Price war on

-ee

race to the bottom

Datuk Ar. Ezumi Harzani Ismail 4 Dec 2021







PAM PERTUBUHAN AKITEK MALAYSIA MALAYSIAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

RACE TO THE TO Μ

Source: https://wtmarketingpros.com/price-war/



CHAPTER 1 : Architects Scale of Minimum Fee – What do we do?

Preamble

In the early days of Architectural practice in Malaysia, architects have the liberty to charge their clients any amount of fee that is reasonable and accepted by the client. Upon enactment of the Architects Act 1967 (Act 117), the practice of architecture is governed by Board of Architects Malaysia (LAM) who ensure good services are delivered and the public safety is not compromised, but there is no rules formulated to regulate architects' remuneration until very much later.

During early 70's economic downturn, many practitioners hit by the slow progress in construction industries which forced them to struggle fighting for jobs. Clients took advantage of the situation by paying low fees to these 'desperate architects'. Unreasonably low fees are just like worms eating the apple, deteriorating the professionalism. To curb this disease, Pertubuhan Akitek Malaysia (PAM) under the leadership of the late Dato' Ar. Kington Loo, introduced the first ever PAM Scale of Fee to the society in 1978. The scale of fee was very much welcomed by the architects, government and also public at large and being used as the main source of reference in computing architect's professional fee.

The advocates for betterment of the profession didn't end there, Dato' Ar. Kington Loo further persuades LAM and the Minister of Works to make the Scale of Fee mandatory. The mission succeeded when Architect (Scale of Minimum Fees) Rules was approved and made mandatory in 1986. The latest revision to the Architect (Scale of Minimum Fees) Rules was gazetted and came to force in 1st March 2010 to supersede the previous rules.

Page 2

Members Direction

The feedbacks received from the members attended the PAM Professional Practice Forum 2012 show the direction that the Scale of Minimum Fees should not be abolished. The Scale of Fees is very much needed by the profession, government and members of public.

A few members recommended that the Scale of Fees should be revised and not to be made mandatory, instead, to be implemented as a fee computation guides. However, 84.6% of the respondents insisted the Scale of Minimum Fees should be made mandatory and more than a quarter of them insisted that the rules have to be enforced. The summary of the feedbacks from the respondents are as follow:

Members views on Scale of Minimum Fee

| To maintain mandatory scale (to be enforced) | 63 | (25) | 88 | 84.6% | | | | | |
|--|-------|------|----|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| To be revised as recommended scale | 16 | | 16 | 15.4% | | | | | |
| To abolish the scale of fees | 0 | | 0 | 0.0% | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| tot | total | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |



REPORTOF PROCURENCE AND A CONSTRUCTION OF A CONS



4.3 Fees Paid by Client vs Minimum Scale of Fees

Private Projects



■ 1 - 10 % ■ 11 - 20% ■ 21 - 30% ■ 31 - 40% ■ 41 - 50% ■ 51 - 60% ■ 61 - 70% ■ 71 - 80% ■ 81 - 90% ■ 91 - 100% ■ Above 100

It is interesting to note that only 6% of the respondents get fees based on Minimum Scale of Fees or close to Minimum Scale of Fees (91% -100%). For the private projects, none of the respondent gets fees above Minimum Scale of Fees. Majority of them get fees between 21 - 40% of the Minimum Scale of Fees with 19% gets fees between 21 - 30%, 16% get fees between 31 - 40%.

It is also disappointing to note that 9% of the respondents get fees between 1 - 10%, and 10% get fees between 11 - 20%.

On the other range;

- 9% get fees between 41 50% of Minimum Scale of Fees
- 9% get fees between 51 60% of Minimum Scale of Fees
- 8% get fees between 61 70% of Minimum Scale of Fees
- 11% get fees between 71 80% of Minimum Scale of Fees
- 2% get fees between 81 90% of Minimum Scale of Fees



■ 1 - 10 % ■ 11 - 20% ■ 21 - 30% ■ 31 - 40% ■ 41 - 50% ■ 51 - 60% ■ 61 - 70% ■ 71 - 80% ■ 81 - 90% ■ 91 - 100% ■ Above 100%

Even for the government project, it is surprising to note that only 21% of the respondent said that fee paid are based on or closed to mandatory Minimum Scale of Fees with 20% said their fees are between 91 – 100% of Minimum Scale of Fees and 1% said they are paid above the Minimum Scale of Fees. More than 80% of the government projects do not follow mandatory Minimum Scale of Fees.

It is interesting to note that on government project, the Architects are either paid close to the Minimum Scale of Fees or way below Minimum Scale of Fees.

It is disappointing to see that 24% of the respondents are involved in government project are only paid fee between 1 – 10% of mandatory Minimum Scale of Fees. On the other range:

- 16% are paid between 11 20% of Minimum Scale of Fees
- 11% are paid between 21 30% of Minimum Scale of Fees
- 5% are paid between 31 40% of Minimum Scale of Fees
- 1% are paid between 51 60% of Minimum Scale of Fees
- 5% are paid between 61 70% of Minimum Scale of Fees
- 8% are paid between 71 80% of Minimum Scale of Fees
- And 8% are paid between 81 90% of Minimum Scale of Fees

When your client says your fee is too high, how will you justify it? Understanding architectural fees structure and knowing how to charge are important in justifying your fees to clients.

Usual fee justifications are fragmented and inconsistent, explaining your time and its value alone may not be able to meet client's fee expectations. There are many elements that affect architect's fee, including scope of services, complexity, geographic, economic and social contexts, reputations etc.

