



MEETING NOTES

EVENT NAME	<i>UK Prosperity Fund – South East Asia Low Carbon Energy Programme Pre-Procurement Market Engagement Activity</i>				
DATE	21 March 2018	START	16:00H SGT	END	19:15H SGT
ATTENDEES	Refer to next page				
VENUE	British High Commission Singapore				
ATTACHMENTS	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. SE Asia Low Carbon Energy Programme Slide Pack2. Event Notes3. Draft Call-Off Contract4. Potential Pricing Methodology and Suggested Pricing Schedule5. Feedback Questionnaire				

NOTES

- High Commissioner Scott Wightman (British High Commission in Singapore) welcomed the attendees, gave an overview of the [UK Prosperity Fund](#) and the SE Asia Prosperity Fund Programmes.
 - Karen Dobson (FCO Procurement Portfolio Lead) provided updates on the process and **indicative timeline** on procurement. The indicative timeline can be found in the attached presentation.
 - Camilla Fenning (Head of SE Asia Climate and Energy Network) provided the Programme overview and discussed the draft Statement of Requirements.
 - Presentation is attached.
 - The Contract Award Notice with the full list of successful framework bidders is published online and can be found the [OJEU Website](#).
 - The Prosperity Fund Framework launch event will take place on 8th May, Tuesday in FCO London from 09:30 to 16:00 (UK).
-

SE Asia Low Carbon Energy Programme Supplier Day

Attendees List

21 March 2018

Framework Bidders		Subcontractors	
1. Adam Smith Intl	Matt Uzzell (BHC) <i>Director Infra & Climate Change</i>	1. Atkins Acuity	Marie Lam-Frendo (BHC) <i>Associate Director</i>
2. AECOM Limited	Magaesh Kumar Naidu (BHC) <i>Technical Director</i> Sarah O'Neill (remote) <i>Consultant, Intl Development</i>	2. Atlas Industries	Liam Thomson (BHC) <i>Business Devt Manager</i>
3. Cardno	Gavin Wyngaard (BHC) <i>Senior Principal, Intl Development</i>	3. Cambridge Econometrics	Hector Pollitt (remote) <i>Director, Head of Modelling</i>
4. Crown Agents	Viv Davies (BHC) <i>Principal Consultant</i>	4. Cambridge Economy Policy Associates	Richard Rodger (remote) <i>Head of Marketing</i>
5. DAI Europe Ltd	Polly Gillingham (BHC) <i>Director of Business Devt</i> Chris Rose (remote) <i>Senior Consultant – Energy & Env.</i>	5. Carbon Limiting Technologies	Beverley Gower-Jones (remote) <i>CEO</i>
6. Deloitte	Balaji M K (BHC) <i>Project Delivery Manager</i>	6. Carbon Trust	Chris Stephens (remote) <i>Asia Director</i> Kate Hooper (remote) <i>Asia Analyst</i> Myles McCarthy (remote)
7. EY	Russell Marsh (BHC) <i>Associate Director</i> Praveen Teckchandani (BHC) <i>Senior Manager</i>	7. CDP Worldwide	Hanah Paik (BHC) <i>Senior Manager</i> Tony Rooke (BHC) <i>Technical Director</i>
8. ICF	Yeen Chan (BHC) <i>Senior Managing Consultant</i>	8. Chatham House	Sian Bradley (remote) <i>Research Associate</i>
9. IHS Energy	Mark Jelinek (BHC) <i>Managing Director</i>	9. Chemonics Intl	Stacy Edgar (BHC) <i>Director, Business Devt</i>
10. IMC Worldwide	Ayodele Sobowale (remote) <i>Prosperity Fund Lead</i>	10. Climate Policy Initiative Indonesia	Suzanty Sitorus (remote) <i>Country Director</i>
11. McKinsey	Giovanni Bruni (BHC) <i>Senior Solution Leader</i> Antonio Della Pelle (BHC) <i>Director of Client Devt</i>	11. Danish Energy Management & Esbensen	Karsten M. Holm (remote) <i>Senior Consultant, Climate & Energy</i>
12. Mott MacDonald	Binu Chaudhary (BHC) <i>Regional Commercial Mgr</i> Euan Low (BHC) <i>Technical Consultant</i>	12. GIZ	Georg Seidl (remote) <i>Project Manager</i>
13. NIRAS	Michael Juel (BHC) Roosa Tuomaala (BHC) Phan Minh Thao (BHC) Saana Ahonesn (remote) Jim Kersey (remote)	13. HKCCI, University of Edinburgh	Shelley Zhou (remote) <i>Chief Executive</i>
14. Oxford Policy Mgt	Megan Titchell (remote) <i>Frameworks Coordinator</i>	14. PEMSEA	Aimee Gonzales (BHC) <i>Executive Director</i>
15. PA Consulting	David Lewis (remote) <i>Principal Consultant</i>	15. Puissance Midlands	Mark Pearce (remote)
16. PwC	Edwina Chin (BHC) <i>Manager, Intl Development</i> Hyun Park (remote) <i>Manager, Intl Devt</i> Lit Ping Low (remote) <i>Assistant Director</i>	16. UNDP	Nasha Chia Hwee Lee (remote) <i>Environmental Associate</i>
17. WSP	Steven Er (BHC)	17. Vivid Economics	Jacob Wellman (remote) <i>Economist</i>

