PPP Models

The PPP models vary from short-term simple management contracts (with or without investment requirements) to long-term and very complex BOT form, to divestiture. These models vary mainly by:

- Ownership of capital assets
- Responsibility for investment
- Assumption of risks, and
- Duration of contract.

The PPP models can be classified into four broad categories in order of generally (but not always) increased involvement and assumption of risks by the private sector. The four broad categorisations of participation are:

- Supply and management contracts
- Turnkey projects
- Lease
- Concessions
- Private ownership of assets.

Management Contracts:

A management contract is a contractual arrangement for the management of a part or whole of a public enterprise by the private sector. Management contracts allow private sector skills to be brought into service design and delivery, operational control, labour management and equipment procurement. However, the public sector retains the ownership of facility and equipment. The private sector is provided specified responsibilities concerning a service and is generally not asked to assume commercial risk. The private contractor is paid a fee to manage and operate services. Normally, payment of such fees is performance-based. Usually, the contract period is short, typically two to five years. But longer period may be used for large and complex operational facilities such as a port or airport.

There are several variants under the management contract including:

- Supply or service contract
- Maintenance management
- Operational management
Supply or service contract:

Supply of equipment, raw materials, energy and power, and labour are typical examples of supply or service contract. A private concessionaire can itself enter into a number of supply or service contracts with other entities/providers for the supply of equipment, materials, power and energy, and labour. Non-core activities of an organization (public or private) such as catering, cleaning, medical, luggage handling, security, and transport services for staff can be undertaken by private sector service providers. Such an arrangement is also known as outsourcing.

Some form of licensing or operating agreement is used if the private sector is to provide services directly to users of the infrastructure facility. Examples of such an arrangement include, catering services for passengers on railway systems (the Indian Railways, for example). The main purpose of such licensing is to ensure the supply of the relevant service at the desired level of quantity and quality.

Maintenance management

Assets maintenance contracts are very popular with transport operators. Sometimes equipment vendors/suppliers can also be engaged for the maintenance of assets procured from them.

Operational management

Management contracts of major transport facilities such as a port or airport may be useful when local manpower or expertise in running the facility is limited or when inaugurating a new operation. Management contracts are also quite common in the transport sector for providing some of the non-transport elements of transport operations such as the ticketing system of public transport and reservation systems. Operational management of urban transport services can also be contracted out to the private sector.

In the simplest type of contract, the private operator is paid a fixed fee for performing managerial tasks. More complex contracts may offer greater incentives for efficiency improvement by defining performance targets and the fee is based in part on their fulfilment.
**Turnkey**

Turnkey is a traditional public sector procurement model for infrastructure facilities. Generally, a private contractor is selected through a bidding process. The private contractor designs and builds a facility for a fixed fee, rate or total cost, which is one of the key criteria in selecting the winning bid. The contractor assumes risks involved in the design and construction phases. The scale of investment by the private sector is generally low and for a short-term. Typically, in this type of arrangement there is no strong incentive for early completion of a project. This type of private sector participation is also known as Design-Build.

**Affermage/Lease**

In this category of arrangement an operator (the leaseholder) is responsible for operating and maintaining the infrastructure facility and services, but generally the operator is not required to make any large investment. However, often this model is applied in combination with other models such as build-rehabilitate-operate-transfer. In such a case, the contract period is generally much longer and the private sector is required to make a significant level of investment.

The arrangements in an affermage and a lease are very similar. The difference between them is technical. Under a lease, the operator retains revenue collected from customers/users of the facility and makes a specified lease fee payment to the contracting authority. Under an affermage, the operator and the contracting authority share revenue from customers/users. Following Figure shows the typical structure of an affermage/lease contract. In the affermage/lease types of arrangements, the operator takes lease of both infrastructure and equipment from the government for an agreed period of time. Generally, the government maintains the responsibility for investment and thus bears investment risks. The operational risks are transferred to the operator. However, as part of lease, some assets may be transferred on a permanent basis for a period which extends over the economic life of assets. Fixed facilities and land are leased out for a longer period than for mobile assets. Land to be developed by the leaseholder is usually transferred for a period of 15-30 years.

It may be noted here that if the assets transferred to the private sector under a lease agreement are constrained in their use to a specific function or service, the value of assets
is dependent upon the revenue potential of that function or service. If assets are transferred to the private sector without restrictions of use, the asset value is associated with the optimum use of the assets and the revenues that they can generate.

Concessions

In this form of PPP, the Government defines and grants specific rights to an entity (usually a private company) to build and operate a facility for a fixed period of time. The Government may retain the ultimate ownership of the facility and/or right to supply the services. In concessions, payments can take place both ways: concessionaire pays to government for the concession rights and the government may also pay the concessionaire, which it provides under the agreement to meet certain specific conditions. Usually such payments by government may be necessary to make projects commercially viable and/or reduce the level of commercial risk taken by the private sector, particularly in the initial years of a PPP programme in a country when the private sector may not have enough confidence in undertaking such a commercial venture. Typical concession periods range between 5 to 50 years. It may be noted that in a concession model of PPP, an SPV may not always be necessary.

Concessions may be awarded to a concessionaire under two types of contractual arrangements:

Franchise
BOT type of contracts

Franchise

Under a franchise arrangement the concessionaire provide services that are fully specified by the franchising authority. The private sector carries commercial risks and may be required to make investments. This form of private sector participation is historically popular in providing urban bus or rail services. Franchise can be used for routes or groups of routes over a contiguous area.

