



MEETING NOTES

EVENT NAME

*UK Prosperity Fund – South East Asia Economic Reform Programme
Pre-Procurement Market Engagement Activity*

DATE

20 March 2018

STARTED

16:15H SGT

ENDED

19:25H SGT

ATTENDEES

Refer to next page

VENUE

British High Commission Singapore

ATTACHMENTS

1. Slide Pack
2. Event Notes
3. Draft Call-Off Contract
4. Potential Pricing Methodology and Suggested Pricing Schedule
5. Feedback Questionnaire

- 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.

NOTES

- Jonathan Turner (Head of SE Asia Economic and Trade Policy 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 in 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 Economic Reform Programme Supplier Day

Attendees List

20 March 2018

Framework Bidders		Subcontractors	
1. Adam Smith Intl	Matt Uzzell (BHC) <i>Director Infra & Climate Change</i>	1. Asian Coalition Against Counterfeiting and Piracy	Andrew Bradshaw (BHC) <i>President</i>
2. Cardno	Gavin Wyngaard (BHC) <i>Senior Principal, Intl Development</i>	2. Cambridge Econometrics	Richard Rodger (remote) <i>Head of Marketing</i>
3. Crown Agents	Viv Davies (BHC) <i>Principal Consultant</i>	3. Cambridge Centre for Alternative Finance	Philip Rowan (remote) <i>Lead, Intl Engagement</i>
4. DAI Europe Ltd	Polly Gillingham (BHC) <i>Director of Business Devt</i> Chris Rose (remote) <i>Senior Consultant – Energy & Env</i>	4. Chemonics Intl	Stacy Edgar (BHC) <i>Director, Business Devt</i>
5. Deloitte	Balaji M K (BHC) <i>Project Delivery Manager</i>	5. Collier IP	Alex Tame (remote) <i>Managing Director</i>
6. Ecorys	Trevor O'Regan (BHC) <i>International Consultant</i>	6. Frost & Sullivan	Tan Shu Jie (BHC) <i>Senior Manager, Client Advisory</i>
7. EY	Sam Wong (BHC) <i>Partner</i> Jason Tan (BHC) <i>Senior Manager</i>	7. GMEX/Navitas	Tom James (BHC) <i>Senior QA Partner</i>
8. Maxwell Stamp	Syed Nuruddin Ahmed (BHC) <i>Managing Director</i> Bertram Chambers (remote) <i>Senior Consultant</i>	8. GovRisk	Nicolas Le Moignan(BHC) <i>Director</i>
9. McKinsey	Emma Dudley (BHC) <i>Knowledge Expert</i>	9. IP Academy	Kok Kitt Wai (BHC) <i>Executive Director Programmes</i> Eric Khoo (BHC) <i>Global Head, Global Exec Institute</i> Peh Toon Meng (BHC) <i>Head, Executive Programmes</i>
10. Mott MacDonald	Euan Low (BHC) <i>Technical Consultant</i>	10. Oxentia	Ye Hsin Shen (remote) <i>Associate Senior Consultant</i> Steve Cleverley (Remote) <i>CEO</i>
11. Nathan Associates	Eamon Cassidy (BHC) <i>Head of Trade Services</i> Lauren DeHaven (BHC) <i>Head of Business Development</i>	11. IPO	Hywel Matthews (remote) <i>Senior Policy Adviser – SE Asia & Japan</i>
12. PwC	Edwina Chin (BHC) <i>Manager, Intl Development</i>	12. Rouse	Lisa Yong (BHC) Kin Wah Chow (BHC) <i>Registered Foreign Lawyer</i>
		13. UK ABC	Allen Lai (remote) <i>Director, Programmes & Partnerships</i>
		14. VCCI	Nguyen Thi Thu Trang (remote) <i>Director</i> Phung Thi Lan Phuong (remote) <i>FTA Issue Manager</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.	ACTION: PLEASE FEEDBACK FURTHER ON THIS THROUGH THE ATTACHED QUESTIONNAIRE.
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.	ACTION: Draft contract to be shared by FCO in advance. PLEASE PROVIDE COMMENTS BACK TO US.
ACTIONS FOR FCO	
The terminology on AML is well developed, but the FinTech terminology could do with some development	ACTION: FinTech terminology to be reviewed.
There may be circumstances outside delivery partners control that delay or prevent delivery.	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.
Extending the delivery timeframe would be valuable, but also impacts suppliers' costing. Clarity would help accurate pricing.	ACTION: Programme team seeking to give definitive answer on programme timeframe in the SoRs.
The ITT will need to be clear on the admin burden on suppliers, particularly around monitoring, reporting, evaluation and learning (MREL).	ACTION: SoRs will include more detail on requirements on suppliers to report.
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. At this stage, potential suppliers should not approach partner governments about the programme. This is to avoid 'engagement fatigue' and potential confusion. Basic information is released publically each year and is searchable online. For IPR, IPO publish information on our cooperation with those countries. We have MOUs with Philippines and Vietnam. A selection of our activities has been published on the SE Asia Prosperity Fund blog.
Please supply more information on the procurement process, including procurement process, 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. We will be looking for in-country and specialist expertise. Sub-contracting is likely to provide a good model for bringing this in.
It is important to tailor activities to different contexts. There is a tension between a general regional approach and country-specific tailored solutions	AGREED. The SoRS reflect a number of prioritised themes, some will require country tailored solution, while others may have a more consistent approach across countries.
Countries in the region are at different stages in AML implementation	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 contact 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.

The 4 month inception period may be too short, 6 months would be preferable.	NOTED. Given the detailed ground work that has already been carried out by FCO policy teams – e.g. scoping the interventions, engaging partner governments – our view is that the inception period is sufficient.
Perception in SE Asia that Intellectual Property is a foreign interest, need to work with local partners	NOTED. We have existing relationships, including with partner governments on IP. Our work to date has shown that a partnership model between UK and local experts works best in delivering change.
Different levels of maturity in different markets, should there be different metrics?	AGREED. This will need to be incorporated into the more detailed results framework during the inception phase.
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.
Is there any background knowledge that framework suppliers can access?	CLARIFICATION: Yes. The business case that FCO produced will be issued in the ITT. Local experts also attended the event as potential sub-contractors. Several of them have been active on Intellectual Property and capital market in the past few years
Will the FCO support supplier's in getting visas where required?	CLARIFICATION: Suppliers will have to apply for and pay for their own visas where required. Where difficulties are encountered, local embassies may be able to assist, however suppliers should satisfy themselves that they have a good prospect of getting visas on their own.
It will be important to have sight of the programme's results framework and theory of change.	NOTED. This will be included as part of the documentation to be published as part of the ITT.