



Workshop Summary

‘Revamping PPPs’ Workshop:

Afternoon Session of the ‘Revamping PPPs’ Symposium

28 February 2009
The University of Hong Kong

Centre for Infrastructure & Construction Industry Development
The University of Hong Kong
and
CIB TG72 on PPP



Table of Contents	Page
1. WORKSHOP BACKGROUND	2
1.1 Objectives and Overview	2
1.2 Participants' Profile	2
1.3 Presentation of Position Papers	2
1.4 Focus Group Discussions	4
1.5 Consolidation Session	5
2. GROUP OUTPUTS – STRATEGIES FOR REVAMPING PPPs	5
2.1 Stakeholder Management in PPPs and Sustainability Management in PPPs	5
2.2 PPP Structures, Systems & Mechanisms	7
2.3 Risk Management in PPPs	9
2.4 Selection of Partner Organizations & Key Personnel in PPPs	9
3. FUTURE DIRECTIONS & POTENTIAL COLLABORATION	11
APPENDIX	13
Appendix I – 'Revamping PPPs' - Seminar Programme	13
Appendix II – 'Revamping PPPs' - Workshop Programme	14

WORKSHOP REPORTING TEAM:

Team Leader: James Wong

Group Session Recordors: Ryan Fan, Terry Li, Lijuan Tao, James Wong, Kelwin Wong

Team members: Akintola Akintoye, Jacky Chung, Mohan Kumaraswamy, Gangadhar Mahesh,
James Wong, Kelwin Wong, Joe Zou

1. WORKSHOP BACKGROUND

1.1 Objectives and Overview

The Workshop was held in the afternoon session of the 'Revamping PPPs' Symposium 2009 (Symposium programme is attached in Appendices I & II). The morning Seminar set the stage by 'revisiting and rethinking' past PPPs with dissemination to over 200 participants. Indeed, the presentations, Q&A and Panel Discussion at the Seminar set the scene for a greater focus on 'revamping and revitalising' future PPPs in the afternoon Workshop.

The Workshop then drilled deeper into core PPP concerns, comparing and synergising R&D on underpinning and emerging issues in order to formulate innovative strategies towards more effective and efficient PPP procurement and delivery. It was designed to revisit lessons learned, and trigger fresh approaches and continuous improvements, alongside recent financial upheavals. The Workshop was also structured to mobilize strong inputs and feedback from experts in public and private sectors and academia. It was divided into **three segments**: i) Presentation of Position Papers; ii) Focus Group Discussions; and iii) Consolidation Session.

1.2 Participants' Profile

The Workshop brought together 53 experts with knowledge and interests in PPP (comprising 11 from government, 13 from consulting firms, 3 from contractor firms and 26 from academia) along with 9 research students, totaling 62 participants. 17 of the workshop participants drew on recent PPP experiences from overseas including from Australia, Canada, Denmark, Greece, Malaysia, Singapore, South Africa, The Netherlands, the UK and USA.

Five experts agreed in advance, to facilitate the group discussions and outputs, as well as to chair the preceding position paper presentations in their group sessions. The chairperson-facilitators were (alphabetically):

- Ir Bryan Clifford, JCP International
- Dr Colin Duffield, The University of Melbourne
- Ms Ada Fung, JP, Hong Kong Housing Authority
- Ir Prof C.K. Mak, JP, Development Bureau (Works)
- Dr Arthur McInnis, Chinese University of Hong Kong

The names of group members are not listed in this Report, since prior permission was not requested, and while grateful for their inputs, neither they nor the facilitators are considered to be individually 'responsible' for the collective outputs, as presented herein.

1.3 Presentation of Position Papers

Prior to brainstorming in the focus groups, two presentations were given in each of the four rooms where the focus group discussions were held. The presentations were based on submitted position papers, that are published in the Symposium Proceedings.

