



# Workshop Pilot Region Murcia

## Developing the Action Plan

25-26 February 2016

### Attendees

#### Regional Department Industry & Energy

Esther Marin Gomez – Director General  
Julian Fernandez Rodriguez  
Horacio Sanchez Navarro

#### InfoMurcia

Rafael Ataz Gomez  
Jose Manuel Ruiz Lopez

#### CITYnvest – partner Energinvest

Jean Francois Marchand

#### CITYnvest – Partner GRE Liège

Erika Honnay

#### CITYnvest – Coordinator Climate Alliance

Elise Steyaert

### Agenda

- 25<sup>th</sup> February (2:00 to 7:00 pm) – Session 1 – Understanding the models risks and opportunities
- 26<sup>th</sup> February (9:00 to 14:00 pm) – Session 2 – Choosing a model for Murcia, development of Action Plan

### Tools to be used

- D2.4\_CITYnvest\_649730\_ComparisonReport.pdf
- D2.6\_CITYnvest\_649730\_Recommendations-Decision Matrix.xlsx/ D2.6\_CITYnvest\_649730\_RecommendationsMatrix\_final.pdf
- Citynvest Strategic plan template\_Ver1.4.docx

### Minutes

The workshop started with a tour the table and an introduction of the I&E department in charge of e.g.: Energy competences: RES - high and low voltage-, Mining, Industries, security and Fire protection. During this week, a public consultation was launched for the Regional Energy Plan. The final document will hopefully be agreed upon by 8 March 2016. The piloting energy efficiency investments are aligned with the Energy Plan Strategy. There are no less than 25 actions listed for this year only. The question was

raised whether the acceptance/refusal via the public consultation process could influence the implementation of the CITYinvest piloting activities and the answer was no: the buildings owned by the regional government are not questionable, as it is in the decision making power of the regional government.

The role of InfoMurcia is the facilitator role in between the domestic practices in the region Murcia and the European project CITYinvest's developments. Jean Francois Marchand will provide the knowledge support to decide upon the operational and financial structure the Programme Delivery Unit (PDU) needs to have in order to achieve the objectives. Erika Honnay, as Work Package leader on the Pilot Regions, provided expertise based on the Renowatt experience in Liège since the last two years. Elise Steyaert, as CITYinvest coordinator, is in charge to keep all the pilot's developments aligned with the CITYinvest commitments and deliverables.

\*\*

The meeting started with an explanation of Jean Francois on the different operational and financial components of the innovative financing models, as in the scope of CITYinvest. This workshop needs to define what will be the Programme Authority (the Regional Government of Murcia), the Programme Delivery Unit (the entity that will execute the work, the daily management), the beneficiaries (public/private) and the projects itself (on the cluster of buildings level). Examples were explained, such as FEDESCO, *Vlaams Energie Bedrijf* and GRE Liège. In the [CITYinvest comparison report](#), 16 models of the 24 that were analyzed have a procedure where the PDU facilitates the bundling of buildings. The GRE Liège project and the Murcia region have some very strong differences because of the ownership of the buildings: in Murcia this is one entity (at regional government level), in Liège it are a group of 11 municipalities, which all separately own buildings (municipal buildings, but the project also focuses on hospitals, private sector and at some point in the future the residential sector). For this reason, the Murcia Pilot cannot replicate the Renowatt model, but similar challenges are remaining: how to convince the whole value chain of the added value of the PDU approach (whether it is Separate contractor based or Energy performance Contracting), how to deal with the time pressure and lengthy process of public procurement, etc.

The discussion went on regarding the role of the PDU, which will have to decide on the procedures, services and the financial solutions. The PDU will develop a contractual framework between the 60 different departments of the regional government.

Esther Marin Gomez explained the current situation regarding energy efficiency (EE) initiatives in their building stock:

- 21 energy audits of buildings are already done.
- A total of 50 buildings will get an energy mapping (inventory of the buildings, more elaborated than the audit), including an estimation of the EE potential. This will be an in-depth study. Based on that, the other buildings will be analysed following the same structure.
- March 2016: tendering procedure starts for the auditors
- September/Oct 2016: the whole picture (detailed energy mapping) for the total amount of 448 buildings has to be ready. Unconfirmed estimation of 2,5-3 million of square meters for total surface of the building stock.

