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Executive summary

Terms of Reference
Atkins was appointed to undertake and evaluation of the Commonwealth Public Private Partnership (PPP) Programme in January 2012. The evaluation was undertaken between January and May 2012. The Terms of Reference provided by the Secretariat required Atkins to:

- Assess the programme’s contribution to the needs and requirements of member countries;
- Find out how the programme is valued by the member governments;
- Gather how the organisational effort spent on the programme can be attributed to Public Sector Development Programme results; and
- Identify lessons learnt from the past seven years of programme operation, redefine its comparative advantage and make recommendations in light of a changed external environment.

Methodology
Our approach to the evaluation has been to understand how and what the programme has delivered, how these deliverables were used by member countries and the extent to which the context for PPP within member countries has changed.

Our evaluation has concentrated has focussed particularly on:

- The ongoing relevance of the PPP Programme to the strategic goals of the Secretariat and the needs of member countries;
- The effectiveness of the PPP Programme in building member country government capability;
- The efficiency with which the PPP Programme has been designed, managed and delivered;
- The impact of the PPP Programme in changing legislation, regulation, policy and procedure within member countries; and
- The sustainability of PPP Programme activities in light of external factors.

The evidence to support the evaluation has been compiled through:

- The review of all the Secretariat’s pertinent records and data relating to the PPP Programme, including ministerial mandates, project documents, activity reports and records, financial information;
- Independent data to examine how the context for PPP within member countries has developed;
- Semi-structured interviews with key Secretariat personnel and stakeholders to improve our understanding of the context behind the PPP programme;
- Questionnaires for completion by senior officials from each member country with responsibility for PPP and those who have previously attended PPP Programme training activities, with particular focus on understanding how respondents value the PPP Programme, how the training has been used and the ongoing relevance of the Secretariat’s support in this area;
- Field visits to Botswana, Jamaica and Zambia for the in-depth exploration with government officials and key local stakeholders of the relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the PPP Programme activities.

PPP Programme Mandate and Content
The PPP programme was started in 2003/04 in response to the need to "encourage ‘smart partnerships’ involving the private and public sectors" (Edinburgh Commonwealth Declaration on Promoting Shared Prosperity, 1997, paragraph 6); the “importance of engaging the private sector in partnership with the member governments to develop infrastructure” (Durban Communiqué, 1999, paragraph 46), and the “need to explore new ways to engage private finance effectively alongside public finance in supporting provision of basic services” (Commonwealth Finance Ministers Communiqué 2003, paragraph 8).

The overall structure of the PPP programme was founded on a support framework comprised of 5 phases encompassing awareness creation, skills training and capacity building, development of enabling framework, project/contract preparation, and project implementation. However in its execution the programme did not
extend beyond the awareness creation, skills training and capacity building. Since 2009 the emphasis of the programme has been on sharing knowledge and expertise within the Commonwealth and the strengthening linkages with international private sector infrastructure fund-providers.

The overall expenditure from the CFTC on the PPP Programme between 2003/04 and 2011/12 has been approximately £1.2 million. Of this, over £500,000 was spent during the second stage of the programme between 2009/10 and 2010/11.

**Delivery of the Programme**

The key activities delivered as part of the programme included:

- 4 ‘Pan-Commonwealth’ workshops – bringing together senior officials and policy makers from across the Commonwealth to raise awareness of PPP, share experiences on PPP delivery and learn from examples of good practice;
- 14 ‘regional’ workshops, delivered in conjunction with Bond University (Australia) and the University of Botswana – involving mid / senior level officials from within a single Commonwealth region, focussing on the individual elements of the development and delivery of PPP, case study examples and the identification of specific PPP opportunities;
- 18 ‘in-country’ workshops – involving representatives from across the public and private sector within an individual country to raise awareness of PPP opportunities and key processes and requirements.
- the development of a ‘Commonwealth PPP Network’ (the CP3N) which has sought to help to build linkages between member countries and the PPP Centres of Excellence to create a ‘virtual network’ of PPP knowledge across the Commonwealth.
- publications and discussion papers which have sought to raise awareness of PPP opportunities and in particular a ‘Public-Private Partnerships Policy and Practice’ reference guide to provide member country practitioners with an overview of the concepts of PPP, the structure of PPPs, examples of good practice and guidance on how and where to obtain further support.

Other activities included: member country visits and scoping missions to discuss opportunities and areas where the Secretariat could offer support; presentations at international PPP-related conferences and events; 2 specific skills-training activities within member countries; and the provision of a short-term consultant to support privatisation law.

**Findings**

**Programme’s contribution to the needs and requirements of member countries**

The needs and requirements of member countries were not determined. Instead the programme was designed and executed in response to the CHOGMs dated 1997 and 1999.

The Secretariat’s PPP Programme has been effective in promoting the awareness, understanding and acceptance of PPP within many of the member countries, but not effective in skills training and capacity building, nor in establishing itself as an effective link between PPP stakeholders other than between Member Countries and the Malaysia PPP Unit.

In the correct environment PPP is only one of many possible forms of “smart partnership” as referred to in the 1997 and 1999 CHOGMs and one of many possible “new ways to engage private finance effectively” as referred to in the Commonwealth Finance Ministers Communiqué of 2003. As there is little evidence of integration and coordination with other GIDD programmes, the PPP programme has been limited in its relevance to these mandates.

**Value of the programme to the member governments**

The key strength of the Commonwealth is that it brings together a network of countries with similar experiences and constraints. The Secretariat’s PPP programme therefore remains relevant in helping these countries to share knowledge and expertise.

The ‘Public-Private Partnerships Policy and Practice’ reference guide has been distributed to participants attending PPP programme activities and appears to be valued by those participants who are responsible for
PPP programmes within their respective countries. However the reference guide does not appear to have been widely distributed to all PPP practitioners within Commonwealth countries.

There are a large number of international and regional development organisations who are responding to Member Country requests for support with PPP programmes and projects. Unlike the Secretariat, many of these organisations have the resources needed to provide the technical assistance required by member countries to implement public-private partnership programmes. There is also no evidence to suggest that member Countries are experiencing any difficulty in engaging these institutions and therefore the relevance of the Secretariat establishing itself as an intermediary is questionable.

The majority of people interviewed have no opinion about the comparative advantage of the Secretariat in the PPP sector, were not aware of the contents of its programme and the support that could be requested, nor where they aware of the process to be followed in requesting such services.

**Contribution to Public Sector Development Programme results**

PPP requires accountability, integrity, transparency, predictability and participation in public sector decision making and implementation for it to be effective. PPP does not in itself increase these aspects of good governance. As such the PPP in itself does not contribute to Result 2 of the Public Sector Development Programme but is dependent on Result 2 being in place.

The PPP Programme in its design and implementation does not provide a clear illustration of how the issues of poverty reduction, gender and citizen-centred services have been specifically addressed and it can therefore be concluded that the PPP Programme is irrelevant with respect to these issues.

**Lessons learnt from the past seven years of programme operation**

Of the 89 individual programmes recorded as being part of the Secretariat’s PPP programme, 54 took the form of workshops or presentations, 32 were informal country scoping missions, leaving only 3 programmes related to skills or capacity development in response to specific requests. All the concerns raised in the Evaluation of Commonwealth Secretariat Training Programmes Report dated September 2010 relating to needs identification, selection of participants, selection of training providers, evaluation of training, and limited post-training support are relevant to this programme.

As has been observed in previous Secretariat evaluations, there are notable concerns over the extent to which the PPP Programme has been allowed to function with limited accountability to achieving results.

Lower and middle income countries that have been less prepared for PPP are enhancing their capacity by modelling their policy, legislation, and institutional structures on the upper middle and high income countries, which may not be appropriate. The generic nature of the Secretariat’s PPP programme and the lack of country-specific follow-up support may unfortunately have contributed to this outcome.

In lower income countries, where the opportunities for PPP in public infrastructure is limited, the attention and resources being spent in the pursuit of PPP projects, may be considered to be a distraction and contrary to pro-poor economic growth.

**Recommendations**

Secretariat advice and assistance be directed at the establishment of accountability, integrity, transparency, predictability and participation in public sector decision making and implementation rather than focus on the mechanics of a particular form of procurement.

Specific training support and advice on PPP be left to the numerous other international and regional development agencies operating within this sector in member countries, many of whom are able to offer significantly greater resources than the Secretariat can provide.

Build on the Secretariat’s key comparative advantage within the PPP sector relating to its network of countries with similar experiences and constraints. Increasing the opportunities for networking beyond the annual meeting of PPP officials and broadening the C3PN concept to include other forms of public procurement should therefore be the focus of the Secretariat’s activity.
Improve the management of activities of the PPP Programme and its accountability to results by establishing a more robust demonstration of how the PPP Programme is contributing to the results of the Public Sector Development Programme and the Strategic Plan.
1. Introduction

1.1. Background to the Evaluation
Atkins was appointed by the Commonwealth Secretariat’s Strategic Planning and Evaluation Division (SPED), in collaboration with the Governance and Institutional Division (GIDD), in January 2012 to undertake and evaluation of the Commonwealth Public Private Partnership (PPP) Programme.

The PPP Programme was introduced by the Secretariat in 2003/04 to help increase the level of private sector participation in infrastructure delivery across the Commonwealth. In particular, the Programme has sought to assist member countries in developing enabling environments for private sector investment, preparing potential projects to offer to private sector markets, and in building networks with private sector investors.

In accordance with the Terms of Reference provided by the Secretariat, the rationale behind the evaluation is to:

1. Assess the programme’s contribution to the needs and requirements of member countries;
2. Find out how the programme is valued by the member governments;
3. Gather how the organisational effort spent on the programme can be attributed to Public Sector Development Programme results; and
4. Identify lessons learnt from the past seven years of programme operation, redefine its comparative advantage and make recommendations in light of a changed external environment.

The evaluation was undertaken between January and May 2012. Evidence in support of the evaluation has been compiled through engagement with Secretariat personnel, Commonwealth member country government officials and key stakeholders.

1.2. The Purpose of this Report
Within this report, we present the findings of the evaluation and our recommendations for the Secretariat, together with detail on how the evaluation has been undertaken. The evaluation findings and recommendations are presented in relation to the following areas:

- The ongoing relevance of the PPP Programme to the strategic goals of the Secretariat and the needs of member countries;
- The effectiveness of the PPP Programme in building member country government capability;
- The efficiency with which the PPP Programme has been designed, managed and delivered;
- The impact of the PPP Programme in changing legislation, regulation, policy and procedure within member countries; and
- The sustainability of PPP Programme activities in light of external factors.

This report follows the submission of an Inception Report for the evaluation, within which we set out our detailed methodology for the study and our work plan.

1.3. Report Structure
Following this brief introductory chapter, the Evaluation Report is structured as follows:

- Chapter two explains our methodology for the evaluation, describing the overall approach and the process through which evidence has been gathered;
- Chapter three describes what has been delivered through the PPP Programme, including detail of resource inputs and activities by type and region;
- Chapter four explores the wider context for PPP within the Commonwealth, examining how the PPP sector has developed within member countries since the inception of the PPP Programme;
- Chapter five presents the findings of our evaluation, presented in accordance with the themes of our evaluation framework; and
• Chapter six contains the key conclusions of our evaluation and our recommendations to the Secretariat for the way forward for the PPP Programme.
2. Methodology

2.1. Introduction
Within this chapter we expand upon the purpose of the evaluation, as set out in the Terms of Reference. We then provide detail on our methodology for the study, explaining how the requirements of the Terms of Reference were met.

Our methodology explains the steps we followed in delivering the evaluation and provides detail on the evaluation framework adopted. This includes an overview of the primary evidence compiled for the study.

2.2. The Approach to the Evaluation
Our approach to the evaluation has been to understand how and what the programme has delivered, how these deliverables were used by member countries and the extent to which the context for PPP within member countries has changed. Evidence has been built on:

- the inputs to the programme - including the design, implementation and management of the programme, the expectations and the activities delivered;
- the outputs of the programme – the take-up of PPP programme activities by member countries, including changes in the perceptions of PPP, improvement in skills levels, institutional reform, and the degree of networking/support ; and
- the outcomes achieved – the extent to which the PPP programme has contributed to the Strategic Plan’s goal of “supporting pro-poor policies for economic growth and sustainable development in member countries” and Key Result 2 of Programme 5 relating to the “delivery of more effective citizen-centred public services”.

