International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Governance Networks And Their Effectiveness In Indian Administration

Subhan Azhar Siddiqui

Research Scholar (Public Administration)
Department of Political Science, A.M.U. Aligarh.

ABSTRACT :

This paper delves into the concept of Network Governance in India by highlighting the role of Governance Networks in Infrastructure development in India. Governance Networks, a distinctive feature of the *New Public Governance,* involves various organizations public, private and non-profit etc. collaborating around a specific issue or policy and operating through negotiation. In India, especially after the liberalization reforms of 1991, Indian government started actively collaborating with big business houses and promoting these networks to deliver public services and implement public policy. The Governance Networks which are specially involved in public service delivery and public policy implementation are known as *Service-delivery and implementation networks*. The government's strategy to enhance private sector involvement in national development and poverty reduction focused on creating a favourable environment through infrastructure development. Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) as implementation networks have emerged as the standard model for executing these infrastructure projects in India which has made it a global leader in building infrastructure, especially among developing countries. This paper also examines the institutional and policy frameworks for PPPs in India and addresses their challenges within Indian democracy to analyse the effectiveness of governance networks in the Indian administration.

Keywords: Governance Networks, Infrastructure Development, Public-Private Partnerships.

Introduction :

The emergence of new governance structures in the liberalized economy in India is driven by the need to attract private investment for addressing development challenges and alleviating poverty, and thus, fostering economic growth. This shift has promoted more open and transparent collaboration between the government and businesses in the form of *interorganizational networks.* The collaborative approach enables governments to concentrate on their primary responsibilities while drawing on the specialized skills of external partners to address specific issues. By forming partnerships with private companies and non-profit organizations, governments can combine resources, share risks and achieve efficiencies that would be difficult to attain within the limitations of traditional bureaucracy or market mechanisms (Osborne, 2010). A governance network, as discussed earlier, refers to a system where various groups or organizations- public, private and non-profit etc. collaborate on an equal footing, each playing a vital role without any single entity being in charge. These groups work together through negotiation, adhering to a common set of goals, rules and values, while still operating within the constraints set by external authorities. Governance networks usually develop around specific policy issues, programs, or resources and are maintained and adapted over time through ongoing interactions among the involved parties (Koppenjan and Klijn, 2004, 2015). Apart from policy making, these networks have been instrumental in delivering public service and implementing public policy in the 21st Century. These networks are a distinctive feature of *New Public Governance.* The Governance Networks involved in public policy implementation and public service delivery are generally referred to as *Service-delivery and implementation or operational networks*. By working together, these networks ensure that public goods and services are delivered in a more coordinated, comprehensive, and sustainable manner.

In Indian administration, especially after liberalization reforms in 1991, the service delivery networks had a profound impact on public policy and the way societal issues were addressed. In neo-liberal paradigm, the Indian government shifted its role from being a direct service provider to a facilitator and a regulator (Mathur, 2010). The focus moved away from the traditional State-led approaches, and the State increasingly sought market-driven solutions to tackle social and economic problems. The government's plan to boost private sector participation in national development and poverty reduction was centred on a key idea: creating a conducive environment by developing crucial infrastructure like power, roads, and transportation (Mathur, 2010). Infrastructure serves as the backbone of a nation's economy and society by directly influencing its capacity to grow and innovate. It is fundamental for businesses to thrive—without reliable electricity, efficient transport systems, and well-maintained roads, companies struggle to operate effectively. A solid infrastructure network—comprising reliable energy sources, efficient transportation systems, high-quality telecommunications, and seamless logistics—lays the foundation for enhanced productivity. When a nation invests in these key areas, it not only upgrades its existing resources but also creates new opportunities for industries to flourish. Businesses, whether local or foreign, seek environments where they can operate efficiently. Thus, a well-developed infrastructure becomes a magnet for private investment. Foreign investors, in particular, are drawn to regions where they can access the resources and facilities necessary to operate without high risks or logistical challenges. In India, **Public–Private Partnerships (PPPs)** have become the

default model for executing infrastructure projects (Pratap and Chakrabarti, 2018). They allow for a collaborative approach where the government partners with private entities to build, design, finance and operate infrastructure that is vital for the nation's development. PPPs have not only contributed to economic growth but have also alleviated the financial burden on the government by leveraging private sector resources and expertise. Overall, they serve as vital *Service delivery and Implementation networks* within the framework of public governance.

Research Methodology

This study used a **qualitative research approach** to explore the effectiveness of governance networks, particularly focusing on **Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs)** as service delivery-networks in Indian administrative system. The research involved an in-depth analysis of case studies and various reports to examine how governance networks operate to deliver infrastructure projects like roads, energy and transportation. In addition to case studies, secondary data was gathered from government documents, academic studies, and international databases. This helped to analyse the performance of governance networks in different contexts. A review of existing literature was conducted to find the challenges in infrastructure development.

