The International Journal of Business Management and Technology, Volume 6 Issue 2 March-April 2022
ISSN: 2581-3889

Research Article Open Access

# An Assessment of the Effectiveness of the Public Private Partnerships for Infrastructural Development in Zimbabwe

[1]Dr David Foya, [2]Nkosana Ncube
[1]Department of Business Management, National University of Science & Technology; Zimbabwe
[2]National Aids Council, Bulawayo, Zimbabwe.

**ABSTRACT:** The study focused on assessing the effectiveness of PPPs in addressing the economic challenges being faced by Zimbabwe with regards to addressing infrastructural woes. The study investigated the effectiveness of PPPs, evaluated the extent to which the determinants were available in Zimbabwe and thus assessed the relevance of PPPs in addressing the challenges faced by Zimbabwe. The researchers used a mixed method approach in this study. Interviews and focus group discussions were carried out with various key informants with specialist knowledge on infrastructure development and involved in the implementation of the PPPs. In addition, 30 questionnaires were sent out to directors and managers in the PPPs industry. The major findings of the study were that the key determinants of success for PPPs were policy consistency, low investment cost, low labour costs, quality management systems and location advantage. The key determinants for success were to a less extent were not available in Zimbabwe. The study unearthed obstacles to private investment, such as political instability, weak public administration, unreliable legal frameworks, corruption, low capacity of project promoters, bankability of projects, lack of long-term financing, and insufficient resources for project preparation.

**Keywords:** Infrastructural development, Public Private Partnerships,

## I. ACCRONYMS

ADB ; African Development Bank
ADBI : Asian Development Bank Institute
BOT : Build Operate Transfer
BBR : Bulawayo Beit bridge Railway
EMA : Environmental Management Authority
ESAP : Economic Structural Adjustment Programme
FDI : Foreign Direct Investment
GNU : Government of National Unity
GoZ : Government of Zimbabwe
IDBZ: Infrastructural Development Bank of Zimbabwe
IMF : International Monetary Fund
MZWP : Matabeleland Zambezi Water Project
ZINARA : ZimbabweNational Road Authority
ZUPCO : Zimbabwe United Passenger Company

### 1.1Background of the study

Zimbabwe is financially handicapped to fund infrastructure which is the bedrock of the economy and the only option is to adopt public private partnerships (PPPs) in order to find a solution to the funding challenges. Traditionally it has been the responsibility of the government to invest in public infrastructure such as highways, bridges and other public utilities. Nowadays given the growing financial burden of the public sector there has been a paradigm shift from traditional means to the engagement of the private players. The government has adopted PPPs as an alternative to address funding challenges. Public Private Partnerships are viable alternatives to infrastructural development in Zimbabwe as they create efficiency and effectiveness in service provision. According to ADBI (2011) PPPs have the potential in provision of quality infrastructure and efficient public services as they have comparative advantage over other forms of financing. Other vital resources such as financial and human skills are vital in these strategic alliances(GoZ,2012). Faced with this financial challenge, PPPs are the best option for the government to engage the private sector to participate in funding particularly large-scale government infrastructure projects that are key for economic development. In a situation where government has limited resources and where assets involved are critical and strategic in nature to be placed wholly in the hands of private sector, PPPs become the best compromise. This arrangement is a win-win situation between government and private sector as both parties stand to benefit.

The economic downturn in Zimbabwe has resulted in the deterioration of existing public infrastructure further worsened by the government's inability to raise funds for such projects. The government adopted PPPs under which the private sector would partner the government through funding, for infrastructure development. Traditionally government fundsinfrastructure development but of late the state has demonstrated reduced commitment to this obligation, citing insufficient financial resources as the major challenge. Private sector participation is necessary to complement and close the government funding gap. Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) are form of strategic alliances to mobilise funds to finance infrastructure and are the solution to address financial challenges by engaging private players to contribute to infrastructure development. The funding gaps create opportunities for PPPs to be the solution for infrastructural challenges. The study investigates and assesses progress made so far and use case studies and previous studies that employed this financial model and suggest solutions for successful strategic alliances. Developing countries such as Zimbabwe have no option but to bridge the gap in funding infrastructure by adopting funding models such as PPPs in order to attract the private sectors.

Foster and Briceño-Garmendia (2010), do assert that Zimbabwe is among African countries that are Highly-Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) with the bulk of government revenues devoted to debt service this is in agreement with RBZ (2016) report that the country has a huge debt of US$ 1.826 billion. Zimbabwe is one of those countries which are highly geared. The economic crisis in countries such as Zimbabwe severely handicaps developing countries trajectories towards infrastructural development investment. It is against this background that home grown initiatives be explored to bridge the funding gap by roping in private players. Numerous researches have been conducted PPPs but they fell short because they did not include the communities concerned. Developing countries have been using tax revenue and or loans from commercial banks or international finance institutions such as the World Bank to fund infrastructure investments. The current economic status of many developing countries is not healthy enough and place an enormous burden on already highly constrained public finances.

### 1.5 Research objectives

The objectives of this paper are to:

- identify challenges faced in the operations of PPP contracts as a

  financing model.