POINTS AND ISSUES RAISED	RESPONSE
ACTIONS FOR SUPPLIERS	
Concern about the inclusion in the SoRs or pricing schedule of risks that are outside the supplier's control. These will get priced in to the bid.	<p>ACTION: a draft pricing schedule has been included with this readout. PLEASE REVIEW AND FEEDBACK YOUR VIEWS.</p> <p>ACTION: SoRs to be clear on the difference between programme KPIs that track whether the programme as a whole is delivering impact and delivery partner KPIs that track whether the delivery partner is meeting the milestones for payments. Delivery Partners will contribute to meeting programme KPIs, but payments will not be linked to them.</p>
Further prioritisation of activity may be needed to ensure anticipated activity can be delivered within budget.	<p>ACTION: Programme team to consider ahead of issuing SoRs. PLEASE FEEDBACK FURTHER ON THIS THROUGH THE ATTACHED QUESTIONNAIRE.</p>
The Draft contract contains some quite challenging clauses for suppliers. Suppliers will need to price in the risk of these where they cannot mitigate them.	<p>ACTION: Draft contract to be shared by FCO in advance. PLEASE PROVIDE COMMENTS BACK TO US.</p>
ACTIONS FOR FCO	
Some - though not all - suppliers considered that the 4 month Inception Phase was too short, suggesting up to 6 months.	<p>ACTION: Length of Phase 1 (inception phase) will be reviewed.</p>
There may be circumstances outside delivery partners control that delay or prevent delivery.	<p>ACTION: The SoRs contain Force Majeure terms already. These will be expanded to clarify what is covered. The SoRs will also make clear that where there is a good case to move funds to another part of the programme that will always be the first option before removing the funds from the programme and reducing the delivery partner's contract.</p>
Extending the delivery timeframe would be valuable, but also impacts suppliers' costing. Clarity would help accurate pricing.	<p>ACTION: Programme team seeking to give definitive answer on programme timeframe in the SoRs.</p>
The ITT will need to be clear on the admin burden on suppliers, particularly around monitoring, reporting, evaluation and learning (MREL).	<p>ACTION: SoRs will include more detail on requirements on suppliers to report.</p>

SoRs need to set out what engagement with partner governments has already been undertaken and whether host governments are already bought in to the programme.	ACTION: FCO to include this information in SoRs. The programme was designed in consultation with partner governments and reflects their priorities in the relevant areas.
Please share information about what activity the UK has previously undertaken with partner countries so suppliers can have background to build on.	ACTION: FCO will look to include in the SoRs a summary of previous work and engagement on these themes with partner countries to demonstrate partner country buy-in and our previous activity with them. Basic information is released publicly each year and is searchable online. A selection of our activities has been published on the SE Asia Prosperity Fund blog.
Please supply more information on the procurement process, including expected timeline, criteria for sub-contractors etc.	ACTION: Some information is already included in the presentation. FCO will look at providing more information.