Data Collection

Secondary data was utilized to support the research, drawing on both national and international sources to offer a broader perspective on the effectiveness of governance networks and PPPs in India's development from a variety of **reliable sources**, including:

- **Government policy documents** and official reports that detail the functioning and outcomes of **Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs)**
- The **World Bank's Private Participation in Infrastructure (PPI)** database, which provides data on the number of PPP projects and investment in key infrastructure sectors
- **Case studies** of major infrastructure projects, such as energy generation, transport systems, and telecommunications, to understand how governance networks were applied in real-life scenarios.

Literature Review

Governments have a longstanding tradition of collaborating with private companies, nonprofits, and other organizations to meet public goals. Historical practices, such as the ancient Greeks outsourcing tax collection and leasing state resources to private entities, illustrate this trend. However, the contemporary framework known as **Governance Networks** represents a more expansive and fundamentally different approach. This shift is driven by advances in technology and societal changes that encourage interconnected organizational structures. According to Eggers (2005), four major trends characterize Governance Networks:

a) **Third-Party Government:** In recent decades, there has been a notable shift towards depending on private firms and nonprofit organizations to deliver services and achieve policy objectives. This transition redefines the role of the public sector from being a direct service provider to a facilitator that coordinates and manages a network of external service providers. Governance Networks involve complex relationships that extend beyond simple outsourcing by integrating multiple stakeholders to enhance the delivery of public goods (Eggers, 2005).

b) **Joined-Up Government:** Traditional hierarchical government structures often face limitations in responsiveness and efficiency. To combat this, there has been an increasing trend towards collaboration among various government agencies at different levels. The "joined-up government" approach aims to dismantle bureaucratic silos and improve the integration of services. By fostering better coordination and information sharing, Governance Networks enable seamless and effective service delivery to the public, improving outcomes across various sectors (Eggers, 2005).

c) **The Digital Revolution:** Technological advancements, especially the rise of the Internet, have significantly reduced the costs of information dissemination and facilitated real-time collaboration across organizational boundaries. Modern digital tools allow government agencies and their partners to share data, streamline processes, and communicate more efficiently. This technological shift has made it easier to establish and maintain Governance Networks, enabling public and private entities to collaborate in ways that were previously impractical (Eggers, 2005).

d) **Consumer Demand:** Today's citizens expect more choices, customization, and control over the services they receive, reflecting the personalized service experiences common in the private sector. Governance Networks respond to this demand by promoting a more flexible and responsive approach to public service delivery. By leveraging technology and collaborative efforts, these networks can offer a broader range of options tailored to individual needs, enhancing citizen satisfaction and engagement (Eggers, 2005).

The study of Governance Networks has emerged as an important field of research, focusing on how different groups—public, semi-public, and private—work together in non-hierarchical ways through negotiation. While initial investigations into how organizations relate to each other started in the 1970s, the idea of Governance Networks became more recognized in the early 1990s. Key studies by researchers such as Marin and Mayntz (1991), Kooiman (1993), Scharpf (1994), March and Olsen (1995), Rhodes (1997a), and Kickert et al. (1997) formed the foundation for this area of study. Later research by Heffen et al. (2000), Pierre and Peters (2000), Bang (2003), and Hajer and Wagenaar (2003) deepened the understanding of Governance Networks, making them a vital part of Public Administration. Various theoretical frameworks guide the examination of Governance Networks, including interdependency theory, governability theory, integration theory and governmentality theory. These frameworks provide diverse perspectives on how society operates and is managed.

- **Interdependency Theory:** This theory posits that Governance Networks function as mechanisms where various autonomous actors—each possessing unique resources like knowledge, funding, and authority—collaborate to tackle policy issues (Rhodes, 1997). These actors depend

on one another since no single entity can address complex problems alone. Continuous interaction and negotiation among actors are essential to leverage collective capabilities and resolve challenges effectively (Sørensen & Torfing, 2005).

- **Governability Theory:** This framework sees Governance Networks as platforms for collaboration among independent actors through horizontal coordination. Scholars like Mayntz (1991), Kooiman (1993), and Scharpf (1994, 1997) emphasize that in a modern society characterized by functional differentiation, fragmentation makes effective governance difficult. Governance Networks improve societal management by allowing different actors to work together, fostering trust and reducing transaction costs (Sørensen & Torfing, 2005).
- **Integration Theory:** This theory suggests that Governance Networks are shaped not only by resource exchanges but also by the institutional structures that dictate acceptable behavior. March and Olsen (1995) argue that actors operate within frameworks of institutional rules that influence their identities and interactions. This perspective emphasizes that Governance Networks involve negotiated coordination among relatively autonomous but interdependent actors (Sørensen & Torfing, 2005).
- **Governmentality Theory:** Governmentality, discussed by Dean (1999) and Foucault (1991), examines how governance networks fit into broader frameworks aimed at enhancing public welfare. This theory reflects the evolution of government practices, transitioning from laissez-faire liberalism to welfare state programs, and later to neoliberal critiques advocating for market-driven solutions. Governmentality Theory highlights how governance networks adapt within changing governance frameworks (Sørensen & Torfing, 2007).

What is Infrastructure?