As illustrated in Figure 1, our evaluation has then focused on the relationship between each of these elements. Our approach has therefore been to question whether the inputs to the PPP Programme have led to successful outputs and whether these in turn have achieved the expected results.

Figure 1. Evaluation approach summary
In undertaking our evaluation, we have followed four key steps:

**Step 1 – Understanding the objectives, inputs and outputs of the PPP Programme**
We reviewed all the Secretariat pertinent records and data relating to the programmes within GIDD, particularly the PPP Programme (including ministerial mandates, project documents, activity reports and records, financial information, etc.), and developed an understanding of the PPP Programme’s context within the overall GIDD programme, its original objectives, the resource inputs, the activities undertaken since its inception and the level of participation of each member country.

**Step 2 – Understanding the context for PPP within member countries**
We examined the changing context of the PPP sector within Commonwealth countries since the introduction of the PPP programme, using data provided by member country governments and external organisations. In particular we:

- Examined the level of take-up of Secretariat activities by member countries (for instance the participation by country in capacity building workshops / courses, the use of guidance material prepared as part of the PPP programme, or the use of structured networks);
- Examined the degree of change in policy, legislation, regulation, process and procedure within member countries;
- Determined the number of PPPs delivered within the Commonwealth and the degree of success or failure since 2003/04; and
- Examined changes in member country “PPP readiness” and “Doing Business” ratings.

**Step 3 – The evaluation of the PPP programme**
The evaluation considered the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the PPP programme through a framework detailed in Appendix B. This framework comprises 12 key evaluation questions, built around these four evaluation themes.

These questions have been used to structure all of our formal engagements with Secretariat personnel, member country governments and key stakeholders.

**Step 4 – Recommendations**
Recommendations are drawn from our review of documentation and engagement with Secretariat personnel, member country government officials and key stakeholders, along with our own insights, based on our understanding of the PPP sector.

**2.3. The Compilation of Evidence**

**2.3.1. Secretariat Employee and Key Stakeholder Engagement**
Semi-structured interviews were held with key Secretariat personnel to improve our understanding of the context behind the PPP programme and the processes used to develop and deliver PPP Programme activities. This included interviews with:

- The PPP Advisor and programme officers;
- Senior officials and other advisors within GIDD;
- Directors of other units within the Secretariat; and
- The Assistant Secretary General.

Details of all those consulted can be found in Appendix C.

**2.3.2. Questionnaire**
Two questionnaires were developed in order to measure the success of the PPP Programme:

- a member country questionnaire – issued to each Primary Contact Point for completion by a senior government official with responsibility for infrastructure planning; and
• a shorter version of the same questionnaire for training participants - issued to those who have attended regional, pan-Commonwealth or in-country training workshops since 2009.

The emphasis of both questionnaires was on understanding how respondents value the work of the Secretariat through the PPP Programme and have used the skills learned during their training. The member country questionnaire also requested views on the ongoing relevance of PPP support to the needs of their country and the future areas of focus for the Secretariat.

The questionnaire was made available for completion online (through Survey Monkey) or as an excel file. A copy of the full member country questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

2.3.3. Field Visits

Field visits were undertaken to Zambia, Botswana and Jamaica which were chosen from countries across the Commonwealth for the reasons presented in Table 2.1 below.

Table 1. Field visit countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Reasons for Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>• Upper-middle income economy&lt;br&gt;• Strong and diversifying economy, but ongoing poverty-reduction challenges</td>
<td>• Short-term consultant provided by Secretariat to develop prioritisation law in 2006&lt;br&gt;• PPP Programme has supported Centre of Specialisation and Management at the University of Botswana in delivering a PPP training course&lt;br&gt;• Officials from Botswana have recently undertaken a ‘work experience placement’ to Malaysia’s PPP Unit with assistance from the Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>• Upper-middle income economy, but with significant budget and infrastructure deficits&lt;br&gt;• Ongoing concern over corruption</td>
<td>• Operational PPPs are already in place, with efforts being made to extend PPP to other sectors&lt;br&gt;• In-country workshop held within Jamaica as part of PPP Programme&lt;br&gt;• Long record of participation in regional PPP Programme workshops and ‘master classes’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>• Low income economy with recognised institutional weaknesses&lt;br&gt;• Widespread corruption concerns</td>
<td>• Known to be actively pursuing PPP&lt;br&gt;• PPP Programme assistance has included training and support as part development of Zambian PPP Unit&lt;br&gt;• Multiple delegates previously attended PPP Programme regional activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The field visits were undertaken between the 23rd and 27th April (to Botswana and Zambia) and 30th April to 3rd May (Jamaica).

Ahead of each field visit, the Commonwealth Secretariat Primary Contact Person of the country was provided with an excel spreadsheet containing the names and contact details of those officials who have participated in Commonwealth sponsored PPP programmes in the past and was requested to schedule meetings with as many as of these individuals as possible over the two day visit. In addition they were requested to schedule meetings with officials currently responsible for PPP programmes as well as meetings with any other development agency providing PPP support in-country. Further support in arranging meetings was provided by GIDD’s regional advisors.

A standard set of questions was prepared (as detailed in Appendix D) which served as the framework of the discussions with the various officials with whom meetings were confirmed. The field mission notes are contained in Appendix E.
3. The Public Private Partnership Programme

3.1. Introduction

Within this chapter, we consider the design, inputs and outputs of the Secretariat’s PPP Programme to better understand what has been invested and what has been delivered since 2004. We begin by examining the programme context, and in particular the origins and objectives of the PPP Programme and how it has been designed to respond to these. Secondly, we consider the delivery of the programme, examining the resource inputs and the activities which have been delivered.

3.2. The Programme Context

3.2.1. The Origins of the Programme

The initial Project Document for the PPP Programme was submitted in April 2004 by the then PPP Advisor, Srinivas Sampath, proposing a programme of activities to extend from 2003/04 to 2007/08. Until that time, PPP advice and support had been part of a wider offering of advisory services on strengthening corporate governance and restructuring.

The decision to focus specifically on PPP is understood to have reflected growing interest by member country governments in the participation of the private sector in public service and infrastructure delivery. The PPP Programme is understood to have responded particularly to discussions within meetings of Commonwealth Heads of Government in 1997 and 1999 and the meeting of Commonwealth Finance Ministers in 2003 (which are considered in greater detail as part of the evaluation in Chapter 5).

The PPP Programme was intended to align with the objectives of the 2004/05 to 2007/08 Commonwealth Secretariat Strategic Plan and specifically:

- Programme 8: Public Sector Development – to build capacity and promote the efficiency and effectiveness of national and regional public sector institutions; and
- Programme 15: Capacity Building & Institutional Development – to strengthen the capacity of local, national and regional institutions in areas critical to good governance and sustainable development through the placement of experts.

The focus was therefore to be on helping member countries to overcome key constraints to increasing private sector participation in infrastructure delivery, through capacity building and advisory activities. Funding for the PPP Programme was to be provided through the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Co-operation (CFTC).

3.2.2. The Design of the Programme

3.2.2.1. The initial PPP Programme – 2004 to 2009

The original Project Document for the PPP Programme submitted by Srinivas Sampath in April 2004 defines the overall objective of the Programme as being to:

“assist Commonwealth member countries in formulating an enabling environment to develop Public-Private Partnerships and improve quality of infrastructure through developing PPPs and private sector investment.”

This is supported by two immediate objectives (the ‘purpose’ of the programme) which are to:

1. Encourage the implementation of PPPs and enhance private sector participation in infrastructure development, through enhanced governance structures and practices, and strengthened public-private interface; and
2. Provide training and capacity building to senior-mid level Government officials, in order for them to enhance their capacities in implementing projects with private sector investment.
The overall structure of the Programme was founded on a framework comprised of 5 phases, representing each stage in the development and procurement of PPP. These are as follows:

- **Initial discussion (Phase I)** – focused on building member country understanding of the key concepts of PPP, potential issues and the necessary legislative and regulatory structures;
- **Capacity building & training (Phase II)** – focused on building capacity through country/region specific training programmes, developing project concepts and providing short term experts for the resolution of key issues;
- **Development of enabling framework / institutions (Phase III)** – focused on enabling the implementation of PPPs through the development of enabling law/legislation for projects, the development of project risk management plans, facilitation in securing funding and advice on consultant selection;
- **Bidding for private sector partner (Phase IV)** – relating to the provision of advice on developing contractual structure and contractual agreements, legal frameworks for implementation, procurement, bidding documentation and bid evaluation;
- **Selection of private of private sector partner (Phase V)** – relating to the provision of advice on the finalisation of contractual framework, facilitation support in the execution of contract agreements and appointment of independent auditors / engineers and advice on technical and final close and project implementation.

A series of activities were developed to correspond with this framework, with the assumption that the PPP Programme would focus on phases I to III during the first two full financial years (2004/05 and 2005/06), before progressing to phases IV and V from 2006/07 onwards. It was anticipated that the PPP Programme would be used to support member countries throughout the PPP lifecycle over the five year programme period, moving countries from the development of an understanding of the concepts and potential applications of PPP, through to the implementation of specific projects. CFTC funding was to be prioritised to phases 1 to 3 of the Programme, with large donors expected to provide most of the funding for activities to be delivered through phases IV and V.

The Project Document identifies a number of key deliverables which focus on the support to be provided for phases I to III. These relate to:

1. **Improving policy makers’ understanding of PPP** and its potential applications and the necessary reforms to enable and support PPP delivery within their countries;
2. **Providing training courses to build the knowledge and capability of government officials** to develop and deliver PPP projects, based on international best practices;
3. **Providing country-specific advisory services** to support the development of enabling frameworks for PPP (from the development of projects and assessment of feasibility, through to procurement and contractual support).

The intention was that country-specific support offered would be overseen by the PPP advisor, with the support and targeted input of the Secretariat’s regional advisors, private sector practitioners, project finance specialists and industry consultants.

The overall project cost for the period 2003/04 to 2005/06 was anticipated as being £226,500.

**3.2.2.2. The second stage of the programme – 2009 to present**

The second Project Document submitted in 2009, corresponded with the appointment of a new Secretariat PPP Advisor (Hee Kong Yong). The Project Document sets out an approach which retains much of that defined previously (and notably the five phases defined above). The most notable difference, however, is an increasing emphasis on the exchange of knowledge, skills and experiences between member countries and the role of national and international private sector partners in developing PPP opportunities.

Within the Project Document, three key challenges are identified which the revised Programme will seek to address:

1. Building capacity within member countries – specifically policy development, skills training and advisory support;
2. Sharing knowledge and expertise within the Commonwealth; and
3. Strengthening linkages with international private sector infrastructure fund-providers.
The activities defined to address these challenges correspond with those set out in the original PPP Programme Project Document, along with a number of new work areas. New activities are to include:

- An annual ‘Commonwealth PPP Conference’ to provide a forum for discussion on PPP for policy makers and project implementers; and
- The eventual creation of a ‘Commonwealth PPP Expertise Centre’ involving external support, to bring together partners from across the Commonwealth and provide a repository of knowledge on PPP best practice;
- The preparation of guidance materials and discussion papers on PPP, including ‘a compendium of best practices on PPP’ and a book on the PPP project life-cycle.

In support of these new activities, the Project Document proposes a significant expansion in the number of international partners engaged in the PPP Programme. In particular this is intended to develop opportunities for the sharing of information and expertise and leveraging funding opportunities. Three particular types of organisation are to be engaged:

- Delivery partners – including universities and training institutions and national PPP advisory bodies;
- Sponsors – particularly international financing institutions; and
- Network Participants – including international PPP advisory organisations.

A key purpose for the PPP Programme is to therefore to support the creation of a PPP network which would help to develop linkages between member country PPP practitioners and these partners. This would then enable the exchange of best practices and utilisation of existing resources and capabilities, rather than seeking to duplicate these through the Secretariat’s support. It is also intended to provide a more self-sustaining model to developing PPP capability across the Commonwealth. As the PPP Programme has developed, this has evolved as the ‘Commonwealth PPP Network’ (CP3N).