- Investigate the PPPs contracts as a financing model for infrastructure development in Zimbabwe.
- examine the terms and conditions that promote success of PPPContracts for

  infrastructure development.

- establishZimbabwe's readiness to implement PPPs models to fund

  Infrastructure.

- recommend sustainable solutions to address infrastructural challenges in Zimbabwe.

## II. Interim literature review

**Public Private Parnerships (Ppps)**

According to Polit and Bocket (2010) PPPs have different meanings to different scholars or researchers. The definition of PPPs depends on the opinions of various authors as they have different experiences about these strategic alliances. The Public Accounts Committee and Estimate Committee Report (2006) agrees that the term has been used since 1990s up now there is no general and universal agreed definition. According to Dube and Chigumira(2010) PPPs involve the public and private sectors where they engage each other and contribute to partnership according to their comparative advantage. In this instance the private has a better comparative advantage of resources such as financial and technical while the public has to create enabling environment. The public and private appropriate risks based on mutual trust as they engage each other and collaborate to perform various duties and responsibilities which they agree to undertake (The World Bank 2007).

The government of Zimbabwe took a policy position in the early 90s to adopt PPPs under which the private sector would partner the government in funding infrastructure. PPPs are a solution and better way of delivering public infrastructure and related services. Public Sector Reforms (PSR) in Zimbabwe started in the early 90s under the Economic Structural Adjustment Program (ESAP) in which the government used strategies like privatisation and commercialisation to improve service delivery. PPPs however, were introduced as a new approach to complement PSRs and accommodate private players in the government business. The Zimbabwean government like many developing countries has been unable to cope with ever increasing demand of its budget requirements. The idea of attracting private players were seen as the best solution to address economic challenges. PPPs operate at the boundary of the public and private sector, being neither nationalised nor privatised as they are compromise between public and private in terms of comparative advantages offered. In 2010 the former Finance Minister Tendai Biti and the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Infrastructure Development Bank of Zimbabwe were in unison that the solution to Africa 's quest for development is a win – win marriage between public and private sector collaboration and active participation of the private sector in the infrastructure development. Harries (2003) also noted numerous benefits associated with PPPs. These include great asset utilisation, innovation, value for money, provide platform for sector wide cooperation, financing from private sector, creation of synergy and capacity building, increase in value of business, better risk allocation, attain high efficiency and quality and promote competiveness and fair competition. PPPs do not affect government responsibility but appropriates risk between the public and the private sector the government concentrate on provision of infrastructure while the private sector provides funds.

Public Private Partnerships are cooperation of some sort of durability between public and private actors in which they jointly develop products and services or products and share risk, cost and resources which are connected with these products (Van Ham and Koppenjan 2005). This definition provides important main features:

•Cooperation- The relationship is not one that is formed around competition as was traditional contracting-Cooperation is based on trust-based relationship between organisations, a more visible risk sharing and a focus on mutual innovation between the public and the private sector.

• Durability- PPP contracts are expected to last for a longer period of time. Theoretically, there is no fixed period that could define a PPP (Greve 2008). Empirically, PPP contracts can run from 15 to 20 years up to 50 to 60 years.

• Joint production, partners complements each other with desired strengths and these are diverse and unique in nature as they have synergetic effects in the long run as what they cannot acquire individually or separately can then be attained. Des, Lumpkin and Taylor (2008) is in unison with Van Ham and Koppenjan (2008) that there are synergetic effects in partnership which result in a win- win situation for both partners.

• Sharing Costs, the government and private sector share cost for example the government may need to construct the road and the private sector will provide much needed capital which the government does not have. The government and private sector agree to share costs the with the government assuming an enabling environment and private sector providing financial resources and money will be recouped after a lengthy period depending on the agreement. Des et al (2008) emphasises that partners must be compatible and trust each other and by being honest and sincere in terms of commitment. Unfortunately, little attention is given to nurturing a close working relationship.

• Risk sharing there are various types risk to be shared these range from financial, construction and governance to name just few. They need to be spelt out clearly from the onset and responsibilities clearly assigned to each partner (Greve 2008).

In nut shell PPPs are long term contracts which are binding and require specific performance from both partners. According to Omoyefa (2008) there is paradigm shift in discharging duties by the government as at desist from traditional ways of funding infrastructure to contemporary ways which accommodates private sector so that business is conducted efficiently and effectively. The macro economic conditions require the public to be flexible and engage the private sector in infrastructural development. In this instance the government will be financially handicapped to fund infrastructure therefore it embarks on resource mobilisation by engaging private sector to come to the rescue by funding infrastructure and operate it for fixed period and recoup initial outlay after that the infrastructure is handed back to public. This is a win- win agreement in which the public and private both benefit in terms of comparative advantages offered by each partner. What is common in these various authors is the collaboration for mutual benefit.

**2.4 Forms of PPPs**

According IMF (2004) there are quite a numbers of forms and these are, Build Operate and Transfer (BOT), Build and Transfer (BT), Build Own Operate and Transfer (BOOT), Build Lease and Transfer (BLT) ,Build Transfer and Operate (BTO), Rehabilitate Operate and Transfer (ROT), Dube and Chigumira (2011).

