Procurement System (e-PS), such as acknowledging receipt and responding, even if no offer is made.

Consultation on the future arrangement of the SOA-QPS

Feedback Form

Part 1 : Basic Information

Name: _____Chung LIU_____

Name of organisation /

company (if applicable): _____Nexify Limited_____

Contact number: _____2152 3260_____

Email address: _____mcliu@nexify.com.hk_____

Part 2: Consultation

Please provide your comments/suggestions (may supplement with a separate sheet if necessary):

1.) Fairness of the calculation methodology

Some contractors only participate in a few work assignments for one category, while some may engage in a significantly higher number of assignments for the same category.

Would it be more flexible to base the number of assessments resulting in poor performance that led to suspension on a ratio (%)? For example, 10% of the total number of assignments awarded for the category.

Additionally, would it be fairer to consider the overall CPS score before making a suspension decision?

2.) Advice on poor marks due to delays

During the SA&D stage, user involvement might be limited, leading to confirmed requirements without clear reviews. The project team would adhere

to the agreed-upon requirements to design and develop the system. However, users might introduce additional details or logic in the workflows at a later stage, necessitating extra programming and paperwork. Despite this, prioritizing adherence to the original schedule may lead to poor CPAR marks or compromised outcomes.

Please advise on how this situation should be justified / improved.

Q3.) <u>Arrangement for SM&S</u>

Our company is registered for Category A Major and frequently bids on projects around $8,000,000 for SI&I. The subsequent SM&S service averages around $1,500,000 per annum.

Under the proposed new limit, the SM&S service would need to extend over 4 years in duration to surpass the demarcation limit ($1,500,000 * 4). If the SM&S duration is shorter, which is common, it would fall under the Category A Minor category.

In this scenario, Category A Major contractors would not be able to bid on or support the maintenance of the systems they have developed. This situation is not only inefficient but also poses risks to the B/D, as higher time costs may be incurred for a new contractor to familiarize themselves with the system.

Please advise on the arrangement considering this scenario.

QPS Consultation/DPO

寄件者:	李志强(金融壹账通香港分公司香港团队) <happylee531@pingan.com>
寄件日期:	2024年10月22日星期二 17:21
收件者:	QPS Consultation/DPO
副本:	凌霄(Daniel Ling); 苏锦明(平安科技OC及SC交付部大湾区交付经理室); 刘柏泉(金融壹账通香港分公司香港团队)
主旨:	SOA-QPS Consultation 22/10/2024 from OCFT
類別:	Internet Email

Dear Sir/Madam,

SOA-QPS未来安排咨询

回馈意见表格
第一部分：基本信息

姓名： Happy Lee
机构／公司名称（如适
用）：OneConnect Financial
Technology (Hong Kong)
Co., Ltd
联络电话： 52251967
电邮地址：
happylee531@PINGAN.com

第二部分：咨询

关于"信息技术应用创新专业人员认证证书"这一项，我们了解到，此项人才认证是由国家工业和信息化部教育与考试中心（以下简称：工信部教考中心）组织统考，并颁发证书。
我们通过中国信通院（工信部直属事业单位）与工信部教考中心建立联系，并得到了培训合作授权，可由中国信通院举办相关培训，包括参加考试所需要具备的资格、相关知识以及考试的形式等等内容，并组织报考该证书。

据了解，国家信息安全评测中心网站上发布的相关信息并未完全覆盖推行安全可靠多元技术资讯科技系统所需的全部技术，我们与中国信通院合作，可以针对此主题组织相关的技术培训，

包括但不仅限于

● 安全可靠多元技术背景及现状培训：全面介绍安全可靠多元技术发展历程以及现今所处的发展阶段，讲解安全可靠多元技术工作推进过程中的关键政策；

● 安全可靠多元技术产品测试与认证：详细介绍安全可靠多元技术产品测试目前依据的文件，产品认证的几种途径以及目前的安全可靠多元技术产品名单；

● 安全可靠多元技术产业发展情况：介绍安全可靠多元技术产业生态，对安全可靠多元技术产品目前的功能、性能做部分可公开内容的展示；

● 安全可靠多元技术产品运维培训：对安全可靠多元技术产品运维相关的技术进行讲解，涉及到数据库、网络安全、终端、运维知识、故障排除等内容。

Cheers，
Happy Lee

☐Urgent ☐Return receipt ☐Expand Group ☐Restricted ☐Prevent Copy ☐Confidential

QPS Consultation/DPO

寄件者:	Sankar VS <Sankar.vs@arup.com>
寄件日期:	2024年10月15日星期二 15:38
收件者:	QPS Consultation/DPO
副本:	Jimmy Chan; Lawrence Leung (SC)
主旨:	RE: Reminder - Consultation on the Future Arrangement of the Standing Offer Agreement for Quality Professional Services
類別:	Internet Email

Hello

As a specialist vendor, specifically focusing on engineering related software development, data governance and analysis, AI modeling and development, it is important for the scoring to be higher for technical (80 perhaps) as those software needs domain knowledge from a reputable firm rather than freelance consultant.