Corresponding with this increase in the scope of the Programme is a substantial increase in the budget requested within the Project Document. This totals £1.83 million over a three-year period.

### 3.3. The Delivery of the Programme: 2003 – 2012

#### 3.3.1. Resource Inputs

From the information provided by GIDD, it is understood that the overall expenditure from the CFTC on the PPP Programme between 2003/04 and 2011/12 has been approximately £1.2 million. Of this, over £500,000 was spent during the second stage of the programme between 2009/10 and 2010/11 (which as described later corresponded with a significant increase in PPP Programme activities).

The Programme has been managed by the PPP Advisor, with the assistance of Programme Officer and a Programme Assistant. A number of the activities delivered through the PPP Programme have also involved the input of staff resources from a number of partner organisations, including:

- Universities and training institutions;
- International Finance Institutions;
- PPP specialists from within member country governments

In a number of instances, resources from the programme appear to have been used to jointly fund activities with delivery partners (for instance through the provision of training programmes within the University of Botswana).

#### 3.3.2. Activities Delivered

The ‘Back to the Office’ reports and notes of the PPP advisors have been used to compile a list of the activities undertaken as part of the PPP Programme between 2004 and 2011. These activities are summarised in Table 2 overleaf, which is followed by a more detailed discussion of what each has involved.
Table 2. Summary of PPP Programme Activities by Calendar Year (2004 – 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pan-Commonwealth PPP workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional PPP workshop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-country PPP workshop / event</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint in-country PPP workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-country skills training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term PPP expert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member country visit / scoping mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation at PPP event (non-Secretariat event)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PPP workshops

As illustrated within Table 2, the Programme has delivered 39 workshop-type events since 2005 which generally correlate with activities defined within phases I and II of the Secretariat’s PPP support framework. These workshop events have typically been of three types:

- Pan-Commonwealth workshops – bringing together senior officials and policy makers from across the Commonwealth to raise awareness of PPP and examples of good practice; enable them to share experiences on PPP delivery and to learn from examples of good practice;
- Regional workshops – involving mid / senior level officials from within a single Commonwealth region, with greater focus on the individual elements of the development and delivery of PPP, case study examples and the identification of specific PPP opportunities;
- In-country workshops – involving representatives from across the public and private sector within an individual country to raise awareness of PPP opportunities and key processes and requirements.

In terms of content, Pan-Commonwealth workshops appear to have largely comprised a series of presentations on the potential applications of PPP and on the experiences of other countries in project implementation. Speakers have therefore included representatives of financial institutions, consultancies and member country PPP units.

As illustrated by the overview of the typical content of the regional and national workshops in Table 3 overleaf, these events have sought to cover a broader range of topics related to PPP. Regional workshops in particular have largely been undertaken in partnership with other organisations – most notably Bond University in Australia (for a series of regional ‘Leadership classes’ between 2007 and 2009) and the University of Botswana (between 2009 and 2011). They have also included the involvement of other multilateral bodies, and in particular the Southern African Development Community (SADC).

In addition to the more general workshops described above, there has also been an attempt to provide topic-specific training workshops, open to participants from across the Commonwealth. From the evidence provided, the only activity of this type undertaken to date has been a ‘project finance and financial modelling workshop’ in Malaysia in 2011.
### Table 3. Pan-Commonwealth, regional and in-country workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Workshops</th>
<th>In-Country Workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td>• Prime Minister / Cabinet members and senior politicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mid/senior level government officials</td>
<td>• Senior officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prime Minister / Cabinet members and senior politicians</td>
<td>• Private sector representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration</strong></td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3-12 days</td>
<td>• 2-3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overview of PPP process and types of PPP</td>
<td>• Overview of PPP process and types of PPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial, political, economic and social environments necessary for PPP</td>
<td>• PPP project development process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overview of financing</td>
<td>• Project selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Risk identification and allocation</td>
<td>• Project appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presentation of case studies, identifying successes and failures</td>
<td>• Policy frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Group exercises</td>
<td>• Risk identification, mitigation and allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presentations by participants on their own experiences</td>
<td>• PPP strategies and structuring options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review by participants of the needs of their countries</td>
<td>• Processes and contract monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Private partner selection</td>
<td>• Private partner selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partners</strong></td>
<td>• Key issues for the public sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Undertaken primarily with partner institutions, including:</td>
<td>• Financing PPPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Mirvac School of Sustainable Development, Bond University, Australia (between 2005 and 2009)</td>
<td>• Case studies presenting successes and failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Centre of Specialisation &amp; Management at the University of Botswana</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involved input from external PPP specialist advisors</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partners</strong></td>
<td>• Regional GIDD advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Mirvac School of Sustainable Development, Bond University, Australia (between 2005 and 2009)</td>
<td>• Private sector representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Centre of Specialisation &amp; Management at the University of Botswana</td>
<td>• PPP advisory bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involved input from external PPP specialist advisors</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Skills training and expert advice
Capacity building activities involving specific training for individual countries on PPP have been very limited, as has the provision by the Secretariat of short-term consultants to help create enabling frameworks for PPP.

The most notable of these has been the provision of a short term consultant to support privatisation law within Botswana, though detail on what this entailed is limited.

Member country visits and presentations at PPP events
As can be seen within Table 2, the number of member country visits increased significantly during 2009 and 2010, along with an accompanying rise in the number of presentations at externally organised events by the PPP advisor.

Many of these visits are termed as ‘scoping missions’ involving discussion with government officials on PPP-related issues and opportunities and encouragement from the advisor to participate in Secretariat activities, or request direct support. From our discussions with the PPP Advisor, we understand that many of these trips have been related to efforts through the PPP Programme to promote the establishment of ‘Commonwealth PPP Centres of Excellence’, whereby member countries with mature PPP units take a leading role in sharing knowledge and resources with others with less PPP capability. Particular focus has been given to encouraging Centres of Excellence within Malaysia, Nigeria and India.

This work is closely tied to the development of a ‘Commonwealth PPP Network’ (the CP3N) which has sought to help to build linkages between member countries and the PPP Centres of Excellence to create a ‘virtual network’ of PPP knowledge across the Commonwealth.

The recent activities as part of the Programme are also understood to have involved significant effort to develop relationships with PPP knowledge organisations, multilateral bodies, and private investors, to position the Secretariat as an intermediary to facilitate engagement with member countries (see illustration below). Much of this activity appears to have involved presenting at / participating in PPP-related conferences and events hosted by external organisations.

Figure 2. Intended Commonwealth PPP support networks

Work experience attachment
Among the initiatives tied to the CP3N has been the promotion of ‘work experience placements’, involving the short-term secondment of officers from member countries with limited PPP capability, into those with more mature institutions, to support the transfer of knowledge and skills.

From the PPP Advisor’s records, it would appear that the one work experience attachment which has occurred to date has involved officers from Botswana travelling to the Malaysian government’s PPP Unit for a two week period. The extent to which this has been funded by the Secretariat, however, is unclear.
PPP reference guide and discussion papers

Since 2009 in particular, there have been a number of publications and discussion papers which have sought to raise awareness of PPP opportunities, assist practitioners in developing projects and to raise awareness of the PPP-related support provided by the Secretariat.

The most notable of these has been the ‘Public-Private Partnerships Policy and Practice’ reference guide in October 2010. This aims to provide member country practitioners with an overview of the concepts of PPP, the structure of PPPs, examples of good practice and guidance on how and where to obtain further support. This reference guide appears to have been distributed to those participating in subsequent PPP Programme activities.

3.3.3. Activities delivered by region

By examining the activities delivered as part of the PPP Programme, it can be seen that there has been a strong focus on those countries within the Asia and Africa regions of the Commonwealth. (Figure 3)

Figure 3. PPP Programme Activities by Commonwealth Region (2004 – 2011)

Examining the activity notes in greater detail shows that:
- No activities were delivered involving member countries from the Americas, Caribbean, or Pacific during the first four years of the programme (beginning 2004 to end 2007);
- Notes are provided for 36 activities in the Asia region between 2008 and 2009. Many of these relate to short visits to Malaysia to assist the Malaysia PPP Unit (3PU) in the delivery of training events – an organisation with which the PPP Adviser has clearly developed strong ties.
4. The Context: Public Private Partnerships within Member Countries

4.1. Introduction
The following chapter provides a brief analysis of how PPP readiness and PPP delivery has advanced or increased within member countries since the commencement of the PPP Programme in 2004. The analysis is supported by independently provided data and by the responses of PPP Practitioners to the member country questionnaire.

4.2. Changes in Member Country Readiness for Public Private Partnerships

4.2.1. Self-reported change in readiness
Within the member country questionnaire, senior officials were asked to specify the state of readiness of their country for PPP prior to the commencement of the PPP Programme (in 2003) and the current state of readiness of their country (at 2012).

The results (presented in Figure 3 below) show that each of the 7 countries to respond to this question consider their state of readiness for PPP to have advanced during this period. It should be acknowledged that the sample is small, but over 70% of countries to respond now consider themselves to be relatively advanced in terms of their legislative, policy and regulatory frameworks for PPP; whilst in 2003 over half of these had either little understanding of PPP or were at the early stages of policy development. No respondent, however, describes their country as being fully ready.

Figure 4. Change in the perceived state of readiness of member countries

4.2.2. Independent data comparison
There is little publically available consistent information on the extent of a particular country’s readiness for PPP. As a proxy measure of the degree of change across the Commonwealth, we have examined the World Bank Group’s ‘Doing Business’ data which is an annually compiled measure of business regulations and
their enforcement within individual countries around the globe. Whilst these measures do not relate directly to the readiness of a country for PPP, they do provide a high level indication of the extent to which a country is attractive to private sector investment.

Our analysis has been focused on how selected indicator values (relating to the ease of starting a business, obtaining credit, enforcing contracts, undertaking construction and the strength of investor protection) have changed within ‘low’ and ‘lower-middle’ income Commonwealth countries between 2004 and 2012. Whilst there is significant difference between individual countries, a number of broad conclusions can be drawn on how the ease of doing business has changed in this time. In particular, these indicators suggest that:

- It has generally become easier to start a business within low and lower-middle income countries, with fewer procedures, a significant reduction in the time taken and notably lower costs;
- The costs of construction have generally fallen, but the number of procedures required to build infrastructure, as well as the time and cost of doing so remain largely unchanged;
- Contract enforcement remains challenging, particular in terms of time taken to resolve disputes and enforce contracts; and
- The level of investor protection within most countries has remained largely unchanged.

Against all indicators, low and lower-middle income Commonwealth countries remain significantly behind upper-middle and high income Commonwealth countries; most notably in the level of protection for investors.

4.3. Trends in Public Private Partnership Delivery within Member Countries

Since the inception of the Secretariat’s PPP Programme there has been substantial growth in both the annual number of privately funded infrastructure projects reaching financial close and the size of these projects. Data from the World Bank indicates that between 1998 and 2003 (the six years preceding the inception of the PPP Programme), 242 private participation infrastructure projects within the Commonwealth achieved financial close, with a total of US$76.1bn invested by the private sector in infrastructure; between 2004 and 2009, these figures rose to 406 projects, with a total investment of US$214.8bn.

Investment by Commonwealth region

The most significant growth in private participation in infrastructure delivery within the Commonwealth has been within Asian countries, where the annual volume of investment rose from US$7.7bn in 2003 to US$40bn in 2009 (see Figure 5). Three quarters of all private sector investment in infrastructure in the Commonwealth between 2004 and 2009 has been in Asia, with over US$124.8bn invested in India during this period (approximately 50% of all investment within the Commonwealth).

The sectors invested in between 2004 and 2009 varied considerably between each Commonwealth region. For most Commonwealth countries, the focus of private sector investment has been in the telecommunications sector (accounting for 77% of investment within African countries, 69% within Caribbean countries and 100% within Pacific countries). For instance:

- no private water and sanitation sector investment was made in Commonwealth countries outside Asia;
- no private investment was made in transport within Commonwealth countries in the Americas, Caribbean and Pacific.

Investment outside of the telecommunications sector has also tended to be concentrated within a limited number of countries. For instance, of the Commonwealth’s 41 low, lower-middle or upper middle income countries:

- only 2 (India and Malaysia) benefited from private sector investment in water & sanitation projects between 2004 and 2009
- 9 benefited from investment in transport; and
- 19 from investment in energy

1 Does not include data for the UK, Australia, or Canada.
This suggests that many countries have continued to experience difficulty in generating market interest in infrastructure projects.