**2.4.1 Build Operate and Transfer (BOT)**

In this aspect of the model the private sector builds operate infrastructure like Plumtree Mutare high way which was constructed by Group Five. The private sector maintains and operate the infrastructure for fixed term during the fixed tenure the private sector will recoup the costs with profits. When the fixed term lapses the private player hands over the facility to the public (Mutandwa and Zinyama, 2015). The government adopted this model to widen the financial horizon to fund infrastructure projects by attracting the private sector to partner the public since the government is financially handicapped due to severe budgetary constraints (Mabika2017). Traditionally infrastructure development has been the burden of the government or local authorities or any other public agencies. Developing countries such as Zimbabwe are finically handicapped to mobilise infrastructure resources by engaging the private players to participate in PPPs such as BOT model which provides a unique opportunity to assist both financier and the owner. Private investment is of vital importance to achieve sustainable infrastructural development (Regional Economic Outlook 2018). According to Mabika (2017) the BOT model is the alternative for the country such as Zimbabwe which is experiencing financial challenges and this model is underpinned on the principle of PPPs. The BOT model has the potential to serve both the public agency and private when implemented transparently and properly. According to the World Economic Forum (2017), carefully attention is needed in view of risk involved. The WEF(2017), emphasises proper adoptions of forms of PPPs with sound institutional and legal framework to assess and mitigate risks. The presence of legal framework enables government and private to benefit effectively.

There are four main infrastructural developments built under BOT model and these are:

- New Limpopo Bridge (NLB 1994)
- Bulawayo –Beitbridge Railway (BBR1996-1998)
- Newland By Pass (2006-2007)
- Plumtree to Mutare road (2012-2014)

These above mentioned infrastructural projects will provide in depth case studies as reference points in Zimbabwe

**2.4.2 Build and Transfer(BT)**

Under this model the private sector finances construction of the infrastructure it does not operate and maintain upon completion the private hands it to the public. The government would then pay the agreed amount incurred in constructing the infrastructure such as dams and roads (World Bank 2007).

**2.4.3 Build Own Operate and Transfer (BOOT)**

As the name suggests in this scheme the private sector builds, constructs owns and operates the facility for a fixed period. In this model the private sector owns the facility and recover its costs including profits through user charges. At the end of the fixed term the infrastructure is then handed to the public (Mutandwa and Zinyama 2015).

**2.3.4 Build Lease and Transfer(BLT)**

This model has same conditions with above mentioned models the only added dimension which makes it unique is lease aspect in which the infrastructure is leased upon completion to the government. During the lease period the private sector recoups its costs and gains. This is one of the strategic alliances adopted by the government which in financially handicapped to fund infrastructure such as bridges, roads and water (Dube and Chigumira2011).

**2.4.5 Build Transfer and Operate(BTO)**

This is similar to BOT but the only added dimension is the re arrangement where the private player transfers the facility upon completion. Then private player then operates on behalf the government and proceeds are shared as per contract agreement (Mutandwa and Zinyama 2015).

**2.4.6 Rehabilitate Operate and Transfer (ROT)**

What is implied in scheme is that the facility exists but it is dilapidated. The private sector will then refurbish and renovate the infrastructure. The private will be permitted to operate the facility for an agreed period. That is when the private player will be able recover its costs (IMF 2004).

**2.4.7 Lease Develop Operate (LDO)**

The private player leases the existing facility from the government, the public refurbishes and upgrades to modern standards before assuming operation rights for a fixed term. The company then recoups its costs operation and government benefit through lease payments (World Bank2007).

**2.4.8 Greenfield and Brown field Projects**

Green field projects are new ones where private player uses either BOT or BOOT models whereas brownfield projects are existing projects where the private player uses models like ROT it is of vital importance distinguish between green field and brown field so that the appropriate model will applied and both partners appraise each other so that they are on same wavelength to mitigate miss understandings in contracts(IMF2004).

**2.5. 1 Stakeholders in PPPs**

According to CEDR (2009) there are seven stakeholders involved in PPPs namely ,the government, contractor, operator, financial agents ,funding agents and regulatory authority,they discussed in detail below.

**(a) The Government**

Each PPP project needs a public entity responsible for the project and for the decision to carry out and design the PPP scheme. At the preparation stage, the public authority prepares the tender documents, manages the tender process, including selecting the winning bid and formalising the contractual framework. During implementation of the project, the public authority ensures that the terms of the contract are followed, without duplicating or replacing other regulatory authorities that could also perform their oversight roles. The public authority is also normally responsible for managing the transfer process at the end of the PPP tenure when the private sector hands over the infrastructure. In this case, the role could include arranging alternative management or operation of the infrastructure (CEDR2009).