The titles of the papers presented, authors and their affiliations were:

i) Critical Success Factors for Knowledge Transfer in PFI projects

Champika Liyanage¹, Taha Elhag² and Tabarak Ballal³

¹ University of Central Lancashire, UK

² University College London, UK

³ University of Reading, UK

ii) Developing a Decision Support System for Concession Period Determination

Xueqing Zhang

The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong

iii) PPPs and the Global Credit Crunch: What Next for the PPP Financial Model and Global Governance?

Peter Raisbeck

Faculty of Architecture, Building and Planning, The University of Melbourne, Australia

iv) PPP's as Temporary Project Organisations

Thomas Grisham¹ and Parthasarathy Srinivasan²

¹ Grisham Consulting Inc., St. Petersburg College, USA

² SRM Energy Pvt. Ltd., Spice Energy, India

v) PPP in Denmark - Is Strategic Partnerships Between the Public and Private Part a Way Forward?

Kristian Kristiansen

Institute for Planning, Innovation and Management, Technical University of Denmark, Denmark

vi) Public Private Partnerships: A Strategic Partnering Approach

Athena Roumboutsos¹ and Nicola Chiara²

¹ Department of Shipping, Trade and Transport, University of the Aegean, Greece

² Department of Civil Engineering, Columbia University, USA

vii) Revamping Public Private Partnerships (PPPs): A Systemic Approach through Establishment and Management of Regional PPP Project Management Offices (PMOs)

Josiah N Nyagwachi¹, JJ Smallwood² and KD Hogan³

^{1,3} Department of Civil Engineering, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, South Africa

² Department of Construction Management, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, South Africa

viii) The Malaysia Private Finance Initiative and Value for Money

Kharizam Ismail, Roshana Takim, Abdul Hadi Nawawi and Aini Jaapar

Graduate Centre Department, Faculty of Architecture, Planning and Surveying, Malaysia

Q & A followed the presentations in each of the group rooms. This triggered the flow of ideas and set the tone for the focus group brainstorming where participants exchanged knowledge and views on designated themes and related topics. The discussion summaries are in Section 2.

1.4 Focus Group Discussions

Participants were divided into 5 groups for the first two segments of the Workshop, with each group focusing on a specific theme as proposed below. The aim was to isolate and develop critical issues in relation to the group theme and related areas; and initiate a consensus on optimal strategies and approaches. Participants registered for the Workshop had been carefully allocated to specific groups on the basis of their expertise, as well as to achieve a good mix and 'balance'. They had been issued with Workshop guidelines and group allocation lists a week before the event. Apart from the group 'facilitators', 'recorders' had also been pre-assigned to record the proceedings in each group.

One on-site 'variation' saw Groups 1 and 4 merging into a larger group, where participants were able to contribute to a broader range of issues due to the perceived close relationship between the two themes (Group 1 – "Revamping Stakeholder management in PPPs" and Group 4 – "Revamping Sustainability management in PPPs").

The themes and suggested sub-themes, as issued a week before the Workshop, along with the group allocations were:

Group 1: Revamping Stakeholder management in PPPs

- (a) Integrated Teamworking & 'Relational Contracting'
- (b) Supply Chains/ Value Networks (& RIVANS*)
- (c) Inter-personal Relationship Management
- (d) Dispute Resolution & Management
- (e) End-user Engagement & Management
- (f)

* RIVANS – Relationally Integrated Value Networks

Group 2: Revamping PPP structures, systems & mechanisms

- (a) Financing Systems
- (b) Contractual Systems (including relational contracting)
- (c) Asset Transfer Mechanisms
- (d) PPP Performance Evaluation & Feedback Systems
- (e) Pricing mechanisms
- (f)

Group 3: Revamping Risk management in PPPs

- (a) Risk Allocation
- (b) Joint Risk Management
- (c) Long Term Risk Management
- (d) Business Continuity Management
- (e) 'Demand Risk' Management
- (f)

Group 4: Revamping Sustainability management in PPPs

- (a) Sustainability Criteria
- (b) Sustainability Evaluation Systems
- (c) Life Cycle Maintenance Management
- (d) Life Cycle Costing
- (e) 'Demand Risk' Management
- (f)