Architects spend hours solving spatial problems in multiple dimensions and understanding the constraints of by-laws with practical and innovative solutions, but what some clients see is just a stack of drawings. How to capture those values and efforts in an effective manner to discuss finances with a potential client?



Before answering the question "Is your fee too high?"

You need to take stock of your own value as an architect and how you provide that value for a client.

Promote the value of an architect

- Architect as an expert.
- A professional. Solving spatial problems in multiple dimensions, understanding the constraints of building regulations.
- Be specific, identify instances where you have saved a client money, time, or won an award with their project.
- Keep those moments as concrete evidence of your value and refer to them often while initiating any conversations with clients.



When client ask for:

good, cheap and fast

I used to ask:

good, cheap or fast?



- Good and cheap thing is not fast;
- Good and fast thing is not cheap;
- Cheap and fast thing is not good.



today :

- Good and cheap is fast;
- Good and fast is cheap;
- Cheap and fast is good.

and:

- Cheaper is not better;
- Slower is not cheaper;
- Better is not slower, neither it is cheaper.



Choose fee structure

Time Charge

- When the scope of works or scope of services is not clear;
- Start with an hourly engagement to get a sense of working style and deliverables before commissioning a project for completion.

Fixed Lump Sum

- Fixed fee is common for Concept Development or Planning when cost of works is uncertain;
- Or for specific architectural task / design review;

Percentage of Cost of Works

- Fee based on percentage of construction cost calculation;
- It aligns the project complexity, cost risk for both the client and architect since pricing is based on the actual building cost.

There are four main fee pricing methods:

- Start with a known scope and build up to a fee;
- Start with an acceptable fee and build down to the scope that the client can afford;
- Determine resources and work the time required;
- Use a unit pricing structure like percentage of construction cost or cost per sq.m.



Top-down Fee Pricing

- Value-based pricing;
- Scope of services will be determined based on available time value for the tasks.





The scope of works and scope of services are determined.





The scope of works and scope of services are determined.





The scope of works and scope of services are determined.



Time





PAM PERTUBUHAN AKITEK MALAYSIA MALAYSIAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS



PAM PERTUBUHAN AKITEK MALAYSIA MALAYSIAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

The scope of works and scope of services are determined.



The scope of works and scope of services are determined.





Cost elements

i. Firm's overhead

Rental, utilities, office supplies, website, cloud storage, registrations, licensing, cost of financing, professional services etc.

ii. Human resources

Salary, wages, bonus, allowances, perks, medical, group insurance, EPF, SOCSO, retirement fund, training etc.

iii. Profit*

Profits, losses, asset value depreciation and tax.

iv. Capital and reinvestment*

IT hardware, network, software, furniture, equipment etc.

v. Risk protection*

Cash reserve, fix deposit, Professional Indemnity Insurance, unemployment insurance.

* Many firms do not consider these elements in cost factors.



2.70

JADUAL 1 : KOMPONEN FP BAGI KAKITANGAN IKHTISAS FIRMA Component for Multiplier Component Ratio A. Benefits of Named Employee 1.00 Salary Bonus, Allowance, Perks & Leave 0.37 EPF/SPF 0.11 SOCSO 0.01 Training 0.02 Subscription to professional bodies, permits and licenses 0.05 Health and medical benefits 0.03 0.03 Retirement/superannuation funds B. Firm's Overhead 0.10 Rental Group Insurance 0.05 Utilities and office supplies 0.05 IT hardware/ network 0.03 Software 0.04 Systems (e.g. ISO, library) 0.02 Professional services including secretarial, audit and legal 0.04 Salaries of non-billable staff including administrative/directors 0.20 Research and development 0.02 Depreciation/amortization 0.07 Cost of capital 0.10 Profit before tax 0.20 Others 0.16

TOTAL



JADUAL 2 : KOMPONEN FP BAGI KAKITANGAN SEPARA IKHTISAS/SOKONGAN TEKNIKAL FIRMA

| Component for Multiplier | Component Ratio |
|---|-----------------|
| A. Benefits of Named Employee | |
| Salary | 1.00 |
| Bonus, Allowance, Perks & Leave | 0.15 |
| EPF/SPF | 0.11 |
| SOCSO | 0.02 |
| Training | 0.01 |
| Health and medical benefits | 0.02 |
| B. Firm's Overhead | |
| Rental | 0.04 |
| Group Insurance | 0.03 |
| Utilities and office supplies | 0.04 |
| IT hardware/ network | 0.01 |
| Software | 0.03 |
| Systems (e.g. ISO, library) | 0.01 |
| Professional services including secretarial, audit and legal | 0.02 |
| Salaries of non-billable staff including administrative/directors | 0.17 |
| Depreciation/amortization | 0.07 |
| Cost of capital | 0.10 |
| Profit before tax | 0.20 |
| Others | 0.07 |
| TOTAL | 2.10 |

PAM PERTUBUHAN AKITEK MALAYSIA MALAYSIAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

The scope of works and scope of services are determined.



Bottom-up fee calculation with additional operational cost factors on top of SoMF tends to result in a higher fee than the Client's expectation.

SoMF has already partially covered the operational cost factors, although not in full. Architects may charge above the scale to cover all the other cost elements.

The scope of works and scope of services are determined.



In a smaller projects, the the operational cost factors can be more than the base fee. It is even more difficult to justify.

The scope of works and scope of services are determined.



C PAM PERTUBUHAN AKITEK MALAYSIA MALAYSIAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

The scope of works and scope of services are determined.



