Public–private partnership

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

A **public–private partnership** (**PPP**) is a government service or private business venture which is funded and operated through a partnership of government and one or more private sector companies. These schemes are sometimes referred to as PPP, P3 or P^3.

PPP involves a contract between a public sector authority and a private party, in which the private party provides a public service or project and assumes substantial financial, technical and operational risk in the project. In some types of PPP, the cost of using the service is borne exclusively by the users of the service and not by the taxpayer.[1] In other types (notably the private finance initiative), capital investment is made by the private sector on the basis of a contract with government to provide agreed services and the cost of providing the service is borne wholly or in part by the government. Government contributions to a PPP may also be in kind (notably the transfer of existing assets). In projects that are aimed at creating public goods like in the infrastructure sector, the government may provide a capital subsidy in the form of a one-time grant, so as to make it more attractive to the private investors. In some other cases, the government may support the project by providing revenue subsidies, including tax breaks or by removing guaranteed annual revenues for a fixed time period.

There are usually two fundamental drivers for PPPs. Firstly, PPPs enable the public sector to harness the expertise and efficiencies that the private sector can bring to the delivery of certain facilities and services traditionally procured and delivered by the public sector. Secondly, a PPP is structured so that the public sector body seeking to make a capital investment does not incur any borrowing. Rather, the PPP borrowing is incurred by the private sector vehicle implementing the project and therefore, from the public sector's perspective, a PPP is an "off-balance sheet" method of financing the delivery of new or refurbished public sector assets. [2]

Typically, a public sector consortium forms a special company called a "special purpose vehicle" (SPV) to develop, build, maintain and operate the asset for the contracted period.[1][3] In cases where the government has invested in the project, it is typically (but not always) allotted an equity share in the SPV.[4] The consortium is usually made up of a building contractor, a maintenance company and bank lender(s). It is the SPV that signs the contract with the government and with subcontractors to build the facility and then maintain it. In the infrastructure sector, complex arrangements and contracts that guarantee and secure the cash flows make PPP projects prime candidates for project financing. A typical PPP example would be a hospital building financed and constructed by a private developer and then leased to the hospital authority. The private developer then acts as landlord, providing housekeeping and other non-medical services while the hospital itself provides medical services.[1]

Contents

Origins

Pressure to change the standard model of public procurement arose initially from concerns about the level of public debt, which grew rapidly during the macroeconomic dislocation of the 1970s and 1980s. Governments sought to encourage private investment in infrastructure, initially on the basis of accounting fallacies arising from the fact that public accounts did not distinguish between recurrent and capital expenditures.

The idea that private provision of infrastructure represented a way of providing infrastructure at no cost to the public has now been generally abandoned; however, interest in alternatives to the standard model of public procurement persisted. In particular, it has been argued that models involving an enhanced role for the private sector, with a single private-sector organization taking responsibility for most aspects of service provisions for a given project, could yield an improved allocation of risk, while maintaining public accountability for essential aspects of service provision.

Initially, most public–private partnerships were negotiated individually, as one-off deals, and much of this activity began in the early 1990s.

PPPs are organized along a continuum between public and private nodes and needs as they integrate normative, albeit separate and distinct, functions of society—the market and the commons. A common challenge for PPPs is allowing for these fluxuations and reinforcing the intended partnership without diminishing either sector. Multisectoral, or collaborative, partnering is experienced on a continuum of private to public in varying degrees of implementation according to the need, time restraints, and the issue at hand. Even though these partnerships are now common, it is normal for both private and public sectors to be critical of the other's approach and methods. It is at the merger of these sectors that we see how a unified partnership has immediate impact in the development of communities and the provision of public services.

Britain

In 1992, the Conservative government of John Major in the UK introduced the private finance initiative (PFI),[5] the first systematic programme aimed at encouraging public–private partnerships. The 1992 programme focused on reducing the Public Sector Borrowing Requirement, although, as already noted, the effect on public accounts was largely illusory. The Labour government of Tony Blair, elected in 1997, expanded the PFI initiative but sought to shift the emphasis to the achievement of "value for money," mainly through an appropriate allocation of risk. However it has since been found that many programs ran dramatically over budget and have not presented as value for money for the taxpayer with some projects costing more to cancel than to complete.

Australia

A number of Australian state governments have adopted systematic programmes based on the PFI. The first, and the model for most others, is Partnerships Victoria.

Canada

The federal conservative government under Stephen Harper in Canada solidified its commitment to P3s with the creation of a crown corporation, P3 Canada Inc, in 2009. The Canadian vanguards for P3s have been provincial organizations, supported by the Canadian Council for Public-Private Partnerships established in 1993 (a member-sponsored organization with representatives from both the public and the private sectors). As a proponent of the concept of P3s, the Council conducts research, publishes findings, facilitates forums for discussion and sponsors an Annual Conference on relevant topics, both domestic and international. Each year the Council celebrates successful public-private partnerships through the National Awards Program held concurrently with the annual conference in November.

