Index

Introductory Note: Please note that PPPs stands for Public–Private Partnerships, while PFIs represents Private Finance Initiatives.

accommodation PPIs (PRIME and STEPS) 7, 86–90
changes and difficulties 89–90
contractual relationships between central departments and private partners 85
features 86–7
flexible structuring 88–9
implementation 46
value for money and risk allocation 88–9
accountability
  downwards 158
  extended 158
  horizontal 158
  limits of 158–9
  narrow 158
  parliamentary 48–9
public bodies, control over PPIs/PFIs
  154
  and public law 4, 39–41
  and regulation 157–9
  through multi-centred conversations 160–64
upwards 158
administrative redress 189
assets, Private Finance Initiatives 2, 3, 67
attentiveness, and ethics 211–12
auditing
  audit, and value for money 58–9, 60
  Audit Commission, UK 56
National Audit Office see NAO (National Audit Office), UK
authority, competition and cooperation linked to 26–7
autonomy
  and collective interests 231
  collective interests 221, 248–50
and control 46–60
and judicial control 181
limited 54–7
link with solidarity and trust 32–5, 36, 37, 98
link with value for money and risk allocation 128
local government, UK 55, 56, 60
meaning 33
and procurement 114
public authorities, enjoyed by 191
and risk identification 124
and solidarity, as contractual starting point 103–4
and value for money 120–21
vulnerability and expertise 248–50

Balfour Beatty 187
BAM PPP UK Ltd 187
bank nationalisation, UK 47
Bates Review (1997) 70
best value 55
Big Society (Agenda), 2011 55, 203, 221, 229
Black, J 31
‘Black Wednesday’ (September 1992) 1, 63, 64
BsF see Building Schools for the Future (BsF) programme
Building Schools for the Future (BsF) programme 7, 40, 59, 71, 213, 247
and community-analogue model 41–2
partnering 144–5
and waste PFIs 213–22
Business Services Association 233
Cabinet Office 52, 73, 74, 142, 262, 264
Public–private partnerships and the law