**2.7 Public Private Partnership In Infrastructural Development**

According to Asian Development Bank Institute (ADBI) (2011) there uptake of PPPs have exponentially increased in world over. The main reason for high uptake of PPPs is there has been paradigm shift from traditional means of funding as the governments have realised that they have limited fiscal space to fund infrastructure projects. The only solution to address infrastructure funding gap is to engage private sector which have a better comparative advantage in terms of technical and financial skills to compensate for government short comings. Public Private Partnerships have boosted quality services as the private sector brings comparative advantage of technical and financial skills which are vital for service delivery (Farlan2005). PPPs are strategic alliances in the public or local authorities share risk and responsibility with private sector and the same time the ensuring that the downside of privatisation is avoided. Ownership and control is clearly defined in terms of responsibilities .According to Marin (2009 many countries have adopted PPPs as turn-around strategies in the last decade. There have been overwhelming response especially from developing countries in the adoption of PPPs as they have financially handicapped to fund infrastructure which has resulted in service delivery (World Bank 2011). Zhou (2012) concurs that poor service delivery that this has resulted public outcry as there government utilities are experiencing challenges of low productivity, poor cost recovery strategies and political interference and opaqueness in executing duties.

## III. Methodology

**Research Design**

The study adopted a mixed method design which used both qualitative and quantitative methods. Mixed method studies promote an understanding of chosen phenomenon in a manner that would not be possible using a single approach (Santos et al., 2017).

The study used the qualitative approach so as to get a deeper understanding. The main challenges faced in a study using mixed methods are the weight attribution used for the qualitative and quantitative results and the time management for the research to be done (Santos et al., 2017). The study used secondary data that is desk study and primary data which included in-depth key informant interviews and questionnaires. Quantitative methods were used to establish the dominant determinants (variables) of PPPs which included location advantage and macroeconomic conditions of a country, industrial investment support, investment cost skills level and availability of human resources, management and service, government policies, laws and regulations and finally stability and consistency of government. Qualitative and quantitative aspects were used to ascertain what determinants influence the success of PPPs in infrastructural development as quantitative is suggestive not conclusive it stimulates further research which his complemented by qualitative method. Mixed method tends to be balanced as it enables the research to make informed decisions

**Population and sampling**

This research paper is targeting The target population for the in-depth interviews consisted of an academic from a university, RBZ official, Ministry of Industry and Commerce official, NGO official, an official from the Infrastructural Development Bank of Zimbabwe (IDBZ), Zimbabwe Investment Authority official, local authority official, Ministry of Transport and Infrastructural Development, National Railways of Zimbabwe (NRZ), Zimbabwe National Road Authority (ZINARA), Local Authority official, Ministry of Finance Official, African Legal Support Facility ( ALSF) official all are based in Zimbabwe. The target population were drawn from the entities which are into infrastructural development that are based in Zimbabwe and are operational.

The sample size for the questionnaire consisted of 39 participants. There are 8 entities in the PPPS and 31 in the infrastructural development. All the entities are based in Zimbabwe and are operational. The respondents were selected purposively by virtue of their knowledgeability of the subject matter under discussion.

The researchers used judgemental and quota sampling in coming up with respondents for the study.

The researchers used interviews and focus group discussions as well as questionnaires in order to get as much information as possible

## IV. Findings

**Investigating the determinants of success for a PPPs**

There are eight factors that have a bearing on the success of an PPPs that are discussed in the study. To further explore the determinants for a successful implementation of the PPPs initiative, factor analysis was performed in Table 4.4 below. The output is such that factors with value greater or equal to 0.5 are considered to be significant enough for responsible stakeholders in infrastructural development to scrutinize.

Seventy-five percent of the respondents do maintain that mutual trust is of vital importance in partnership as every partner should be sincere in terms of translating what has been agreed into reality and is process not an event. In addition, due to technological revolution taking place, modern technological equipment is preferred in order to surpass demand and the availability of infrastructure. Thus, low cost investments will be the right move and with state of the art equipment cuts in labour costs can be effected and no need to build new structures if they are already available. A conducive environment enables attraction of financial resources from the private sector to complement government effort in funding infrastructure.

More than 65% of the respondents argued that government policy framework is another key determinant to be considered. The enabling environment is vital to attract domestic and foreign investment especially from private players. Government policy must promote development of industry and there should be political will to make sure that the policies drafted are implemented in good faith for the benefits of the industry. Financing is aided by good investment policies. The ease of doing business comes into play as this aids in the quicker opening of new businesses which is advantageous for the city is and the country at large. The financing model can be in terms of using the local financial institutions of the country and foreign investment.

The study also sought to establish the views of key informant interviewees on the determinants of success for a PPPs. To answer this, KII were interviewed.

**Evaluating the extent to which the determinants of success for PPPs are available in Zimbabwe**

The factors referred to as determinants were subjected to data extraction analysis in order to pick those determinants which are not correlated to each other. The determinants extracted included the following; proximity to local based suppliers of raw materials, financial and non- financial incentives, low investment costs, political stability, tax exemptions, duty free zones as well as investments allowances/promotions.