The term **Infrastructure,** which literally means the **"underlying structure",** was borrowed from the French and was first introduced into the English language in 1927. But it didn't gain widespread usage in economic conversations until final quarter of the 20th century. Although it serves as the foundation upon which societies and economies are built, it is a great surprise to believe that there is no universal definition for it.
It is often categorized in two broad areas:

- **Physical (Hard) Infrastructure** – This includes fixed and tangible assets like roads, bridges and power plants etc. that form the backbone of modern economies.
- **Organizational or Social (Soft) Infrastructure** – This refers to the systems and institutions that support human capital, such as education and healthcare services.

Categories of Infrastructure:

a) Economic Infrastructure:

- **Energy Projects:** Power generation (hydro, thermal and other forms of renewable energy), transmission networks, and distribution systems form the cornerstone of modern life. Without reliable energy infrastructure, economic activities get limited and reduce overall productivity.
- **Telecommunication Networks:** In today's digital age, the infrastructure supporting telecommunication and broadband services is as vital as electricity and water supply. A robust telecom network is essential for connectivity, business operations and national security. It underpins industries from banking to manufacturing.
- **Transport Systems:** Efficient transportation—comprising roads, railways, airports, and seaports—ensures that goods and people can move smoothly across regions, connecting markets and fostering trade. Good transport infrastructure reduces transaction costs and make economies more competitive.
- **Urban Infrastructure:** This includes everything from public transportation (metros, buses) to water treatment plants, sewage systems, and waste management facilities. As cities grow, urban infrastructure plays an increasingly critical role in ensuring that these densely populated areas remain functional, healthy, and productive.

b) Social Infrastructure:

- **Education:** Schools, universities, and vocational training centres contribute to human capital development. Education infrastructure is not only a driver of individual success but also a prerequisite for broader economic advancement. Countries with better education systems tend to have higher levels of productivity and innovation.
- **Healthcare:** Hospitals, clinics, and other health facilities are essential for maintaining a healthy workforce. Access to quality healthcare increases life expectancy, reduces disease burdens, and supports the overall well-being of populations. A healthy society is more productive, contributing more effectively to economic growth.

c) Some Other forms:

- **Industrial Parks and SEZs:** These specialized zones create environments for industries to thrive, often supported by tailored infrastructure like power grids, roads, and ports. They attract both domestic and foreign investors and so contribute to job creation and economic diversification.
- **Irrigation and Storage Facilities:** Agriculture remains a significant sector in many emerging economies. Proper irrigation systems, storage facilities, and distribution networks ensure food security and efficient market access, preventing crop loss and reducing rural poverty.

The benefits of infrastructure investment go beyond merely attracting private capital. The resulting growth in industry and commerce leads to **job creation**, which boosts overall economic welfare (Pratap and Chakrabarti, 2018). A country with modern airports, well-connected ports, and efficient highways ensures that goods and services can move freely and quickly to reduce delays and operational costs. Lower transportation costs make industries more competitive on the global stage and enable them to offer products at lower prices and improving their market reach. These dynamics create a virtuous cycle where increased productivity and investment lead to higher growth, job opportunities, and incomes for the population. On the flip side, countries that lack adequate infrastructure face considerable obstacles. Power shortages, for instance, push industries to depend on costly self-generated power,

which reduces profitability and competitiveness. Poor transport networks create delays, raise costs, and slow down supply chains, disrupting everything from manufacturing processes to the timely delivery of products to markets.

Defining PPPs

Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) are agreements formed between government bodies and private companies to deliver public services or develop infrastructure. However, there isn't a single, universally accepted definition of PPPs, which can cause confusion regarding their interpretation and implementation. For example, in Brazil and France, laws differentiate between projects funded by users (user-pays) and those funded by the government (government-pays). Only the projects governed under the latter category are typically labelled as PPPs. According to Pratap and Chakrabarti (2018), PPPs as commercial transactions between a private and public entity where:

- A private entity delivers a service for a significant period, usually longer than what is typical for standard contracts (Pratap and Chakrabarti, 2018).
- The private party assumes various risks, including those associated with construction, operations, and finance (Pratap and Chakrabarti, 2018).
- Compensation comes from either direct payment from the government, user fees, or a combination of both (Pratap and Chakrabarti, 2018).

The funding for infrastructure services under Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) can come from multiple sources. One common method is user fees, where the private sector charges individuals directly for services, such as tolls on roads or fees for electricity usage, helping to recover the costs of providing these services (Pratap and Chakrabarti, 2018). Another option is government payments, where the government may pay private companies directly to keep user fees low, ensuring that services remain accessible to the public. For example, if the Delhi government wants to offer reduced electricity tariffs for households using less than 400 units per month, it may need to provide subsidies to private electricity providers to maintain service quality. This combination of funding sources allows private companies to recover their investments while enabling the government to uphold its responsibility of providing affordable public services to citizens.

Public-Private Partnerships and their Effectiveness in Indian Administration

India has positioned itself as a global leader in executing Public-Private Partnership (PPP) projects, ranking second among developing countries in both the number of projects and the total investment, according to the World Bank's Private Participation in Infrastructure database. This strong performance is evident across various infrastructure sectors, although the distribution of projects and investments reveals specific trends.