Group 5: Revamping the Selection of Partner Organisations & Key Personnel in PPPs

- (a) Partner Organisation Selection **Criteria**
- (b) Key Personnel Selection **Criteria**
- (c) Partner Organisation & Key Personnel Selection **Systems**
- (d) Performance Evaluation of Partners **and** Key Personnel
- (e) Potential for 'Integrated Procurement' through RIVANS* type long term network
- (f)

* RIVANS – Relationally Integrated Value Networks

1.5 Consolidation Session

After the focus group discussions, each group compiled a list of findings and outcomes. The facilitator or a nominated 'rapporteur' presented a summary of the respective group outputs at the Consolidation Session where participants from other groups added their input and views. The overall findings - as obtained from the group recorders and the group presentations by the facilitators/ rapporteurs, as well as from the combined consolidation session outputs - were examined and compiled as in section 2 that follows.

2. GROUP OUTPUTS – STRATEGIES FOR REVAMPING PPPs

2.1 Stakeholder Management in PPPs and Sustainability Management in PPPs

Unique Economic and Political Environment

The drivers for PPPs vary from country to country, given each unique economic environment and political background. For instance, economically stronger governments do not have the same needs for private capital. A clear mandate is another key driver to adopt PPP, e.g. as in British Columbia, Canada but not in HK. In order to make PPP schemes successful, a strong and clear political mandate is also essential to ensure continuity and stability over the life cycles of the projects. In democratic political systems, there is a risk that a change in government can drive a PPP project off course (i.e. a newly elected government may not be in favor of a PPP project supported by the previous government).

Challenges Facing the Hong Kong Government

When there is a large group of stakeholders involved, for example in the West Kowloon Cultural District project, negotiation is extremely difficult because detailed plans cannot be issued to every party concerned, expecting a consensus to be reached. Therefore,

leadership and facilitators are extremely important. The decision making process cannot be changed unless the political structure changes. In Hong Kong, this is a particularly challenging issue to deal with, because of the media attention received (where all government actions and decisions are magnified and scrutinised, and may attract heavy criticism). The government has to be fair. In many cases, a compromise was reached, rather than a consensus. This is in contrast to places like Greece where the majority of the decisions are taken at the government level, and not much information is released to the public.

Government-Private Sector Relationship in Mainland China

In Mainland China, the concept of the government viewing the private sector as a partner and partnership towards greater value for money is still in its infancy stage, due to the political history of central government controls. The government does not perceive a private company as a partner, but instead assigns the projects and maintains control in the decision making process. The term public-private-partnership is not in any official documents in the PRC.

There will certainly be a learning curve in Mainland China as companies that were formerly state-owned make the transition towards privatization and re-learn the dynamics of working and developing relationships with the government. A metaphorical comparison was made between PPP and a complex engine, where the legal documentations, framework, etc. represents the gears, and all of these components are made to work with the help of partnerships acting as lubricants for the engine.

Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholders must be better informed and stakeholder engagement needs to be improved in Hong Kong. The task of managing stakeholders is difficult in Hong Kong because the current system lacks direction, making it a real challenge to move forward with proposed plans. There are many ideas and preferences from various parties and this so-called “wish-list” is unmanaged. Public engagement has to be done properly so that the projects are presented informatively in a way that can help stakeholders thoroughly understand the financial and social implications. In addition, the project cycle needs to be more clearly illustrated. It is important to conduct public engagement properly in an organized manner, but not in a way that would allow public opinion to manage the project itself. The proper approach should have sound leadership with key decisions made and the directions set by the leader. Then the relevant stakeholders should be engaged and consulted.

Sustainability as a Selling Point

On the issue of sustainability, it is believed that a sustainable design of a product can be a selling point in the marketplace, such as minimizing the carbon footprint, environmentally-friendly designs, etc. A long-term partnership, benefits to the community, sustainable revenue stream, and project recognition are viewed as being attributes of PPP projects that would appeal to all parties involved.