Secondly, it is a wide spread knowledge in market some QPS vendors just outsource to several freelance one man band which would introduce high risk in terms of future maintenance. There must be more quality constraints introduced in the contract regarding sub-contracting to protect the government's interests.

Lastly, QPS has somehow synonymous with cheapest vendor even if quality is only on paper.   It is essential for DPO to relook at the whole quality concept specially documentation and rigorous testing process.

If you receive this email when you are not "at work" please wait until you are "at work" before reading or replying

Sankar V S
Director | Advanced Digital Engineering | Digital Services Leader (East Asia)
MBA PMP CISA CISM CDPSE MHKIE MHKCS

Arup
Level 5, Festival Walk, Kowloon Tong
Hong Kong
d +852 2908 4012
m +852 5286 8830
arup.com

Follow me
Sankar V S | LinkedIn
Follow Arup
LinkedIn Twitter Instagram YouTube Facebook

From: QPS Consultation/DPO <qps_consultation@digitalpolicy.gov.hk>
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2024 3:30 PM
To: QPS Consultation/DPO <qps_consultation@digitalpolicy.gov.hk>
Subject: Reminder - Consultation on the Future Arrangement of the Standing Offer Agreement for Quality Professional

☐Urgent ☐Return receipt ☐Expand Group ☐Restricted ☐Prevent Copy ☐Confidential Services
Importance: High

To: SOA-QPS4 Sub-contractors

Reminder of Consultation Close on 22 October 2024

<If you have already returned the feedback of the captioned consultation exercise to us, please ignore this email>

Re: preceding email.

2. The consultation will close on **22 October 2024 (Tuesday)** . Please do not miss the opportunity to share with us your views on the future SOA-QPS arrangement. Please send us your comments and suggestions by emailing qps_consultation@digitalpolicy.gov.hk.

3. For details, please refer to the consultation paper published at the DPO website www.digitalpolicy.gov.hk/en/news/consultations/.

Common Services and Sourcing Division
Digital Policy Office

From: QPS Consultation/DPO
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2024 1:10 PM
To: QPS Consultation <qps_consultation@ogcio.gov.hk>
Subject: Consultation on the Future Arrangement of the Standing Offer Agreement for Quality Professional Services

To: SOA-QPS4 Sub-contractors

Consultation on the Future Arrangement of the Standing Offer Agreement for Quality Professional Services

The Digital Policy Office (DPO) released today (September 23) a consultation paper on the future arrangement of the Standing Offer Agreement for Quality Professional Services (SOA-QPS). Practitioners of the information technology (IT) industry are welcome to offer their views.

The SOA-QPS5 in use will expire in early 2026. The DPO today launched the consultation on improvements to the present arrangement to, among others, strengthen the regulating and monitoring procedures of contractors' performance by taking into account contractors' performance in contracts awarded under the previous round of SOA-QPS and outside the SOA-QPS scheme.

2

Other proposals put forward by the DPO include introducing a new category for IT systems adopting diversified secure and reliable technologies, raising the upper limit of the contract value of individual projects as well as raising the demarcation limit of contract value for minor and major groups.

Since its first launch in 2005, the SOA-QPS scheme has all along been an effective means to cope with the Government's large demand for IT professional services. The scheme also provides a promising business prospect for the IT industry and helps bring innovative and creative IT services to government departments.

The SOA-QPS scheme involves a two-stage bidding process. In the first stage, the Government enters into Standing Offer Agreements (SOAs) with a certain number of suppliers (SOA Contractors) that have been selected through open tendering. During the second stage within the validity period of the SOAs, government bureaux and departments (B/Ds) invite technical and price proposals for individual IT projects from the SOA Contractors. B/Ds will award a service contract to the contractor with a proposal meeting the technical requirements and attaining the highest combined score according to the marking scheme. Up to August 31, 2024, 1 696 services contracts were awarded under present SOA-QPS5 with an accumulated contract value of about HKD 2,685 million.

The consultation paper can be downloaded from the DPO website (www.digitalpolicy.gov.hk/en/news/consultations/). Interested parties may refer to the consultation paper for details and forward their comments and suggestions by email (qps_consultation@digitalpolicy.gov.hk) on or before October 22, 2024. An online briefing session will be held by the DPO on October 8, 2024, with details available on the above website.

Common Services and Sourcing Division
Digital Policy Office

_____

Electronic mail messages entering and leaving Arup business systems are scanned for viruses and acceptability of content.