At lower levels of government P3s have been used to build major infrastructure projects like transit systems, such as Viva (bus rapid transit) and Ontario Highway 407.

Canadian private sector companies, such as CPCS Transcom Limited, have also emerged as industry leaders for P3 projects. CPCS Transcom Limited is an Ottawa, ON based consulting firm providing advisory services across a broad spectrum of infrastructure sectors, including: Ports, Rail, Urban (transit and property development), Power, Marine, Multimodal Logistics and Roads. On of the company's current projects involves providing advisory services for the privatization of the Power Holding Company of Nigeria.

India

The Government of India defines a P3 as "a partnership between a public sector entity (sponsoring authority) and a private sector entity (a legal entity in which 51% or more of equity is with the private partner/s) for the creation and/or management of infrastructure for public purpose for a specified period of time (concession period) on commercial terms and in which the private partner has been procured through a transparent and open procurement system."[6]

The union government has estimated an investment of $320 billion in the infrastructure in the 10th plan.[7] The major infrastructure development projects in the Indian state of Maharashtra (more than 50%) are based on the P3 model. In the 2000s, other states such Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, Gujrat, Tamil Nadu also adopted this model. Sector-wise, the road projects account for about 53.4% of the total projects in numbers, and 46% in terms of value. Ports come in the second place and account for 8% of the total projects (21% of the total value).[8] Other sectors including power, irrigation, telecommunication, water supply, and airports have gained momentum through the P3 model. As of 2011, these sectors are expected get an investment of Rs. 20,27,169 crore (according to 2006–2007 WPI).[9]

Japan

In Japan since the 1980s, the third sector (第三セクター *daisan sekutā*) refers to joint corporations invested both by the public sector and private sector.

In rail transport terms, a *third sector* railway line is a short line or network of lines operated by a small operator jointly owned by a prefectural/municipal government and smaller interests. Third sector lines are generally former JR Group (or Japanese National Railways (JNR) before 1987) lines that were divested from the national company.

Russia

The first attempt to introduce PPP in Russia was made in St. Petersburg (Law #627-100 (25.12.2006), "On St. Petersburg participation in public-private partnership").[10]

Nowadays there are special laws about PPP in 69 subjects of Russian Federation.[11] But the biggest part of them are just declarations. Besides PPP in Russia is also regulated by Federal Law #115-FZ (21.07.2005) "On concessional agreements"[12] and Federal Law #94-FZ (21.07.2005) "On Procurement of Goods, Works and Services for State and Municipal Needs".[13] In some ways PPP is also regulated by Federal Law №116-FZ (22.07.2005) "On special ecomonic zones"[14] (in terms of providing business benefits on special territories - in the broadest sense it is a variation of PPP).

Still all those laws and documents do not cover all possible PPP forms.

In February 2013 experts rated Subjects of Russian Federation according to their preparedness for implementing projects via public-private partnership. The most developed region is Saint Petersburg (with rating 7.8), the least – Chukotka (rating 0.0).

By 2013 there are near 300 public-private partnership projects in Russia.[15]

The importance of public-private partnerships

Over the past two decades more than 1,400 PPP deals were signed in the European Union, representing a capital value of approximately €260 billion.[16] Since the onset of the financial crisis in 2008, estimates suggest that the number of PPP deals closed has fallen more than 40 percent.[17][18]

Investments in public sector infrastructure are seen as an important means of maintaining economic activity, as was highlighted in a European Commission communication on PPPs.[19] As a result of the significant role that PPPs have adopted in the development of public sector infrastructure, in addition to the complexity of such transactions, the European PPP Expertise Centre (EPEC) was established to support public-sector capacity to implement PPPs and share timely solutions to problems common across Europe in PPPs.[20]

PPPs provide a unique perspective on the collaborative and network aspects of public management. The advancement of PPPs, as a concept and a practice, is a product of the new public management of the late 20th century and globalization pressures. The term "public-private partnership" is prey to thinking in parts rather than the whole of the partnership, which makes it difficult to pin down a universally accepted definition of PPPs.

Controversy

A common problem with PPP projects is that private investors obtained a rate of return that was higher than the government's bond rate, even though most or all of the income risk associated with the project was borne by the public sector.[18]

It is certainly the case that government debt is cheaper than the debt provided to finance PFI projects, and cheaper still than the overall cost of finance for PFI projects, i.e. the weighted average cost of capital (WACC). This is of course to attempt to compare incompatible and incomplete economic circumstances. It ignores the position of taxpayers who play the role of equity in this financing structure. Making a simple comparison, however, between the government's cost of debt and the private-sector WACC implies that the government can sustainably fund projects at a cost of finance equal to its risk-free borrowing rate. This would be true only if existing borrowing levels were below prudent limits. The constraints on public borrowing suggest, nevertheless, that borrowing levels are not currently too low in most countries. These constraints exist because government borrowing must ultimately be funded by the taxpayer.