The narrative on availability of these determinants in Zimbabwe is subjective depending on one's interpretation of the current environment in the country. One of the issues pertaining to the mutual trust. Another interesting aspect for discussion is the political stability in the country. The political environment guarantees freedom and survival of firms although other rights are a requirement for success. So the conclusions to be drawn from the above group of factors is that they are worth looking into and check for their availability in the country. Before further analysis can be drawn an analysis of variance was again performed based on their positions (Manager and Directors) as given in Table4.9 below

Table 4.1: Descriptive Statistics

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Corruption | 30 | 4.57 | .728 |
| Risk | 30 | 4.43 | .728 |
| Investment allowances | 30 | 4.43 | .728 |
| Political stability | 30 | 1.70 | .535 |
| Trust | | | |

**Source: Primary data**

The descriptive analysis also shows that tax credits and investments allowances tend to bring relief to the companies in the city of Bulawayo. For political stability, the mean value of 1.70 implied that the political sphere around was not welcoming to the level expected by investors across the world due to uncertainty in the current political environment.

The study also sought to establish the views of Key Informant Interviewees on the extent to the determinants of success for an PPP are available in Zimbabwe.

Table 4.2 Determinants of success for PPP available in Zimbabwe – KII

| Determinants of successforPPPs program available in Zimbabwe | Number of Interviewees who cited this reason | Percentageof intervieweeswho cited this reason |
|---|---|---|
| Corruption | 7 | 100 |
| Favourable macro-economic environment | 1 | 14 |
| Industrial investment support | 3 | 42.8 |
| Investment cost (Infrastructure)&valueof Trade | 7 | 100 |
| Skills level & availabilityof financial resources | 6 | 85.7 |
| Qualitymanagement systems | 2 | 28.6 |
| Government policies | 4 | 57 |
| Law & regulations | 2 | 28.6 |
| Stability&consistencyof government& Policies | 1 | 14 |

**Source: Primary data**

Table 4.2 above shows the determinants of success that are available in Zimbabwe according to the key informant interviewees. The table indicates that the dominant factors that are available in Bulawayo are location advantage, infrastructure, skills level and availability of human resources.

**Assess the relevance of PPPs in addressing country's funding challenges**

The various factors considered to be of benefits that are relevant in addressing Bulawayo's economic challenges included employment creation, products competitiveness, and ease of cash crisis in banks by having foreign currency availability, re-birth of Bulawayo as an industrial hub, inflow of new technologies as well as new financial avenues for upcoming firms.

**Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.**

There are benefits that will be realised from the implementation of PPPs. Public Private Partnerships utilise local resources in that particular area and maximise on available limited infrastructure to achieve benefits. So creation of synergies is somewhat guaranteed with PPPs. Thus, synergy creation should be the benefit in implementation of PPPs policy. The main thrust in PPPs implementation lies with the government of the day and the political will to see it through. That will attract foreign investment coupled with other incentives for investing in those various sectors of the economy. The growth of an economy improves availability of foreign currency reserves because of exports. The analysis above gives some of the most important benefits likely to be accrued through the initiative and those factors had a significant value above 50% to need attention.

The study notes that intellectual capabilities on the part of the management is directly attributed to the level of education and experience in the infrastructural development. The success of PPP hinges on many factors including those explained above.

The pie chart below shows the responses received from key informant interviewees on whether PPPs are relevant in addressing country's funding challenges. 71% of the key informant interviewees indicated that PPPs were relevant in addressing country's economic challenges because they were able to attract foreign direct investment which would contribute to exports and receipt of foreign currency. In addition, there would be employment creation and spill over to the rest of the economy. 29% of the respondents said that somewhat PPPs were relevant in addressing country's funding challenges. The KII indicated that PPPs had to be used with other policies because if they were used on their own the benefits would be limited.

**Relevance of PPPs in addressing country`s economic challenges**

As a result of weak economy, the Zimbabwean Government is not able to carry out major infrastructural projects. Hence the need for

The closing remarks that can be drawn from the analysis are that there are a number of issues that have to be in place for proper implementation of Public Private Partnership concept for the benefit of Zimbabwe. The benefits to be realised are greater than the disadvantages.

## V. Conclusion

The analysis of the study findings has shown that PPPs are highly complicated undertakings, which require vast amounts of resources as well as robust experience and expertise from both public and private sector. The study has shown that the recently adopted decision to implement PPPs is a noble idea as PPPs can indeed help in bringing investment to areas traditionally set aside for the public sector especially when the government is in financial quagmire. However, there are a lot of areas that still need to be conducted to create the vital ground for PPPs to commence. These issues include finalisation of the policy, institutional framework, risk analysis, management, financing and mobilisation and incentivising the private sector to participate fully in the process. From private sector stand point the political and economic environment is not favourable for investors to commit their financial resources to be partner with the public. Zimbabwean policy environment is volatile, unreliable and unpredictable it instil fear on investors that they be victim of policy changes. Many private investors will not join PPP arrangements unless perceptions about investment climate is positive. The PPP policy is not in place to be supported by operating and institutional framework and this does not enhance and guarantee the private sector confidence. However, the public appears to be sluggish to accommodate private players even though it claims to be looking for partners. This is backed by various PPP conditioned proposals from private sector that have been rejected. To assert that this sector has completely failed dismally to lure partners would be unfair. Global experience shows that it does not require legal frameworks but just political will and government guarantee for PPP to yield sustainable outcomes. Zimbabwe needs to learn from its counterparts regionally and internationally success of PPP so that PPPs can fully materialise.