SAMPLE: CONSULTATION FEE: 4 Blocks 800 units Apartment

| A) Consultation Fee - T | | | | | | | | exam | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|---------|--------------|--------------|------|------|------|--------|------|------|---------|------------|----------|-----------------|
| | | | | | | | Man | month | 1 | ' | | | <u> </u> | |
| Name | Position | Exp. | Current Rate | Average Rate | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | MFactor | r Rate | Mmonth | Total (RM) |
| Professional | | | | | р | re | cor | nstruc | tion | post | | | | |
| Ar. Abu Bin Ali | Project Director | 48 | 30,000.00 | 35,850.00 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.00 | 107,550.00 | 10 | 1,075,500.00 |
| 2 Ar. Ah Chong | Design Director | 32 | 30,000.00 | 31,400.00 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 94,200.00 | 9 | 847,800.00 |
| Ar. Ah Moy | Project Architect | 25 | 15,500.00 | 18,866.60 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 6 | 2.70 | 50,939.82 | 50 | 2,546,991.00 |
| Aminah Binti Hassan | Design Architect | 16 | 8,000.00 | 8,356.36 | 12 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.70 | 22,562.18 | 22 | 496,368.00 |
| Suzanne Lee | Planner | 18 | 6,500.00 | 6,841.25 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.70 | 18,471.38 | 12 | 221,656.50 |
| Suhana Binti Ali | Planner | 11 | 5,500.00 | 5,788.75 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.70 | 15,629.63 | 12 | 187,555.50 |
| Ar. Aman Bin Shah | BIM Manager | 19 | 12,000.00 | 13,800.00 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2.70 | 37,260.00 | 9 | 335,340.00 |
| Professional fee | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 5,711,211.00 |
| Sub Professional | | | | | | | | | | | | | | •,• • •,= • • • |
| Jamie Tiong | BIM Checker | 32 | 5.200.00 | 5.872.10 | 6 | 12 | 12 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2.10 | 12.331.41 | 40 | 493,256.40 |
| 2 Faizal Amir Jusoh | BIM modeller | 6 | 4.250.00 | 4.727.66 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2.10 | 9.928.09 | 46 | 456,692.25 |
| Lai Siew Eng | BIM modeller | 5 | 4,100.00 | 4,441.67 | 12 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2.10 | 9,327.50 | 36 | 335,790.00 |
| Derrick Chong | BIM modeller | 2 | 3,850.00 | 4,235.00 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2.10 | 8,893.50 | 30 | 266,805.00 |
| Zalena Ismail | Architect. Asst. | 2 | 3,600.00 | 4,009.37 | 6 | 12 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2.10 | 8,419.68 | 35 | 294,688.80 |
| Hanimah Ahmad | Architect. Asst. | 2 | 3,600.00 | 3,852.00 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.10 | 8,089.20 | 24 | 194,140.80 |
| Wong Soo Wang | Illustrator / Render | 11 | 6,600.00 | 6,831.00 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.10 | 14,345.10 | 4 | 57,380.40 |
| 3 Donald Meng | Graphic Artist | 7 | 4,600.00 | 4,857.60 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.10 | 10,200.96 | 5 | 51,004.80 |
| J Lim Swee Kim | IT Manager | 9 | 3,800.00 | 4,522.00 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2.10 | 9,496.20 | 6 | 56,977.20 |
| Ahmad Foo | Authority Liaison | 31 | 5,800.00 | 6,684.50 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.10 | 14,037.45 | 4 | 56,149.80 |
| Sub Professional Fee | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2,262,885.4 |
| Clerical | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rossie Jeffery | Project Secretary | 27 | 4,310.00 | 5,120.28 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1.90 | 9,728.53 | 10 | 97,285.32 |
| Clerical Fee | | | | | | | | | | | | 10 | | 97,285.32 |
| Total Consultation Fee | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 9 071 381 7 |
| | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | 8,071,301.71 |
| 6% Services Tax | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 404,202.5 |
| B) Reimbursable cost | <u>}</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I) Office operating cost - | - on site | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - Communication (Intern | iet, Telephone,Fax, | postage | e etc) | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 |
| - Drawing and Printing | | | | | | | | | | | | | I | 30,000.00 |
| - Computer infrastructure | e and software | | | | | | | | | | | | | 20,000.00 |
| - Professional Indemnity | y Insurance (10 year | rs) | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 500,000.00 |
| ii) Sub-consultancy serv | vices & report | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - | loos a roport | | | | | | | | | | | | I | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| iii) Mileage | | | | | | | | | | | | | I | 10 000 00 |
| - Milege, toi, parking etc | <u>. </u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | 40,000.00 |
| Total Reimbursable Cos | st | | | | | | | | | | | | | 590,000.00 |
| Total Cost (excluding Se | ervice Tax) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 8,661,381.77 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | incl. SST | | 9.145.664.6 |