The transport sector leads in the number of PPP projects, particularly in road construction, with a total of 386 road initiatives. In contrast, the energy sector attracts the most investment, primarily focused on electricity generation. Out of the total investment of $143 billion in the energy sector, a substantial $132 billion is dedicated to generating electricity.

However, sectors like water and sewage have seen limited participation in terms of project numbers and investment. This limitation is largely due to challenges related to recovering costs and the political sensitivity surrounding water tariff increases, which are necessary for sustainable infrastructure funding. Moreover, while there is significant private investment in electricity generation, distribution has attracted less interest due to the greater political complexities involved. The telecommunications sector has also garnered considerable investment, benefiting from better mechanisms for cost recovery. While road projects make up the largest number of PPP initiatives, they are generally smaller in scale compared to major telecommunications projects. Together, the energy and telecommunications sectors represent a significant share of the PPP landscape in India.

The top 10 sponsors of Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) in India account for more than half of all projects and investments, and most of these sponsors are domestic companies, with nine out of ten being Indian firms. This indicates that India's PPP program is mainly homegrown, partly because there are concerns about the risks associated with foreign exchange, which are higher in infrastructure sectors. In most cases, infrastructure revenues are in local currency and relying on foreign currency financing could create a mismatch that leads to financial instability. As a result, domestic companies face fewer risks and challenges, making them better suited to manage these projects.

In terms of trends, India has seen substantial growth in PPPs, particularly during the 11th Plan period (2007–2012), when PPPs accounted for over one-third of total infrastructure investments, amounting to around $500 billion. This increase in PPP activity coincided with a rise in the number of projects. Even during the global financial crisis of 2008, investment levels remained strong due to proactive measures taken by the Indian government and the Reserve Bank of India to minimize the crisis's impact on PPP projects. However, after 2012, there was a noticeable drop in both the number of projects and the amount of investment. Fortunately, from 2014 to 2016, this downward trend began to reverse, aided by new policy initiatives such as the hybrid annuity model for road projects and enhancements in the power generation sector, particularly regarding coal availability.

India’s federal structure plays a key role in the distribution of PPP projects. The top five states—Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Karnataka, and Gujarat—are responsible for the majority of the nation's total PPP investments as shown in the figure below.

Figure: Most popular states for PPPs in India. Source: Ernst and Young. Accelerating Public-Private Partnerships in India

Among these, Andhra Pradesh stands out as the leader in both the number of projects and the amount of investment. This success can be attributed to the state's proactive approach in promoting PPPs, particularly through the **AP Infrastructure Development Enabling Act of 2001**. This legislation provides a framework for executing infrastructure projects, outlining criteria for selecting developers, various types of PPP models, and limits on state financial support for these projects.

The Government of Andhra Pradesh offers substantial support for PPP initiatives, which includes financial help through **viability gap funding (VGF)**, exemptions from sales tax and stamp duty, access to government-owned land, and assistance with administrative tasks like obtaining clearances and services at project sites. Meanwhile, Maharashtra, Karnataka, and Gujarat each contribute approximately 11% of total PPP investments, with road projects being the most common type of PPP in these states. In contrast, the bottom 10 states account for only 3.5% of total PPP investments, highlighting the regional disparities in attracting investment. These differences suggest that some states provide a more favorable environment for PPPs, thanks to better infrastructure, governance, and financial support systems. As a result, other regions may find it more challenging to attract private investments in infrastructure projects.

While India's PPP program has witnessed impressive growth and has become a key player in infrastructure development, challenges still persist, particularly in sectors like water and sewerage. The political and financial complexities of managing these sectors make it difficult to achieve widespread private sector participation. Nonetheless, the success of the program in sectors like energy, roads, and telecommunications, along with the proactive measures taken by both central and state governments, demonstrates the potential of PPPs in transforming India's infrastructure landscape.

Institutional and Policy Framework for PPPs in India

To support PPP projects, India has implemented a series of policies, institutional frameworks, financial mechanisms, and simplified processes that encourage private sector involvement in infrastructure development. This approach aims to deliver infrastructure more efficiently, while also conserving public funds by attracting private capital. India's policy for PPPs focuses on promoting private investment in both economic and social infrastructure. The government encourages private participation to deliver infrastructure projects on time, within budget, and with higher operational efficiency. This approach also helps divert limited public resources towards non-commercial sectors, such as rural roads, where private investment is less likely to flow.

To facilitate this, India has established several institutional bodies to streamline the appraisal and approval processes for PPP projects. The **Public-Private Partnership Appraisal Committee (PPPAC)** is a key entity in this structure, chaired by the Secretary of the Department of Economic Affairs, and includes other key members such as those from Niti Aayog and the Department of Legal Affairs. Since its formation in 2006, the PPPAC has approved over 300 central projects with a total investment exceeding $50 billion.