By than, they have 2 possibilities: or each department does its own contracts with the support of I&E, of the I&E department takes this responsibility, clusters buildings and coordinates the action.

Unconfirmed estimation of 2,5-3 million of square meters for total surface of the building stock.

CITYinvest is a support program at the service of the region for Murcia. The aim is to have the learning experience from the other models to support the implementation of a new long-term dedicated structure in Murcia.

The current impact estimation indicates a 16,6 Gwh saving, which would require and investment (total) of €57,18 million. This is a very high (expensive) ratio Gwh versus investment needs. One of the reasons could be the type of buildings (old) and its construction quality. But we can see the quality of other countries is not better (for example, Belgium's building stock is 70% below EU average and has an energy consumption per square meter of 22% higher for heating demand.)

We continued with a discussion on payback times, market conditions and the classification of the 24 case studies according to these criteria. For example the Liège case has as average 38% savings with an average cost of 250€ per square meter and a payback time of 21 years (it includes the RES components). Even more important than payback times for public authorities, according to Erika's experience, is the cash flow. Even if it prolongs the contracts, it is more convincing when the cash flows by

the energy savings are positive.

Previously it was interesting to go for third party financing (with the performance guarantee) to reconsolidate the debt, but since the EUROSTAT guidance note on 7 august 2015, it clarifies that EPC always goes to the debt of the public authority. Therefore, third party finance, at rates of 8% or above, does not make sense as local/regional authorities can borrow from the market at very low rates (around 2%). How to further convince politicians? Long-term investments that save costs, and that will make some future investments of building maintenance already part of it (so prevents future additional investments that should happen).

Further discussions continued on external or internal maintenance of the buildings. In the Murcia pilot, there are mainly internal contracts for maintenance. The debate, that has to take place at the PA level, is when an EPC model is chosen -> the ESCO will take care of all services, including the maintenance. This has efficiency gains, but discussions are about internal jobs that become obsolete.

A presentation was given by Jean Francois on two types of implementation models: Separate Contractor Based and EPC/ESC. The operational models (how to implement) include different roles: facilitation, integration, financing only. Now, what is best for the Murcia Pilot? Jean Francois advocated for a facilitation role of the PDU to bundle the 448 buildings in around 10-15 procurement contracts of 6-10 years (example explained by Jean Francois). The integrator role would be more difficult. The 'Hacienda', financial department will remain in charge of signing the contracts, but the PDU dedicated structure in the I&E department can facilitate the whole process, incl. the design of the contracts. But you need a highly skilled team, dedicated structure of qualified staff members with full time focus.

There are different regional departments (60), and each one has an agency with a responsible person for EE measures to achieve the target of 23%. This effort started already a long time ago, but the projects were in the end never executed. So now they, launched the phase of updating the figures. (Energy consumption: 98% comes from electricity, only 2% is gas). Main purposes are electric appliances (computers, printers), cooling/heating systems and the lighting. The substantial amount of 75% of the savings should be obtained by the lighting and cooling refurbishments. The remaining 25% comes from regulation (smarter energy management system). The cooling measures will require measures in the building envelope, says Jose Manuel. According to Jean Francois, this will not be necessary because the final part of the savings can be achieved by better performance of the equipment. An idea could be to ask the Province of Barcelona on their experiences of EPC contracting, as they operated in quiet similar conditions. There is a problem on the level of the buildings: the whole heating and cooling system needs to be adapted and that will be a very costly operation.

The workshop went on about how to estimate the value of the buildings. The relationship to what you invest in the building should be in relation to the value of the building. If you invest more than what the building is worth via EPC (almost never the case) you can at least reconsolidate (when 50% is on the balance sheet of the ESCO)).