Dispute Resolution and Management

Due to the complexity of partnerships and interactions of various parties involved in a PPP scheme, there is also a need to deal with legal and contractual issues such as how to protect against litigation and disputes if partners fall out. A proper framework with reasonable contractual terms and risks allocation is needed to safeguard the interest of all parties. PPP schemes should be sustainable after a proper framework has been developed,. Furthermore, a change of mindset is needed so that stakeholders (government, private sector and public) focus on a “win-win-win” scenario instead of trying to gain advantages over other parties. Trust needs to be established so that a new type of relationship can be developed and adversarial attitudes amongst the parties can be eliminated.

Monopolization

Concerns were raised about the possibility of a monopoly situation when private firms establish a solid reputation, expertise in PPP projects and a strong working relationship with the government, which would then make it difficult for new players to enter to the market. Another potential problem raised was regarding rival conglomerates not being able to work together when brought together to work on a PPP project. There was a question regarding whether or not a single contractor has the ability to handle a large scale PPP project and the answer from a representative in a private construction firm was positive in terms of capital, technology and management ability. Firms need to be diversified and offer a wide range of products and services in order to develop a reputation within the industry, and to grow.

2.2 PPP Structures, Systems & Mechanisms

Financing Systems

There are various possible PPP models, including joint-ventures, strategic partnerships to make better uses of government/ public assets, Design-Build-Operate and Design-Build-Finance-Operate, etc. However, there should not be one single model to fit all PPP projects. The public and private sectors must work closely together to determine the optimal scope of collaboration and financial arrangements in each PPP project to benefit members of the public who use the services, the government and the private sector. PPP projects should be structured to deliver public services that can best meet the needs of the public without compromising the necessary quality or service standards. It was stressed that the selection of financing model should link with the fundamental problem, e.g. lack of credit or liquidity. Focus should therefore be on achieving the optimal gearing ratio between equity and debt under the current business environment. Value, risk allocation and incentives are the keys to make the PPP models ‘work’.

Contractual Systems (including Relational Contracting)

The key issues related to the PPPs’ contractual systems include:

- How to allow project stakeholders’ interests to be aligned
- How to allow incentives to achieve value for money
- How to deliver success along the PPP supply chain
- How to allow partnership between the public and the private sectors

Generic 'models' for PPP contractual systems may be useful for a series of similar projects, if the right balance can be struck between the chosen standard form and customization required for project specific models, and if the risks are well-understood, evaluated and properly allocated in each case. Another key issue is that there is a lack of historical data of different types of PPP projects to evaluate how the risk transfer mechanisms could work and translate into value for money. It is worthwhile to establish a global/regional PPPs database in order to achieve continuous improvement.

Asset Transfer Mechanisms

The asset transfer issue was usually neglected in the past, but now needs to be considered more carefully. Although it is extremely difficult to foresee the changes (e.g. functional changes needed) over long concession periods (e.g. 25 years), the acceptance criteria should be set in the early stage of a project. Subsequent to the asset transfer, it should still provide value for money and ensure proper hand-over condition of the asset. Otherwise a penalty should be imposed. Flexibility should be allowed for the private sector to innovate and propose solutions to meet changing demands by providing financial incentives under the PPP financing structure. Tenderers should, at the same time, provide proof of intent, and consider the resources required and efficiency of the asset when transferred. Hence, sustainability of the asset/facility is the key aspect to be addressed.

PPP Performance Evaluation & Feedback Systems

"Knowing what we want" at the early stage of a PPP project is imperative for the evaluation and feedback systems in order to evaluate performance, i.e. measure the right things. For instance, a key performance index/ indicator (KPI) could be compiled and assessed to ensure value of the project. Continuous monitoring and feedback using appropriate metrics has to be conducted for continuous improvement. Tenderers should be challenged for achieving value for money, optimising whole life costing, and ensuring fair risk allocation and mitigation. In addition, continuous improvement founded on the experience and knowledge of preceding projects is important. This could be managed by international corporations /agencies.