To enhance infrastructure development, the Indian government established the **Cabinet Committee on Infrastructure (CCI)** in 2009, led by the Prime Minister. This committee was responsible for reviewing and approving various initiatives aimed at attracting private investment in infrastructure. However, it has been disbanded in recent years.

At the state level, infrastructure projects are evaluated and approved by the **Empowered Institution (EI)** and the **Empowered Committee (EC)**, which function similarly to the central committees. India has also created independent regulatory agencies for different infrastructure sectors to ensure effective oversight. For instance, the **Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI)** manages the telecommunications sector, while the **Central Electricity Regulatory Commission (CERC)** oversees electricity regulation at the national level. In addition, State Electricity Regulatory Commissions (SERCs) operate within individual states. Other regulatory bodies include the **Tariff Authority of Major Ports (TAMP)** for port operations, **the Airport**

Economic Regulatory Authority (AERA) for airports, and a proposed **Rail Tariff Authority** for railway services. These agencies play a crucial role in minimizing regulatory risks for private investors, thereby fostering a more attractive environment for investment in infrastructure projects.

To enhance the financial viability of Public-Private Partnership (PPP) projects, the Indian government launched the **Viability Gap Funding (VGF) Scheme** in 2006. This program aims to close the gap between the economic and financial returns of infrastructure projects. If a project is considered economically beneficial but not financially feasible, the government can provide up to 20% of its capital cost as support. In some cases, state governments may add another 20%. This funding encourages private investors to engage in projects that might not otherwise attract investment. As of now, the VGF scheme has supported 324 projects, totalling around ₹2.5 trillion, with the government contributing ₹0.5 trillion. Additionally, the **India Infrastructure Finance Company Limited (IIFCL)** was set up to offer long-term loans for infrastructure projects. Unlike regular banks, which often struggle to fund long-term assets due to short-term liabilities, IIFCL provides essential financial backing and raises funds from both domestic and international sources. By late 2016, IIFCL had approved ₹404 billion for 229 projects, including direct loans and refinancing for other banks.

Given the complexity of PPP projects involving various stakeholders—such as private companies, contractors, and government agencies—India has established standardized documents and processes to streamline these projects. These documents clarify contract terms and reduce risks for all parties involved. The framework includes **Model Concession Agreements (MCAs),** guidelines for specifications and standards, and rules for user charges. The Planning Commission has published MCAs for different sectors like highways, ports, and railways. Furthermore, **Request for Qualification (RfQ)** and **Request for Proposal (RfP)** documents have been developed to help prequalify bidders and simplify the bidding process, making it easier for both domestic and foreign investors to participate in PPP projects.

In 2015, the Indian government formed a committee led by **Dr. Vijay Kelkar** to evaluate and revamp the Public-Private Partnership (PPP) model. The committee was tasked with reviewing past experiences, understanding risks in various sectors, and proposing changes based on both Indian and international best practices. Their goal was to create an improved framework for the effective implementation of PPP projects, while also enhancing the capacity of government bodies involved.

Key Points from the Report are as follows:

a) Importance of Infrastructure:

- Infrastructure development is essential for India's growth. PPPs are a tool that can speed up this process.
- With India being one of the largest markets for PPPs, it's vital to conduct periodic reviews to ensure the continued success of these projects. Such reviews should happen every three years or sooner.

b) Changing Mindsets for Success:

- Successful PPPs require a shift in attitude among all parties, including government departments, private entities and oversight institutions.
- It is crucial to focus on the partnership between public and private sectors, rather than merely on financial transactions.
- The prevention of corruption act should be revised to protect public servants from punishment for genuine errors while keeping corrupt actions punishable.

c) Strengthening the PPP Framework:

- India's PPP framework is evolving, but it needs further improvement in governance, institutions and capacity-building.
- There is an urgent need for a national institution dedicated to PPPs, called "3PI," which would act as a centre of excellence in this field. This institution should also focus on research and building a more advanced dispute-resolution mechanism.

d) Risk Allocation and Regulation:

- Proper risk allocation is critical for the success of PPPs. The Kelkar Committee emphasized that risk should be assigned to the party most capable of managing it.
- While the existing Model Concession Agreements (MCA) have been helpful, they need to be revisited to accommodate project-specific risks.
- The committee also stresses the need for independent regulators in sectors where PPPs are used to ensure accountability and fair operations.

e) Need for a Strong Legal Framework:

- The committee welcomes the review of the Arbitration Act, urging the inclusion of time limits on hearings to ensure quicker resolution of disputes.
- It also suggests introducing a national PPP policy endorsed by the Parliament, which will provide clear guidelines and help develop PPPs in new sectors like health and urban transport.

f) Addressing Stalled Projects:

- Many PPP projects have stalled and require immediate attention. The committee recommends creating sector-specific institutional frameworks to deal with these issues.
- Lessons from the highways sector, which has successfully addressed similar challenges, can be applied to other sectors as well.

g) Dispute Resolution:

- Quick, equitable, and effective dispute resolution mechanisms are essential for the smooth running of PPP projects.
- Contracts should have clearly defined processes for resolving disputes, allowing for flexibility within the financial and commercial framework of the project.

h) Discouraging Small PPP Projects:

The committee advises against adopting PPPs for very small projects, as the costs and complexities outweigh the benefits.