An important element in the discussion is the usage of the ERDF budget: there is 5 MIO available for the Murcia region , but this needs to be put in a detailed action plan before JUNE 2016. As soon as possible, they need to have the full picture of the building stock, to know where to prioritize in the projects. In two weeks time, there should be a political decision to go for a model based on EPC or SCB, with an integrator or facilitator role. Based on that, all the studies need to be executed. The global picture of the total amount of investments can already be estimated by following figures: according to the desirable energy savings, a cost between 150-200 € per square meter should be calculated. There is an estimated total amount of surface of 75,000 square meter. This would mean a total investment €37,5 million, according to Erika. What is key is A) the political commitment (the I&E department is confident on that) to know the level of savings for the 448 buildings in the coming years to be achieved, B) convincing all decision makers in the different departments, C) how to target already most energetic buildings in the first phase to reach already close to 60-70% of the total savings.

\*\*

Second day

Started with a presentation of Esther Main Gomez on the recent renovation of 8 hospitals, where 64% of the investments went to

the technical equipment. 10% for the building control and the remaining went to the building envelope. Energy Savings achieved were around 20%. Interesting to see now what's the difference with the buildings we are tackling in the CITYinvest pilot.

In order to make use of the ERDF budget for this purpose (€5,2 million), the I&E team will prioritize the first set of buildings where they have already the energy data and where external maintenance contracts are put in place. By the 1st of august they want to have the energy mapping of another set of 50 buildings. Until November the tendering procedures will happen. Between December 2016 and July 2017 they the works would be executed. The contracts would go over 15 years.

The next discussion went on the EU public procurement rules, which need to be ratified in national legislation and which includes now the possibility for social clauses. Erika will send information on this to the I&E department how they interpreted this in Liège. Attention should be paid to the market fragmentation.

The next topic was the difference between negotiated procedures and the competitive dialogue system. Under a competitive dialogue, you have defined the objectives and evaluate technical criteria accordingly. But than you have less flexibility to change the scope of the projects afterwards. This happens most often in very technical complex contracts. The procedure is heavy and it is costly for legal purposes. The competition will be very innovative, because the ambition is set and the potential executors have to come up with the best measures to obtain this. In the negotiated procedure, there is more flexibility and the detailed scope is defined during the process.

Erika will send a presentation on the explanation between the two.

Next on the agenda was a presentation by JF: what does it take to follow the EPC procedure? The goal is to obtain GUARANTEED savings, to have secured cash flows (precondition to have third party financing). The way to get there is a holistic approach in the design, build, maintains and operation phases of the buildings. Under an SCB model: both technical and financial risk (controlled cash flow is more difficult) is taken by the PDU. With this, the cost of transaction of the project becomes very high. It is recommended by Erika to start prioritizing the buildings, which have external maintenance contracts, because it is less politically sensitive because there is no internal employment involved. On top, it are possible the biggest buildings with the highest energy savings potential. The internal maintenance contracts would be transferred to energy saving tracking, this would also make it less sensitive to go for EPC.

Erika recommends to make a mixture of the models as the buildings are so different, so many factors of the buildings (complexity of the systems, operational use, ..). But those buildings that are already under maintenance contracts -> no reason not to go for EPC. Especially when looking at the example of how the other department worked in the hospitals with external subcontracted maintenance: this went via EPC and quiet fast.

Jean Francois gave a detailed example of analyzing the investment costs versus energy saving % and NPV (investment costs + maintenance costs - the savings, calculated by actual values) and how to chose between different offers. Question of Esther: so how important is the estimation of all this elements in the beginning? The answer is that it depends on whom you want to convince with the figures you get out of the offers. The Life cycle cost of a building includes all phases of design and build, maintenance and operation, energy needs. (M&O + energy = accounts often for 75% , that explains the importance of working with NPV). If you do the tender of EPC on NPV base with a fixed contract duration of e.g. 10 years. (this does not mean the

investment has to be paid back in 10 years). It fixes only the 'play ground of the ESCO'. You can agree also on negative NPV (you have not recovered 100% the cost of the investment). But a positive NPV -> when that's required, the operation should be budget neutral in that period. Instead of making decisions based on periods (X years), you can also choose to decide based on energy savings/cost savings percentages. A third option is to fix and investment cap, a max amount.