A number of Australian studies of early initiatives to promote private investment in infrastructure concluded that, in most cases, the schemes being proposed were inferior to the standard model of public procurement based on competitively tendered construction of publicly owned assets (Economic Planning Advisory Commission (EPAC) 1995a,b; House of Representatives Standing Committee on Communications Transport and Microeconomic Reform 1997; Harris 1996; Industry Commission 1996; Quiggin 1996).

One response to these negative findings was the development of formal procedures for the assessment of PPPs in which the focus was on "value for money," rather than reductions in debt. The underlying framework was one in which value for money was achieved by an appropriate allocation of risk. These assessment procedures were incorporated in the private finance initiative and its Australian counterparts from the late 1990s onwards.[*citation needed*]

In 2009, the New Zealand Treasury, in response to inquiries by the new National Party government, released a report on PPP schemes that concluded that "there is little reliable empirical evidence about the costs and benefits of PPPs" and that there "are other ways of obtaining private sector finance", as well as that "the advantages of PPPs must be weighed against the contractual complexities and rigidities they entail".[21]

Nowadays, a new model is being discussed, called the public–private community partnership (PPCP) model, wherein both the government and private players work together for social welfare, eliminating the prime focus of private players on profit.[*citation needed*] This model is being applied more in developing nations such as India.[*citation needed*]

Privatisation of water

After a wave of privatisation of many water services in the 1990s, mostly in developing countries, experiences show that global water corporation have not brought the promised improvements in public water utilities. Instead of lower prices, large volumes of investment and improvements in the connection of the poor to water and sanitation, water tariffs have increased out of reach of poor households. Water multinationals are withdrawing from developing countries and the World Bank is reluctant to provide support.[22]

The privatisation of the water services of the city of Paris was proven to be unwanted and at the end of 2009 the city did not renew its contract with two of the French water corporations.[23][24] After one year of being controlled by the public, it is projected that the water tariff will be cut by between 5% and 10%.[25]

Health public-private partnerships

A health services PPP can be described as a long-term contract (typically 15–30 years) between a public-sector authority and one or more private sector companies operating as a legal entity. The government provides the strength of its purchasing power, outlines goals for an optimal health system, and empowers private enterprise to innovate, build, maintain and/or manage delivery of agreed-upon services over the term of the contract. The private sector receives payment for its services and assumes substantial financial, technical and operational risk while benefitting from the upside potential of shared cost savings.

The private entity is made up of any combination of participants who have a vested interested in working together to provide core competencies in operations, technology, funding and technical expertise. The opportunity for multi-sector market participants includes hospital providers and physician groups, technology companies, pharmaceutical and medical device companies, private health insurers, facilities managers and construction firms. Funding sources could include banks, private equity firms, philanthropists and pension fund managers.

For more than two decades public-private partnerships have been used to finance health infrastructure. Now governments are increasingly looking to the PPP-model to solve larger problems in healthcare delivery. There is not a country in the world where healthcare is financed entirely by the government. While the provision of health is widely recognized as the responsibility of government, private capital and expertise are increasingly viewed as welcome sources to induce efficiency and innovation. As PPPs move from financing infrastructure to managing care delivery, there is an opportunity to reduce overall cost of healthcare.

Market potential for health PPPs

The larger scope of Health PPPs to manage and finance care delivery and infrastructure means a much larger potential market for private organizations. Spending on healthcare among the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and BRIC nations of Brazil, Russia, India and China will grow by 51 percent between 2010 and 2020, amounting to a cumulative total of more than $71 trillion.[26] Of this, $3.6 trillion is projected to be spent on health infrastructure and $68.1 trillion will be spent on non-infrastructure health spending cumulatively over the next decade. Annually, spending on health infrastructure among the OECD and BRIC nations will increase to $397 billion by 2020, up from $263 billion in 2010. The larger market for health PPPs will be in non-infrastructure spending, estimated to be more than $7.5 trillion annually, up from $5 trillion in 2010.[26]

Health spending in the United States accounts for approximately half of all health spending among OECD nations, but the biggest growth will be outside of the U.S. According to PwC projections, the countries that are expected to have the highest health spending growth between 2010 and 2020 are China, where health spending is expected to increase by 166 percent, and India, which will see a 140 percent increase. As health spending increases it is putting pressure on governments and spurring them to look for private capital and expertise.[26]

Product development partnerships

Product development partnerships (PDPs) are a class of public–private partnerships that focus on pharmaceutical product development for diseases of the developing world. These include preventive medicines such as vaccines and microbicides, as well as treatments for otherwise neglected diseases. PDPs were first created in the 1990s to unite the public sector's commitment to international public goods for health with industry's intellectual property, expertise in product development, and marketing.

International PDPs work to accelerate research and development of pharmaceutical products for underserved populations that are not profitable for private companies. They may also be involved in helping plan for access and availability of the products they develop to those in need in their target populations. Publicly financed, with intellectual property rights granted by pharmaceutical industry partners for specific markets, PDPs are able to focus on their missions rather than concerns about recouping development costs through the profitability of the products being developed.