Transparency and Efficiency:

- The committee warns against using PPPs simply as a way for governments to avoid financial responsibility. The focus should be on long-term infrastructure delivery rather than just accessing grants.
- It also suggests discouraging unsolicited proposals, often called "Swiss Challenge," as these can lead to a lack of transparency in procurement.

Engaging with Long-Term Investors:

- To attract long-term investments, the government should consider offering opportunities in operational PPP projects. Stable, revenue-generating projects can attract pension and institutional funds.
- Equity in successful infrastructure projects can be sold to investors, freeing up funds for new developments.

Recommendations for the Future:

a) Review and Improve Contracts: PPP contracts should focus on service delivery rather than just financial benefits. Risks must be carefully allocated among stakeholders, and detailed guidelines should be followed for renegotiating agreements when necessary.

b) Encouraging Independent Regulation:

- Independent regulators should be set up for sectors with PPPs to maintain fair operations and ensure that all stakeholders adhere to the rules.
- Regulations should focus on long-term projects, which often span 20-30 years, to protect private developers from sudden policy changes.

c) Revitalizing Stalled Projects: Projects that have stalled should be reassessed, and where possible, unresolved issues like land acquisition should be addressed promptly. If a project can't make progress, it should either be rebid or completed with public funds.

d) Streamlining Governance:

- Amendments to the Prevention of Corruption Act are needed to separate honest errors from corruption.
- A dedicated PPP institute should be established to build expertise and support for stakeholders involved in PPP projects.
- The government should avoid allowing public sector undertakings (PSUs) to bid for PPP projects, as this conflicts with the principle of private sector involvement.

e) Finance and Monetization:

- Banks should be encouraged to issue bonds, such as **Zero-Coupon Bonds**, to lower the cost of borrowing for infrastructure projects.
- Successful projects can also be monetized, attracting long-term investors and freeing up funds for new projects.

India's success in expanding its PPP model depends on a shift in mindset, stronger risk management and the development of a robust legal and institutional framework. By implementing these recommendations, India can continue to use PPPs as a vital tool for economic growth, while ensuring that infrastructure projects meet the needs of its citizens efficiently and equitably.

Issues and Challenges in Indian Democracy

The process of network governance depends heavily on the political and social environment which may not always align with public interests. The growing influence of **"crony capitalism"** where big businesses can manipulate policy decisions to their advantage is a big concern in the Indian democratic system (Mathur, 2010). This brings up the possibility of network governance failure, where social and political dynamics prevent the creation of public purposes. Jessop (1998) as well as Sorenson and Torfing (2004), for instance, have highlighted that governance networks, just like states and markets, can fail. In India, this concern is particularly pressing as there is a strong possibility that big business houses could unduly influence decisions in their favour by undermining public interests.

A key challenge lies in the state's **ability to negotiate** within these governance networks. Evidence suggests that both political and bureaucratic leadership have benefited personally from liberalization policies, weakening their ability to negotiate effectively for the public good (Mathur, 2010). This situation is exacerbated by the growing overlap between public and private interests, which makes public servants less inclined to prioritize public welfare. As a result, partnerships between the government and private entities are often unequal, with private interests dominating. However, the capacity of the state is not solely determined by its legitimacy but also by the performance of its institutions. Bureaucracy, which plays a crucial role in policy implementation, has struggled to adapt to this new model of governance. Despite numerous efforts to reform the bureaucracy, progress has been slow. This remains one of the most significant challenges to good governance in India today. Without a well-functioning bureaucracy, the government's ability to negotiate effectively in partnerships and collaborations with the private sector is severely compromised (Mathur, 2010). Furthermore, since India gained independence, there has been a steady decline in the effectiveness of **accountability institutions**. Increasingly, it has fallen upon civil society to hold the government accountable for issues related to financial transparency and administrative responsibility. While the Right to Information Act (RTI) has empowered citizens to demand accountability, and Public Interest Litigation (PIL) has provided a legal recourse for those aggrieved by government actions, achieving justice through these channels remains a struggle. The decentralization efforts brought about by Constitutional Amendments have also faced challenges in implementation. Despite these difficulties, the RTI has emerged as a powerful tool for curbing corruption and holding public officials accountable, making it one of the most significant advancements in the pursuit of good governance. Therefore, as the governance landscape becomes more complex with the increasing number of institutions and partnerships, the state's ability to negotiate for the public interest must be strengthened.

Moreover, when these partnerships operate outside the traditional government hierarchy, ensuring accountability becomes even more difficult. The challenges faced today are a direct result of India's sluggish efforts to reform its bureaucracy and institutions. Corruption remains high on the public agenda, but the mechanisms to control it have weakened over time. Reports from bodies like the Comptroller and Auditor-General (CAG), Central Vigilance Commission (CVC), and the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) are often ignored, undermining efforts to maintain accountability. The growing use of PPPs in implementing public policies must be viewed within this broader context of state capacity and accountability.