**Investment by country income level**

Examining this data by country income level shows that low income countries in particular have experienced particular difficulty in attracting private sector investment beyond the telecommunications sector (which represents over 80% of investment). Additionally, whilst the level of investment has grown across all income groups, per capita sector investment in low income Commonwealth countries and £11 in lower-middle income countries. By comparison, the equivalent figure for upper-middle income countries was £30.

**Figure 6. Private Sector Investment in Infrastructure within the Commonwealth by income group (2004 – 2009)**

Source: World Bank (2011)
5. **Findings of the Evaluation**

5.1. **Introduction**

Within this chapter we present the findings of the evaluation, based on the results of the Secretariat personnel and stakeholder interviews, member country and training participant questionnaires and field visits. The findings are structured in accordance with the evaluation themes identified within Chapter 2 and in accordance with the themes of the evaluation framework presented in Appendix B.

5.2. **The Relevance of the PPP Programme**

5.2.1. **Alignment with CHoGM Mandates**

It is understood that the programme originates from a need for support to member countries on PPP identified through the 1997 and 1999 CHoGMs and the 2003 Commonwealth Finance Ministers Meeting. The former two, in particular, are the key reference points within the original PPP Programme Project Document.

Having reviewed the official notes of each of these meetings, it is evident that the need for strengthening engagement between the public and private sectors to support member country development featured prominently in these discussions. The meeting notes, for instance refer to:

- the need to “encourage ‘smart partnerships’ involving the private and public sectors” (Edinburgh Commonwealth Declaration on Promoting Shared Prosperity, 1997, paragraph 6);
- the “importance of engaging the private sector in partnership with the member governments to develop infrastructure” (Durban Communiqué, 1999, paragraph 46);
- the “need to explore new ways to engage private finance effectively alongside public finance in supporting provision of basic services” (Commonwealth Finance Ministers Communiqué 2003, paragraph 8)

What we have not been able to discern from the meeting notes, however, is a clear instruction to the Secretariat to provide specific support to member governments in the development of PPP. What is contained within the 2003 Finance Ministers Communiqué is an instruction to the Commonwealth Business Council (CBC) to:

> “help facilitate further steps to share, among Commonwealth members, experience and techniques of developing public private partnerships” (Paragraph 8).

The Secretariat is provided with a general instruction (which notably is not specific to PPP support alone) to assist the CBC by:

> “facilitating exchanges between countries on best practice on all aspects of service delivery, including participation and effective regulation” (Paragraph 9).

In reality, it would appear that the PPP Programme has assumed much of both the roles ascribed to the CBC and the Secretariat. There is evidence of collaboration between the two organisations on specific projects (see discussion later in this chapter), but most activities appear to have been undertaken in parallel and there is no reference at all to the CBC within the PPP Programme project documents.

5.2.2. **Alignment with the Strategic Plan**

The PPP Programme is currently identified as being part of the Public Sector Development Programme (Programme 5) within the 2008/09 – 2011/12 Commonwealth Secretariat Strategic Plan. In particular, the PPP Programme is identified as supporting Result 2 which relates to the “delivery of more effective citizen-centred public services”. One of the key areas of work of the programme is “developing enabling environments for public-private partnerships” and an indicator is provided which directly corresponds to the PPP Programme (Indicator 5), relating to “enhancing competencies and policy frameworks to implement public-private partnerships”.

The PPP Programme is also identified within the Economic Development Programme of the Strategic Plan (Programme 6), which has an overall objective to “strengthen policies and systems that build resilience and support inclusive and sustainable growth in member states”. Particular reference is made to “supporting PPPs as a vehicle for mainstreaming gender in national economic growth.”

Whilst the PPP Programme is specifically referenced within the Strategic Plan, the relationship between its implementation and the objectives of the Secretariat is currently not well defined. Neither the Strategic Plan, nor the most recent Project Document for the PPP Programme (submitted in 2009) provide a clear illustration of how the activities of the PPP Programme will support the delivery of the objectives of either the Public Sector Development Programme or the Economic Development Programme. In particular:

- There is no demonstration as to how PPPs or increasing private sector participation in infrastructure more generally will lead to more citizen-centred services;
- There is no detail on how the indicator relating to the programme is to be measured, how it will lead to the desired results, or how it is to be used;
- The relationship between PPP and gender issues is undefined, with no mention of gender as a specific concern in any of the PPP documentation or programmes undertaken; and
- Important linkages between PPPs and supporting economic growth and reducing poverty are recognised within the Project Document, but these are not picked up on at all anywhere else.

It would appear, instead, that the inclusion of the PPP Programme with the Public Sector Programme is a reflection more of the internal organisation of the Secretariat, rather than its strategic alignment with the desired results. The PPP Programme seems to have been included within this area to provide it with a home, rather than to reflect its contribution to the specific results of Programme.

### 5.2.3. Alignment with the needs and state of readiness of member countries

The five phases of the PPP Programme (described in Chapter 3) provide a broad support framework which is seemingly intended to offer any area of support a member country could possibly need in developing and implementing PPP projects. As such, the Programme could potentially respond to any request by a member country, though it is clear that many are unaware of what can be provided by the Secretariat, or how to request support.

**Figure 7. Questionnaire respondents’ suggested future priorities for the Secretariat**
As Figure 7 illustrates, despite most countries reporting that the state of readiness for PPP had advanced within the member country questionnaire (see Figure 4 in Chapter 4), it remains the case that for the questionnaire respondents, the most significant area where support required from the Secretariat is in raising awareness of PPP opportunities. Half of the respondents also consider providing training and capacity building support to be a high priority.

Questionnaire respondents also identify support in engagement with the private sector to be a high priority (70% of respondents), reflecting the apparent difficulty of member countries in obtaining market interest in PPP projects. By contrast, the priority given to networking with other PPP support bodies and sharing knowledge between member countries is more modest. This should be tempered, however, by what appears to be limited understanding of the Secretariat’s activities in this area (discussed later in this chapter).

5.2.4. The comparative advantage of the PPP Programme

Questionnaire respondents were asked to state the extent to which they believe the areas of the Secretariat’s comparative advantage identified within the Secretariat’s Strategic Plan relate to the support and advice provided as part of the PPP programme.

As can be seen in Figure 7, the majority of respondents agree or strongly agree that the Secretariat:

- can be depended upon to respond quickly and effectively to requests (63%);
- is important in facilitating the exchange of experiences, knowledge and resources (59%); and
- can be trusted to be more impartial than other providers of PPP advice (54% of respondents).

Figure 8. Member country perceptions of the Secretariat’s identified areas of comparative advantage

For many of those consulted as part of the evaluation (and particularly those engaged as part of the field visits), the key strength of the Commonwealth is that it brings together a network of countries with similar experiences and constraints. The Secretariat therefore has an important role in helping these countries to share knowledge and expertise.

As is illustrated within Figure 7, however, it is concerning that a large proportion of who do not know, or have no opinion about the comparative advantage of the Secretariat in the PPP sector. It was also particularly apparent during the field visits that many of those interviewed were less aware of the services that could be
provided by the Secretariat than they were of those available from a number of other development agencies, or from neighbouring countries.

5.3. The Effectiveness of the PPP Programme

5.3.1. The extent to which the Programme has enhanced the capacity of member country governments to implement PPP projects

Regional / Pan-Commonwealth Workshops

Within the responses to the member country and training evaluation questionnaires, there is consensus that regional and pan-Commonwealth workshops\(^2\) have been highly useful in improving their member country's states of readiness for PPP (of the 10 responses to this question, 8 suggested the workshops were 'highly useful'; the remainder did not know).

Respondents, however, were largely unable to identify specific examples of the way in which the skills learned have been applied. The most frequently identified benefit is that officers have been able to learn from the experiences of PPP projects and PPP units within other countries (4 of 10 respondents), which has subsequently supported the identification of new opportunities.

The two respondents who attended the regional workshops and have been most successful in implementing their PPP skills have both benefited from significant additional training (both having enrolled in courses offered by other providers of PPP advice). This result is confirmed by the evidence gathered during the field visits. In Zambia the majority of the officials currently responsible for PPP programmes have undergone IP3 training in the USA and are qualified PPP specialists. In Botswana only a small number of those who participated in the Secretariat's programmes are currently involved with PPP.

In-country PPP activities

Of the five questionnaire respondents to specify that Secretariat-supported PPP training activities had been held within their country, all regard these events as having been ‘useful’ or ‘very useful’ in improving their country’s readiness for PPP.

As with the regional and pan-Commonwealth activities, the key benefits of these events is identified as being in raising awareness of PPP and in identifying potential new opportunities.

In Zambia, the view was that the Secretariat ‘in-country’ programmes were useful in broadening the understanding and acceptance of PPP, but that they themselves did not learn much except that they benefitted from the case studies presented. In Botswana the view was that although they benefited from these programmes and particularly from the case studies presented, there was a need for more detailed training. In Jamaica, some of the officials currently involved with the transport PPP projects have been exposed to PPP training other than by the Secretariat. Also, in Jamaica, some of those officials currently involved with the development of PPP policy, legislation, and institutional capacity have been exposed to the Secretariat’s PPP programme but they expressed the need for much more detailed PPP training.

PPP Practitioners Reference Guide

Four of the questionnaire respondents have access to the Secretariat’s PPP Guide. Three regard it as being very useful. Particular examples include in helping to determine at an early stage what is needed for a successful PPP project and in helping to respond to related queries from the public and politicians.

The PPP Practitioner’s Reference Guide was visible on the desk of the Head of Zambia’s de-facto PPP unit and officials within this unit confirmed the above findings. However the document is only in the possession of those who attended a recent in-country workshop; there is not a broad awareness of its existence. In Botswana and Jamaica, the document was also only in possession of those who attended the recent in-country workshops.

\(^2\) These comprise the Bond University Leadership Programme, Pan-Commonwealth PPP Leadership workshops and Regional PPP Leadership workshops
5.3.2. The extent to which the Programme has encouraged the implementation of PPP projects and enhanced private sector participation infrastructure development

From the statistics provided in Paragraph 4.3 above, and from the field visits to Zambia, Botswana, and Jamaica, it is clear that for the majority of the Commonwealth Countries there has not been a noteworthy increase in the number of PPP projects implemented outside of the telecommunications sector. Also, the growth in the telecommunications has been through the privatization of Utility companies and not PPP in terms of the narrow and common understanding of PPP.

The Secretariat’s PPP programme, together with similar efforts from several other international and regional development agencies, does appear to have increased the awareness and broad understanding of PPP resulting, to varying degrees of success, in an increased state of readiness to deal with PPP. However this, in the majority of member countries, has not translated into an increase in the number of PPP projects implemented or an increase in private sector participation in infrastructure development.

5.3.3. The extent to which member countries depend on the support network provided by the programme

The responses to the member country and event participant questionnaire suggest that the Secretariat is well regarded as a provider of guidance, advice and training on PPP.

Of the questionnaire respondents, 70% considered the Secretariat to be a highly important provider of guidance, advice and training on PPP – with 62% regarding the Secretariat as being the most important (Figure 9). Other important resources include those provided by the World Bank Institute (identified by 46% of respondents) and support provided by consultants (38% of respondents).

Figure 9. Questionnaire respondents’ perceptions of the most important providers of guidance, advice and training on PPP

What is also apparent within the questionnaire results, however, is that those who have been most involved in the development of PPP projects have largely benefited from significant support from other institutions, whereas those who have had less involvement have tended to only have received support from the Secretariat. The field visits to Zambia, Botswana and Jamaica highlighted that there are numerous other international and regional development agencies that are offering their assistance to Commonwealth...
member counties, and doing so much more proactively than the Commonwealth Secretariat. It was evident from the interviews undertaken with officials responsible for PPP programmes were unaware of the extent of the services provided by the Secretariat and did not know the approach to follow to request such support besides the informal requests made to the PPP Specialist.

C3PN
A quarter of the questionnaire respondents indicate that their country is participating in the CP3N (3 of 12 respondents). All agree that the C3PN is of use, though only one respondent suggests it is critical. None were able to provide specific examples of how the network has yet been used.