Consultation on the future arrangement of the SOA-QPS

Feedback Form

Part 1 : Basic Information

Name:	Wilson Yeung
Name of organisation / company (if applicable):	System Aid Medical Services Limited
Contact number:	9193 3339
Email address:	wilson.yeung@samhk.com

Part 2: Consultation

Please provide your comments/suggestions (may supplement with a separate sheet if necessary):

We welcome the government initiative to foster the development of the local IT industry, particular in the SME software development outsourcing service arena.

Related to Point 3.2 of the Proposal to segregate security related services into a new Category of Work Assignment, we fully support the idea as it shall not only better ensure focus of SME's in the respective expertise but lessen the disruption to SME's who are not in the security related service trade, like ourself.

From a commercial point of view, we expect the government to issue guidelines to B/D's improve cashflow arrangement in terms of Payment Milestones. Currently most assignments require contractors to operate in negative cashflow in extended periods of time.

Thank you for your attention.

Consultation on the future arrangement of the SOA-QPS

Feedback Form

Part 1 : Basic Information

Name:	Angela CHENG
Name of Organisation / company (if applicable):	Top Level Corporation Limited
Contact number:	3999 5313 / 9486 7182
Email address:	sales@toplevel.com.hk / angela.cheng@toplevel.com.hk

Part 2 : Consultation

Please provide your comments/suggestions (may supplement with a separate sheet if necessary):

Referring to Clause 3.2 & 3.3 of your Consultation Paper about the setup of a new category ("Category D") for implementation and related services for IT systems adopting diversified secure and reliable technologies and requirements for the proposed key project staff, we would like to express our comments and concerns as follows:

1. As mentioned in clause 2.4, the government has been exploring ways and means to "foster the development of the local IT industry, in particular the IT start-ups and small and medium enterprises (SMEs), through facilitating their participation in government IT projects". However, the proposed requirements of the new Category D do not seem to be aligned with the policy of the government in supporting local-based SMEs.

2. As a Hong Kong-based SME, we find that the staffing requirements under Category D are stringent and hard to fulfill in a short period of time. The proposed key project staff for this Category are required to have experience in implementing IT systems adopting secure and reliable technologies listed on the website of the China Information Technology Security Evaluation Centre. However, those listed technologies are not widely adopted in Hong Kong at the moment.

3. While we are eager to participate in IT projects under Category D, acquiring these technologies takes time and resources. We doubt if average Hong Kong-based SMEs will have the time and resources to learn the technologies, apply

them and acquire sufficient implementation experience that can meet government requirements, before the beginning of next round of SOA-QPS tendering exercise.

4. To avoid marginalizing Hong Kong-based SMEs and to ensure that local SMEs have equal chance to participate in the IT projects of Category D, we have the following suggestions:

   a. <u>Postpone executing the certification and experience requirements in next round of SOA-QPS tendering exercise</u>
   We suggest DPO to postpone executing the requirements for the proposed key project staff in terms of their certification and previous experiences in implementation of IT systems adopting the "secure and reliable technologies" as published at website of the China Information Technology Security Evaluation Center in the coming round of SOA-QPS tendering exercise.

   Instead, DPO should allow individual Bureau/Department (B/D) to apply such kind of technology certification and experience requirements when B/D has to implement an individual project falling into Category D.

   In this way, high-calibre Hong Kong-based SMEs may not be easily edged out of Category D. Rather, they are given more time to equip themselves to meet the special requirements for IT projects under Category D.

   b. <u>Provide the details of technology requirements and the path to obtain professional certification</u>
   We find that the information provided by DPO regarding the technologies concerned and certification is insufficient. DPO is urged to provide detailed information on the project experience requirements for Category D.

   While the government is planning to implement IT projects with secure and reliable technologies, they should ensure that IT professionals familiar with such technologies are available locally. Currently, the 信息技術應用創新專業人員認證證書 is not available in Hong Kong. We need to get certified at examination sites in the mainland.

   DPO are suggested to:
   i)   Provide more details information about this certificate and the path to obtain the certificate; and
   ii)   Assist local IT professionals to get certified in Hong Kong site.

Thank you.

Consultation on the future arrangement of the SOA-QPS

Feedback Form

Part 1 : Basic Information

Name:	Pak-sun Ting
Name of organisation / company (if applicable):	Votee Limited
Contact number:	+852 9572 9338
Email address:	pak@votee.com

Part 2: Consultation

Please provide your comments/suggestions (may supplement with a separate sheet if necessary):

We, at Votee Limited, appreciate the opportunity to provide a thorough evaluation of the proposed SOA-QPS revisions, including specific recommendations for refinement. For full details, please refer to the supplementary document following this page.

Please submit the feedback form by email to qps_consultation@digitalpolicy.gov.hk on or before **22 October 2024**.