- Efficiency and Reform Group 72, 165, 262
- policy note 112, 113, 114
- and practical issues 111–12
- care, ethic of see ethic of care
- Care Quality Commission 166
- care-givers and care-receivers, differences 212
- CBI 187, 233
- CCT (compulsory competitive tendering) 55, 142, 223
- CHP (Community Health Partnership) 94–5
- Civil Service Reform Plan 83
- CLG (Communities and Local Government) 74
- coalition government, UK 69, 233–4
- collective interests 207–58
- and autonomy 221, 231, 248–50
- BsF programme and waste PFIs 213–17
- ethic of care 210–13
- ethical commitments, legal requirements and social changes 222–32
- PPPs and PFIs as tool for structuring public–private relationships 220–22
- transversal policies 230–32
- prioritisation of interests within relationships 210–13
- procedural linkages (social value and well-being) 227–30
- public sector equality duty 224–7
- shifts at centre (reconfiguration of interplays) 217–20
- social value and well-being 227–30
- and solidarity 221, 231, 251–4
- subsidiarity and proximity 251–4
- tensions between institutions and communities 232–44
- and trust 221–2, 231–2, 254–7
- see also communities; institutions
- Committee of Public Accounts (PAC), House of Commons see PAC (Public Accounts Committee), House of Commons communities 10–11
- collective interests 208–13
- community as intermediary level of relationships between contracts and state 41
- community-analogue model see community-analogue model (focus on third parties and ethics)
- contributions to, ethic of care 246–8
- ethic of care 246–8, 260–63
- generalised cooperation 147–9
- and institutions
- BsF programme and waste PFIs 213–17
- clarifying institutions’ ‘powers and communities’ interests 242–4
- PPPs and PFIs as tool for structuring public–private relationships 220–22
- relationships with 209–10
- shifts at centre (reconfiguration of interplays) 217–20
- tensions 232–44
- whether moving in same direction 213–22
- interfaces between institutions, law and communities 1, 36, 43–4
- meaning 31
- multiple belongings 209–10
- and narratives see narratives and communities
- in PPP regulatory space 260–63
- PPPs and PFIs considered as 209
- without shared aims 202–4
- Communities and Local Government (CLG) 74
- Community Health Partnership (CHP) 94–5
- community-analogue model (focus on third parties and ethics) 9, 41–2, 43
- commuters 19, 93–4
- competence, and ethics 211, 212
- competition
- autonomy and solidarity 103
- competitive dialogue 13, 107–8, 109, 110, 111
- cooperation and authority linked to 26–7
- fair 115
- organised 106–16
- and procurement 106–7, 114–15, 116
- complaints, and third parties 188–90
### Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>complexity</td>
<td>109, 115, 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definition of a complex contract</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and formalising of discretion</td>
<td>141–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrative of</td>
<td>141–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP/PFI partnership</td>
<td>108, 109, 141–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risk mapping</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR)</td>
<td>180, 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comptroller and Auditor General</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compulsory competitive tendering (CCT)</td>
<td>55, 142, 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistency</td>
<td>31–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and shared meanings</td>
<td>31–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructing the Team (Latham Report), 1994</td>
<td>65, 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction industry, UK</td>
<td>64–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consultation, third parties</td>
<td>184–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Principles, 186, 191</td>
<td>187–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at level of PPP/PFI projects</td>
<td>187–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limits</td>
<td>187–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no statutory duty to consult in common law</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury consultation leading up to PF2</td>
<td>186–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contingency planning team (CPT)</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contract compliance (linkages)</td>
<td>222–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting State, The (Harden)</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contracts/contract law</td>
<td>103–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autonomy and solidarity, as contractual</td>
<td>103–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>starting point</td>
<td>103–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenges to contract law</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘contract culture’</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contract versus contractual behaviour</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contractual performance, unlikely</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safety net for</td>
<td>173–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enforcement of rights</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and formalisation</td>
<td>38, 102–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and legitimate expectations</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>market contract stereotype</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-legal techniques suggested for</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and responsiveness</td>
<td>37–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on-the-spot exchanges</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see also market-analogue model (focus on contract and responsiveness)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contractual governance</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>133, 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and autonomy</td>
<td>46–60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperation as reclaiming, over performance</td>
<td>139–40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal, from inside</td>
<td>138–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>framing, over PPPs and PFIs</td>
<td>154–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>judicial</td>
<td>154, 172, 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spending of taxpayers’ money</td>
<td>160–68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperation</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority and competition, linked to</td>
<td>26–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generalised</td>
<td>147–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between government and industry</td>
<td>49–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>link with formalisation and protection</td>
<td>149–51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>link with trust and formalisation</td>
<td>104–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and partnership</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as reclaiming control over performance</td>
<td>139–40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordination techniques</td>
<td>25–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competition, cooperation and authority</td>
<td>26–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>law</td>
<td>27–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft law and reflexive processes</td>
<td>29–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corporatism</td>
<td>47, 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cost/benefit analysis</td>
<td>174–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotterrell, R</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courts</td>
<td>168–82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT (contingency planning team)</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig, P</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossrail, funding</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR (Comprehensive Spending Review)</td>
<td>180, 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies, A</td>
<td>4–5, 7, 40, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBFO model (design, build, finance and operate)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deference principle, third parties</td>
<td>177–81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defra see Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>democracy</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Health Network</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Education (DfE)</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)</td>
<td>72, 180, 229, 249–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Environment and Waste PFIs</td>
<td>215, 216, 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bsf programme</td>
<td>215, 216, 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health (DH)</td>
<td>94, 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Social Security</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transport</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental PFI Units</td>
<td>135, 164, 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deregulation, UK</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public–private partnerships and the law

devolvement, PPP policies

devolution

discretion

as ‘antithesis of law’

competition, cooperation and authority

linkage

in contractual performance

exercise of in public interest

formalising

fragmentation

‘hole in the doughnut’ metaphor

and hybridity

legalism

PPPs and PFIs embedded in

and regulatory space

scopes of

standard, ethic of care

see also public authorities

distrust

downwards accountability

Dworkin, R

Economic Advisory Council, UK

Economic Planning Board, UK

Education Funding Agency (EFA)

EFA (Education Funding Agency)

Efficiency and Reform Group (ERG)

equality

Ernst and Young

ethic of care

collective interests

contributions to communities

discretion

standard

ethical components

expansion

flexibility

law, roles and limits

missing dimensions of PPPs and PFIs

narratives and communities

origins within feminism

PPP regulatory space, communities in

as practice and value

prioritisation of interests within

relationships

trust

ethics

ethic of care see ethic of care

ethical commitments, legal

requirements and social changes

need for ethical framework

and third parties

European Monetary System (EMS)

extended accountability

external boundaries

FBC (final business case)

feminism, and ethic of care

final business case (FBC)