From the discussion undertaken during the field visits, it is clear that the comparative advantage of the Secretariat is its network of countries with similar experiences and constraints. As such any tool to improve the sharing of experiences of member countries is encouraged. However many of the people interviewed were unaware of C3PN. In Zambia, the head of the de-facto PPP Unit had just returned from a Secretariat-sponsored C3PN programme in Malaysia and indicated that it entails the regular meeting of officials to share experiences.

5.4. The Efficiency with which the PPP Programme has been Delivered

5.4.1. The design of the Programme
As described previously, the PPP Programme has been designed around a generic framework which covers all potential areas of support to member countries. As the Programme has evolved, it appears that the areas of support have actually expanded, rather than become more focussed on those where the Secretariat can have greatest benefit.

Within the original 2004 Project Document, Phase 1 of the Programme was to relate to developing an in-depth understanding of the specific issues and required legislative structures/reforms of individual countries. These would be delivered initially through a policy-centred seminar with policy makers and cabinet members; the outputs of which would then inform specific capacity building and training activities. There is, however, no record provided within the project documentation of these seminars having been held.

There is evidence that the PPP Advisor has worked with the GIDD Regional advisors when designing activities for individual countries. The body of intelligence prepared on the needs and relative state of readiness for PPP of member countries, however, is very limited. A lack of country-specific intelligence would appear to be a common problem across the Secretariat, and there currently appears to be limited understanding among advisors of other areas within member countries where the Secretariat is providing support.

Given the limited knowledge of the specific needs of participants, most activities have been largely generic in nature to accommodate those with all levels of understanding of PPP. The majority of the programmes implemented were therefore initiated by the Secretariat, rather than being the result of a direct request for assistance from member countries and the focus has been on promoting a broader acceptance and understanding of PPP amongst politicians as well as the general skills development of officials. In particular, no distinction appears to have been made in the selection of participants or in the content of the courses between the different levels of skills amongst participants.

As part of the regional workshops, the individual needs of member countries were considered largely through the interaction with workshop participants, who were encouraged to present on their country’s current level of readiness for PPP and to begin to develop an action plan for improving this. This action plan could then be developed to identify specific areas of support from the Secretariat. It would appear, however, that few specific requests have subsequently been submitted.

Officials responsible for PPP programmes interviewed during the field visits expressed a lack of understanding of the workings of the Secretariat and did not know how to approach it for assistance. This possibly explains the limited number of occasions when a Secretariat programme was implemented in response to a direct request.
5.4.2. The extent to which the Programme has been delivered as planned

As discussed within Chapter 3, the activities delivered through the PPP Programme have related primarily to those which correspond to phases one to three of the five-phase support framework. As a consequence, fewer than half of the activities defined during the first PPP Programme period (2003/04 to 2007/08) appear to have actually been delivered. Furthermore, there would seem to be a lack of any reporting from this period demonstrating the extent to which the delivery of activities against the planned programme has been monitored, or the extent to which the agreed budget has been met.

Given this, the 2009 Project Document, which is the basis of most recent programme of activities, appears highly ambitious, with the programme areas not rationalised to reflect difficulties in past performance, but instead further extended. This period also corresponds with a significant increase in the budget for the PPP Programme (rising from between £100,000 and £140,000 per year, to approximately £250,000), but with no evident increase in the level of staff resource to deliver activities. Given the previous record of delivery of the first programme period, it is worrying that there appears to have been little challenge to the deliverability of the planned programme.

In this regard, the management of the PPP Programme reflects the concerns of the 2010 evaluation of the Secretariat’s training programmes over the approach to annual budget setting within the Secretariat. In particular, there appears to be no clear criteria behind the allocation of funding to advisors, who are in turn given autonomy to undertake activities as deemed appropriate. Reflecting another of the concerns of the evaluation, there also appears to have been no criteria on how this budget should be allocated between types of initiative, country, or region (with the principal proviso appearing to be that an advisor should not overly concentrate on one country). Across the Secretariat, and particularly within GIDD, there is worrying lack of awareness and understanding about what the PPP Programme is seeking to achieve, what activities have been undertaken, or how the activities of the Programme relate to those of other advisors.

Annual reporting has been introduced since 2009/10, seemingly to improve transparency and to better demonstrate how investment is supporting the delivery of Strategic Plan results. The information presented in the Annual Reports for 2009/10 and 2010/11 does suggest broad correlation between overall planned spend and actual spend. However, the activities are very broadly defined and it is not at clear whether the outputs of the activities delivered correspond with those which were planned.

It is apparent too, that there is a strong need for a more robust demonstration of how the PPP Programme is contributing to the results of the Strategic Plan. The current approach within the Annual Report is based on a highly subjective and anecdotal discussion, with no quantifiable measures of performance. It is understood that, as with much of GIDD, neither the Commonwealth’s ARTEMIS programme management system, nor results-based management techniques have yet been used in the development or delivery of PPP Programme activities.

5.4.3. The extent to which the PPP Programme has made use of member country knowledge and other externally available resources

Throughout the delivery of the PPP Programme, there has been recognition by the PPP advisor that the Secretariat would be unable to deliver the planned activities without the extensive involvement of external partners. As a result, there has been significant effort to build partnerships with other organisations, and in particular academic and training institutions and member country centres of PPP excellence. Key examples have included:

- Working jointly with Bond University and the University of Botswana to develop and deliver PPP training courses;
- Working with member country PPP Units (and particularly the Malaysia PPP Unit) to promote the sharing of good practice and resources with other member countries;
- Engaging international financing institutions and PPP specialists as part of the development of the C3PN.

Recent programme activity, especially, has sought to bring in a wider range of partners to support the Secretariat’s assistance. In particular, this has involved member country PPP units leading on the sharing of skills and knowledge with other countries to provide support which can be sustained without continual Secretariat input. The number of examples of member countries who appear to have made use of the C3PN...
to draw on the resources of other countries, however, appears modest and the success of the PPP advisor in building centres of PPP excellence within the Commonwealth has largely been confined to Malaysia.

Similarly, the activities with the University of Botswana have been intended to help establish a centre for training on PPP which would be able to support those across the Africa region. It is understood, however, that this training has been discontinued.

From our understanding it would seem that the Secretariat has not worked as closely with the CBC as was originally envisaged as part of the Commonwealth Finance Ministers Meeting in 2003. The CBC’s activities within the PPP sector have related to facilitating engagement between the public and private sectors to raise awareness of PPP opportunities, support governments in the implementation of enabling legislation for PPP and ensure that proposed projects are attractive to the private sector. Much of this work is therefore highly similar to the activities delivered through the PPP Programme. Most of the activities delivered by both organisations appear to have been undertaken entirely independently from each other, however, with collaboration appearing to have been limited to on one or two specific projects (where the Secretariat has largely provided training support).

5.5. The Overall Impact and Sustainability of the Programme

5.5.1. The impact of the Programme in changing legislation, regulation, policy and process and procedure within member countries

As demonstrated within Chapter 4, there is a general perception amongst the respondents to the member country questionnaire that the state of readiness for PPP within their country has improved since the year of the introduction of the PPP Programme in 2003. As previously identified, however, whilst there is evidence from the data provided by the World Bank that private sector investment in infrastructure has increased significantly within member countries during this period, within most low and lower-middle income countries, investment beyond the telecommunications sector appears to have been limited.

Figure 10. Member Country Questionnaire – the impact of the PPP Programme
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- Raising political awareness of PPP
  - Significant positive impact: 14% 14%
  - Positive impact: 29%
  - No impact: 43%

- Improving the capacity of Government officials to deliver PPP projects
  - Significant positive impact: 14%
  - Positive impact: 43%
  - No impact: 29%

- Helping to identify necessary legislative, regulatory and policy change to support PPP
  - Significant positive impact: 43%
  - Positive impact: 29%
  - No impact: 29%

- Helping to build PPP networks with other Commonwealth country governments
  - Significant positive impact: 14%
  - Positive impact: 14%
  - No impact: 29%

- Improving engagement with the private sector on infrastructure investment opportunities
  - Significant positive impact: 29%
  - Positive impact: 14%
  - No impact: 29%

- Improving engagement with International Finance and Development institutions
  - Significant positive impact: 14%
  - Positive impact: 14%
  - No impact: 43%
As is illustrated in Figure 10 on the previous page, respondents to the member country questionnaire suggest that the greatest impact of the PPP Programme has been in:

- Improving the capacity of officials to deliver PPP projects (with 57% of respondents suggesting the programme has had a significant positive / positive impact); and
- Helping to identify necessary legislative, regulatory and policy change to support PPP (43% of respondents).

Of the seven countries to respond to this question, two suggest that the Programme has also had a positive effect in raising political awareness and improving engagement with the private sector.

Where the programme is considered to have had least impact is in helping to build PPP networks with other countries and improving engagement IFI and development institutions.

No respondents regard the programme as having had a negative impact in the advancement of PPP, but many are unclear as to what the impact has been.

Despite the response to the questionnaire, it was overwhelmingly evident that the officials currently responsible for PPP within their countries were in need of more detailed and specific PPP training. The generic and entry level nature of the Secretariat programmes structured around case studies may have something to do with this, but more obvious is the regular turnover of staff. Many of the beneficiaries of the Secretariat programmes are no longer directly responsible for PPP programmes in their country.

The evidence gathered from the field visits was that the Secretariat’s greatest impact has been in raising the political awareness of PPP and identifying the need for policy, legislative and regulatory reform. Unfortunately, from the evidence gathered during the field visits, some of the member countries with weaker and smaller economies are modelling their policy and institutional structures on countries with stronger economies and these may be proving to be inappropriate and ineffective. In Botswana, provision has been made for the establishment of a PPP Unit, but due to financial constraints (the official response) this has not happened. In Jamaica it has been decided to establish a PPP Unit within the Development Bank of Jamaica which appears to potentially duplicate the functions of the Contractor General Office.

5.5.2. Sustainability

The training participant questionnaire results raise concern that the skills taught during the training events have not been retained within member country governments. Questionnaires were sent via email to over 100 individuals who had attended either regional, pan-Commonwealth or in-country events. Around a third of these emails were undeliverable due to the email address being no longer active. Of the highly limited number of responses received, many of the respondents stated that they had been unable to use the skills learned.

Furthermore, despite an indication that PPP readiness has generally increased across the Commonwealth, many countries appear to have difficulty in securing political or senior official support for PPP projects. Four-fifths of questionnaire respondents identified raising awareness of PPP for politicians and senior government officials as a key priority for the Secretariat in future.

The evidence gathered during the field visits suggested that the inability to secure political and senior official support for PPP projects has less to do with the lack of awareness and more to do with the feasibility of PPP projects. There was particular concern from a number of those engaged from within the Secretariat and CBC that member countries continue to have insufficient capability in developing PPP projects which are likely to attract market interest.

It is also apparent that many of those who are less prepared for PPP are enhancing their capacity by modelling their policy, legislation, and institutional structures on the more advanced countries which may not be appropriate. An example of this is the establishment of PPP Units in Zambia, Botswana and Jamaica where the economy is simply not big enough to sustain continuous programme of PPP projects.
6. Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1. Conclusions

The relevance of the PPP Programme
The term PPP or P3 commonly refers to a specific procurement method with a unique set of contractual requirements for which standard guidelines and contract documentation have been developed. It is only one of many forms of partnership between the public and private sector ranging from Civil Works and Service Contracts, Management Contracts, Lease contracts, PPP Concessions, Joint Ventures, and Full Divestiture. It is only one of many possible forms of “smart partnership” as referred to in the 1997 and 1999 CHoGMs and one of many possible “new ways to engage private finance effectively” as referred to in the Commonwealth Finance Ministers Communiqué of 2003. As there is little evidence of integration and coordination with other GIDD programmes, the PPP programme has been limited in its relevance to these mandates.

