

note (a):

"7. I remained of the view that the best interests of the community would be served if it were possible to establish a collaborative approach which draws on the best aspects of each of the leading proposals.

8. For this reason alone, I considered that I would be justified in concluding the RFP exercise without making a selection and pursuing a collaborative approach, rather than following the advice of the evaluation panel and selecting the leading Proponent.

9. I noted that the review committee has expressed no objection to my concluding the RFP exercise without making a selection, albeit for different reasons.

10. Taking into account the evaluation report, the advice of the review committee, and my own assessment, I decided not to invite any of the proponents to form an Implementer to take forward their proposal."

[Extracts from Mr Jeremy Godfrey's e-mail dated October 8, 2010 @ 0110 pm]

note (b):

"The FSI option is judged not feasible because of uncertainties about how long it would take to secure the necessary approvals and the risk of dysfunction on the Board if it was drawn from both HKCSS and eInclusion." [Extracts from Mr Jeremy Godfrey's e-mail to PSCT dated November 26, 2010 @ 0657 pm]

note (c):

"11. We have considered launching a new selection exercise involving only the two organisations...

12. Nonetheless, there would be concerns over fairness and procedural propriety with this approach...

13. A fresh selection exercise would also delay implementation by at least a month. The two leading contenders might complain that they expected the next step would be for them to begin implementation, not to devote more resources to a renewed bidding exercise." [Extracts from Mr Jeremy Godfrey's minute via PSCT, SCED, SFST to FS dated December 1, 2010.]

note (d):

"18. She told me that we should do what we considered to be the right thing in the interests of the low income families. [Extracts from Mr Jeremy Godfrey's submission to LegCo ITB Panel dated May 25, 2011]

note (e):

See para 15 of Mr Jeremy Godfrey's submission of May 25, 2011 to LegCo ITB Panel.

note (f):

"I believed that a consortium that included iProA would have a very good chance of being selected in a fair process, as long as they produced a good proposal and as long as the evaluation criteria gave due weight to business expertise." [Extracts from Mr Jeremy Godfrey's submission to LegCo ITB Panel dated May 25, 2011]

note (g):

"I have found myself with a continuing feeling that you are uneasy about my objectives and the approaches I am taking. Over time, this has led me to magnify the importance of even the smallest signals – an unreturned phone call or an instruction given directly to one of my deputies – and to interpret them as evidence of an agenda to block my plans. I recognise that these feelings are probably unfounded and that I should have articulated my concern and sought to resolve the issues." [Extracts from Mr Jeremy Godfrey's e-mail to PSCT dated December 24, 2010 @ 1225 pm]