These not-for-profit organizations bridge public- and private-sector interests, with a view toward resolving the specific incentive and financial barriers to increased industry involvement in the development of safe and effective pharmaceutical products.

International examples

International product development partnerships and public–private partnerships include:

- Sandy Springs, Georgia, USA, City services are performed in a public-private partnership. Sandy Springs, at first glance, appears to be run just like other similarly sized cities, with a council-manager form of government. However, it is the first city in the nation to outsource services to such a great extent to a private sector company. The city's police department took over services from the county on July 1, 2006 with 86 Police Officers from all over the State of Georgia, and is now staffed by 128 officers. The city's fire department began operations in December 2006. The department consists of 97 full-time firefighters. It is staffed by 91 full-time firefighters and 52 part-time firefighters. The police department answered 98,250 calls in FY 2010 while the fire department handled 17,000 responses to 8,205 calls for service.
- The PATH Malaria Vaccine Initiative (http://www.malariavaccine.org) (MVI) is a global program of the international nonprofit organization Program for Appropriate Technology in Health (PATH). MVI was established in 1999 to accelerate the development of malaria vaccines and ensure their availability and accessibility in the developing world.
- The Roll Back Malaria (RBM) Partnership was founded in 1998. RBM is the global framework for coordinated action against malaria. It forges consensus among key actors in malaria control, harmonises action and mobilises resources to fight malaria in endemic countries.
- The Drugs for Neglected Diseases Initiative (DNDi) was founded in 2003 as a not-for-profit drug development organization focused on developing novel treatments for patients suffering from neglected diseases.
- Aeras Global TB Vaccine Foundation is a PDP dedicated to the development of effective tuberculosis (TB) vaccine regimens that will prevent TB in all age groups and will be affordable, available and adopted worldwide.
- FIND [1] (http://www.finddiagnostics.org/) is a Swiss-based non-profit organization established in 2003 to develop and roll out new and affordable diagnostic tests and other tools for poverty-related diseases.
- The Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization is financed per 75% (750 Mio.US$) by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, which has a permanent seat on its supervisory board.
- The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis & Malaria, a Geneva-based UN-connected organisation, was established in 2002 to dramatically scale up global financing of interventions against the three pandemics.
- The International AIDS Vaccine Initiative (IAVI), a biomedical public–private product development partnership (PDP), was established in 1996 to accelerate the development of a vaccine to prevent HIV infection and AIDS. IAVI is financially supported by governments, multilateral organizations, and major private-sector institutions and individuals.

- The International Partnership for Microbicides is a non-profit product development partnership (PDP), founded in 2002, dedicated to the development and availability of safe, effective microbicides for use by women in developing countries to prevent the sexual transmission of HIV. See also Microbicides for sexually transmitted diseases.
- Medicines for Malaria Venture (MMV) is a not-for-profit drug discovery, development and delivery organization, established as a Swiss foundation in 1999, based in Geneva. MMV is supported by a number of foundations, governments and other donors.
- The TB Alliance is financed by public agencies and private foundations, and partners with research institutes and private pharmaceutical companies to develop faster-acting, novel treatments for tuberculosis that are affordable and accessible to the developing world.
- A UN agency, the World Health Organization (WHO), is financed through the UN system by contributions from member states. In recent years, WHO's work has involved more collaboration with NGOs and the pharmaceutical industry, as well as with foundations such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation. Some of these collaborations may be considered global public–private partnerships (GPPPs); 15% of WHO's total revenue in 2012 was financed by private foundations.[27]
- The United Nations Foundation & Vodafone Foundation Technology Partnership, a five-year, $30 million commitment, leverages the power of mobile technology to support and strengthen humanitarian work worldwide. Partners include the World Health Organization (WHO), DataDyne, the mHealth Alliance, the World Food Program (WFP), Telecoms Sans Frontieres, and the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA).

Similar public-private partnerships outside the realm of specific public-health goods include:

- The United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR) (http://www.unisdr.org/partners/private-sector) is part of the United Nations Secretariat and its functions span the development and humanitarian fields. Public–private partnerships for disaster management bring together the private sector for PPP models with a tool box of partnership opportunities towards resilience, capacity building, and sustainability goals.[28]
- The public-private partnership for improving teaching and learning in schools in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates.

Financing

A key motivation for governments considering public private partnerships is the possibility of bringing in new sources of financing for funding public infrastructure and service needs.[18] It is important to understand the main mechanisms for infrastructure projects, the principal investors in developing countries, sources of finance (limited recourse, debt, equity, etc.), the typical project finance structure, and key issues arising from developing project financed transactions.[29] Some governments utilize a public sector comparator for calculating the financial benefit of a public private partnership.