Pricing Mechanisms

When the private sector is asked to price the facility, key considerations should be: how much subsidy they could get, who should determine the amount of the subsidy (e.g. for a toll road), and how such a process is to be evaluated. Benchmarking can be a problem as objective indicators are inadequate. Benchmarking is sometimes based on operating cost which may not necessarily be the right method of pricing. For example, inflation can lead to inaccuracy and re-pricing would then be necessary. Another example would be the advance in technology which can reduce the operating cost. Therefore, having a 5 to 7-year window, could render a benchmark unrealistic/ inaccurate and allow the private sector to make a windfall gain. Risk pricing is another area where potential issues may arise because it is complicated to determine the extent of risk involved and the associated cost. These are still immature concepts and more transparency and contingency allowance will be needed.

General Concerns and Recommendations

'PPP-light' was proposed as a special template for budget surplus countries in general. But the difficulties of refinancing PPP projects in the current credit crisis and the need to build robust refinancing mechanisms were stressed. Refinancing was seen to be more difficult to achieve in emerging markets. It was felt that organisations like ADB and World Bank should take the lead in developing PPP models for emerging markets.

The importance of understanding value flow in PPPs for designing effective and efficient contract systems was discussed and was recommended as a potential research area. Documentation of PPP financial arrangements and their relative effectiveness in different jurisdictions was also seen to be important in developing knowledge-bases for the future.

2.3 Risk Management in PPPs

Pros and Cons of Risk Management in PPPs

Positive and negative comments on risks involved in PPPs were discussed. On the positive side, the participants in general, believed that potential risks are reasonably well understood and captured in policy. Furthermore, drafting for risks in contracts is well developed. Risk realisation has demonstrated the reality of risk transfer.

On the negative side, flexibility in PPPs is not well addressed. Contracts cannot provide adequate flexibility for the duration of a PPP project life cycle which can last for 20 to 30 years. There is also excess transfer of risk to contractors and the measurement of risk is not sound. Different tax rules on public and private projects create ambiguities and issues for PPPs. Change in government policy, for example from greenfield to brownfield development induce risk into PPPs.

Flexibility in Contracts and Risk Allocation

To tackle the issue of contract flexibility, participants suggested renegotiating contracts on a periodic basis, in accordance with local government policies and regulations. More research into the PPPs and construction industry could also help PPP parties to better understand the business nature and room for flexibility. Suggestions from tenderers could be a good source for ideas on improving flexibility in the final contract. Lessons learned from alliances with other parties could facilitate such learning processes in PPP as well.

To further balance the sharing of risks between public and private sectors (including sub-contractors), open 'education' (knowledge dissemination) and expert opinions could help parties to better understand a fair risk allocation mechanism. The situation could also be improved by investigation and research into establishing sound risk allocation schemes.

2.4 Selection of Partner Organizations & Key Personnel in PPPs

Assessing Potential Partners

Selecting the right partner in a PPP project is critical to the success of the project because of the long duration of the relationship over the life of the project. Proper research, planning

and understanding of needs for a particular project has to be carried out prior to the selection process.

The key performance index/ indicator (KPI) used for partner selection depends on the nature of the project and can be divided into two parts: measurable (tangible) and intangible. Tangible (measurable and objective) components include financial statements, safety statistics, tender price and other quantitative data. The Housing Authority has developed a contractor selection and tender evaluation system by making use of contractors' performance scores obtained from the "Performance Assessment Scoring System", which can assess, store and share information of past performances of contractors within the Housing Authority. Intangible elements, which are much more complicated and difficult to measure, include innovation, design, health and safety features, environmental commitments, openness of communications and other special characteristics. Many of these intangible (abstract and subjective) components, however, cannot be simply measured. Therefore, more innovative methods have to be developed for evaluating those intangible items.

It was recommended that more research can be done from the independent standpoint of academia, in the area of partner selection in PPP projects, particularly in the identification of criteria for measuring and assessing the intangible components for more well-rounded partner selection.

