B. Operating model comparisons

Figure B1 compares the two service delivery models the State Penalties Enforcement Registry (SPER) considered.

Figure B1
Comparison of service delivery models

Feature	Debt service manager model—May 2014	Software as a service model—May 2015
Outsourcing	Total	Partial
Services to be provided by vendor	• Provide software as a service • Manage the debt register • Manage the collection of a portion of the penalty debts referred to SPER through a panel of private sector debt collection agencies	• Provide software as a service • Ongoing advice regarding business intelligence, data analytics, and other matters specific to debt collection without direct involvement in the collection of debts
Debt collection services retained by SPER	SPER only manages non-commercial debt (hardship cases and debtors who can but will not pay)	SPER manages all debt collection
System owner	Vendor	Vendor
SPER requirements	Vendor accountable for outcomes which meet minimum system requirements.	A system that supports SPER to achieve its outcomes and which meets system requirements.

Source: Queensland Audit Office.