A number of key risks need to be taken into consideration as well. These risks will need to be allocated and managed to ensure the successful financing of the project. The party that is best placed to manage these risks in a cost-effective way may not necessarily always be the private sector. However, there are a number of mechanisms products available in the market for project sponsors, lenders and governments to mitigate some of the project risks, such as: Hedging and futures contracts; insurance; and risk mitigation products provided by international finance institutions.[30]

Centralised PPP units

The World Bank (2007) [31] states that governments tend to create Centralised PPP Units as a response to weaknesses in the central government's ability to effectively manage PPP programmes. Different governments suffer from different institutional failures in the PPP procurement process, hence these Centralised PPP units need to address these different issues by shaping their functions to suit the individual government needs. The function, location (within government) and jurisdiction (i.e. who controls it) of dedicated PPP Units may differ amongst countries, but generally these include:

- Policy guidance and advice on the content of national legislation. Guidance also includes defining which sectors are eligible for PPPs as well as which PPP methods and schemes can be carried out.
- Approving or Rejecting proposed PPP projects i.e. playing a gatekeeper role that can occur at any stage of the process i.e. at the initial planning stage or at the final approval stage.
- Providing technical support to government organisations at the project identification, evaluation, procurement or contract management phase.
- Capacity building i.e. training of public sector officials that are involved in PPP programmes or are interested in the PPP process.
- Promote PPPs within the private sector i.e. PPP market development.

A 2013 review [32] which targeted research based on the value of centralised PPP Units (and does not look at the value of PPPs in general or any other type of PPP arrangement as the review was aimed at providing evidence in terms of decision making to whether to set up, or not, a Centralised PPP Unit) found-

- No quantitative evidence: There is very little quantitative evidence of the value of centralised PPP coordination units against ministries or government agencies individually procuring PPP projects. Most of the studies available on PPP Units tend to focus on their role and only carry out brief descriptive analyses of their value.

- Limited Authority: The majority of the PPP Units reviewed in the literature do not play a particularly important role in approving or rejecting PPP programmes or projects. Whilst their advice is used in the decision making process by other government bodies, the majority do not actually have any executive power to make such decisions themselves. Hence, when they have more authority their value is seen to be higher.

- PPP Units differ by country and sector: Government failures, in regards to PPP units, vary by government. The requirements for PPPs also vary by country and sector and so do the risks involved (i.e. financial, social etc.) for the country government. Hence PPP Units need to be tailored to solve these failures, properly assess risks and be located in the correct government departments where it can command the most power. PPP Units can play a number of important roles in the PPP process, however not all PPP Units will play the same role as their functions have been tailored to individual country needs. In some cases, limits to their authority have curtailed their effectiveness.

- Implicit value: The lack of rigorous evidence does not prove that PPP Units are not an important contributor to the success of a country's PPP programme. The literature review does show that whilst there is no quantitative data, there are widespread perceptions on the importance of a well-functioning PPP unit for the success of a country's PPP programme.

The author of the 2013 review [32] found no literature that rigorously evaluates the usefulness of PPP Units. The literature does show that PPP Units should be individually tailored to different government functions, address different government failures and be appropriately positioned to support the country's PPP Programme. Where these conditions seem to have been met, there is consensus that PPP Units have played a positive role in national PPP Programmes.

Specific cases

While some PPP projects have proceeded smoothly, others have been highly controversial. Australian examples include the Airport Link, the Cross City Tunnel,[33] and the Sydney Harbour Tunnel, all in Sydney; the Southern Cross Station redevelopment in Melbourne; and the Robina hospital in Queensland.

In India, public-private partnerships have been extremely successful in developing infrastructure, particularly road assets under the National Highways Authority of India and Midday Meal Scheme with Akshaya Patra Foundation

In Canada, public–private partnerships have become significant in both social and infrastructure development. PPP Canada Inc. was created as a Crown corporation with an independent Board of Directors reporting through the Minister of Finance to Parliament. Its mandate is to improve the delivery of public infrastructure by achieving better value, timeliness and accountability to taxpayers, through P3s. The Corporation became operational in February 2009 with the appointments of a chair of the board of directors and a chief executive officer.

PPPs exist in a variety of forms in British Columbia through the focused efforts of Partnerships BC, a company registered under the Business Corporations Act, that is wholly owned by the Province of British Columbia and reports to its shareholder the Minister of Finance. Projects include the Canada Line rapid transit line, the Abbotsford Hospital and Cancer Centre and the Sea-to-Sky Highway project.[34] In Quebec, a number of notable PPPs include the McGill University Health Centre, the new western extension of Autoroute 30 and Université de Montréal's Hospital Research Center.

In the UK, two-thirds of the London Underground PPP was taken back into public control in July 2007 after only four and a half years at an estimated cost of £2 billion and the remaining one-third was taken back into public control in May 2010 after seven and a half years for a purchase price of £310m.[35] The Government had paid advisers £180m for structuring, negotiating and implementing the PPP and had reimbursed £275m of bid costs to the winning bidders.[36] The 30-year PPP contract for the refurbishment of the MOD Main Building in London was estimated to give a saving of only £100,000 as compared to the £746.2m cost of public procurement.[37] The refinancing of the Fazakerley Prison PFI contract following the completion of construction delivered an 81% gain to the private sector operator.[38] The NATS PPP saw 51% of the UK's air traffic control service transferred to the private sector, however following the decline in air traffic after the September 11 attacks, the Government and BAA Limited each invested £65m in the private sector operator in 2003.[39]

In Newfoundland Robert Gillespie Reid contracted to operate the railways for fifty years from 1898, though originally they were to become his property at the end of the period.