The generic nature of the Secretariat’s PPP programme is a reflection of the lack of any assessment or analysis of the specific needs and relative state of PPP readiness of each member country. Little evidence exists that the individual programmes took account of the different levels of accountability, integrity, transparency, predictability and participation in public sector decision making within various counties. Also, the overwhelming majority of programmes undertaken as part of the Secretariat’s PPP programme where initiated by the Secretariat rather than being in response to specific requests for assistance by Member Countries. This together with the evidence that many Commonwealth countries have continued to experience difficulty in generating market interest in infrastructure projects, and the feedback that the most significant area where support is still required from the Secretariat is in raising awareness of PPP opportunities, leads to the conclusion that the Secretariat PPP programme has not been relevant in “enhancing competencies and policy frameworks to implement public-private partnerships” (Public Sector Development Programme Indicator 5).

The PPP Programme in its design and implementation does not provide a clear illustration of how the issues of poverty reduction, gender and citizen-centred services have been specifically addressed and it can therefore be concluded that the PPP Programme is irrelevant with respect to these issues.

There are a large number of international and regional development organisations who are responding to Member Country requests for support with PPP programmes and projects. Unlike the Secretariat, many of these organisations have the resources needed to provide the technical assistance required by member countries to implement public-private partnership programmes. There is also no evidence to suggest that member Countries are experiencing any difficulty in engaging these institutions and therefore the relevance of the Secretariat establishing itself as an intermediary is questionable.

The evidence gathered seems to indicate that a large proportion of people do not know, or have no opinion about the comparative advantage of the Secretariat in the PPP sector. It was also particularly apparent during the field visits that many of those interviewed were not aware of the services that could be provided by the Secretariat nor where they aware of the process to be followed in requesting such services.

For many of those consulted as part of the evaluation (and particularly those engaged as part of the field visits), the key strength of the Commonwealth is that it brings together a network of countries with similar experiences and constraints. The Secretariat’s PPP programme therefore remains relevant in helping these countries to share knowledge and expertise.

The effectiveness of the PPP Programme
The Secretariat’s PPP Programme, along with a number of other international and regional development agencies operating largely independent of each other, has been effective in promoting the awareness, understanding and acceptance of PPP within many of the member countries. This has largely been achieved through workshops that facilitate the sharing of PPP experiences in different countries.

Of the 89 individual programmes recorded as being part of the Secretariat's PPP programme, 54 took the form of workshops or presentations, 32 were informal country scoping missions, leaving only 3 programmes related to skills or capacity development in response to specific requests. All the concerns raised in the
Evaluation of Commonwealth Secretariat Training Programmes Report dated September 2010 relating to needs identification, selection of participants, selection of training providers, evaluation of training, and limited post-training support are relevant here, and therefore it can be concluded that the PPP programme has not been effective in skills training and capacity building.

One of the objectives of the recent activity of the Programme defined as “Scoping Missions” was to position the Secretariat as an intermediary providing an effective link between Member Countries, PPP knowledge organisations, PPP Centres of Excellence, and private investors. Beside the Malaysian PPP Unit, little evidence exists that the Secretariat has established itself as an effective link between PPP stakeholders other than between Member Countries.

The ‘Public-Private Partnerships Policy and Practice’ reference guide has been distributed to participants attending PPP programme activities and appears to be valued by those participants who are responsible for PPP programmes within their respective countries. Besides these participants, the reference guide does not appear to have been widely distributed to all PPP practitioners within Commonwealth countries. The reference guide is relevant but certainly is not the only reference document available to PPP practitioners.

The efficiency with which the PPP Programme has been delivered
As has been observed in previous Secretariat evaluations, there are notable concerns over the extent to which the PPP Programme has been allowed to function with limited accountability to achieving results.

The intention was that specific capacity building and training activities would be identified through policy-centred seminars with policy makers and cabinet members. However, there is no record provided within the project documentation of these seminars having been held. Instead generic PPP workshops were conducted involving politicians, government officials and other interested parties without any clear objective other than to create awareness and share experiences. The intention was that these workshops would define the action plans for skills training and capacity building and identify specific areas of support from the Secretariat. It would appear, however, that few specific requests were subsequently submitted.

It is apparent that considerable resources have been invested in delivering generic training activities initiated by the Secretariat, rather than being the result of a direct request for assistance from member countries, which in many instances have been attended by those who have not been able to subsequently use the skills they have learnt, and therefore have not resulted in the advancement of PPP capability within member countries.

There is little evidence of coordination and integration of PPP activities with the Commonwealth Business Council as was originally envisaged as part of the Commonwealth Finance Ministers Meeting in 2003. Most of the activities delivered by both organisations appear to have been undertaken entirely independently from each other.

The impact and sustainability of the PPP Programme
For all the reasons identified above the impact of the PPP programme on “enhancing competencies and policy frameworks to implement public-private partnerships”, and “smart partnerships” has been minimal.

Lower and middle income countries that have been less prepared for PPP are enhancing their capacity by modelling their policy, legislation, and institutional structures on the upper middle and high income countries, which may not be appropriate. The generic nature of the Secretariat’s PPP programme and the lack of country-specific follow-up support may unfortunately have contributed to this outcome.

Given the current political and economic environment in some member countries, where the opportunities for PPP in public infrastructure is limited, the attention and resources being spent in the pursuit of PPP projects, may be considered to be a distraction and contrary to pro-poor economic growth.

Within an environment where accountability, integrity, transparency, predictability and participation in public sector decision making and implementation is not well established, the promotion of PPP may be contrary to the attainment of “smart partnerships”.

PPP requires accountability, integrity, transparency, predictability and participation in public sector decision making and implementation for it to be effective. PPP does not in itself increase these aspects of good
governance. As such the PPP in itself does not contribute to Result 2 of the Public Sector Development Programme but is dependent on Result 2 being in place.

### 6.2. Recommendations

Secretariat advice and assistance be directed at the establishment of accountability, integrity, transparency, predictability and participation in public sector decision making and implementation rather than focus on the mechanics of a particular form of procurement.

Specific training support and advice on PPP be left to the numerous other international and regional development agencies operating within this sector within member countries, many of whom are able to offer significantly greater resources than the Secretariat can provide.

Build on the Secretariat's key comparative advantage within the PPP sector relating to its network of countries with similar experiences and constraints. Increasing the opportunities for networking beyond the annual meeting of PPP officials and broadening the C3PN concept to include other forms of public procurement should therefore be the focus of the Secretariat's activity.

Improve the management of activities of the PPP Programme and its accountability to results by establishing a more robust demonstration of how the PPP Programme is contributing to the results of the Public Sector Development Programme and the Strategic Plan.
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## Appendix B. The Evaluation Framework

### Table 4. PPP Programme Evaluation Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Key Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Sources of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. To what extent does the programme remain aligned with the CHOGM Mandate?</td>
<td>• CHOGM Mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• GIDD personnel interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. To what extent does the programme remain aligned with the objectives of the Public Sector Development Programme?</td>
<td>• Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• GIDD interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. To what extent does the programme remain aligned with the needs and state of PPP readiness of member country governments?</td>
<td>• Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Field trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. What is the comparative advantage of the programme relative to PPP capacity building support and assistance provided by other international organisations?</td>
<td>• Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• GIDD personnel interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholder interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Field trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. To what extent has the PPP programme enhanced the capacity of senior-mid level Government officials to implement PPP projects (Programme objective 1)?</td>
<td>• Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Field trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• KPI data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. To what extent has the programme encouraged the implementation of PPPs and enhanced private sector participation in infrastructure development (Programme objective 2)?</td>
<td>• KPI data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Field trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholder interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. To what extent do member countries depend on the support network provided by the programme (Programme Objective 3)?</td>
<td>• Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Field trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. To what extent has the PPP Programme been designed to take into account the specific needs of member countries?</td>
<td>• GIDD personnel interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Field trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. To what extent have the activities of the programme been managed and delivered in accordance with planned activity schedules, agreed budgets and expected outcomes?</td>
<td>• GIDD personnel interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Programme/project plans and reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Expenditure data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. To what extent has the Commonwealth Secretariat made use of member country knowledge and other externally available resources to support the delivery of the objectives of the programme?</td>
<td>• GIDD personnel interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Programme/project plans and reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholder interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Key Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Sources of Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact and Sustainability</td>
<td>11. To what extent has PPP legislation, regulation, policy, process and procedure changed within member countries and what has been the impact of the PPP programme on these changes (both intended or unintended)?</td>
<td>• Questionnaire&lt;br&gt;• Field trips&lt;br&gt;• Stakeholder interviews&lt;br&gt;• KPI data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. To what extent do the services provided by the programme remain relevant in light of external factors</td>
<td>• Questionnaires&lt;br&gt;• GIDD personnel interviews&lt;br&gt;• Field trips&lt;br&gt;• Stakeholder interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C. The Member Country Questionnaire

C.1. Introduction
Contained within this appendix are the member country questionnaire issued to the Primary Contact Point of each country on the 21st January 2012 and the covering letter which accompanied it.
C.2. Member Country Questionnaire Covering Letter

Please let us know your views on the Commonwealth Secretariat’s Public Private Partnership Programme and what support you believe it should provide

The Commonwealth Secretariat has been working for the past 8 years to support the implementation of Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) within member countries, as a means of achieving private sector investment in infrastructure.

Since 2004, the Commonwealth Secretariat’s PPP Programme has provided a range of support activities for member country governments aimed at:

- Helping to build the capability of government officials to deliver successful PPPs
- Helping to create enabling environments for private sector investment
- Helping to provide a support framework for governments implementing PPP projects

Specific activities undertaken have included a series of Pan-Commonwealth workshops, in-country training activities and the development of tools to support PPP knowledge and resource sharing between member countries.

Atkins has been appointed by the Commonwealth Secretariat to undertake an independent evaluation of this Programme; specifically to examine:

- How it has contributed to member country needs
- How the Secretariat’s PPP-related support is valued
- What has happened as result of the programme’s activities within member countries
- How the Secretariat can ensure it is providing the right kind of PPP support to member countries.

The evaluation is being led by the Strategic Planning and Evaluation Division of the Secretariat, with Kassum Abdullayev (k.abdullayev@commonwealth.int) as the manager of the study.

Our findings and recommendations will be used to help the Secretariat to ensure its PPP-related support is relevant, effective and helps to achieve a lasting impact in promoting economic growth and poverty reduction within member countries.

The Member Country Questionnaire

Understanding and learning from the views and experiences of those who have received training or support from the Secretariat on PPP is vital to ensuring that the Secretariat’s work in this area is best meeting the needs of member countries.

We have therefore developed a questionnaire for completion by a senior / middle level official with responsibility for infrastructure development / PPP projects within each country. This will provide a crucial measure of how the training and support provided by the Secretariat has been used and is valued. It will also be critical in helping to determine what the Secretariat’s role should be in enabling PPPs in future.

We recommend that, for your convenience, the questionnaire is completed online. To complete the questionnaire, please click on the web link below.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/PPPEvaluation

The questionnaire should take less than an hour to complete.

Alternatively, if you are unable to complete the questionnaire using the above link, an Excel version of the questionnaire is provided as an attachment to this email. This can be completed electronically.

Please return the completed questionnaire to:

ben.j.richards@atkinsglobal.com
### C.3. Member Country Questionnaire

**Commonwealth Secretariat PPP Programme Evaluation: Member Country Questionnaire**

1. Please specify which Commonwealth region your country is within

   - [ ] Africa
   - [ ] Asia
   - [ ] Caribbean
   - [ ] Pacific

2. What is your responsibility with regard to infrastructure development / PPP within your country?

   

3. Approximately how many senior / middle level officials are currently responsible for public infrastructure development within your country?

   

4. Which of the following do you consider to be the most significant constraints to public sector infrastructure development in your country? (Please select up to 3 constraints in the order of their significance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>Most Significant</th>
<th>2nd Most Significant</th>
<th>3rd Most Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political instability</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of credible long-term infrastructure plan(s)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited budget</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited public sector capacity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited private sector capacity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   If "Other", please specify below

5. Which of the following arrangements are currently used in the delivery of public infrastructure services within your country? (Please select all arrangements that have been used by the relevant sector)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrangement</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>Energy</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Telecoms</th>
<th>Waste</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Department / Utility</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Utility</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Works and Service Contracts (FIDIC, JCT, ICT, etc...)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Contracts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance Contracts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease and Affirmage Contracts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concessions</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Ventures</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Divestiture</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Which of the following statements do you believe would best describe your country’s readiness for PPP in 2003? Which best describes your country’s readiness for PPP now?