## VI. Recommendations

The study recommends the following ways if meaningful and health partnerships are to be realised.

- Quick finalisation of the policy's legal, regulatory and institutional framework which has already has already been initiated by the government. Direct participation by private sector requires sufficient legal and regulatory framework for the different forms of PPPs and other vehicles.
- PPPs require the conducive economic, political, legal and financial framework to be put in place lure private investors to participate fully in large numbers in infrastructural development. The government need to see to it that policies are formulated and implemented in consistently and reliably so as to improve private investor perceptions about the country with emphasis on safeguarding property rights.
- There is also need to by the government to mobilise and incentivize the private sector to participate fully in the process.
- All stakeholders need to roped in including civic society and community as they are the custodians of the infrastructure the government need to conduct awareness programs so that the community buy in to avoid destruction of infrastructure.
- It is of vital importance to set up PPP unit within government to administer national PPP programme, ensure operational accountability and conduct feasibility, risk analysis and management.
- There is need to engage well trained experts to trigger and drive the PPP process. These experts are key drivers in developing capacities, building legal and regulatory structures ,stimulating market interest and initiate pilot projects in order test and demonstrate the value of PPPs
- It is of vital importance to instil culture maintaining infrastructure especially the Department of Public Works Should make sure that it routinely maintains infrastructure to avoid meagre resources being channelled to PPPs forms like ROT which are expenses can be avoided .This is very critical if not addressed, it would be matter of time before the infrastructure would demand for more resources for rehabilitation again. This calls for proactivity in the Department of Public Works.

## References


[1.] ADB (2008), Public Private Partnership Handbook, ADB Working Paper,

[2.] African Development Bank Group (2013), Country Strategy Paper 2013-2017, ADB Available at http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Project-and-Operations/2013-2017-_Lesotho_-_Country_Strategy_Papers_-_Draft_Version.pdf.

[3.] Akintoye, A, et al., (2001), Framework for Risk Assessment and Management of Private Finance Initiative Projects, Glasgow Caledonian University

[4.] Asian Development Bank (ADB) (2008), Public-Private Partnership Handbook, Asian Development Bank

[5.] Axis Consulting (2013), PPPs Country Paper: Tanzania, Southern African Development Community - Development Finance Resource Center PPP Network (SADC3P)

[6.] CEDR (2009), Public Private Partnerships (PPP), Conference of European Directors of Roads (CEDR) Secretariat General, CEDR report 2009/01

[7.] Clyde and Co (2013), Public Private Partnerships in Tanzania: The new regime explained, Clyde and Co Projects & Construction Briefing

[8.] Des, G .G., Lumpkin G.T. and Taylor M.L. (2008) Strategic Management .New York: Macgraw-hill

[9.] Dube C and Chigumira G (2010), The Scope For Public-Private Partnerships For Infrastructure Development In Zimbabwe, ZEPARU Working Paper Series, ZWPS 03/10, Zimbabwe Economic Policy Analysis and Research Unit

[10.] Dube, C. and Chigumira, G. (2011), The Scope for Public Private Partnerships for Infrastructure Development in Zimbabwe. Zimbabwe Economic Policy Analysis and Research Unit (ZEPARU), edition, Merrill Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

[11.] Foster, V. and Briceño-Garmendia, C. 2010. Africa`s infrastructure: a time for transformation. Washington: World Bank.

[12.] From Recent Experience, University of Toronto Faculty of Law, March 19, 2013

[13.] GoK (2011), Policy Statement on Public Private Partnerships, Government of Kenya, November, 2011

[14.] GoK (2009), PPP Act [2013], Government of Kenya

[15.] GoK (2009), PPP Regulations [2009], Government of Kenya

[16.] Government of Tanzania (2009), National Public Private Partnership (PPP) Policy, The United Republic of Tanzania, 2009

[17.] GoZ (2001), Procurement Act [22:14], Government of Zimbabwe

[18.] GoZ (2013), Zimbabwe Agenda for Sustainable Socio-Economic Transformation, Government of Greve, C. (2008), Contracting for Public Services. London and NY, Routledge.

[19.] Harding A (2009), Review of the Effectiveness of Port and Port Terminal Concessions, USAID Southern Africa Global Competitiveness Hub, Gaborone

[20.] Harper P (2015), Public-Private Partnerships and the Financial Cost to Governments: Case Study on the Power Sector in Uganda, Jubilee debt Campaign, 2015

[21.] Hodge, G. and Greve, C. (2005), The Challenge of Public-Private Partnerships. Learning from International Experience. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

[22.] IMF, (2004), Public-Private Partnerships, International Monetary Fund Fiscal Affairs Department

[23.] Independent Review Mechanism (IRM) (2008), Compliance Review Report On the Bujagali Hydropower and Interconnection Projects, IRM Compliance Review Panel, African Development Bank

[24.] Khalid A and Bassam Abu-Hijleh(2017) Critical Success Factors for Public Private Partnerships in UAE Construction Industry – Comparative Analysis between the UAE and the UK Journal of Engineering , Project and Production Management.