SAMPLE: CONSULTATION FEE: 4 Blocks 800 units Apartment

| Name Name <th< th=""><th>A) Consultation Fee -</th><th>Table 1</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>Mor</th><th>nthly</th><th></th></th<> | A) Consultation Fee - | Table 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Mor | nthly | |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------|----------------------|------|------|------|-------|--------|------|--------|--------|-------------|--------|--------------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|----------|---------|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| Imm Peaksing Deal Deal <thdeal< th=""> Deal Deal <</thdeal<> | | | | | Γ | | | Man r | mont | ı | | | | | | Cost | | EPF& | | OT/ | Office | Company | Current | Projected | |
| Professional por Constrained Portage | Name | Position | Exp. | Current Rate Average | Rate | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 4 2025 | MFacto | r Rate | Mmonth | Total (RM) | factor | Salary | Socso | Bonus | Share | Overhead | Profit | Overhead | Overhead | Profit |
| Ar. A Drong Degid Director 48 300000 5.54000 1 1 2 1 30010 5.5000 1 1 2 2 1 30010 5.5000 1 1 2 2 1 0 | Professional | | | | | pre | | cor | nstruc | tion | DOS | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.47.55.677 |
| Ar. Ah Cong Design Dendar 22 30,000.00 31.400.00 4 1 1 0 0 30.00 0.00 0.25 0.42 7,500.00 7,880.00 1(6.45) 982. Arn Ah May Polexid Archited. 16 8,000.00 3,893.80 1(1.65) 982. 1(2.62) 1(2.72) 1(2.72) 1(2.72) 1(2.62) 1(2.72) <t< td=""><td>Ar. Abu Bin Ali</td><td>Project Director</td><td>48</td><td>30.000.00 35.850</td><td>0.00</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>1</td><td>3.00</td><td>0 107.550.0</td><td>0 10</td><td>1.075.500.00</td><td>2.58</td><td>3 1.00</td><td>0.13</td><td>0.60</td><td>0.60</td><td>0.25</td><td>0.42</td><td>7.500.00</td><td>8.962.50</td><td>150.570.00</td></t<> | Ar. Abu Bin Ali | Project Director | 48 | 30.000.00 35.850 | 0.00 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.00 | 0 107.550.0 | 0 10 | 1.075.500.00 | 2.58 | 3 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.25 | 0.42 | 7.500.00 | 8.962.50 | 150.570.00 |
| Ar. A. May Proper Archited: 2 1 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 2 2 1 1 2 1 2 2 1 1 2 1 1 2 0 0 0 2 1 2 0 0 0 2 1 2 0 <td>Ar. Ah Chong</td> <td>Design Director</td> <td>32</td> <td>30,000.00 31,400</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>3.00</td> <td>94.200.0</td> <td>0 9</td> <td>847.800.00</td> <td>2.58</td> <td>3 1.00</td> <td>0.13</td> <td>0.60</td> <td>0.60</td> <td>0.25</td> <td>0.42</td> <td>7.500.00</td> <td>7.850.00</td> <td>118,692.00</td> | Ar. Ah Chong | Design Director | 32 | 30,000.00 31,400 | 0.00 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 94.200.0 | 0 9 | 847.800.00 | 2.58 | 3 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.25 | 0.42 | 7.500.00 | 7.850.00 | 118,692.00 |
| Arnone Dies Archited. 16 8.000.00 8.056.81 12 6 4 0 0 2.70 2.256.21 2.2 4.08.88.00 1.68 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.00 0.25 1.12 2.000.00 2.850.01 1.13 1.14 2.000.00 2.25 1.12 2.000.00 2.25 1.12 1.260.00 0.00 0.25 1.12 1.260.00 1.020 0.00 0.25 1.12 1.260.00 1.030.00 0.25 1.12 1.260.00 1.030.00 0.00 0.25 1.12 1.260.00 1.047.00 1.000.01 0.00 0.25 1.12 1.260.00 1.047.00 1.000.01 0.00 0.25 1.12 1.260.00 1.047.00 1.000.01 0.00 0.25 1.12 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.000.01 0.00 0.25 1.12 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.260.00 1.260.00 <td>Ar. Ah Moy</td> <td>Project Architect</td> <td>25</td> <td>15,500.00 18,866</td> <td>6.60</td> <td>2</td> <td>6</td> <td>12</td> <td>12</td> <td>12</td> <td>6</td> <td>2.70</td> <td>50,939.8</td> <td>2 50</td> <td>2,546,991.00</td> <td>1.68</td> <td>3 1.00</td> <td>0.13</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.30</td> <td>0.25</td> <td>1.02</td> <td>3,875.00</td> <td>4,716.65</td> <td>962,196.60</td> | Ar. Ah Moy | Project Architect | 25 | 15,500.00 18,866 | 6.60 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 6 | 2.70 | 50,939.8 | 2 50 | 2,546,991.00 | 1.68 | 3 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.25 | 1.02 | 3,875.00 | 4,716.65 | 962,196.60 |
| Suzane lee Penner 16 6500.00 6.44.25 6 3 3 0 0 0 27.01 18.41.138 12 21.056.56 1.58 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.00 0.22 1.12 1.262.00 1.70 1.71 1.71 1.71 1.71 1.71 1.71 1.71 1.71 1.71 1.71 1.71 1.71 1.71 1.71 1.71 1.72 1.71 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 | Aminah Binti Hassan | Design Architect | 16 | 8,000.00 8,356 | 6.36 | 12 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.70 | 22,562.1 | 8 22 | 496,368.00 | 1.58 | 3 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 1.12 | 2,000.00 | 2,089.09 | 205,900.80 |
| Shahas Bint All Panner 1 55000 55000 575550 1.66 1.00 0.13 0.00 0.25 1.12 1.47.19 77.10 Arama BR Shah BM Manager 19 12.000.00 13.800.00 2 2 1 1 2.701 1562.665.31 1.66 1.00 0.13 0.00 0.25 1.12 1.47.19 77.17 Arama BR Shah BM Manager 19 12.000.00 5.872.10 6 12 2 2 1 1 2.701 1.68 1.00 0.13 0.00 0.25 1.12 1.47.19 77.11 Sub Professional Jamei Tong BM Modeler 6 1.20 1.21 2.60 1.22 1.00 2.206 1.66 1.00 1.30 0.00 0.01< | Suzanne Lee | Planner | 18 | 6,500.00 6,84 | .25 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.70 | 18,471.3 | 8 12 | 221,656.50 | 1.58 | 3 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 1.12 | 1,625.00 | 1,710.31 | 91,946.40 |
| Ar. Aran Bin Shah BM Manager 19 12,000,00 3,800,00 2 2 1 1 2,70 37,280,00 9 335,340,00 1.86 1.00 0.13 0.00 0.25 1.02 3,000,00 3,460,00 126,1 Portessional | Suhana Binti Ali | Planner | 11 | 5,500.00 5,788 | 3.75 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.70 | 15,629.6 | 3 12 | 187,555.50 | 1.58 | 3 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 1.12 | 1,375.00 | 1,447.19 | 77,800.80 |