financial crises, and public spending

flexibility

and bindingness

ethic of care

flexible structuring

private finance, bringing into public

projects

and stability

formalisation

and contracts

and control

discretion

and elusive certainty

formalised long-term contracts

formalised process, complexity and

legal gaps

limits

link with cooperation and protection

link with trust and formalisation

and management

relationship between PPP parties

soft law and reflexive processes

and trust

4Ps (Public Private Partnership Programme)

fragmentation, link with hybridity and

intermediation

Freedland, M

functionalism

funding, termination

Gateway Process

BsF programme and waste PFIs

Gateway Review

phases

third parties, relationships with PPPs/

PFIs

Yseult Marique - 9781781004555

Downloaded from Elgar Online at 02/20/2019 12:45:13AM via free access
Index

Gershon Review (1999) 71

government contracts, public law 5, 40

Greater Manchester Waste PFI;
investment costs 2, 12, 52, 170, 171

Harden, I 192

Health Committee, House of Commons
232–3, 234

Hellowell, M 234

High Speed I, guarantees 78

highways 53, 86

Hinchingbrooke Health Care NHS Trust
240

HM Customs and Excise, and STEPS 87

Hodge, Margaret 203, 204

horizontal accountability 158

hospitals 
accommodation PPIs (PRIME and
STEPS) 86

failing PFI, knock-on effects 235–42
financial problems 12

guarantees 78

Lewisham Hospital, closure of services
238, 239, 243, 244, 269

Peterborough and Stamford Hospitals
NHS Trust, financial problems 18,
240–42, 249

planning policy 13

promotion and resistance 232–5

South London Healthcare Trust 12,
235, 236–40, 263

House of Commons

select committees 168, 232–3, 234

see also PAC (Public Accounts
Committee), House of Commons;
Transport Committee, House of
Commons