There are three types of risks: operational (taken by the PA, the use of the building) , industrial (taken by the ESCO, the achievement of the energy savings) and financial (taken by the bank, the return on investment)

We discussed the organizational structure for the Murcia region, with 60 different departments under 9 regional ministries under direct supervision of the Region's president. The energy budgets is fragmented in different budget categories over all departments. The highest political level, the president, can however change this system and centralize this budget via contracting in the Hacienda. The energy savings will compensate for the 'loss in budget' of these departments, because it enables them to spend money on other things. So how to convince all the other departments (because it will feel as a lowered budget): first a meeting where the I&E team will provide instructions for all the secretariat generals of the 9 regional ministries. After that, a meeting can be set up with the 60 departments to indicate one key contact to be part of this effort.

Discussion on the timeframe:

- Pooling/aggregation: depends on the standard contractual agreement: how much time it will take to convince the different 'customers in the 60 departments'. The Spanish national level has developed standardized contracts, this can be a great help.
- Project circle; benchmarking, pooling/aggregating, convincing customers; framework contracts, tendering procedures, negotiations, and acceptance of financial 'inspectors', granting the contracts, start of the works. You need to count at least an average of 18 months for such a procedure according to the CITYnvest partners. However, the I&E department counts on executing the programme faster. They will try to save time in the data collection phase and in the negotiation phase with the offers and the decision making process from the highest level. But there are EU legislations on procedural rules for public procurement that you cannot overcome: you have to count at least X amount of months for the potential candidates to respond to the tender.

Erika explained the need to have a task force with 100% full time dedication and as it is a strategic objective of the president, he should enable the creation of this on the best suitable level, directly under his supervision or under the regional ministry where the I&E department is located. The PDU role will be taken up by the I&E team. According to CITYnvest analysis of the 24 case studies; that would be a dedicated team of 5-10 people working full time for 2-3 years. This budget needs to be secured. Secondly, the services the PDU will provide needs to be described: PDU makes the tendering procedure and financing for the PDU comes from the Hacienda. But what will be the financing source for the actual investment? Third party investors? How to operationalize task force in action? How to employ the right qualified staff there? These are the first questions that will need to be investigated in the days following this workshop.

### Action Points

- Elise to prepare the minutes
- Elise to facilitate the contact with the Barcelona Province EPC experience
- Elise to share all relevant CITYnvest documents with I&E team, especially planning documents
- Elise to provide Grant Agreement criteria for in-house consultants to the I&E department

- Elise to organise the next Skype meeting, 8 March from 10:00-11:00

\*\*

- Erika to send the explanation between competitive dialogue and the negotiated procedure to I&E department

- Erika to send information on the public procurement social clauses

\*\*

- I&E team to send the Energy Plan presentation to Jean Francois - EnergInvest, Erika - Gre Liège and Elise - Climate Alliance, and to keep these three partners informed on the pilot developments

- Rafael to write the preparatory note on the Spanish National workshop

(Rafael can be supported by Miguel Casas, Spanish speaking colleague of Energinvest ([mcasas@energinvest.be](mailto:mcasas@energinvest.be)))

- The Action Plan template can help to structure the investigation of the different open questions. For any questions, the I&E department can count on full support of the CITYnvest partners.

### Contact information

MARIN GOMEZ, ESTHER ([esther.marin2@cam.es](mailto:esther.marin2@cam.es))

SANCHEZ NAVARRO, HORACIO ([horacio.sanchez@cam.es](mailto:horacio.sanchez@cam.es))

FERNANDEZ RODRIGUEZ, JULIAN ([julian.fernandez3@cam.es](mailto:julian.fernandez3@cam.es))

ATAZ GOMEZ, RAFAEL ([Rafael.Ataz@info.cam.es](mailto:Rafael.Ataz@info.cam.es))

HONNAY, ERIKA ([erika.honnay@greliège.be](mailto:erika.honnay@greliège.be))

MARCHAND, JEAN FRANCOIS ([jfmarchand@energinvest.be](mailto:jfmarchand@energinvest.be))