See also

- European PPP Expertise Centre
- Global Development Alliance
- Global Partnership Initiative

- Global public–private partnership
- Public/social/private partnership (PSPP)
- Private participation in railway share
- The Partnering Initiative
- USAID

References

1. ^ *a b c* Barlow, J., Roehrich, J.K. and Wright, S. (2013). Europe Sees Mixed Results From Public-Private Partnerships For Building And Managing Health Care Facilities And Services. Health Affairs. 32(1):146-154 http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23297282
2. ^ Virginia Tan (Allen & Overy) *Public-Private Partnership (PPP)*, (Advocates for International Development, June 2012)http://a4id.org/sites/default/files/files/%5BA4ID%5D%20Public-Private%20Partnership.pdf
3. ^ Zheng, J. Roehrich, J.K. and Lewis, M.A. (2008). The dynamics of contractual and relational governance: Evidence from long-term public-private procurement arrangements. Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management. 14(1): 43-54 http://www.scopus.com/record/display.url?eid=2-s2.0-41049112855&origin=inward&txGid=yXIvJQ7AsPq0YyDQfJmJLCa%3a2
4. ^ Moszoro M., Gasiorowski P. (2008), 'Optimal Capital Structure of Public-Private Partnerships', IMF Working Paper 1/2008 (http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1087179). Papers.ssrn.com (2008-01-25). Retrieved on 2011-11-20.
5. ^ The private finance initiative (PFI) (http://www.parliament.uk/commons/lib/research/rp2001/rp01-117.pdf). (PDF) . Retrieved on 2011-11-20.
6. ^ "PPP" (http://jurisonline.in/2010/11/public-private-partnership-in-india/). Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, Government of India. 2007.
7. ^ S.S. Raju (2011). "A successful Indian model". *The Hindu Survey of Indian Industry 2011*.
8. ^ "http://www.pppindiadatabase.com/Uploads/Status%20of%20PPP%20Projects%20as%20on%20July%2031,%202011.pdf>".
9. ^ "PPP" (http://www.pppinindia.com/overview.php).
10. ^ "Об участии Санкт-Петербурга в государственно-частных партнерствах" (http://www.webcitation.org/65XAu80NB) (in russian). Archived from the original (http://cisp-spb.ru/docs/%D0%BE%D1%82%2025.12.2006%20%E2%84%96%20627-100.pdf) on 2012-02-18. Retrieved 4 августа 2008.
11. ^ Геворкян, Арфи; Литвинова, Анастасия. "Правительство одобрило закон о государственно-частном партнерстве" (http://www.rbcdaily.ru/economy/562949986141162) (in Russian). Retrieved 27 марта 2013.
12. ^ "Федеральный закон "О Концессионных Соглашениях"" (http://base.consultant.ru/cons/cgi/online.cgi?req=doc;base=LAW;n=132969;div=LAW;dst=100005) (in Russian). Retrieved 27 марта 2013.
13. ^ "Федеральный закон "О Размещении заказов на поставки товаров, выполнение работ, оказание услуг для государственных и муниципальных нужд"" (http://base.consultant.ru/cons/cgi/online.cgi?req=doc;base=LAW;n=132677;div=LAW;dst=100003) (in Russian). Retrieved 27 марта 2013.
14. ^ "Федеральный закон "Об особых экономических зонах в Российской Федерации"" (http://base.consultant.ru/cons/cgi/online.cgi?req=doc;base=LAW;n=142952;div=LAW;dst=100005) (in Russian). Retrieved 27 марта 2013.
15. ^ Гагарин П.А., Двинянин Е.А. "Государственно-частное партнерство как инструмент реализации масштабных проектов" (http://www.gradient-alpha.ru/assets/docs/PPP-Research-14.03.2014.pdf) (in Russian). Retrieved 27 марта 2013.
16. ^ Public Private Partnerships in Europe. (http://www.bei.europa.eu/attachments/efs/efr_2010_v04_en.pdf). (PDF) . Retrieved on 2011-11-20.
17. ^ PFI projects hit fresh low as few deals closed (http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/58156c2e-007b-11df-b50b-00144feabdc0.html). Ft.com (2010-01-13). Retrieved on 2011-11-20.
18. ^ *a b c* Barlow, J. Roehrich, J.K. and Wright, S. (2010). De facto privatisation or a renewed role for the EU?

Paying for Europe's healthcare infrastructure in a recession. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*. 103:51-55.