human rights, and public law 4

hybridity 5, 8

and discretion 96

link with fragmentation and
intermediaries 204–6

New Social Contract 39

PPIs as hybrids of public and private
partners 9, 14–16, 20, 30, 50–51, 96

information, limited access to 175–7

Infrastructure UK (IUK) 40, 52, 69, 73,
147, 164, 261

innovation, narrative of 142–4

institutional forms 34

institutions 46–60

BsF and waste PFIs, balance driven by
institutions 213–17

and communities

BsF programme and waste PFIs
213–17

PPIs and PFIs as tool for structuring
public-private relationships
220–22

relationships with 209–10

shifts at centre (reconfiguration of
interplays) 217–20

tensions between 232–44

whether moving in the same
direction 213–22

institutionalisation and Treasury 70–73

interfaces between institutions, law and
communities 36, 43–4

‘powers and communities’ interests,
clarifying 242–4

instrumental programmes 46, 94–6

integration 256–7

interdependence

and contract law 103, 104

highlighted by PSED 182

and solidarity 104, 115

between state and market 68–70

intermediaries 190–2

and fragmentation 204–6

internal organisation, and relational
distance 24–5

interpersonal trust 33

interpretative community 31

James Review 218, 221, 248

joint ventures 95

joint-utility maximisation 104

judicial control 154, 181

procurement decisions 172–3

KPMG 233

Labour Government (1997–2010), UK 2,
67, 68, 70–71, 82, 232

laissez faire policies 47

Lamont, Norman 62
law
coordination techniques 27–30
discretion seen as ‘antithesis of law’ 21
ethic of care 245–6
formal 29
functions 28–9
interfaces between institutions, law and communities 1, 36, 43–4
legal gaps in PPP/PFI partnerships 108 and non-legal techniques 27–9, 46
place in PPPs and PFIs 28
private 38
and public contracts 3–5
public law and accountability 39–41
and regulatory space 59
roles and limits, ethic of care 245–6
soft law and reflexive processes 29–30
LEAN principles, application of 112
European regulations and directives 77–81
legitimate expectations 131, 174, 180, 182
leveraging 231–2
Lewisham Healthcare NHS Trust 238
Lewisham Hospital, closure of services 238, 239, 243, 244, 269
LIFT (Local Improvement Finance Trust) 46, 59, 71, 85, 94–6, 118, 214, 262
companies (LIFTCos) 94, 95, 253
‘express LIFT’ 95–6
linkages 222–4, 245–9, 253, 260, 267–8
contractual 230, 231, 255–6
procedural 227–30
Local Government Association 71–2
Local Government Ombudsman 189–90
local government, UK 46, 54–7
BsF programme and waste PFIs 214
limited autonomy 55, 56, 60
and Partnership for Schools 178, 214
powers 54, 55
relationship with central government 54, 55
ultra vires acts 56, 57
Local Improvement Finance Trust (LIFT) see LIFT (Local Improvement Finance Trust)
Local Improvement Finance Trusts 94
Local Partnerships 40, 110, 164
pragmatism 70, 71–2, 74
London Assembly 90
London Olympics (2012) 92
London Transport Users Committee 93
London Underground Limited (LUL) 91
London Underground PPPs (LU PPPs) 6, 85
from 2003 to 2010 90–94
and commuters 93–4
as complex contractual setting 90–91
discretion in contractual performance 92–3
guarantees 78
implementation 46
investment costs 12
Jubilee Line extension 64
long-lasting lack of investment 20
Office of Rail Regulation 166
see also Metronet (private consortia); Tube Lines
LU PPPs see London Underground PPPs (LU PPPs)
Maastricht criteria 63
Macneil, I 31, 38
Major, John 64
Major Projects Authority (MPA) 72–3, 83, 165, 201
Major Projects Review Group (MPRG) 74
management, and formalisation 126–7
Mapley department, and STEPS 87, 88
market contract stereotype 40
market mechanisms, performance 132–3
market-analogue model (focus on contract and responsiveness) 9, 10, 14, 37–9, 207, 257
in accommodation 86–90
changes and difficulties 89–90
features 86–7
flexible structuring 88–9
and community-analogue model 41
limitations 208
PFIs as 65–7
PRIME and STEPS designed as 86
and state-analogue model 40, 45, 46, 84, 98, 101, 206
summary 43
MEAT (most economically advantageous tender) 107, 108, 122
Metronet (private consortia) 6, 98
failure 12, 91, 92–3, 135, 162
Index

Monitor (healthcare regulator) 236, 240, 241–2, 243, 244
Morgan, B 27
MPA (Major Projects Authority) 72–3, 83, 165, 201
MPRG (Major Projects Review Group) 74
NAO (National Audit Office), UK 7, 119, 233, 240
and English PPPs 54, 58–9, 86
and third parties 160–62, 163
narratives 8–9, 10
and communities see narratives and communities
of complexity 141–2
of innovation 142–4
of partnering 144–6
for PPPs 6–8
public services as 192–4
of responsiveness 194–6
supplementing of legal techniques 97–8
of transparency 197–202
narratives and communities 30–37
autonomy, solidarity and trust 33–5
consistency and shared meanings 31–2
ethic of care 35–7
PPP/PFI partnership 140–49
tensions
ambiguous means 197–202
contracts 194–6
public services as narrative beyond contracting state’s shortcoming 192–4
transparency 197–202
win-win approach 143
narrow accountability 158
National Air Traffic Services (NATS) 51, 75
National Audit Office (NAO) see NAO (National Audit Office), UK
National Coal Board, UK 48
National Economic Development Council, UK 50
National Economic Development Office (NEDO), UK 50
National Enterprise Board, UK 48
National Health Service see NHS
National Infrastructure Plan 73
nationalisation, UK 47, 48
NATS (National Air Traffic Services) 51, 75
NEDO (National Economic Development Office), UK 50
neo-institutional theory 15
New Labour, UK see Labour Government (1997–2010), UK
New Public Contracting 194–5
New Public Management 15
New Social Contract 38, 39, 194, 196, 203, 266
NGOs (non-governmental organisations) 225
NHS (National Health Service)
Hinchingbrooke Health Care NHS Trust 240
implementation of PFIs within 234–5
Lewisham Healthcare NHS Trust 238
Lewisham Hospital, closure of services 238, 239, 243, 244
Peterborough and Stamford Hospitals NHS Trust 18, 240–42, 249
role of private sector within 235
South London Healthcare Trust (SLHT) 12, 235, 236–40, 263
see also Health Committee, House of Commons; hospitals; Primary Care Trusts (PCTs); Private Finance Initiatives (PFIs)
Norman, Jesse 203, 204
OBR (Office for Budget Responsibility) 199
Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR) 199
Office for National Statistics (ONS) 229
Office of Government Commerce (OGC) see OGC (Office of Government Commerce)
Office of Rail Regulation, LU 166
OGC (Office of Government Commerce) 52, 97, 110, 147, 164
and developing supporting institutions 70, 71, 72, 73
Oliver, D 247–8
ombudsmen 189–90
ONS (Office for National Statistics) 229
Open Data White Paper 2012 199
open procurement 13
Public–private partnerships and the law

Open Public Services – White Paper 56, 193
organisational theory 15
Oxfordshire PFI Alert Group 233