(Please choose one statement for each column)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little understanding of PPP opportunities within country</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early stages of policy development, with some understanding of the key concepts and issues for country</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In process of developing legislative, policy and regulatory frameworks for PPP</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative, policy and regulatory frameworks are relatively advanced, with specific PPP projects in development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully ready, with PPP projects already successfully delivered</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If "None of the above", please specify what you believe the state of readiness to be below

---

7. Which of the following do you consider to be the highest priorities for your Government if your country’s current state of readiness for PPP is to be improved?

(Please select up to 5 in order of importance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Top priority</th>
<th>2nd highest priority</th>
<th>3rd highest priority</th>
<th>4th highest priority</th>
<th>5th highest priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishing / improving political acceptance and policy</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing / improving the legislative and regulatory framework for PPP</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing / improving procedures and institutions</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building skills to develop credible long-term infrastructure plans</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building skills to enable the identification of projects suitable for PPP</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building skills to enable the development of PPP contracts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building skills to enable the procurement and negotiation of PPP contracts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building skills to enable the regulation and monitoring of PPP contracts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above / Not appropriate</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If 'Other' (please specify)
8. Which of the following providers of guidance, advice and training on PPP have you found to be most important for your country?
(Please select up to 5 in order of importance 1st being most important)

- African Capacity Building Foundation
- African Development Bank
- Asian Development Bank
- Commonwealth Country Centres of Excellence
- Commonwealth Secretariat
- European Investment Bank
- Independent consultancy advice
- International Finance Corporation (IFC)
- Islamic Development Bank
- Private Infrastructure Development Group
- Public-private Infrastructure Advisory Facility (PPIAF)
- United Nations
- World Bank Institute
- Other

If Other, please specify

9. With specific regard to the Commonwealth Secretariat’s PPP advice and support, please specify the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

- The Secretariat can be trusted to be more impartial in its advice on PPP than the other providers of PPP advice
- The Secretariat can be depended upon to respond quickly and effectively to your Government's PPP-related needs
- Without the Secretariat's facilitation, there would be less exchange of PPP experiences, PPP knowledge and PPP resources between member countries
- Without support from the Secretariat it would be more difficult to obtain support / grants / loans from International Finance Institutions and Development Organisations for PPP projects
10. How many senior / middle level officials with current responsibility for the development of public infrastructure services within your country have attended the following Commonwealth Secretariat activities:

- PPP Executive Leadership Programme (at Bond University, Australia)
- Pan-Commonwealth PPP Leadership Workshops
- Regional PPP Leadership Workshops

11. How useful do you consider these events to have been in helping improving your country’s state of readiness for PPP?

- Very useful
- Some use
- Not useful
- Don’t know

12. Can you provide any specific examples of how the skills learned during these events have been used to improve your country’s readiness for PPP or the successfullness of PPP projects?

13. Have any specific obstacles been encountered when seeking to implementing the lessons learned during these events?
14. Has the Commonwealth Secretariat held an 'in-country PPP workshop' on behalf of your Government?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don't know

15. If yes, what were your Government's objectives / requirements for the workshop(s)?
(please briefly outline below)

16. How useful do you consider this workshop to have been in improving your Country’s state of readiness for PPP?

☐ Very useful
☐ Limited use
☐ Not useful
☐ Don’t know
☐ Useful

17. Can you provide any specific examples of how the in-country workshop activities have helped to improve your country’s state of readiness for PPP or the successfulness of PPP project delivery?
18. Have any specific obstacles been encountered when seeking to implementing the lessons learned during these events?

19. If senior / middle level officials have participated in PPP capacity building activities other than those provided by the Commonwealth Secretariat since 2003, please provide a brief summary below:

(Please provide a brief description of each activity and the name of the activity sponsor)

20. Is your country actively participating in the Commonwealth’s PPP Network (C3PN)?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don’t know

21. If yes, how important do you find the C3PN to be in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slight use</th>
<th>No use</th>
<th>Not relevant</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing knowledge and experiences of PPP with other Commonwealth countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening contacts with PPP knowledge and development organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building contacts with potential private investors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying sources of information and guidance on PPP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Other, please specify
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22. Do you have any specific examples of how the C3PN has helped to improve your country’s state of readiness for PPP, or improve the successfulness of PPP projects?

23. Do you / your colleagues have access to the Commonwealth Secretariat’s "Public-Private Partnerships Policy and Practice: Reference Guide"?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

24. If yes, how useful to you / your colleagues is the Reference Guide?

- Very useful
- Some use
- Not useful
- Don't know

25. Can you provide any specific examples of how you have used the ‘Public-Private Partnerships Policy and Practice: Reference Guide’?
26. Since 2004, have you / your colleagues worked with the Commonwealth Secretariat to analyse your country's specific needs with regard to PPP?

◇ Yes
◇ No
◇ Don't know

27. Since 2004, has your Government requested specific PPP advice from Commonwealth Secretariat staff in relation to any of the following areas:
   (please tick all those that apply)

   Legislation
   Regulation
   Policy
   Procedure
   Institutional reform
   Project development and procurement
   Other

If "Other", please specify below

28. If yes, why did your Government choose to contact the Commonwealth Secretariat for assistance?
   (please provide a brief description below)

29. How satisfactory was the Commonwealth Secretariat’s response to your requests?

◇ Highly Satisfactory
◇ Satisfactory
◇ Not Satisfactory
◇ Highly unsatisfactory
◇ Don't know
30. If the Commonwealth Secretariat’s response was not satisfactory, please describe why below

31. Within your country, how significant an impact do you feel the Commonwealth Secretariat’s PPP Programme has had in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Description</th>
<th>Significant positive impact</th>
<th>Positive impact</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Negative impact</th>
<th>Not relevant</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raising political awareness of PPP</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the capacity of Government officials to deliver PPP projects</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to identify necessary legislative, regulatory and policy change to support PPP</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping to build PPP networks with other Commonwealth country governments</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving engagement with the private sector on infrastructure investment opportunities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving engagement with International Finance and Development institutions</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If ‘Other’, please specify below

32. If you identified any negative impacts above, please provide a brief description below.
33. Have there been any other unintended or unexpected impacts from the Commonwealth Secretariat’s PPP activities? (Please provide a brief description below)

34. Which of the following do you think should now be priorities for the Commonwealth Secretariat with regard to PPP? (Please select your top priority and up to 2 others)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Top priority</th>
<th>2nd highest priority</th>
<th>3rd highest priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raising awareness of PPP for politicians and senior government officials</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing training and capacity building support</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing impartial advice and assistance on PPP</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating sharing of experiences and knowledge between member countries</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building partnerships with other PPP support organisations to facilitate governments in obtaining the support they need</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping member countries to engage with potential private sector investors</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing reference materials for member countries</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above. PPP should not be a priority for the Commonwealth Secretariat</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If "Other", please specify below
35. Finally, if you have any further comments you wish to make with regard to the Commonwealth Secretariat’s PPP Programme, please add these in the box below:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your answers will be crucial in helping the Commonwealth Secretariat to provide the most appropriate support on PPP.

If you would be willing to provide some further details to support us in our analysis, please do so in the boxes below. Please note that all responses to this questionnaire will be treated confidentially and will not be attributed to specific countries or individuals in our evaluation report.

Your country (optional) 

Your name: (optional) 

Your email address: (optional)
Appendix D. Field Visits

D.1. Field Visit Discussion Framework

The following questions were prepared to serve as the framework within which the discussions with officials were directed:

- Your country’s definition/understanding/concerns of PPP.
- Describe your country’s PPP environment (political and institutional) in 2003/4.
- The current challenges your country faces in the development of public infrastructure in general and PPP in particular.
- The current institutional arrangement regarding PPP implementation and the maturity of these arrangements.
- Names and contact details of officials currently involved with infrastructure development and PPP.
- List of PPP projects implemented or being implemented over the last 10 years.
- The extent of private sector interest in PPP in your country.
- What is your understanding of the Commonwealth Secretariat Public Sector Development Programme and the aims of the PPP Programme specifically.
- What do you consider the Secretariat’s comparative advantage is in providing PPP support?
- What have been the sources of PPP support in your country over the last 10 years?
- What are your expectations of the support provided by the Secretariat?

D.2. Field Visit Notes

D.2.1. Zambia

Interviewees

- Ms Betty Musonda – Department of Human Resource Development and the representative for the Primary Contact Person Mr Alfonso Banda.
- Mr Mungu Mwilsa – Department of Energy – Participant at In-country workshop held in December 2010.
- Mr Stephen Gumboh – Head of Department for Policy and Implementation and Secretariat to the PPP Technical Committee.
- Mr Hibene Mwiinga – Officer within the Department for Policy and Implementation and PPP Secretariat.
- Mr Hundson Mulumbi – Officer within the Department for Policy and Implementation and PPP Secretariat.
- Mr Issac Ngoma – Director of the Economic Association of Zambia and Member of the PPP Technical Committee.

Summary of notes

The PPP Programme Review Questionnaire was distributed by the PCP via email to all known participants and officials. However, many of the emails were returned as “address unknown”. For the field trip an attempt was made to confirm meetings with 17 government officials who participated in the March 2011 Heads of Government PPP workshop sponsored by the Secretariat, but only one response was received. This confirms the high rate of change in the structure of departments and of the officials within key positions within those departments.

The Secretariat’s PPP programmes were arranged through the Department of Human Resource Development which happens to be the department within which the POC resides. It was this department who requested nominations of participants from Line Ministries. It was reported that there were times when key officials were unable to attend these programmes due to other commitments at the specified dates.

Mr Mungu Mwilsa, who participated in the Bond University PPP programme sponsored by the Secretariat in 2007, was nominated after completing an application form distributed to Line Ministries. Prior to being nominated he had no involvement with PPP. He subsequently had a minor role participating in the working groups set-up to establish the PPP policy and legislation which was enacted in 2009. Besides this contribution he has not and is not involved with PPP in his sector (energy).
Several of the officials currently responsible for the implementation of the PPP programme in Zambia have been trained by IP3 in the USA and have IP3 certificates demonstrating that they are Certified PPP Specialist. This training was sponsored by the Government of Zambia.

The Zambian PPP policy and legislation was enacted in 2009 and was one of the outcomes of the broader Public Sector Reform Programme which was overseen by the World Bank. The Department of Policy and Implementation within the Ministry of Finance and National Planning is currently responsible for the management of the implementation framework in terms of the Act and are currently performing the functions of the PPP Unit to be established in terms of the Act. The functions to be performed by the PPP Unit includes the development of best practice guidelines and standardised bidding documents and PPP agreements; assessing project affordability, value-for-money, feasibility and contingent liability; approve terms of reference for consultancy assignments; monitor progress; and provide training and advisory services. Line ministries, local authorities and other public bodies are responsible for the identification, selection, and monitoring of PPP projects in their sectors. Projects are approved or rejected by a Council whose members are appointed by the President.

The Department of Policy and Implementation (the de facto PPP Unit) have attempted to identify the key person responsible for PPP implementation in Line Departments, but due to the rapid change of staff, these contacts are tenuous. As a result coordination is ineffective.

The overriding reason for the political acceptance of PPP is the limited public budget to provide public services. However it was accepted by those interviewed that “user pay” opportunities within Zambia is also limited. It is for this reason that PPP projects are by and large undertaken where users are already paying for services such as at university hostels, border post infrastructure, and hospitality services. Roads and water projects are severely constrained by the “user pay” principle.

The officials within the Department of Policy and Implementation received their PPP training from sources other than the Secretariat, but have participated in the Secretariat’s programmes. Their comment is that they may not have learnt anything new at the in-country programmes, but considered these programmes useful in broadening the awareness of PPP thereby assisting with the advocacy role and reducing resistance. The comment was that the Secretariat’s programmes are directed at those with no understanding of PPP.

The Secretariat’s regional programmes, which include other country representatives, are considered useful in providing an opportunity of learning from each other’s experiences. The comment was that these networking opportunities are valuable as Commonwealth Countries deal with similar issues.

Most current projects originated as unsolicited bids. A large number of projects recently implemented have serious problems resulting in termination, renegotiation, or nationalisation.