19. ^ European Commission Communication on PPP November 2009 (http://www.eib.org/epec/infocentre/documents/Commission%20Communication%20on%20PPP-en.pdf)
20. ^ European PPP Expertise Centre (http://www.eib.org/epec/). Eib.org. Retrieved on 2011-11-20.
21. ^ "Brian Rudman: Promised electric trains derailed by misguided enthusiasm" (http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10575753). *The New Zealand Herald*. 1 June 2009. Retrieved 21 February 2010.
22. ^ the Water Justice Project (http://www.tni.org/article/public-water-services) on Transnational Institute
23. ^ Reversal of privatisation of Paris' water (http://cupe.ca/privatization/paris-water-public-hands). Cupe.ca (2010-02-25). Retrieved on 2011-11-20.
24. ^ Deputy Mayor of Paris Anne Le Strat tells how Paris put water services back into public hands (http://www.canadians.org/campaignblog/?p=6480). Canadians.org (2011-02-18). Retrieved on 2011-11-20.
25. ^ Water tariff cut (http://www.globalwaterintel.com/news/2011/2/paris-marks-year-public-water-price-cut.html). Globalwaterintel.com (2011-01-13). Retrieved on 2011-11-20.
26. ^ ***a b c*** PricewaterhouseCoopers' Health Research Institute, (2010). [Build and Beyond: The (r)evolution of healthcare PPPs] http://www.pwc.com/us/ppphealth, p9.
27. ^ http://www.who.int/about/resources_planning/A66_29-en.pdf
28. ^ "PPP in disaster risk reduction" (http://www.unisdr.org/partners/private-sector). United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. Retrieved 7 May 2012.
29. ^ "PPP in Infrastructure Resource Center" (http://ppp.worldbank.org/public-private-partnership/financing). World Bank. Retrieved February 2012.
30. ^ "Risk Mitigation Mechanisms & Products - PPP in Infrastructure Resource Center" (http://ppp.worldbank.org/public-private-partnership/financing/risk-mitigation-mechanisms-products). World Bank. Retrieved February 2012.
31. ^ World Bank (2007) "Public Private Partnership Units: Lessons for their designs and use in infrastructure"
32. ^ ***a b*** Alberto Lemma. "Literature Review: Evaluating the Costs and Benefits of Centralised PPP Units" (http://partnerplatform.org/?52awcpfx). EPS PEAKS.
33. ^ Moore, Matthew, "Open Secrets" (http://www.smh.com.au/news/national/open-secrets/2005/10/30/1130607152241.html), *Sydney Morning Herald*, 31 October 2005. Accessed 7 January 2007.
34. ^ An Introduction to Public Private Partnerships (http://www.partnershipsbc.ca/pdf/An%20Introduction%20to%20P3%20-June03.pdf). (PDF) . Retrieved on 2011-11-20.
35. ^ "Tube maintenance back 'in house' as new deal is signed" (http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/london/8669823.stm). BBC News. 8 May 2010. Retrieved 10 May 2010.
36. ^ "London Underground PPP: Were they good deals?" (http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/0304/london_underground_ppp.aspx?alreadysearchfor=yes). National Audit Office. 17 June 2004.
37. ^ "Ministry of Defence: Redevelopment of MOD Main Building" (http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/0102/redevelopment_of_mod_building.aspx). National Audit Office. 18 April 2002.
38. ^ "The Refinancing of the Fazakerley PFI Prison Contract" (http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/9900/the_refinancing_of_the_fazaker.aspx). National Audit Office. 29 June 2000.
39. ^ "Refinancing the Public Private Partnership for National Air Traffic Services" (http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/0304/refinancing_nats.aspx?alreadysearchfor=yes). National Audit Office. 7 January 2004.

Further reading

- Abou-bakr, A (2013), *Managing Disasters Through Public-Private Partnerships,*Georgetown

University Press.