Experiences from Various Organizations

Hong Kong MTRC: prospective partners were invited to have discussions in a workshop environment, to learn something about the projects while the client got to understand their possible approaches / ways of thinking. Thereafter, all sides focus on specific areas and get to know who would be involved in the project. In some projects, the MTRC employs a two-stage target selection process, and may set up a target cost (depending on complexity and risks) at the second stage. At this stage, the client will also assess how well they can work with the core project team during the process and this contributes to the selection.

UK - Utilities Infrastructure: site visits to current work locations of potential partners helped when identifying the intangibles for joint ventures or other partnership projects. Two to three days of workshops, interviews and focus group meetings help to collect data and provide feedback on the actual implementation process. Although the partnership strength itself is difficult to quantify, these site visitations offer opportunities for client to observe and learn from previous experiences and make more informed decisions on potential partnerships.

Hong Kong Housing Authority: A new mechanism has been introduced to incentivise and incorporate contractors' innovations in an 'Integrated Contract'. In addition to the existing two-envelope system i.e. fee and technical envelopes (past performance on quality, safety, etc.), innovation proposed by tenderers will also be assessed via a third envelope. This envelope also involves two elements: a) the innovative idea; and b) the cost to implement that idea, which will be evaluated later/ independently. This approach is to encourage innovative designs and to promote competition.

Switzerland - Development project: the final selection between two contractors is done through a joint workshop with the client where a two-day session is conducted with each finalist. A normal scoring process is still carried out, but the purpose of these workshops is to assess the cooperation capacities of each of these contractors. Amongst the discussion topics were ways of innovation and collaboration.

High cost of bidding for PPP Projects

While the potential return and scale of project is large in PPP schemes, the cost associated with the bidding process is also very large. Measures need to be taken to reduce the bidding costs of these projects. It is believed that reducing bidding costs in PPP projects can lead to greater interest (and competition) among private firms. In Melbourne, one approach taken to reduce bidding costs for major PPP projects is to narrow down to two bidders after filtering through initial submissions and analyzing responses to special interests. In addition, the specific information requested from proposals has also been streamlined. e.g. dispensing with calls for typical safety or environmental plans. It was also noted that some big PPP players themselves may not mind the high cost of bidding, in that it would keep away some more difficult competition.

Organisation Culture and Transparency in Workshops

Organisation culture is an important aspect of partnership which is difficult to assess and compare. Workshops are seen as an effective way to develop partnerships and bring different organizational cultures together. The public sector must remain transparent and objective in order for workshop assessments to be effective. Key personnel who will take up significant roles in the project must join these workshops in order for them to be effective. Conversely, assurances were needed that those persons show-cased as key project personnel by tenderers should in fact be deployed if awarded this project. This was raised, because some tenderers bidding for many jobs in parallel, may be unable to keep such promises, if they win more than one project at the same time, or if some personnel leave the organization/ country.

Trust and Risk Allocation

Trust must be built from the beginning of the process. With long-term, one-off projects like in PPP, it is difficult to build up mutual trust between all the parties involved. One approach, as in the Housing Authority's, is to avoid dumping unfair risks on contractors, but instead allocate risk equitably and appropriately amongst parties involved. Also, all tenderers know how they will be evaluated in the tendering system. The Housing Authority also engages a Dispute Resolution Advisor (DRA) to minimize disputes during contract period for all building and piling contracts, and engages a Dispute Avoidance Advisor (DAA) in the drafting of contract conditions for an Integrated Contract.

3. FUTURE DIRECTIONS & POTENTIAL COLLABORATION

The third segment of the Workshop followed the above group discussions and outputs. The consolidated outputs from each group were presented to the whole Workshop body and

enhanced with additional inputs and discussions in the 'Group Feedback Presentations and Consolidation' session, facilitated by Prof. Mohan Kumaraswamy.