Often, private investors are guaranteed returns on their investments regardless of the project's success, thanks to mechanisms like viability gap funding and user fees. Whether the project involves building roads, airports, healthcare facilities, or schools, the users are required to pay fees that ultimately reimburse the private investors. International organizations such as the World Bank and Asian Development Bank have promoted full cost recovery

through user fees, arguing that without such mechanisms, service quality will not improve, and private sector involvement in utilities will be limited. This undermines the notion that the private sector assumes significant risks in these partnerships, as they often have their investments secured regardless of project outcomes. In the social sector, PPPs face additional challenges. For example, a partnership may build healthcare facilities, but if the health outcomes of the beneficiaries do not improve, the project cannot be considered successful. Similarly, while schools may be established through partnerships, the quality of education may remain subpar, and the benefits of these services may not reach the poor. The purpose of these partnerships is to deliver services more efficiently and equitably, but if they fail to do so, the entire premise of the partnership is defeated. To address this, strong regulatory frameworks and accountability mechanisms are needed to ensure that partnerships meet their intended goals.

Partnerships in countries like the United States are often more successful because of strong regulation, transparency, and active civil society organizations that hold both the government and private sector accountable. In contrast, India lacks these robust mechanisms, making it more challenging for partnerships to deliver effective results. Furthermore, the Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) that govern these partnerships should be made public to ensure transparency, but this is often not the case, resulting in a lack of public oversight. To ensure that these partnerships serve the public interest, there must be a clear understanding of the roles of each partner, the project's financing, the goals of the partnership, and how the project will be executed. This information needs to be placed in the public domain for the benefit of the people who will be affected by these partnerships.

Conclusion :

The evolution of governance in India, especially in the context of neoliberal economic policies, has significantly reshaped the role of the state. Traditionally, the government was primarily responsible for providing essential services and meeting the needs of society. However, with neoliberalism, the approach has shifted towards involving private businesses and civil society in these roles. This collaborative method allows the government to focus on its core responsibilities while benefiting from the resources, skills, and efficiency of private companies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). This type of cooperation, known as governance networks, is a key innovation in today's public administration.

One of the areas where these networks have had a major impact is in infrastructure development. Since economic liberalization, India has increasingly turned to Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) to build, finance, and operate projects like roads, airports, power plants and telecommunications systems etc. Infrastructure is crucial for economic growth because it helps businesses function better, creates jobs and improves the quality of life for people. By involving the private sector through PPPs, the Indian government has attracted investments in infrastructure, reducing the financial burden on the state. This approach has made India a global leader in infrastructure development, particularly in terms of the number of PPP projects.

The participation of the private sector has not only accelerated development but has also improved the management and maintenance of infrastructure projects. The PPP model aims to balance public welfare with the efficiency of the private sector. Private companies, which often have more flexibility and expertise in handling large-scale projects, are motivated to deliver projects on time and maintain high standards of service. At the same time, the government oversees these projects to ensure public interests are protected. This approach has worked well in sectors like power generation, transportation, and telecommunications.

However, while the benefits of PPPs and governance networks are clear, they also come with challenges, particularly regarding **accountability and transparency**. When the government partners with private entities, there is a risk that public interests could take a back seat to private profits. In India, concerns have been raised about **'crony capitalism'**, where large businesses may influence government policies for their benefit. This undermines the idea of equal partnerships between the public and private sectors and weakens the government's ability to negotiate effectively for its citizens. Another problem with PPPs is the lack of clear accountability. When multiple stakeholders are involved, it is often unclear who is responsible for ensuring that public services are delivered as promised. This issue is made worse because many of these partnerships operate outside the usual government framework, making it difficult for citizens and oversight bodies to hold the parties accountable. Additionally, the agreements that govern these partnerships, known as Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs), are often not made public, which reduces transparency. Addressing these issues is essential if PPPs are to succeed in serving the public good.

India's bureaucracy, which has traditionally been the backbone of public service delivery, has struggled to adapt to this new model of governance. Despite efforts to reform bureaucratic institutions, progress has been slow, and the bureaucracy remains inefficient and resistant to change. This is a major challenge for the success of PPPs because a functioning government is crucial for negotiating and regulating these partnerships. Without an effective bureaucracy, the government cannot manage the complexities of modern governance networks or ensure that public interests are protected.

While PPPs have been relatively successful in developing infrastructure, their performance in delivering social services has been mixed. In many cases, private sector involvement has not significantly improved the quality of services, especially for the poor. This raises concerns about whether PPPs are suitable for addressing social challenges. For example, in healthcare, PPPs may help build hospitals, but if health outcomes do not improve, the partnership cannot be considered successful. Similarly, in education, building schools does not mean success if the quality of education remains poor.