| Professional fee 5,711,211.00 Sub Professional Jame Toong BML Checker 32 5,200,00 5,872,10 6 12 12 6 3 1 2,10 12,331,41 40 493,256,40 1.78 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.30 0.15 0.32 637,50 779,15 692,11 1.78 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.30 0.15 0.32 637,50 779,15 692,25 1.78 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.30 0.15 0.32 657,50 682,55 1.00 1.78 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.30 0.15 0.32 657,50 682,55 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.30 0.15 0.32 640,00 77,50 683,52 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.30 0.15 0.32 640,00 77,50 683,52 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.01 0.20 0.01 0.20 0.01 0.01 0.02 0.00 0.15 0.32 640,00 | Ar. Aman Bin Shah | BIM Manager | 19 | 12,000.00 13,800 | 0.00 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2.70 | 37,260.0 | 0 9 | 335,340.00 | 1.68 | 3 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.25 | 1.02 | 3,000.00 | 3,450.00 | 126,684.00 |
| Constrained Contraction Jamie Trong BM Checker 22 5.200.00 5.872.10 6 12 12 6 3 1.210 12.331.41 40 493.256.40 1.78 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.30 0.15 0.32 780.00 808.27 757.50 852.25 1.78 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.30 0.15 0.32 663.25 1.78 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.30 0.15 0.32 663.25 51.00 6662.5 51.1 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.30 0.15 0.32 661.25 51.00 662.5 51.1 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.30 0.15 0.32 661.25 51.00 662.5 51.1 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.30 0.15 0.32 661.25 51.00 1.78 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.30 0.15 0.32 670.00 780.00 775.0 852.25 1.00 1.1 1.0 1.2.01 1.4.00 1.78 1.00 1.13 0.20 0.30 0.15 0.32 | Professional fee | i - | | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 5 711 211 00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub Professional Lamine Tong Tazai Amm Jusoh BilM modeler 6 4,520,00 6,872,10 6 1 2 1 2,00 12,331,41 40 493,256,40 1,78 1,00 0,33 0,20 0,30 0,15 0,32 780,00 980,82 75, 615,00 1,78 1,00 0,13 0,20 0,30 0,15 0,32 780,00 980,82 75, 615,00 1,78 1,00 0,13 0,20 0,30 0,15 0,32 75,00 700,15 632 615,00 662,62 51, Laris war Ling Mindeder 2 3,850,00 612 12 2 1 1,00 9,827,80 683,579,00 0,15 0,32 615,00 655,00 0,30 0,15 0,32 615,00 655,00 0,30 0,15 0,32 510,00 615,00,32 670,00 633,00 0,15 0,32 640,00 655,00 1,76 1,00 0,30 0,00 0,15 0,32 640,00 645,60 0,0 0,15 0,32 640,00 0,15 0,32 640,00 0,15 0,32 640,00 <td></td> <td>5,711,211.00</td> <td>/</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 5,711,211.00 | / | | | | | | | | | |
| partier fund juito decleti 32 2.40000 367.20 6 1 2 1 2 1 2 2 2 1 | Sub Professional | PIM Checker | 20 | E 200 00 E 97 | 10 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 2.10 | 10 001 4 | 1 10 | 402.256.40 | 1 70 | 1 00 | 0.12 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.15 | 0.22 | 790.00 | 000.00 | 75 160 00 |
| Index of the design of the | Jamle Hong | BIM Checker | 32 | 5,200.00 5,87 | | 12 | 12 | 12 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2.10 | 0 0 0 2 8 0 | 40 | 493,200.40 | 1.70 | | 0.13 | 0.20 | 0.30 | 0.15 | 0.32 | 637.50 | 700.15 | 60 501 20 |
| Lind Section 0 <t< td=""><td>Lai Siow Eng</td><td>BIM modeller</td><td>5</td><td>4,250.00 4,721</td><td>.00</td><td>12</td><td>12</td><td>6</td><td>6</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>2.10</td><td>0 327 5</td><td>9 40</td><td>335 700 00</td><td>1.70</td><td>3 1.00</td><td>0.13</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.30</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.32</td><td>615.00</td><td>666.25</td><td>51 168 00</td></t<> | Lai Siow Eng | BIM modeller | 5 | 4,250.00 4,721 | .00 | 12 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2.10 | 0 327 5 | 9 40 | 335 700 00 | 1.70 | 3 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.20 | 0.30 | 0.15 | 0.32 | 615.00 | 666.25 | 51 168 00 |
| Domain Name Architect. Sat. 2 0.0000 1/000037 6 12 12 2 2 1 2 1 | Derrick Chong | BIM modeller | 2 | 3 850 00 4 23 | 5.00 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2.10 | 8 893 5 | 0 30 | 266 805 00 | 1.70 | 3 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.20 | 0.30 | 0.15 | 0.32 | 577 50 | 635.25 | 40 656 00 |
| Haimati Ahmad Architect. Asst. 2 3.800.00 3.852.00 6 12 6 0 0 2.10 8.099.20 24 194.140.80 1.78 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.30 0.15 0.32 540.00 577.80 29.1 Wong Soo Wang Illustrator / Rende 11 6.600.00 6.871.06 2 1 0 0 2.10 1.20.05 6 51.00.40 1.78 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.30 0.15 0.32 540.00 577.80 29.1 Lin Swee Kim IT Manager 9 3.800.00 4.522.00 1 1 1 1 1 1.210 9.496.20 6 55.977.20 1.78 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.30 0.15 0.32 570.00 673.30 8,8 Sub Professional Fee 2.262.885.45 1 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.30 0.15 0.32 570.00 678.30 8,8 Clerical 9.728.53 10 0.728.52 1.8 1.00 0.13 0.20 | Zalena Ismail | Architect Asst | 2 | 3 600 00 4 009 | 37 | 6 | 12 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2.10 | 8 4 1 9 6 | 8 35 | 294 688 80 | 1.78 | 3 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.20 | 0.30 | 0.15 | 0.32 | 540.00 | 601.41 | 44 904 96 |