Next, Prof. Akintola Akintoye led the collective discussions on the 'way forward', with the aim of formulating a TG72 PPP research agenda. Examples of the highlighted main recommended key research areas were:

- i) Sustainability issues in PPPs e.g. how to build and sustain collaborative partnerships between the public and private sectors as well as sustainable social, economic and environmental performance, also extending to 'sustainable procurement'
- ii) Improving particularly sensitive/ weak aspects of long-term risk analysis and management in PPPs
- iii) Formulating 'value propositions' (for value identification & assessment) e.g. in comparing the 'value' of PPP over traditional procurement in specific project types
- iv) Credit crunch implications on PPP financing arrangement in specific jurisdictions, as well as comparisons across jurisdictions
- v) Identification of critical success factors, test criteria and knowledge-bases for making PPPs work better e.g. in Hong Kong
- vi) Connecting researchers and practitioners with wide PPP knowledge/ experience to any government / industry groups that may need quick solutions, while facilitating the medium and long-term R&D needed to develop sustainable solutions for the above issues

Prof. Akintoye strongly encouraged participants to continue exchanging ideas and enhancing collaboration on PPP R&D through (a) the already available CICID platform and website, and (b) under the auspices of the now available international platform of the CIB TG72 on PPP.

He announced two conferences incorporating TG72 sessions: (i) International Conference on Innovation in Construction, at Loughborough, UK in September 2009, and (ii) CIB 2010 World Congress, at Salford, UK in May 2010 (with CIB W92 on Procurement Systems).

Meanwhile, Symposium material, including Proceedings, photographs and morning Seminar powerpoints, would also be posted on the HKU CICID web-site at http://www.hku.hk/cicid/3_events.htm

Suggestions and comments were invited, especially those based on PPP experiences and/or initiatives that may be compared and documented, as well as specific proposals and offers for action and participation – to whatever extent possible, given different levels of time constraints. Please send suggestions, proposals and/or expressions of interest, to Prof. Mohan Kumaraswamy: mohan@hku.hk

APPENDIX I – ‘REVAMPING PPPs’ SYMPOSIUM - SEMINAR PROGRAMME

Times	Session Topics / Activities	Speakers
08:15 – 08:45	Registration and Welcome Reception	
08:50 – 09:00	Seminar Objectives & Outline	Ir Prof Mohan Kumaraswamy and Prof Akintola Akintoye CIB TG72 Joint Coordinators
09:00 – 09:05	Welcome Address	Prof Lap-Chee Tsui Vice Chancellor, The University of Hong Kong
09:05 – 09:20	<i>Opening Keynote Speech</i> "New Form of Partnership in Driving Our Development"	Mrs Carrie Lam, JP Secretary for Development, Development Bureau, HKSAR
09:20 – 09:35	<i>Overseas Keynote Speech</i> "Value for Money in a Changing World Economy"	Mr John Fitzgerald , Deputy Secretary, Commercial Division, Department of Treasury and Finance, Victoria, Australia; <i>with</i> Dr Colin Duffield , Uni. of Melbourne, Australia
09:35 – 09:50	"West Kowloon Cultural District: Financial Alchemy through PPP?"	Ms Fiona Waters Director - GHK (HK), GHK Consulting Ltd., Hong Kong
09:50 – 10:05	"Singapore PPP Trends and Lessons Learned"	Mr Alex Wong Of Counsel, Lovells Lee & Lee, Singapore
10:05 – 10:20	Q&A Session	
10:20 – 10:40	Coffee Break	
10:40 – 10:55	"Recent Development of China's Infrastructure PPP"	Mr Leo Zhang General Manager, Jumbo Consulting Co., China
10:55 – 11:10	"Delivering PPP's in emerging markets - insights from practical experience"	Mr Edward Doherty Director, Gammon Capital, Singapore
11:10 – 11:25	"Delivering essential infrastructure through PPPs - the UK experience"	Mr John Yeap <i>with</i> Mr Ian Laing , Partners, Pinsent Masons, Hong Kong
11:25 – 11:40	"Financial crisis show stopper for DBMFO projects in the Netherlands?"	Dr Anneloes Blanken , Ministry of Finance, The Netherlands <i>with</i> Prof Geert Dewulf , University of Twente, The Netherlands
11:40 – 11:55	Q&A Session	
11:55 – 12:35	PANEL DISCUSSION: Facilitator - Ir Prof C.K. Mak , JP, Permanent Secretary for Development (Works), HKSAR Mr Steve Barclay Assistant Director, Efficiency Unit, HKSAR Mr Edward Doherty Director, Gammon Capital, Singapore Dr Colin Duffield , Associate Professor, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Melbourne, Australia Mr Ken Mathers CEO, South Eastern Integrated Transport Authority, Australia Mr Alex Wong , Of Counsel, Lovells Lee & Lee, Singapore	
12:35 – 12:45	Seminar Closing and Way Forward	Prof Akintola Akintoye and Prof Mohan Kumaraswamy CIB TG72 Joint Coordinators