To ensure PPPs are effective, especially in the social sector, there is a need for strong regulatory frameworks and accountability mechanisms. Regulatory bodies must be given the power to oversee these partnerships and ensure that they achieve their intended goals. It is also important that the benefits of PPPs reach all parts of society, particularly the poor, who often rely the most on public services. If PPPs fail to deliver fair outcomes, they risk increasing inequality rather than reducing it. Furthermore, it is crucial to carefully evaluate whether PPPs are suitable for addressing social challenges. While they have been successful in infrastructure development, their performance in sectors like healthcare and education has been less convincing. Policymakers need to consider whether PPPs are the right approach for tackling these complex issues and, if so, how they can be structured to deliver fair results for all citizens. At the same time, the private sector should take on a fair share of the risks involved, rather than being guaranteed profits regardless of the project's success.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the Public-Private Partnerships as *Service-delivery networks* can be an effective way to deliver services and promote economic growth, but only if they are carefully designed and regulated to serve the public interest. Policymakers must remain vigilant in ensuring that these partnerships do not become a vehicle for private profit at the expense of public welfare. By addressing the challenges outlined in this chapter, India

can continue to harness the potential of PPPs while safeguarding the interests of its citizens and ensuring that governance networks contribute to achieve the vision of *Viksit Bharat* by 2047.

REFERENCES:

Books and Articles

1. *Bang, Henrik*, ed. *Governance as Social and Political Communication*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.
2. *Dean, Mitchell. Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage, 1999.
3. *FICCI and Ernst & Young. Accelerating Public Private Partnerships in India*. 2012.
4. *Foucault, Michel.* "Governmentality" In The Foucault Effect, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, 87–104. Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.
5. *Goldsmith, Stephen, and William D. Eggers. Governing by Network: The New Shape of the Public Sector*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2005.
6. *Hajer, Maarten, and Hendrik Wagenaar,* eds. *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
7. *Heffen, Oscar Van, Walter J. M. Kickert, and J. A. Thomassen,* eds. *Governance in Modern Society: Effects, Change, and Formation of Government Institutions*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000.
8. *Jessop, Bob.* "The Rise of Governance and the Risks of Failure: The Case of Economic Development." *International Social Science Journal* 50, no. 155 (1998): 29–45.
9. *Kickert, Walter J. M., and Joop F. M. Koppenjan.* "Public Management and Network Management: An Overview." In *Managing Complex Networks: Strategies for the Public Sector*, edited by Walter J. M. Kickert, Erik Hans Klijn, and Joop F. M. Koppenjan, 35–62. London: Sage, 1997.
10. *Klijn, Erik Hans, and Joop Koppenjan. Governance Networks in the Public Sector*. London: Routledge, 2015.
11. *Klijn, Erik Hans, and Joop F. M. Koppenjan. Managing Uncertainties in Networks: A Network Approach to Problem Solving and Decision-Making*. London: Routledge, 2004.
12. *Kooiman, Jan,* ed. *Modern Governance: New Government-Society Interactions*. London: Sage, 1993.
13. *March, James G., and Johan P. Olsen. Democratic Governance*. New York: The Free Press, 1995.
14. *Marin, Bernd, and Renate Mayntz,* eds. *Policy Networks: Empirical Evidence and Theoretical Considerations*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1991.
15. *Mathur, Kuldeep.* "Governance as Networks: Emerging Relationships among the State, Business, and NGOs in India." *Indian Journal of Human Development* 4, no. 2 (2010): 253–79.
16. *Osborne, Stephen P.* "Introduction: The (New) Public Governance: A Suitable Case for Treatment?" In *The New Public Governance?* edited by Stephen P. Osborne, 17–32. London: Routledge, 2010.
17. *Pierre, Jon, and B. Guy Peters. Governance, Politics, and the State*. Houndmills: MacMillan Press, 2000.
18. *Pratap, Kumar V., and Rajesh Chakrabarti. Public-Private Partnerships in Infrastructure: Managing the Challenges*. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore, 2018.
19. *Rhodes, R. A. W. Understanding Governance: Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity, and Accountability*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1997.
20. *Scharpf, Fritz W.* "Interorganizational Policy Studies: Issues, Concepts, and Perspectives." In *Interorganizational Policy Making: Limits to Coordination and Central Control*, edited by K. I. Hanf and Fritz W. Scharpf, 345–70. London: Sage, 1978.
21. *Sørensen, Eva, and Jacob Torfing,* eds. *Theories of Democratic Network Governance*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Government reports and related websites

1. Ministry of Finance. 2015. Report of the Committee on Revisiting and Revitalising Public Private Partnership model of infrastructure (Dr. Vijay Kelkar Committee Report). http://dea.gov.in/sites/default/files/ReportRevisitingRevitalisingPPPModel.pdf
2. Ministry of Power. 2007. Power sector profile: Western region. http://powermin.nic.in/indian_ electricity scenario/pdf/WR1007.pdf.
3. Ministry of Power. 2008. Annual report 2007–08. http://powermin.nic.in/indian_electricity_scenario/pdf/Annual_Report_2007-08_English.pdf
4. World Bank. Private Participation in Infrastructure (PPI) Project database. www.ppi.worldbank.org.
5. World Bank. http://data.worldbank.org/country/india