Build-Operate-Transfer

In a Build-Operate-Transfer or BOT (and its other variants namely Build-Transfer-Operate (BTO), Build-Rehabilitate-Operate-Transfer (BROT), Build-Lease-Transfer (BLT)) type of arrangement, the concessionaire undertakes investments and operates the facility for a fixed period of time after which the ownership reverts back to the public sector. In this type of arrangement, operating and investment risks can be substantially
transferred to the concessionaire. However, in a BOT type of model the government has explicit and implicit contingent liabilities that may arise due to loan guarantees provided and default of a sub-sovereign government and public or private entity on non-guaranteed loans. By retaining ultimate ownership, the government controls policy and can allocate risks to those parties best suited to bear them or remove them.

In a BOT concession, often the concessionaire may be required to establish a special purpose vehicle (SPV) for implementing and operating the project. The SPV may be formed as a joint venture company with equity participation from multiple private sector parties and the public sector. In addition to equity participation, the government may also provide capital grants or other financial incentives to a BOT project. BOT is a common form of PPP in all sectors in Asian countries. A large number of BOT port and road projects have been implemented in the region.

Under the Build-Rehabilitate-Operate-Transfer arrangement, a private developer builds an add-on to an existing facility or completes a partially built facility and rehabilitates existing assets, then operates and maintains the facility at its own risk for the contract period. BROT is a popular form of PPP in the water sector.

A key distinction between a franchise and BOT type of concession is that, in a franchise the authority is in the lead in specifying the level of service and is prepared to make payments for doing so, whilst in the BOT type the authority imposes a few basic requirements and may have no direct financial responsibility.

**Private ownership of assets**

In this form of participation, the private sector remains responsible for design, construction and operation of an infrastructure facility and in some cases the public sector may relinquish the right of ownership of assets to the private sector.

It is argued that by aggregating design, construction and operation of infrastructure services into one contract, important benefits could be achieved through creation of synergies. As the same entity builds and operates the services, and is only paid for the successful supply of services at a pre-defined standard, it has no incentive to reduce the quality or quantity of services. Compared with the traditional public sector procurement model, where design, construction and operation aspects are usually separated, this form
of contractual agreement reduces the risks of cost overruns during the design and construction phases or of choosing an inefficient technology, since the operator’s future earnings depend on controlling costs. The public sector’s main advantages lie in the relief from bearing the costs of design and construction, the transfer of certain risks to the private sector and the promise of better project design, construction and operation.

There can be three main types under this form:

- Build-Own-Operate type of arrangement
- Private Finance Initiative (a more recent innovation)
- Divestiture by license or sale

**Build-Own-Operate**

In the Build-Own-Operate (BOO) type and its other variants such as Design-Build-Finance-Operate, the private sector builds, owns and operates a facility, and sells the product/service to its users or beneficiaries. This is the most common form of private participation in the power sector in many countries. For a BOO power project, the Government (or a power distribution company) may or may not have a long-term power purchase agreement (commonly known as off-take agreement) at an agreed price from the project operator.

In many respects, licensing may be considered as a variant of the BOO model of private participation. The Government grants licences to private undertakings to provide services such as fixed line and mobile telephony, Internet service, television and radio broadcast, public transport, and catering services on the railways. However, licensing may also be considered as a form of “concession” with private ownership of assets. Licensing allows competitive pressure in the market by allowing multiple operators, such as in mobile telephony, to provide competing services.

There are two types of licensing: quantity licensing and quality licensing. By setting limits through quantity licensing, the government is able to moderate competition between service providers and adjust supply between one area and other. Quality licensing however, does not place any restriction on number of providers or the amount of service produced but specifies the quality of service that needs to be provided. The government may get a fee and a small share of the revenue earned by the private sector under the licensing arrangement.
Private Finance Initiative

In the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) model, the private sector similar to the BOO model builds, owns and operates a facility. However, the public sector (unlike the users in a BOO model) purchases the services from the private sector through a long-term agreement. PFI projects therefore, bear direct financial obligations to government in any event. In addition, explicit and implicit contingent liabilities may also arise due to loan guarantees provided to lenders and default of a public or private entity on non-guaranteed loans.

In the PFI model, asset ownership at the end of the contract period may or may not be transferred to the public sector. The PFI model also has many variants.

The annuity model for financing of national highways in India is an example of the PFI model. Under this arrangement a selected private bidder is awarded a contract to develop a section of the highway and to maintain it over the whole contract period. The private bidder is compensated with fixed semi-annual payments for his investments in the project. In this approach the concessionaire does not need to bear the commercial risks involved with project operation.

Apart from building economic infrastructure, the PFI model has been used also for developing social infrastructure such as school and hospital buildings, which do not generate direct “revenues”.

Divestiture

This third type of privatization is clear from its very name. In this form a private entity buys an equity stake in a state-owned enterprise. However, the private stake may or may not imply private management of the enterprise. True privatization, however, involves a transfer of deed of title from the public sector to a private undertaking. This may be done either through outright sale or through public floatation of shares of a previously corporatised state enterprise.

Full divestiture of existing infrastructure assets is not very common. However, there are many examples of partial divestiture.