APPENDIX II – ‘REVAMPING PPPs’ SYMPOSIUM - WORKSHOP PROGRAMME

Time	Position Paper Presentations / Focus Group (Parallel Sessions)				
12: 45 – 2:00PM	Lunch – for Workshop Attendees - at Senior Common Room, 15 Floor K.K. Leung Building, HKU				
Venue	Room LE 2	Room LE 3	Room LE 4		Room LE 5
Sub-Theme	Group 2 Revamping PPP Structures, Systems & Mechanisms	Group 3 Revamping Risk Management in PPPs	Group 1 Revamping Stakeholder Management in PPPs	Group 4 Revamping Sustainability Management in PPPs	Group 5 Revamping the Selection of Partner Organisations and Key Personnel in PPPs
2:00 – 2:15PM	PPP in Denmark - Is Strategic Partnerships Between the Public and Private Part a Way Forward? Kristian Kristiansen Institute for Planning, Innovation and Management, Technical University of Denmark, Denmark	Developing a Decision Support System for Concession Period Determination Xueqing Zhang The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong, China	Critical Success Factors for Knowledge Transfer in PFI projects Champika Liyanage¹, Taha Elhag² and Tabarak Ballal³ ¹ University of Central Lancashire, UK ² University College London, UK ³ University of Reading, UK		PPP's as Temporary Project Organisations Thomas Grisham¹ and Parthasarathy Srinivasan² ¹ Grisham Consulting Inc., St. Petersburg College, USA ² SRM Energy Pvt. Ltd., Spice Energy, India
2:15 – 2:30PM	PPPs and the Global Credit Crunch: What Next for the PPP Financial Model and Global Governance? Peter Raisbeck Faculty of Architecture, Building and Planning, The University of Melbourne, Australia	The Malaysia Private Finance Initiative and Value for Money Kharizam Ismail, Roshana Takim, Abdul Hadi Nawawi and Aini Jaapar Graduate Centre Department, Faculty of Architecture, Planning and Surveying, Malaysia	Public Private Partnerships: A Strategic Partnering Approach Athena Roumboutsos¹ and Nicola Chiara² ¹ Department of Shipping, Trade and Transport, University of the Aegean, Greece ² Dept, of Civil Engineering, Columbia University, USA		Revamping Public Private Partnerships (PPPs): A Systemic Approach Through Establishment and Management of Regional PPP Project Management Offices (PMOs) Josiah N Nyagwachi¹, JJ Smallwood² and KD Hogan³ ^{1,3} Department of Civil Engineering, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, South Africa ² Department of Construction Management, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, South Africa
2:30 – 2:40PM	Q&A Session	Q&A Session	Q&A Session	Q&A Session	Q&A Session
2:40 – 3:50PM	Focus Group 2	Focus Group 3	Focus Group 1	Focus Group 4	Focus Group 5
3:50 – 4:00PM	Coffee Break				
4:00 – 5:00PM	Group Feedback Presentations and Consolidation - All Groups at Hui Pun Hing Lecture Theatre (LE 1)				
5:00 – 5:15PM	PPP Research Agenda & CIB TG 72 Action Plan, Chaired by Prof. Akintola Akintoye				