| Control Control <t< td=""><td>Hanimah Ahmad</td><td>Architect Asst</td><td>2</td><td>3 600 00 3 853</td><td>2 00</td><td>6</td><td>12</td><td>6</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>2.10</td><td>8 089 2</td><td>0 24</td><td>194 140 80</td><td>1.78</td><td>3 1.00</td><td>0.13</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.30</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.32</td><td>540.00</td><td>577.80</td><td>29 583 36</td></t<> | Hanimah Ahmad | Architect Asst | 2 | 3 600 00 3 853 | 2 00 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.10 | 8 089 2 | 0 24 | 194 140 80 | 1.78 | 3 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.20 | 0.30 | 0.15 | 0.32 | 540.00 | 577.80 | 29 583 36 |
| Thing Control | Wong Soo Wang | Illustrator / Rende | 11 | 6 600 00 6 83 | 00 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.10 | 14 345 1 | 0 4 | 57 380 40 | 1.78 | 3 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.20 | 0.30 | 0.15 | 0.32 | 990.00 | 1 024 65 | 8 743 68 |
| Dimber of a binder | Donald Meng | Graphic Artist | 7 | 4 600 00 4 85 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.10 | 10 200 9 | 6 5 | 51 004 80 | 1.78 | 3 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.20 | 0.30 | 0.15 | 0.32 | 690.00 | 728.64 | 7 772 16 |
| Definition Distribution Distribution <td>Lim Swee Kim</td> <td>IT Manager</td> <td>9</td> <td>3 800 00 4 523</td> <td>2 00</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>2.10</td> <td>9 496 2</td> <td>0 6</td> <td>56 977 20</td> <td>1.78</td> <td>3 1.00</td> <td>0.13</td> <td>0.20</td> <td>0.30</td> <td>0.15</td> <td>0.32</td> <td>570.00</td> <td>678.30</td> <td>8 682 24</td> | Lim Swee Kim | IT Manager | 9 | 3 800 00 4 523 | 2 00 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2.10 | 9 496 2 | 0 6 | 56 977 20 | 1.78 | 3 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.20 | 0.30 | 0.15 | 0.32 | 570.00 | 678.30 | 8 682 24 |
| Sub Professional Fee 2,222,885.45 Clerical Rossi e Jeffery Rossi e Jeffery Project Secretary 27 4,310.00 5,120.28 1 2 2 2 1 1.90 97,285.32 1.48 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.00 0.15 0.42 646.50 768.04 21,4 Clerical Fee 97,285.32 97,285.32 97,285.32 1.48 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.00 0.15 0.42 646.50 768.04 21,4 Clerical Fee 97,285.32 97,285.32 1.48 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.00 0.15 0.42 646.50 768.04 21,4 Clerical Fee 97,285.32 1.484,282.91 34,331.50 38,498.72 2,100,0 Communication (Internet, Telephone, Fax,postage etc) 0.00 0.00 30,000.00 20,000.00 30,000.00 20,000.00 30,000.00 20,000.00 20,000.00 20,000.00 20,000.00 20,000.00 20,000.00 20,000.00 20,000.00 20,000.00 20,000.00 20,000.00 20,000.00 20,000.00 <t< td=""><td>Ahmad Foo</td><td>Authority Liaison</td><td>31</td><td>5.800.00 6.684</td><td>.50</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>2.10</td><td>14.037.4</td><td>5 4</td><td>56,149.80</td><td>1.78</td><td>3 1.00</td><td>0.13</td><td>0.20</td><td>0.30</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.32</td><td>870.00</td><td>1.002.68</td><td>8.556.16</td></t<> | Ahmad Foo | Authority Liaison | 31 | 5.800.00 6.684 | .50 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.10 | 14.037.4 | 5 4 | 56,149.80 | 1.78 | 3 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.20 | 0.30 | 0.15 | 0.32 | 870.00 | 1.002.68 | 8.556.16 |
| Clerical Clerical Spectroscol Rossie Jeffery Project Secretary 27 4,310.00 5,120.28 1 2 2 1 1.90 9,728.53 10 97,285.32 Clerical Fee 97,285.32 97,285.32 97,285.32 34,331.50 36,50 30,50 30,500 30,500,00 30,500,000 30,500,000 30,500,000,00 30,000,00 | Sub Professional Fee | • | | • | | | | | | | | | | | 2 262 885 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Rossie Jeffery Project Secretary 27 4,310.00 5,120.28 1 2 2 2 1 1,90 9,728.53 10 97,285.32 Clerical Fee 97,285.32 97,285.32 10 97,285.32 1.48 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.00 0.15 0.42 646.50 768.04 21,4 Go Services Tax 97,285.32 97,285.32 97,285.32 1.48 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.00 0.15 0.42 646.50 768.04 21,4 B) Reimbursable cost 97,285.32 97,285.32 97,285.32 1.48 1.00 0.13 0.20 0.00 0.15 0.42 646.50 768.04 21,4 B) Reimbursable cost 0.00 30,000.00 | Clerical | | | | | | | | | | | | | | _,,_, | | | | | | | | | | |
| Clerical Fee 97,285.32 Total Consultation Fee 8,071,381.77 6% Services Tax 484,282.91 B) Reimbursable cost 0.00 - Communication (Internet, Telephone, Fax, postage etc) 0.00 - Draving and Printing 30,000.00 - Computer infrastructure and software 20,000.00 - Professional Indemnity Insurance (10 years) 500,000.00 i) Wileage 0.00 - Milege, tol, parking etc. 40,000.00 Total Cost (excluding Service Tax) 8,661,381.77 incl. SST 9,145,664.88 | Rossie Jefferv | Project Secretary | 27 | 4.310.00 5.120 | .28 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1.90 | 9,728,5 | 3 10 | 97,285,32 | 1.48 | 3 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.42 | 646.50 | 768.04 | 21,505,18 |
| Total Consultation Fee 8,071,381.77 6% Services Tax 484,282.91 9) Reimbursable cost 0.00 1) Office operating cost - on site 0.00 - Communication (Internet, Telephone,Fax,postage etc) 0.00 - Drawing and Printing 30,000.00 - Computer infrastructure and software 20,000.00 - Professional Indemnity Insurance (10 years) 500,000.00 ii) Sub-consultancy services & report 0.00 - Milege, tol, parking etc. 40,000.00 Total Reimbursable Cost 590,000.00 Total Cost (excluding Service Tax) 8,661,381.77 incl. SST 9,145,664.68 | Clerical Fee | 1 | | ., | | | - | _ | | | | | 0,12010 | | 97.285.32 | | | | | | | | | | , |