STEYAERT, ELISE ([e.steyaert@climatealliance.org](mailto:e.steyaert@climatealliance.org))

### Summary of the operational and financial components used during the workshop

<p><b><i>Program Authority/Program Delivery Unit roles, functions, resources and contractual framework</i></b></p>	<p>The Program Authority (PA) and the Program Delivery Unit (PDU) are the two main stakeholders that will manage and implement the program or the model.</p> <p>2. <b>Program Authority (PA):</b> The Program Authority (PA) is the public entity or organization that is in charge of the program or that controls the Program Delivery Unit (PDU). This is typically a national or regional government, a provincial or local authority or council or a city or municipal council. The Program Authority (PA) defines the vision and the program scope including the targeted beneficiaries, the level of ambition, the implementation model and the funding vehicle that is being put in place. The Program Authority also identifies within the stakeholders/parties who can play the role of Program Delivery Unit (PDU), and determines the services that it will offer to the beneficiaries. The Program Authority is also responsible for securing the funding of the Program Delivery Unit (PDU) □</p> <p>3. <b>Program Delivery Unit (PDU):</b> The Program Delivery Unit (PDU) is the organization that is specifically set-up (and/or entitled) to implement/execute the program. It is often a separate legal entity, but can also be a department or project team within an existing organization. It can be a public, a public-private or a private entity/organization, depending on the local capabilities. In the most advanced [elaborated?] models, the</p>
--	---

Program Authority (PA) has set-up a specific legal entity to play the role of Program Delivery Unit (PDU), either as a local public company or a mixed company (public-private).

***Beneficiaries, type of projects & Level of “ambition” Impact of the models***

The beneficiary profile, the type of projects and the level of ambition will have a significant impact on the model:

- **Beneficiaries:** They can come from the public sector, the commercial sector, the residential sector and/or the industrial sector.
- **Type of projects:** These can be Energy Efficiency building retrofit projects, Energy Efficiency public lighting retrofit projects, Energy Efficiency industrial retrofit projects or renewable energy projects.
- **Level of ambition:** the level of ambition can be classified as follows:
  - Up to 35% reduction of energy consumption and/or GHG emissions: this level of ambition could be reached with short and middle term contract durations (average 10 years) based on technical installation (HVAC, lighting, electrical...) retrofits and managed energy services. As basic indicator, **the price per square meter in case of a building retrofit could be less than 50€.** Typically the ESCO market based offer targets this level of ambition. The market is also able to offer ESCO and TPF financing options for this level of ambition.
  - Up to 50% reduction of energy consumption and/or GHG emissions: this level of ambition could be reached with middle and long term contract durations (between 15 and 25 years) based on technical installations (HVAC, lighting, electrical...) retrofits, envelope retrofits (insulation), [near building] renewable energy generation and managed energy services. As basic indicator, the price per square meter in case of a building retrofit could be less than 200 €. There are various examples in Europe of EPC/ESC models that have addressed such a level of ambition. ESCO financing and/or TPF financing will be more challenging for this level of ambition.
  - Up to 75% reduction of energy consumption and/or GHG emissions: this level of ambition can only be reached with long or very long term contract durations (min. 25 years) based on deep retrofits. As basic indicator, the price per square meter in case of a building retrofit could range from 800 € to over 1500€. There are a few examples in Europe of EPC/ESC model that have addressed such a level of ambition. This level of ambition requires **a mix of financing solutions (conventional financing, ESCO financing, PDU financing, Investment fund).**
  - Carbon neutral: this level of ambition can only be reached with combined deep retrofit and renewable energy generation projects. This level of ambition will require a mix of financing solutions (conventional financing, ESCO financing, PDU financing, Investment fund).

***Implementation model pros and cons***

The implementation model is the method by which the projects are technically and operationally implemented in the field, most often by using contractors or subcontractors. Typical implementation models are Energy Performance Contracting, Energy Supply Contracting and Separate Contractor Based.