[25.] Koppen ,J (2005)The Formation of Public –Private Partnerships :Lessons from nine transport infrastructure projects in the Netherlands .Public Administration

[26.] Leedy, P. 1993. Practical Research: Plal1l1il1g alld Desigl1. Fifth edition.

[27.] Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2015). Practical research. Planning and design (11th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

[28.] Leedy, P. 1989, Practical Research, Macmillan, New York

[29.] Leedy, PD & Ormrod, JE 2005, Practical research: planning and design, 8th

[30.] Macmillan Publishing Company, New York.

[31.] Mutazu G.( 2000) Implementation of Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) on Infrastructure Development in Zimbabwe school the Built and Natural Environment , Glasgow Caledonian University.

[32.] Nsasira R, Basheka B C and Oluka N (2013), Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) and Enhanced Service Delivery in Uganda: Implications from the Energy Sector, International Journal of Business Administration Vol. 4, No. 3; 2013

[33.] OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development). (2010). 3rd annual OECD Symposium on Public-Private Partnerships, Paris, 12–13 April 2010.

[34.] Osei-Kyei,R and Chan ,A.(2015) Review of Studies on Crictical Studies on Critical Success Factors for Public – Private Partnership (PPP) projects from 1990 to International journal of Project Management.

[35.] Panneerselvam, R (2014). Research methods, second edition. Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited. Panneerselvam, R (2009). Research methodology. New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited

[36.] Partnerships British Colombia (2003), An Introduction to Public Private Partnerships, Partnership British Colombia

[37.] PPIAF (2009), Toolkit for Public-Private Partnerships in Roads & Highways, Module 1: Overview and Diagnosis, Public-Private Infrastructure Advisory Facility

[38.] PPPU (2015), Legal and Regulatory Framework for PPPs in Kenya, WB Webinar Series, 2015

[39.] Pushak, N.and Briceno-Garmendia, C. M. (2011) Zimbabwe Infrastructure: a continental perspective. Africa Infrastructure Country diagnostic - Country report. Washington: The International Bank for Reconstruction/ the World Bank

[40.] Regional Economic Outlook (2018) Sub Saharan Africa, Reserve Bank of Zimbabwe 2016.

[41.] Savas, E.S. (2000), Privatisation and Public-Private Partnerships. New Jersey: Chatham House

[42.] Supply And Sewerage Services In Dar Es Salaam, Water Papers No 69032, World Bank

[43.] T Zinyama and A . G Nhema (2015) Public – Private Partnership:Critical Review and Lessons Learnt for Zimbabwe . Public Policy Administration Research Volume .5. Number 6

[44.] The Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) (2015), Evaluating the environment for public–private partnerships in Africa: The 2015 Infrascope, EIU, London.

[45.] Tito B (2011), Statement of Managing Director Eng Benhadard Tito in A Week of the Ministry Of Transport to Mark 50 Years of Tanzania Mainland Independence, Tanzania Ministry of Transport, 2011

[46.] Trebilcock M and M Rosenstock (2013), Infrastructure PPPs In The Developing World: Lessons

[47.] Triche T (2012), A Case Study Of Public-Private And Public-Public Partnerships In Water

[48.] Van Ham, H. and Koppenjan, J. (2001), Building Public-Private Partnerships. Public Management Review, 3(4) 593-616.

[49.] Ventures Africa, 2003, The Role of Public-Private Partnerships in Africa, found online at http://venturesafrica.com/role-public-private-partnerships-building-industries-thrive/ accessed 09 May 2016

[50.] World Bank (2013), Technical Assistance for Zimbabwe's PPP Enabling Environment, World Bank, http://documents.worldbank.org/

[51.] World Economic Forum( 2017 ) The Global Competitiveness Report

[52.] World Road Association(2011).International Climate Change Adaption Framework for road Infrastucture

[53.] XS-Axis Consulting (2013), PPPs Country Paper: Malawi, Southern African Development Community - Development Finance Resource Center PPP Network (SADC3P), Available at http://www.sadcpppnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/malawi_27012014.pdf.

[54.] XS-Axis Consulting (2014), PPP Country Paper: Lesotho, Southern African Development Community- Development Finance Resource Center PPP Network (SADC3P), available at http://www.sadcpppnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/lesotho_27012014.pdf.

[55.] Zimbabwe

[56.] Zinyama T and A G Nhema (2015), Public-Private Partnerships: Critical Review and Lessons for Zimbabwe, Public Policy and Administration Research; Vol.5, No.6 Argyris G. Kagiannas, K. D.,( 2003)The role of Build Operate Transfer in promoting, Athens: National Technical University of Athens

[57.] ADB. 2005. Public-Private Partnership Handbook.6 ADB Avenue, Mandaluyong City 1550 Metro Manila, Philippineswww.adb.org Publication Stock No. 071107.

[58.] ADBI. 2011. Appropriate Financial Instruments for Public-Private Partnership to Boost

[59.] Cross-Border Infrastructural Development-EU Experience. Kasumigaseki Building 8F 3-2-5 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku Tokyo 100-6008, Japan.

[60.] Babbie, E.R. 1986. The Practice of Social Science Research. Belmont: Wardsworth Publishers.