| Total Consultation Fee 8,071,381.77 34,331.50 38,498.72 2,100, 6% Services Tax 484,282.91 2 B) Reimbursable cost 0.00 0.00 - Communication (Internet, Telephone,Fax,postage etc) 0.00 0.00 - Drawing and Printing 20,000.00 20,000.00 - Professional Indemnity Insurance (10 years) 500,000.00 500,000.00 ii) Nileage 0.00 0.00 0.00 - Milege, tol, parking etc. 40,000.00 0.00 Total Cost (excluding Service Tax) 8,661,381.77 9,145,664.68 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | , | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6% Services Tax 484,282.91 2 B) Reimbursable cost 0.00 1) Office operating cost - on site 0.00 - Communication (Internet, Telephone, Fax, postage etc) 0.00 - Drawing and Printing 30,000.00 - Computer infrastructure and software 20,000.00 - Computer infrastructure and software 20,000.00 - Professional Indemnity Insurance (10 years) 500,000.00 ii) Sub-consultancy services & report 0.00 - Mileage 40,000.00 Total Reimbursable Cost 590,000.00 Total Cost (excluding Service Tax) 8,661,381.77 incl. SST 9,145,664.68 | Total Consultation Fee | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 8,071,381.77 | , | | | | | | | 34,331.50 | 38,498.72 | 2,100,116.42 |
| B) Reimbursable cost I) Office operating cost - on site - Communication (Intermet, Telephone,Fax,postage etc) 0.00 - Drawing and Printing 0.00 - Computer infrastructure and software 20,000.00 - Professional Indermity Insurance (10 years) 500,000.00 ii) Sub-consultancy services & report 0.00 - Milege, tol, parking etc. 40,000.00 Total Reimbursable Cost 590,000.00 Total Cost (excluding Service Tax) 8,661,381.77 incl. SST 9,145,664.68 | 6% Services Tax | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 484,282.91 | | | | | | | | | | 24.25% |
| I) Office operating cost - on site 0.00 - Communication (Internet, Telephone,Fax,postage etc) 0.00 - Drawing and Printing 30,000.00 - Computer infrastructure and software 20,000.00 - Professional Indemnity Insurance (10 years) 500,000.00 ii) Sub-consultancy services & report 0.00 - 0.00 - 0.00 Total Reimbursable Cost 590,000.00 Total Cost (excluding Service Tax) 8,661,381.77 incl. SST 9,145,664.68 | B) Reimbursable cost | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - Communication (Internet, Telephone, Fax, postage etc) 0.00 - Drawing and Printing 30,000.00 - Computer infrastructure and software 20,000.00 - Professional Indernnity Insurance (10 years) 500,000.00 ii) Sub-consultancy services & report 0.00 - 0.00 iii) Mileage 40,000.00 - Milege, tol, parking etc. 40,000.00 Total Reimbursable Cost 590,000.00 Total Cost (excluding Service Tax) 8,661,381.77 incl. SST 9,145,664.668 | I) Office operating cost | - on site | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| - Drawing and Printing 30,000.00 - Computer infrastructure and software 20,000.00 - Professional Indemnity Insurance (10 years) 500,000.00 ii) Sub-consultancy services & report 0.00 - 0.00 iii) Mileage 40,000.00 - Milege, tol, parking etc. 40,000.00 Total Reimbursable Cost 590,000.00 Total Cost (excluding Service Tax) 8,661,381.77 incl. SST 9,145,664.68 | - Communication (Inter | net, Telephone,Fax | postage | e etc) | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| - Computer infrastructure and software 20,000.00 - Professional Indemnity Insurance (10 years) 500,000.00 ii) Sub-consultancy services & report 0.00 - 0.00 iii) Mileage 40,000.00 - Milege, tol, parking etc. 40,000.00 Total Reimbursable Cost 590,000.00 Total Cost (excluding Service Tax) 8,661,381.77 incl. SST 9,145,664.68 | - Drawing and Printing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 30.000.00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| - Professional Indemnity Insurance (10 years) 10,00000 ii) Sub-consultancy services & report 0.00 - 0.00 iii) Mileage 40,000.00 - Milege, tol, parking etc. 40,000.00 Total Reimbursable Cost 590,000.00 Total Cost (excluding Service Tax) 8,661,381.77 incl. SST 9,145,664.68 | - Computer infrastructu | re and software | | | | | | | | | | | | | 20,000,00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| ii) Sub-consultancy services & report 0.00 · 0.00 iii) Mileage 40,000.00 · Milege, tol, parking etc. 40,000.00 Total Reimbursable Cost 590,000.00 Total Cost (excluding Service Tax) 8,661,381.77 incl. SST 9,145,664.68 | - Professional Indemnit | v Insurance (10 vea | ars) | | | | | | | | | | | | 500 000 00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| III) Sub-consultancy services & report 0.00 - 0.00 III) Mileage 40,000.00 - Milege, tol, parking etc. 40,000.00 Total Reimbursable Cost 590,000.00 Total Cost (excluding Service Tax) 8,661,381.77 Incl. SST 9,145,664.68 | =) Cub concultoney con | vises 8 report | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | |
| • 0.00 iii) Mileage 40,000.00 • Milege, tol, parking etc. 40,000.00 Total Reimbursable Cost 590,000.00 Total Cost (excluding Service Tax) 8,661,381.77 incl. SST 9,145,664.68 | II) Sub-consultancy ser | vices & report | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| iii) Mileage 40,000.00 - Milege, tol, parking etc. 40,000.00 Total Reimbursable Cost 590,000.00 Total Cost (excluding Service Tax) 8,661,381.77 incl. SST 9,145,664.68 | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.00 | 1 | | | | | | ex | amr |)le | |
| - Milege, tol, parking etc. 40,000.00 Total Reimbursable Cost 590,000.00 Total Cost (excluding Service Tax) 8,661,381.77 incl. SST 9,145,664.68 | iii) Mileage | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 000000000 | | | | | | | 0/1 | | | |
| Total Reimbursable Cost 590,000.00 Total Cost (excluding Service Tax) 8,661,381.77 incl. SST 9,145,664.68 | - Milege, tol, parking et | с. | | | | | | | | | | | | | 40,000.00 | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Cost (excluding Service Tax) 8,661,381.77 incl. SST 9,145,664.68 | Total Reimbursable Co | st | | | | | | | | | | | | | 590,000,00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| incl. SST 9,145,664.68 | Total Cost (ovoluding C | Convice Tex) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 661 204 77 | | | | | | | | | | |
| incl. SST 9,145,664.68 | Total Cost (excluding S | Dervice Tax) | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | 0,001,381.// | 4 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | incl. SST | | 9,145,664.68 | 3 | | | | | | | | | |