- Burnett, M. "PPP – A decision maker's guide", European Institute of Public Administration, 2007
- Chinchilla, C. "El nuevo contrato de colaboración entre el setor público y el sector privado", Revista Española de Derecho Administrativo nº 132 (2006)
- Gonzalez Garcia, J. "El contrato de colaboración público privada", Revista de Administración Pública, nº 170 (2006).
- Linotte Didier, *Un cadre juridique désormais sécurisé pour les contrats de partenariat*, AJDA, n° 1/2005 du 10 janvier 2005.
- Monera Frédéric, *Les financements innovants de services et de projets publics*, Revue de la Recherche Juridique – Droit prospectif, PUAM, 2005-1, p. 337 & s.
- Moszoro M., Gasiorowski P. (2008), 'Optimal Capital Structure of Public-Private Partnerships', IMF Working Paper 1/2008. [2] (http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1087179)
- Colman, J. (2002), 'Mumbo jumbo…and other pitfalls:Evaluating PFI/PPP projects', National Audit Office PFI / PPP Conference "Bringing about beneficial change, London, May.
- Economic Planning Advisory Commission (EPAC) (1995), 'Final Report of the Private Infrastructure Task Force', Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- Economic Planning Advisory Commission (EPAC) (1995), 'Interim Report of the Private Infrastructure Task Force', Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- Harris, A.C. (1996), 'Financing infrastructure: private profits from public losses', Audit Office of NSW, Public Accounts Committee, Parliament of NSW, Conference, Public/Private infrastructure financing: Still feasible?, Sydney, September.
- House of Representatives Standing Committee on Communications Transport and Microeconomic Reform, (1997), 'Planning not Patching: An Inquiry Into Federal Road Funding', The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- Industry Commission (1996), 'Competitive Tendering and Contracting by Public Sector Agencies', Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- Minnow, Martha and Jody Freeman (2009), Government By Contract: Outsourcing and American Democracy, Harvard U.P.
- Möric, K. (2009), 'Les partenariats public-privé – le choix du partenaire privé au regard du droit communautaire, Editions Larcier, 264 p.
- Onses, Richard (2003). *The Public Private Partnership of Cartagena de Indias – Colombia: Agbar´s Experience*. Barcelona. ISBN 84-607-8089-9.
- Quiggin, J. (1996), 'Private sector involvement in infrastructure projects', Australian Economic Review, 1st quarter, 51–64.
- Spackman, M. (2002), 'Public-private partnerships: lessons from the British approach', Economic Systems, 26(3), 283–301.
- Strauch, L. (2009), 'Public Private Partnership in European Road Infrastructure: PPP as Investment Asset Following the M6 Road Project in Hungary', VDM.
- Nazar Talibdjanov and Sardorbek Koshnazarov, UNDP & Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Uzbekistan, Public-Private Partnership in Uzbekistan: Problems, Opportunities and Ways of Introduction (2008–2009)
- Monbiot, G. (2000), 'Captive State, The Corporate Takeover of Britain', Macmillan.
- Venkat Raman, A. and JW Bjorkman (2009), 'Public Private Partnerships in Health Care in India: Lessons for Developing Countries'. London. Routledge.
- PwC Health Research Institute (2010), 'Build and beyond: The (r)evolution of healthcare PPPs'

http://www.pwc.com/us/ppphealth
- National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy (2012), 'Facing the elements: building business resilience in a changing climate' http://preventionweb.net/go/26487

External links

- C.R.E.A.M. Europe PPP Alliance - EuroPPP and MasterPPPlan Initiative (http://www.cream-europe.eu)
- The World Bank, 2011. Public Private Partnership in Infrastructure – Resource Center for Contracts, Laws and Regulation (http://ppp.worldbank.org)
- United Nations Foundation & Vodafone Foundation Technology Partnership (http://www.unfoundation.org/our-solutions/mobile-technology/)
- The World Bank, 2010. The World Bank on private water operations in rural communities (http://water.worldbank.org/water/publications/private-operators-and-rural-water-supplies-desk-review-experience/)
- The World Bank, 2009. The World Bank on public-private water mechanisms for urban utilities (http://water.worldbank.org/water/publications/public-private-partnerships-urban-water-utilities-review-experiences-developing-countri/)
- European PPP Expertise Centre (http://www.eib.org/epec/)
- The EPEC PPP Guide (http://www.eib.or/epec/g2g/index.htm)
- Private Participation in Infrastructure database (http://ppi.worldbank.org)
- A Primer on Public-Private Partnerships (http://blog-pfm.imf.org/pfmblog/2008/02/a-primer-on-pub.html#more)
- Canadian Union of Public Employees on P3s (http://cupe.ca/public-private-partnerships)
- What are Public Private Partnerships? (http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/1518523.stm) BBC News
- CEE Bankwatch PPP study – Never mind the balance sheet – the dangers posed by public-private partnerships in central and eastern Europe (http://bankwatch.org/publications/never-mind-balance-sheet-dangers-posed-public-private-partnerships-central-and-eastern-)
- Overpriced and underwritten. The hidden costs of public-private partnerships (http://bankwatch.org/public-private-partnerships)
- Public Private Partnership in the Provision of Health Care Services to the Poor (http://www.south.du.ac.in/fms/idpad/idpad.html)
- D+C article 09/2010: Green for Growth Fund Southeast Europe by KfW Entwicklungsbank and the European Investment Bank (http://www.inwent.org/ez/articles/178603/index.en.shtml)
- Build and Beyond: The (r)evolution of healthcare PPPs (http://www.pwc.com/us/ppphealth)
- Public–private partnership in uzbekistan: problems, opportunities and ways of introduction (http://www.undp.uz/en/publications/publication.php?id=103) by Nazar Talibdjanov and Sardorbek Koshnazarov, UNDP
- IFC Advisory services in public-private partnerships (http://www.ifc.org/ppp)
- Institute for Public-Private Partnership (http://www.pppinstitute.com)
- Public-Private Partnership portal of Burgas, Bulgaria (http://ppp.burgas.bg)
- Public Private Partnership in disaster risk reduction (http://www.unisdr.org/partners/private-sector)
- How to create an RFP for a PPP Project bid or tender (http://www.indianrealestatefordummies.in/2013/04/how-to-make-rfp-request-for-proposal.html)

Categories: Public–private partnership | Government finances | Public economics | Government procurement