The following organisations were named as being actively providing PPP advice and support in Zambia: NEPAD, ADB, OECD, SADEC, World Bank. OECD sponsored a 5 day PPP training programme as recently as March 2012 and a follow-up is planned.

There is continued significant private sector interest in PPP projects. However, due to the recent nationalisation of the national telecommunications company and the renegotiation of the Kasumbalesa Border Post PPP project, a number of projects are currently being delayed due to private sector demands for “Letters of Comfort”.

The Secretariat’s PPP Policy and Practice Reference Guide was visible on the desk of the Head of the Department of Policy and Implementation. Others within that department also commented on the usefulness of this publication.

The Secretariat is perceived to have less conditionality attached to their offer of assistance than most other international agencies.

**Conclusions**

The regular change in the organisational structure within departments as well as the frequent change of officials within departments implies a high degree of knowledge loss and the need for regular and repeated training.
It is apparent that officials within Line Departments are unaware of the content of Secretariat’s PPP programme and that their involvement in any specific programme has been as a result of responding to a notice received from the PCP or other official within the Department of Human Resource Development requesting nominations for participants. Despite the Department of Policy and Implementation having taken on the functions of the PPP Unit in terms of the Act, they have not requested any assistance from the Secretariat simply because they do not have an understanding of the process involved in securing its services.

The feasibility of PPP projects in Zambia is severely constrained by the “user pay” principle. Projects currently proceeding are those where users are already paying for services and where the economics have been proven without depending on government contribution and as such are not directed at the majority of the population.

Despite the officials responsible for the implementation of PPP projects being formally trained and certified as PPP Specialists by IP3, and having participated in various capacity building programmes sponsored by various development agencies, a number of PPP projects are proving to be contentious. This is no different to the international experience, highlighting the complexity of this method of procurement.

There are an overwhelming number of international development agencies who are offering PPP advice and support. The Secretariat’s only comparative advantage is its network of countries with similar experiences and that it applies less conditionality to its offer of assistance.

D.2.2. Botswana

Interviewees
- Mr Gobitsa Mmereki: Manager of Carrier services within Botswana Telecommunications Corporation
- Mrs Khumo Mogaetso: Deputy Director: Mineral Affairs: Ministry of Minerals Energy and Water Resources
- Ms Alice Mmolawa: Communications Officer: Ministry of Minerals Energy and Water Resources
- Mr Ignatius Oarabile: Deputy Director: Development Programmes within Ministry of Finance and Development Planning
- Mr Archie Planning Officer: development programmes: Ministry of Finance and Development Planning
- Mr Herrick Mpuku: Programmes Manager: SADC-Development Finance Resource Centre

Summary of notes
The Ministry of Finance and Development Planning invited Line Ministries and other government agencies to nominate staff to participate in Secretariat-sponsored programmes.

PPP Policy and Guidelines have been in place since 2009. There is no PPP specific legislation. In terms of the policy, a PPP Unit should have been established within the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning. The posts for the PPP Unit were created, but have not been filled. The functions of the PPP Unit are being undertaken by the development programme section within the Ministry. However progress is frustratingly slow.

The Development Programmes Division has seconded Planning Officers to line departments to monitor the implementation of development programmes and source financing. The level of exposure to PPP amongst these officers varies – some have had no training, whilst others have undertaken IP3 courses. Training has also been provided by the South African PPP Unit.

Mr Mmereki was working for a government agency called Public Enterprises Evaluation and Privatization Agency (PEEPA) when nominated to attend the Bond University courses sponsored by the Secretariat. This was his first academic exposure to PPP and has subsequently attended various PPP courses sponsored by other organisations including IP3, South Africa’s PPP Unit, and SADC which has established a P3 exchange Forum. He also attended the Secretariat’s in-country programme in 2010. Between then and leaving PEEPA in January 2012, he was a member of the various technical teams established to develop specific PPP projects. He is no longer involved with PPP projects.

Mrs Mogaetsho was a Planning officer within the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning when she was nominated to attend the Bond university course in 2007. She has not received any other exposure to
PPP training. On her return she was involved with establishing Botswana’s PPP Policy and Guidelines which includes the establishment of PPP Unit. Given the limited scope for PPP, she in hindsight is not convinced that the establishment of the PPP Unit was correct. She left the Ministry of Finance in 2008 where she is responsible for the development of minerals policy and legislation.

Ms Mmolawa was working in the policy division of the Energy Department when she replaced her boss on the Bond University course in 2008. She has had no involvement in PPP before or since attending this course. She however indicated that the knowledge she gained from the course is useful to her in her job as communications officer in the energy department.

Mr Makepe was working in the development Programmes section and working on the Ombudsman building project when he was nominated to attend a 5 day PPP course sponsored by the Secretariat in Nairobi in 2009. He also attended the 5 day course in Gaborone in 2010. He is still in that division and is still part of PPP technical teams. However, many projects are currently on hold due to the financial crises. He has had no other training and expressed a desire for more specific training in project finance etc.

Mr Oarabile has had no Secretariat PPP training. Attended a PPP conference in Kenya sponsored by PPIAF (World Bank)

The general view in Botswana is that PPP is too expensive. This is a view generated out of the experience with the Ombudsman building PPP project in particular.

PPP Projects currently being developed include:

- Botswana International University of Science and Technology: apparently politically inspired; has had several changes of project manager; had IFC as the transaction advisors but whose contract has terminated; currently co-ordinated by Ministry of Education by an official who has had no PPP training. This project has been in existence since at least 2007
- Government Fleet management project: apparently cancelled politically when it became obvious that current perks associated with private use of government vehicles would no longer be available.
- Dry Port: Procurement of Transaction Advisors currently in the tender evaluation stage; administered by the Ministry of Transport and Communications
- Kazungula Bridge: Transaction advisors are appointed; currently EOI are being prepared; administered by the Ministry of Transport and Communications. This project has been under discussion since 2000 at least

Of the five Botswana representatives who participated in the Bond University PPP programme, none are currently involved in PPP project development. However, two are still in positions in government where the skills learnt could still be useful (one in the Ministry of Infrastructure and the other in the Tertiary Education Council.

PPP projects that have been implemented include the SADC building as well as two other government buildings including the Ombudsman building. Although taking a long time and considered to be expensive these PPP projects appear to have been successful. However, it was commented that this may only be because of the lack of transparency.

The PPP projects already implemented are related to the provision of building services; none are facilities for the use of the general public.

Public Enterprises Evaluation and Privatization Agency (PEEPA) services included PPP capacity building and advocacy. In this role they sponsored several government officials on fact finding missions to health facilities in South Africa and United Kingdom as well as education facilities in Malaysia.

There appears to be a high degree of political interference in the development of PPP projects resulting in project cancellation and delay.

Parliament regularly expresses its frustration with the slow progress with regard to the development of PPP projects. There is also a high private sector interest in the promotion of PPP.
Evaluation of the Commonwealth Secretariat's Public Private Partnership Programme
Draft Evaluation Report

Those who participated in the earlier Secretariat PPP programmes used to receive regular follow-up email from the Secretariat’s PPP advisor which participants appreciated. However these stopped when Srinivas Sampath left.

The officials interviewed were aware of the CP3N network but were not involved and did not know how to get involved.

The view was expressed that the Secretariat are the most forthcoming with offers to assist and were more prepared to sponsor programmes than others.

The Secretariat’s PPP Reference Guide was distributed as part of course documentation at the workshop held in 2010 in Gaborone. It is considered useful by those who have the document. However key officials are not aware of its existence.

The World Bank has been approached for Technical Assistance in developing PPP legislation.

D.2.3. Jamaica

Interviewees
- Veronica Warmington: Ministry of Finance
- Annmarie Rhoden: Ministry of Finance
- Gordon Summers: Director; Economic Development and Community Integration: Urban Development Corporation
- Rose Forbes, Tanikie McClarthy, Wayne Robertson: Ministry of Industry, Investment, and Commerce
- Ivan Anderson: Managing Director: NROCC (National Road Operations Company)
- Patrick Rose; National Works Agency
- Lloyd Pascoe and Dawn Ebanks: MIND (Management Institute for National Development)
- Lillymae Walder: Jamaica Customs
- Dana Morris-Dixon V. P. Planning and Corporate Development: JAMPRO
- Miss Delaine Morgan V.P. Trade and Business Development: JAMPRO
- Mrs. Elecia Myers Senior Consulting Officer, Planning & Policy Department: JAMPRO

Summary of notes
Ms Rhoden attended an Executive Leadership Secretariat-sponsored programme in 2007, the 4 day programme in Antigua in 2011, and the C3PN programme held in Malaysia recently. Before 2007 she had no responsibility for PPP; afterwards she was one of the drivers for the establishment of a PPP framework in Jamaica. She has had no other PPP training. At the C3PN she requested and UKAS (Malaysia’s PPP Unit) has agreed to provide practical work opportunities for two Jamaica officials.

Ms Warmington attended the Bond University training in 2008. She had no involvement in PPP before. She is now within the Ministry of Finance assisting Ms Roden.

The functions of the Privatization Unit within the Development Bank of Jamaica, which was established in 1990’s, are being extended to include PPP. They will be supported by a division within the Ministry of Finance

The reasons given for adopting PPP is “to create fiscal space”.

Currently there is controversy within Jamaica regarding the transparency related to Unsolicited Bids.

PPP projects have been implemented for quite some time now, but now it has been determined that it must be done within a defined framework. The Privatization Unit is currently developing the policy and guidelines with Technical Assistance from IDB.

The Secretariat is a favoured source of assistance because of the “freebees”. However, most of those interviewed were unaware of the services provided by the Secretariat and unaware of the approach to be followed in soliciting its support.
The Management Institute of National Development provides training including PPP training. The PPP training was initiated by the Secretariat and was held in 2010. Lloyd Pascoe and Dawn Ebanks attended the Secretariat programme in Antigua last year. They and MIND has not been involved in any PPP initiatives within Jamaica since then.

Mr Summers is involved with urban infrastructure development. He has had no formal PPP training except by MIND and has to-date not been involved in PPP in a practical sense but has a background in Banking. He is unfamiliar with what the Secretariat does.

The concern was expressed about the limited opportunity for PPP unless smaller projects can also be done efficiently through PPP

The officials interviewed from the Ministry of Industry Investment and Commerce have had no PPP training but are involved with the discussions with Privatization Unit.

The NROCC have implemented a toll road through a PPP concession signed in 2001. They were assisted by Transaction Advisors funded internally. NROCC is a corporate entity established to administer the concessions related to toll roads. NROCC staff have had no exposure to the Secretariat’s PPP programmes but some have undergone IP3 training. They are not aware of the Secretariat’s C3PN.

Other PPP concessions include Montego Bay Airport and currently the extensions to the airport in Kingston where the Airports Company is being assisted by World Bank.

The National Works Agency is responsible for roads. They will be taking over the Toll roads once concessions come to an end. They provide technical input to the concession agreements entered into by NROCC. Roads are maintained by the agency. Patrick Rose is the Director of Planning and Research. He was exposed to IP3 courses in 2008 and attended the MIND/Secretariat programme in 2010. He is of the view that the balance of power between the private and public sector in the current Toll Road PPP is heavily biased in favour of the private sector. He is not aware of the services provided by the Secretariat and does not know how to approach it for assistance.

Miss Lillymae Walder is the Deputy Commissioner within Jamaica Customs. She attended the Secretariat-sponsored Bond University PPP programme in 2008. She has had no direct involvement in any PPP initiatives or projects in Jamaica.

JAMPRO, and particularly Delaine Morgan, is involved with the development of PPP policy within Jamaica. Delaine had had PPP training through World Bank and IDB; she is not aware of the Secretariat’s PPP programme.

Much in the news whilst on the field trip was the issue of transparency and governance related to procurement. Currently within Jamaica, all procurement is monitored by an institution known as the Contractor General. However there is currently an attempt by politicians to by-pass this institution.

Only Denise Arana, General Manager of Privatization Services has been exposed to PPP training. She attended an IDB sponsored programme in Mexico, before attending the Secretariat’s programme in Malaysia this year. She benefited from the networking these opportunities provided.

The other two Development Bank representatives, who will be responsible for the expansion of their services to include PPP, have had no PPP training at all.

The need was expressed for much more detailed training and it was expressed that the Secretariat together with other development institutions would be approached to assist.
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