- **EPC/ESC model:** Energy Performance Contracting (EPC) or Energy Supply Contracting (ESC) is a method by which an ESCO (Energy Services Company) acts as a unique contractor and assures all the technical and performance risks of the contract. The ESCO offers to the contracting beneficiary performance guarantee on the energy savings (EPC) or “useful” energy for a contractually agreed price (ESC) that secures the stream of savings allowing to reimburse the investment. In the EPC/ESC model, the Program Delivery Unit (PDU) can act either as a project facilitator or project integrator but does not take on the technical risks of the project (neither does the

	<p>beneficiary). The EPC/ESC model is the key condition to access to ESCO and/or Third party financing (TPF). □</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Separate contracting:</b> Separate contracting is a method to implement multi-technique energy efficiency or renewable energy projects, by which each step of the process is dealt with by a separate party (energy auditor, engineering company, installer or contractor, maintenance company) and by which individual projects (e.g. boiler replacement, relighting, isolation, etc.) are <b>executed by separate contractors for each technique. In this model, the Program Delivery Unit (PDU) can act either as a facilitator of integrator, but it can be useful to have the Program Delivery Unit (PDU) or another organization to act as an integrator to ensure an end-to-end delivery of the energy efficiency program and provide a consistent level of service from the different contractors. In the Separate contracting model, the Program Delivery Unit (PDU) and/or the beneficiary take on the technical risks of the project. In this model, there is</b> also little room to access to Third party financing (TPF). □</li> </ul>
--	--

<p><b>Operating Services</b></p>	<p>The Operating Services are the kind of services that are delivered by the Program Delivery Unit (PDU). They can be Marketing, Aggregation, Integration, Facilitation, Financial Advice, Financing and Assessment (or a combination of):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Marketing:</b> Marketing covers the commercialization and promotion of the services of energy efficiency to the beneficiaries. This covers the whole range of communication and commercial development services that are necessary to inform the beneficiaries of the types of offerings that are available to them. It also covers the pricing policy and product/services development. □</li> <li>• <b>Aggregation:</b> see below □</li> <li>• <b>Facilitation:</b> Facilitation means that the Program Delivery Unit (PDU) does not sign the contract with the beneficiary, but coordinates or “facilitates” the whole process of project delivery on behalf of the beneficiary. The contracts are signed directly between the beneficiary and the contractors. This role is often played by the Program Delivery Unit (PDU) in case of EPC/ESC implementation model, where the contract is signed directly between the beneficiary and the ESCO. Managing the tendering process is typically part of facilitation services offered in case of EPC or ESC projects. □</li> <li>• <b>Integration:</b> Integration means that the Program Delivery Unit (PDU) acts as an intermediary between the beneficiary on one hand and the contractors or subcontractors on the other hand. <b>This means that the contract for the delivery of the energy efficiency is signed between the integrator and the beneficiary and that the integrator signs contracts with the (sub)contractors. This role is often associated with the Separate Contractor Based implementation model, although it can also be applied to EPC or ESC. In the integrating model, the Program Delivery Unit (PDU) takes on the technical and performance risks of the project, except to have back-to-back agreements with the beneficiary on one hand and the ESCO on the other hand (in the case of EPC/ESC model).</b> □</li> <li>• <b>Financial Advice:</b> see below □</li> <li>• <b>Financing:</b> see below □</li> <li>• <b>Assessment:</b> Assessment is the role by which the PDU evaluates the technical and financial viability of an energy efficiency project and decides whether or not the project gets implemented and/or financed. The PDU will typically use a number of criteria to judge whether the project is acceptable or not. □</li> </ul>
----------------------------------	--

<p><b>Level of “aggregation” pros and cons</b></p>	<p>Bundling, pooling, and aggregation of projects and or beneficiaries are common practices in use amongs the studied models:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bundling/pooling:</b> Bundling/pooling means that the beneficiary or the Program Delivery Unit (PDU) bundles/pools the</li> </ul>
--	---

projects in one or more single projects to increase the size of the projects in order to make these feasible and/or to create economies of scale both operationally and financially. This approach could be applied either to the EPC/ESC model as well as the Separate contracting model (see below).