[61.] Bayliss, Kate and David Hall (2000) Independent Power Producers: A Review of the Issues A PSIRU Report for PSI http://www.psiru.org/reports/2000-11-E-IPPs.doc.

[62.] Blackburn, K. and M. Christensen. 1989. ―Monetary Policy and Policy Credibility: Theories and Evidence.‖Journal of Economic Literature XXVII.

[63.] Burnett, M. 2007. Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) - A Decision Maker's Guide. European Institute of Public Administration (EIPA).

[64.] Burns, N and Grove, S.K. 1997. The practice of nursing research: Conduct, Critique and Utilization. 3rd edition. Philadelphia: Saunders.

[65.] Claire, S. (1959). Research Methods In Social Relations. U.S.A: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Colman, J. ―Examining the Value for Money of Deals under the Private FinanceInitiative/Public Private Partnership.‖ Public Policy and Administration 15, no. 4 (2000):72–82.

[66.] Dube, C. and Chigumira, G. 2011. The Scope for Public-Private Partnerships for Infrastructure Development in Zimbabwe. Harare, ZEPARU.

[67.] European Commission. 2003. Guidelines for Successful Public-Private Partnerships. March 2003, Directorate-General for Regional Policy.

[68.] Farlam, P. 2005. Working Together Assessing Public–Private Partnerships in Africa. The South African Institute of International Affairs.

[69.] Government of Zimbabwe (2012) Budget Statement, Harare, Printflow. Government of Zimbabwe (2013) ZIMASSET, Harare, Printflow. Government of Zimbabwe PPP Draft Document (2010), Harare, Printflow.

[70.] Guion, L.A., Diehl, D.C., and McDonald, D. 2011. Conducting an In-depth Interview. University of Florida.

[71.] Harris, C. 2003. Private Participation in Infrastructure in Developing Countries: Trends, Impact and Policy Lessons. Washington DC: World Bank.

[72.] Hodgson, G., 1988. Economics and Institutions. Polity Press, Cambridge. ‗The approach of institutional economics', Journal of Economic Literature, 36(1):166–92.

[73.] Holsti, O.R. 1968. ―Content Analysis‖, in The Handbook of Social Psychology, ed. Gardner

[74.] Lindzey and Elliot Aronson, Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

[75.] Lane, P. 1993. Anatomy Of A Public-Private Partnership. Center for Real Estate Quarterly Report, vol. 7, no. 2.

[76.] Marin, P., 2009. PPP for Urban Water Utilities: A review of Experience in Developing Countries. Washington DC: World Bank.

[77.] PPIAF (Public-Private Infrastructure Advisory Facility). 2002. ―Emerging Lessons in Private Provision of Infrastructure Services in Rural Areas: Water and Electricity Services in Gabon.‖ PPIAF and the World Bank, Washington, DC.

[78.] Renda, A. and Schrefler, L. 2006. Public-Private Partnerships-Models and Trends in the European Union. Brussels, European Parliament.

[79.] Sawyer, M. 2005. The Private Finance Initiative: The UK Experience. In Procurement and Financing of Motorways in Europe. Research in Transportation Economics. No. 15, Elsevier.

[80.] OECD. 2008. OECD Principles for Private Sector Participation in Infrastructure. Paris: OECD.

[81.] Polit, D.F and Hungler, B.P. 1995. Nursing research: Principles and methods. 5th Edition. Philadelphia: Lippincott.

[82.] Price-Waterhouse and Coopers. 2006. Hybrid PPPs: Levering EU funds and Private Capital. January 2006, PPIAF—Public Private Infrastructure Advisory Facility.

[83.] Rice, P. and Azzy, D. 1999.Qualitative Research Methods: A Heath Focus. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

[84.] Scott, M. 1990. Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods (2nded.). Newbury Park CA: Sage Publication.

[85.] Smith, W. 1997. Utility Regulators: The Independence Debate. Public Policy for the Private Sector Note No. 127. October. Washington, DC: World Bank. Available: http://rru.worldbank.org/Documents/PublicPolicyJournal/127smith.

[86.] Tellis, W. 1997. ―Application of a Case Study Methodology.‖ The Qualitative Report, 3 (3), 34-49.

[87.] Tongco, C. 2007. ―Purposive Sampling as a Tool for Informant Selection: Research Methods.‖ A Journal Plants, People and Applied Research, 3 (5), 147-158.

[88.] Vining, A., & Weimer, D. (2005). Economic perspectives on public organizations. In D. Ferrin, L. Lynn, & M. Pollitt (Eds.), Oxford handbook of public management (pp. 209-233). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

[89.] Williamson, O.E. 1999. Public and Private Bureaus: A transaction cost perspective. Journal of Law, Economics and Organization 15 (1) 306-342.

[90.] World Bank. 2009. Attracting Investors to African Public-Private Partnerships: A Project Zhou, G. 2012. Fiscal Management In Zimbabwe. Department of Political and Administrative Studies, University of Zimbabwe.

[91.] ZIMSTAT. 2012. Census 2012: Preliminary Report. Harare: Government of Zimbabwe.4785