The scope of works and scope of services are determined.



PAM PERTUBUHAN AKITEK MALAYSIA MALAYSIAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS





How to win a price war?

Increase Quality, Don't Lower Price

The word "cheap" tends to carry a negative connotation – "cheap service". The word "inexpensive" has a more positive ring – "inexpensive service".

Clients perceive the more expensive service to be better-quality, even if they don't know it's key benefits and features.

Take a Step Back and Analyse Your Competitor

Take a step back, and asked yourself "Do you need to engage in a price war?" Your competitor could be acting out of desperation instead of competition.

Analyse how profitable or ruinous business has been for the competition.

Stop Racing to the Bottom

Join the race that bring you to the top.



How to Avoid a Price War With Competitors

Focus on Value instead of Price

- Price competition will undervalue your own services.
- Causes miss revenue enhancement opportunities.
- It is essential to understand what make your service different from others.
- Implementation of value-based pricing.

Introduce Price Fences / Tiering

- Create segment / tiers on services that match client's willingness to pay.
- Create "pricing indicator" that fit into specific ranges or clients expectation.
- Provide flexibility to match competitive offers with "lower-tiered", while protecting your premium service.

Communicate With a Purpose

- Communication on price structure / fee basis is critical to success.
- Intimidating tactic to avoid a price war and win a price war, forcing competitors to re-evaluate their strategy.

Business Process

There are three things to prevent a price war:

- Evaluate your company's capacity and forecast,
- Evaluate competitor pricing and actions and,
- Evaluate your current offering and value proposition.



Global market share held by Nokia smartphones from 1st quarter 2007 to 2nd quarter 2013

Sources: IDC; Nokia; Gartner © Statista 2014 Additional Information Worldwide; Gartner, IDC, Nokia

Datuk Ar. Ezumi Harzani Ismail