Response to the Public Consultation Paper:
Consultation on the future arrangement of the SOA-QPS

Detailed Consultation Opinion on Future Arrangement of the Standing Offer Agreement for Quality Professional Services (SOA-QPS)

Prepared on October 21, 2024

Table of Contents

Introduction

This consultation paper outlines several proposed changes to the SOA-QPS scheme, aiming to improve security, contractor performance, and responsiveness to market conditions. While the proposals generally move in the right direction, several areas require further clarification and refinement. This opinion addresses each proposal individually and offers specific recommendations.

P1: Introducing a new Category for IT systems adopting diversified secure and reliable technologies

The focus on diversified, secure, and reliable technologies is crucial in the current geopolitical climate. Creating a dedicated category (Category D) acknowledges this need and can encourage adoption of these technologies.

Specificity of "diversified secure and reliable technologies"

The reference to the China Information Technology Security Evaluation Center (www.itsec.gov.cn/aqkkcp/cpgg/) is helpful but requires more explicit definitions within the SOA-QPS documentation. A clear list of accepted technologies and standards should be provided to avoid ambiguity and ensure consistent application.

Stringent admission requirements

While justified by the sensitive nature of these systems, the requirements may inadvertently exclude smaller or newer companies with relevant expertise but lacking specific certifications. Consider offering alternative qualification pathways, such as demonstrable project experience or partnerships with certified entities.

CNNVD TSU requirement

Mandating Technical Support Unit status within CNNVD for subcategory D2 seems overly restrictive, especially given its focus on SRAA services. This could limit competition and should be reconsidered. Perhaps a strong recommendation or preferential scoring would be more appropriate.

P2: Enhancing the regulating and monitoring procedures of contractor's performance

Tightening performance monitoring is essential for ensuring service quality. Reducing the threshold for "Poor overall performance" and "Poor performance in individual work assignments" from three to two instances can lead to earlier intervention and improved accountability.

Appeals process

While the proposal mentions escalation within the B/D, a formal appeals process for contractors contesting CPAR scores is crucial for fairness and transparency. This process should be clearly defined and readily accessible.

Performance improvement plans

Suspending contractors without offering opportunities for remediation might be counterproductive. Consider implementing mandatory performance improvement plans for contractors nearing suspension thresholds.

P3: Taking into account contractors' past performance in government IT contracts not awarded under the SOA-QPS scheme and the immediate preceding round of SOA-QPS contracts that are still active

Considering past performance in both T1-Contracts and T2-Contracts provides a more holistic view of a contractor's capabilities and reliability. This strengthens the assessment process and promotes accountability.

Clarity on T2-Contract assessment

The process for handling T2-Contracts, particularly the escalation and final decision-making regarding disputed CPARs, needs further clarification. A standardized procedure with defined timelines should be established.

Weighting of T1/T2 Contracts

The proposal doesn't specify the relative weighting of T1/T2-Contracts compared to SOA-QPS contracts in the overall performance score. Clear weighting criteria should be established to ensure a balanced assessment.

P4: Setting up the Contract Administrative Matters Monitoring Mechanism

Addressing administrative responsiveness is important for efficient project execution. The proposed point deduction scheme offers a concrete mechanism for incentivizing timely compliance.

Transparency and communication

The CAO should ensure transparent communication of the point deduction rules and regular updates on contractors' point standings. This promotes awareness and encourages proactive compliance.

Flexibility

While the CAO's ability to adjust the scheme is necessary, clear guidelines for such adjustments should be established to prevent arbitrary changes. Contractors should be adequately consulted before any significant modifications.

P5: Merging Minor and Major Groups of Category C into one Group

This simplification streamlines the procurement process and seems justified based on usage statistics and future demand projections.

P6: Raising the Demarcation Limit from HK$3 million to HK$5 million

Adjusting the demarcation limit for inflation is sensible and allows SMEs to compete for larger projects while maintaining a balance with the Major Group.

P7: Raising the Financial Limit from HK$20 million to HK$25 million

Increasing the financial limit in line with rising IT professional salaries is reasonable and ensures that the SOA-QPS remains relevant for larger projects.

SME participation

While the proposals acknowledge the importance of SME participation, further measures could be explored, such as dedicated quotas or preferential scoring for SMEs in certain categories.

Regular review

The SOA-QPS scheme should be regularly reviewed and updated to adapt to evolving market conditions and technological advancements. A clear review cycle should be established.

Consultation and feedback

Ongoing consultation with the IT industry is crucial for ensuring that the SOA-QPS remains effective and meets the needs of both the government and the private sector.

Conclusion

By addressing the concerns and incorporating the recommendations outlined above, the DPO can further strengthen the SOA-QPS scheme and create a more robust and efficient framework for procuring quality professional IT services.