PAC (Public Accounts Committee), House of Commons 90, 119 and third parties 160, 161–2, 163
parliamentary accountability 48–9
Parliamentary Ombudsman 190
partnership and cooperation 133
Local Partnerships 40, 70, 71–2, 74, 110, 164
narrative of partnering 144–6
possibility of partnering 266
state-analogue model 40
see also PPP/PFI partners, organising long-term relationships between Partnership for Health 94
Partnership for Schools (PfS) 178, 214, 267
Partnerships UK (PUK) see PUK (Partnerships UK)
patients, as third parties 19
PCTs (Primary Care Trusts) 95
performance changes 134–7
compliance, adjusting 129–40
contactual 92–3, 173–5
cooperation as reclaiming control over 139–40
and discretion 13, 92–3
market mechanisms 132–3
monitoring 133
payment issues 132–4
preserving relationship and protecting parties’ interests 130–32
Private Finance 2 (PF2) 138–9
self-interest, opposition 150
soft services 136–7
stability and flexibility, balance between 134–7
personal trust 33
Peterborough and Stamford Hospitals
NHS Trust, financial problems 18, 240–42, 249
PFI s see Private Finance Initiatives (PFIs)
PfS (Partnership for Schools) 178, 214, 267
Pollock, A 233, 234
polycentricity and differentiation of interests 14, 17–20
PPP Arbiter 162
and London Underground PPPs (LU PPPs) 91, 93, 98
and PPP/PFI partnerships 131–2, 135, 136
PPP/PFI partners, organising long-term relationships between 10, 100–51
autonomy risk identification 124
and solidarity, as contractual starting point 103–4
and value for money 120–21
communities and shared narratives 140–49
narrative of complexity 141–2
narrative of innovation 142–4
narrative of partnering 144–6
complexity 108, 109
compliance, adjusting 129–40
efficient rationality, gaps in implementing 127–9
elaboration of PPPs/PFIs 106–16
formalisation 10, 149–51
discretion and elusive certainty, formalising 114–16
formalised long-term contracts 102–6
formalised process, complexity and legal gaps 108
link with trust and cooperation 104–6
organised competition 106–16
competitive dialogue 13, 107–8, 109, 110, 111
payment issues 132–4
performance compliance, adjusting 129–40
cooperation as reclaiming control over 139–40
payment 132–4
preserving relationship and protecting parties’ interests 130–32
practical issues and informal answers 111–14
preserving relationship and protecting parties’ interests 130–32
relational nexus 116–29, 150
Public finance, bringing into public projects 62–7
construction industry, UK 64–5
investment, infrastructure 64, 65, 66
PFI technique in 1992 65
public deficit 62, 63
Ryrie Rules 63, 64
state failure 62–5
whether PFIs considered as
market-analogue model 65–7

Private Finance Initiatives (PFIs)
accounting difficulties 52
assets 2, 3, 67
central government scrutiny 57
credits 69–70
Departmental PFI Units 135, 164, 233
duration 16
English, rebranded as PPPs in 1997 1
evolution/introduction of 45, 46, 47, 62
framing control over 154–9
hospitals
failing, knock-on effects 235–42
financial problems 12
guarantees 78
Peterborough and Stamford Hospitals NHS Trust, financial problems 18, 240–42, 249
promotion and resistance 232–5
missing dimensions 257–8
mutual commitments of parties under 116
oscillating between market-analogue and state-analogue models 45, 46, 84, 98, 101
paradoxical context of experimentation and routinisation 29
PFI technique in 1992 65
PPP partners, long-term relationships
see PPP/PFI partners, organising long-term relationships between public and private relationships, organisation 6
public projects, investments in 12
as relational contracts 102
relaunching of (December 2012) 3
revision of incentives 53
services 2, 67
structuring role, disappearance 220–21

Treasury consultation leading up to 186–7
Public–private partnerships and the law