NOTES AND CLARIFICATIONS

Does the secondary benefit aim impact on sub-contracting?	CLARIFICATION: Prosperity Fund programmes have been designed to look at what partner countries need and where the UK has expertise to offer. It is likely therefore that UK sub-contractors would have valuable expertise to bring, however there is no requirement to use UK sub-contractors and UK content will not be a criteria for assessing bids.
There is a tension between a general regional approach and country-specific tailored solutions.	AGREED. The programme must not simply be a selection of country-by-country projects. For economies of scale a more regional approach is required, though there will be scope to tailor to specific countries e.g. different timelines; pilots (perhaps with subsequent roll out); focussing on clutches of countries; additional initial TA in some countries to bring up to speed etc.
Countries in the region are at different stages in their policy frameworks and expertise on green finance and energy efficiency. Green finance is moving quickly in this region so a challenge to encourage countries towards similar standard.	AGREED.
How is the FCO programme team structured?	CLARIFICATION: The regional team in Singapore will be the primary point of contact for the lead implementer. The in-country FCO programme managers will be the primary point of contract for sub-contractors and in-country delivery partners. More details will be in the management case of the business case which will be published as part of the ITT documents.

Is there scope for stock taking during the inception phase and validating assumptions?	CLARIFICATION: The inception phase should be used for that purpose, however bidders will be expected to deliver the programme set out in their bids except where there is mutual agreement with FCO Programme team to refocus activity so care should be taken when putting the bid and budget together.
ITT will give suppliers 8 weeks to respond. That is not very long to put a complex bid together.	NOTED. We recommend suppliers begin planning and having conversations with potential sub-contractors in advance of the ITT being issued. From date of supplier event to bid submission is 12 weeks.
There are various definitions of green finance and energy efficiency.	AGREED. Definitions will be in the business case circulated with the ITT documents.
Can we supply details of other donors' work in region?	CLARIFICATION: Yes. In business case annex.
One risk is the high transaction costs in some countries due to bureaucracy.	AGREED.
Is there any limitation on number of sub-contractor?	CLARIFICATION: No, but suppliers should consider the value for money assessment if they intend to use several tiers of sub-contractors.
Will the Carbon Trust scoping study be supplied?	CLARIFICATION: No - this was an internal document between the FCO and Carbon Trust and not intended for wider publication. However, the relevant material is contained in the business case which will be available. In addition, a short overview of the CT findings produced by the consultants will be included as part of the ITT documentation.
Does all research/analysis activity have to be undertaken in the target countries?	CLARIFICATION: No. Suppliers can conduct such activity elsewhere (for example, a supplier with a London or Singapore base could undertake some of the consultancy work underpinning the interventions there).
It will be important to have sight of the programme's logframe.	NOTED. This will be included as part of the business case to be published as part of the ITT.
Want clear understanding in SORS of balance between primary and secondary benefit.	NOTED.
Want clearer picture of how green finance interventions link to poverty reduction, and what mechanisms can demonstrate poverty reduction.	NOTED.
Want sight of fund level indicators.	NOTED. Hope to include these with ITT.

Will an indicator be access to electricity?	CLARIFICATION: Might measure this if possible, but less relevant to most of region. More likely to measure access to clean electricity i.e renewables.
Key risks may be around donor saturation, level of buy-in, consortia risks in integrating both themes.	NOTED.
Want clearer understanding of relationship with FCO during inception phase.	NOTED. Will clarify in the SORs.
To what extent is there flexibility in allocation between countries?	CLARIFICATION: Expect each country to have similar allocation of funding/interventions and across themes. But some flexibility depending on where we can achieve most impact. Will clarify further in SORs. There will be flexible and adaptive programme management
What is the timeline for change at institutional level?	CLARIFICATION: Programme KPIs (as opposed to supplier KPIs) will be measured over a 10 year period. Though supplier KPIs will be framed so as to support the longer term programme KPIs.
Can the programme interventions be leveraged by working with existing projects/donors?	CLARIFICATION: Yes. We want an ambitious but realistic programme. If some interventions can complement or work with existing donor activity, this may be beneficial, as long as adhering to PF and ODA guidelines e.g. on primary benefit
Working with countries' NDCs as a platform to begin with to ensure national government buy-in and engagement may be beneficial.	AGREED. The business case contains details of each government's NDC commitment, targets on energy efficiency and policies or ambition on financing for clean energy
Will one measurement of suppliers' payment by results be in terms of the number of green finance contracts awarded to UK companies?	CLARIFICATION: No - this would not be allowed under ODA guidelines. We may measure the impact of the programme in terms of increased green finance flows in the region, but the extent to which this flows to UK companies will not be linked to suppliers' payment by results.
Who is the programme's Senior Reporting Official (SRO)?	CLARIFICATION: Scott Wightman, British High Commissioner, Singapore.