- **Aggregation:** Aggregation means that the Program Delivery Unit (PDU) bundles the projects of multiple “internal” customers by acting on behalf of them and by making them available to the market. The aggregation service can include bundling/pooling of projects. This approach requires that the Program Delivery Unit (PDU) be entitled to act on behalf of the beneficiaries.

**2.6. Financing & Funding Vehicle** The Funding Vehicle is the entity or structure that is used to finance the projects. Typically, the analysed models/programs make use of the following funding vehicles (or a combination of) :

- **Investment fund:** the Program Authority (PA) or the Program Delivery Unit (PDU) setup a public, public-private, public-citizens fund to provide total or partial project financing of the program. The fund can operate on a stand-alone basis, in cooperation with the Program Delivery Unit (PDU) or be integrated into the Program Delivery Unit (PDU). In this case, the fund takes on the financial risk of the project.
- **PDU financing:** the Program Delivery Unit (PDU) acts as the funding vehicle, providing financing, either through an own fund (or the Investment fund) or by packaging external financing solutions into an integrated financing service. In this case, the Program Delivery Unit (PDU) takes on the financial risk of the project.
- **ESCO financing:** the ESCO or contractor acts as the funding vehicle, providing financing through either EPC financing or ESC financing. In this case, the ESCO takes on the financial risk of the project. The Program Delivery Unit (PDU) can support the beneficiary with financial advice and financial engineering services providing guidance and consultancy on ESCO financing for its project
- **Conventional financing:** the beneficiaries pack internal (own funds) and external financing (financial institutions, utility funds, etc.) solutions in order to finance his projects. In this case, the beneficiaries take on the financial risk of the project. The Program Delivery Unit (PDU) can support the beneficiary with financial advice and financial engineering services providing guidance and consultancy on available funding for the concerned project.

**Potential template for the Action Plan**

Program scope and ambition	Description
Program authority (PA)	<i>Describe and detail the Program Authority</i>



Type of projects	<i>Describe and detail the type of projects</i>
Level of ambition	<i>Describe and detail the level of ambition</i>
Scope of the program	<i>Describe and detail the scope of the program</i>
<b>Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Description</b>
Beneficiaries	<i>Describe and quantify the Beneficiaries</i>
Potential [Investment volume)	<i>Describe and quantify the Beneficiaries potential (number, size and funding requirements of projects)</i>
Operational and contractual framework	<i>Describe and detail the Beneficiaries operational and contractual framework between Beneficiaries and the Program Delivery Unit (PDU) and/or the Funding Vehicle (in case of Investment Fund)</i>
<b>Program Delivery Unit (PDU)</b>	<b>Description</b>
Program Delivery Unit (PDU)	<i>Describe and detail the Program Delivery Unit</i>
Implementation model	<i>Describe and detail the Program Delivery Unit implementation model</i>
Operating services	<i>Describe and detail the operating services offered by the Program Delivery Unit (including aggregation and financing services)</i>
Operational and contractual framework	<i>Describe and detail the Program Delivery Unit operational and contractual framework:</i> * between the Program Authority and the Program Delivery Unit * between the Program Delivery Unit and the Beneficiaries * Between the Program Delivery Unit and the third parties (ESCO, Contractors, suppliers, funding vehicle)
Organisational and skills resources	<i>Describe and detail the organisational and skills resources requirements</i>
Staff resources	<i>Describe and quantify the staff resources requirements</i>

Financial resources	<i>Quantify the funding requirements and the funding source</i>
<b>Financing and funding vehicle</b>	<b>Description</b>
Funding needs	<i>Describe and quantify the funding requirements for the program</i>
Funding vehicle(s)	<i>Describe and detail the funding vehicle(s) for the program</i>
Operational and contractual framework	<p><i>Describe and detail the Funding vehicle(s) operational and contractual framework:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>* between the Program Authority and the Funding Vehicle(s)</i></li> <li><i>* between the Program Delivery Unit and the Funding Vehicle(s)</i></li> <li><i>* Between the Funding Vehicle(s) and the beneficiaries</i></li> <li><i>* Between the Funding Vehicle(s) and the third parties (ESCO, Contractors, suppliers)</i></li> </ul>