as tool for structuring public-private relationships 220–22
transversal policies 230–32
waste see waste PFI
transversal policies 230–32
whether considered as market-analogue model 65–7
working definition 2
see also Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs)
private finance projects (PFPs) 163
private law 38
Private Sector Resource Initiative for the Management of the Estate see PRIME (Private Sector Resource Initiative for the Management of the Estate), 1998
privatisation, UK 47, 49, 63
procurement 4, 13, 24, 62
and organised competition 106–7, 114–15, 116
rejection of bids 170
relational nexus 122
and third parties 170–3
proximity 253–4
PSBP (Priority School Building Programme) 218, 221, 248
PSBR (Public Sector Borrowing Requirement), UK 63, 68
PSC (Public Sector Comparator) 103, 120, 121
PSED (public sector equality duty) 177, 181, 182, 223, 245, 251, 268
procedural requirements transformed into substantial equity 224–7
Public Accounts Committee (PAC) see PAC (Public Accounts Committee), House of Commons
public authorities 17, 100, 103, 153, 191
accountability see accountability
balancing of interests 30–31, 50–51, 83, 210
discretion see discretion
objectives and powers 3, 5
relationships 13–14
public contracts, and law 3–5
public law
and accountability 4, 39–41
government contracts 5, 40
see also state-analogue model (focus on public law and accountability)
Public Private Partnership Programme (4Ps) 71–2
Public Sector Borrowing Requirement (PSBR), UK 63, 68
Public Sector Comparator (PSC) 103, 120, 121
public sector equality duty (PSED) see PSED (public sector equality duty)
public services
comparison of New Labour and coalition government policies 193
as narrative 192–4
versus public infrastructures 194
social value and wellbeing 227–30
public spending, and financial crises 1–3
Public–Private Partnerships (PPPs) 9–10, 45–99
accounting difficulties 52
audit and value for money 58–9
autonomy and control 46–60
beyond English PPPs 269–71
boundaries, setting 21–3
central and local government relationships 54, 55
and construction industry 64–5
control
audit and value for money 58–9
and autonomy 46–60
procurement 4, 13, 24, 62
and organised competition 106–7, 114–15, 116
rejection of bids 170
relational nexus 122
and third parties 170–3
proximity 253–4
Public–Private Partnerships and the law

Columns Design XML Ltd / Job: Marique_Public_Private_Partnershipsxxxxxxxxxxxxxx / Division: Index /Pg. Position: 10 / Date: 9/7

Yseult Marique - 9781781004555
Downloaded from Elgar Online at 02/20/2019 12:45:13AM via free access
Index

framing control over 154–9
functionalism 82–4
as hybrids of public and private partners
9, 14–16, 20, 30, 50–51, 96
illustrations from English PPPs 84–96
infrastructure underinvestment 61
institutions 46–60
developing supporting institutions 60–77
instrumental programmes 46, 94–6
interfaces between institutions, law and communities 1, 36, 43–4
law and public contracts 3–5
legalism 77–81
local government see local government, UK
London Underground PPPs (2003–10) and commuters 93–4
as complex contractual setting 90–91
discretion in contractual performance 92–3
market-analogue model in accommodation 86–90
whether PFIs considered as 65–7
missing dimensions 257–8
mutual commitments of parties under 116
narrative 8–9
narratives and communities 30–37
autonomy, solidarity and trust 33–5
consistency and shared meanings 31–2
ethic of care 35–7
oscillating between market-analogue and state-analogue models 45, 46, 84, 98
paradoxical context of experimentation and routinisation 29
PFI partners, long-term relationships
see PPP/PFI partners, organising long-term relationships between pragmatism 60–77
private finance, bringing into public projects 62–7
and privatisation 51
public and private relationships, organisation 6
public projects, investments in 12
public spending and financial crises 1–3
regulation 12–44
background 20–25
coordination techniques 25–30
narratives and communities 30–37
tensions in 14–20
regulation models 37–42
community-analogue see
community-analogue model (focus on third parties and ethics)
market-analogue see
market-analogue model (focus on contract and responsiveness)
state-analogue see state-analogue model (focus on public law and accountability)
regulatory space 8, 13, 20–25
concept 21
and discretion 21–3
discretion in PPP regulatory space 96–9
external boundaries 21–3
internal organisation and relational distance 24–5
prior to PPPs and PFIs 47–51
as relational contracts 102
relational distance 20, 24–5
research approach 6–8
standardisation 75–7
state community bridging of state and market 82–4
failure 62–5
interdependence between state and market 68–70
role as enabler 61
tensions
decision-making 17–18
long-term relationships and changing circumstances 14, 16–17
polycentricity and differentiation of interests 14, 17–20
PPPs as hybrids of public and private partners 9, 14–16, 20, 30, 50–51, 96
as tool for structuring public-private relationships 220–22
transversal policies 230–32
Treasury and institutionalisation 70–73
and spending powers 51–4

Yseult Marique - 9781781004555
Downloaded from Elgar Online at 02/20/2019 12:45:13AM via free access
Public–private partnerships and the law

working definition 2
see also Private Finance Initiatives (PFIs)
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