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 PPFs 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
Efficiency and Reform Group 72, 165, 262
policy note 112, 113, 114
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

complexity
definition of a complex contract 109
and formalising of discretion 115–16
narrative of 141–2
PPP/PFI partnership 108, 109, 141–2
risk mapping 123
Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) 180, 217
Comptroller and Auditor General 161
compulsory competitive tendering (CCT) 55, 142, 223
consistency 231, 247
and shared meanings 31–2
Constructing the Team (Latham Report), 1994 65, 144
construction industry, UK 64–5
consultation, third parties 184–8
Consultation Principles 186, 191
at level of PPP/PFI projects 187
limits 187–8
no statutory duty to consult in common law 185
Treasury consultation leading up to PF2 186–7
contingency planning team (CPT) 241
contract compliance (linkages) 222–3
Contracting State, The (Harden) 192
contracts/contract law
autonomy and solidarity, as contractual starting point 103–4
challenges to contract law 17
‘contract culture’ 119
contract versus contractual behaviour 102
contractual performance, unlikely safety net for 173–5
enforcement of rights 104
and formalisation 38, 102–6
and legitimate expectations 131
market contract stereotype 40
non-legal techniques suggested for 105
and responsiveness 37–9
on-the-spot exchanges 128
see also market-analogue model (focus on contract and responsiveness)
contractual governance 38
control 2, 133, 154
and autonomy 46–60
cooperation as reclaiming, over performance 139–40
formal, from inside 138–9
framing, over PPPs and PFIs 154–9
judicial 154, 172, 181
spending of taxpayers’ money 160–68
collaboration 10, 100
authority and competition, linked to 26–7
generalised 147–9
between government and industry 49–50
link with formalisation and protection 149–51
link with trust and formalisation 104–6
and partnership 133
as reclaiming control over performance 139–40
coordination techniques 25–30
competition, cooperation and authority 26–7
law 27–9
soft law and reflexive processes 29–30
corporatism 47, 209
cost/benefit analysis 174–5
Cutrell, R 166
courts 168–82
CPT (contingency planning team) 241
Craig, P 103
Crossrail, funding 53
CSR (Comprehensive Spending Review) 180, 217
Davies, A 4–5, 7, 40, 105
DBFO model (design, build, finance and operate) 65
deferece principle, third parties 177–81
Defra see Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)
democracy 41
Democratic Health Network 233
Department for Education (DfE) 218
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) 72, 180, 229, 249–50
BsF programme and waste PFIs 215, 216, 219
Department of Health (DH) 94, 237
Department of Social Security 86
Department of Transport 162
Departmental PFI Units 135, 164, 233
deregulation, UK 47

Yseult Marique - 9781781004555
Downloaded from Elgar Online at 05/13/2019 11:40:31AM
via free access
Public–private partnerships and the law

developmental individualism 42
devolved entities, PPP policies 45
discretion
as ‘antithesis of law’ 21
competition, cooperation and authority
linkage 26–7
in contractual performance 92–3
exercise of in public interest 153
formalising 114–16, 127–9
fragmentation 21
‘hole in the doughnut’ metaphor 21–2
and hybridity 96
legalism 77–81
PPPs and PFIs embedded in 12–13
and regulatory space 21–3, 96–9
scopes of 13
standard, ethic of care 244–57
see also public authorities
distrust 35
downwards accountability 158
Dworkin, R 21–2

Economic Advisory Council, UK 50
Economic Planning Board, UK 50
Education Funding Agency (EFA) 218
EFA (Education Funding Agency) 218
Efficiency and Reform Group (ERG) 72, 165, 262
equality 230, 231
Ernst and Young 187
ethic of care 11, 259–71
collective interests 211, 245–8, 257–8
contributions to communities 246–8
discretion standard 244–57
ethical components 211–12
expansion of 211
flexibility 264–7
law, roles and limits 245–6
missing dimensions of PPPs and PFIs, capturing 257–8
narratives and communities 35–7
origins within feminism 211
PPP regulatory space, communities in
260–63
as practice and value 36
prioritisation of interests within
relationships 210–13
trust 267–9
ethics
ethic of care see ethic of care
ethical commitments, legal
requirements and social changes
222–32
need for ethical framework 16
and third parties 41–2
European Monetary System (EMS) 63
extended accountability 158
external boundaries 21–3

FBC (final business case) 178, 217
feminism, and ethic of care 211
final business case (FBC) 178, 217
financial crises, and public spending 1–3
flexibility 10, 11, 20
and bindingness 146
ethic of care 264–7
flexible structuring 88–9
private finance, bringing into public projects 68, 69
and stability 134–7
formalisation 5, 10
and contracts 38
and control 133
discretion 127–9
and elusive certainty 114–16
formalised long-term contracts 102–6
formalised process, complexity and
legal gaps 108
limits 134
link with cooperation and protection
149–51
link with trust and formalisation 104–6
and management 126–7
relationship between PPP parties 27
soft law and reflexive processes 29–30
and trust 35, 126–7
4Ps (Public Private Partnership Programme) 71–2
fragmentation, link with hybridity and
intermediation 204–6
Freedland, M 39, 40
functionalism 82–4
funding, termination 177–81

Gateway Process 40, 73–5, 80, 120, 263
BsF programme and waste PFIs 214–15
Gateway Review 97, 176
phases 74
third parties, relationships with PPPs/
PFIs 165, 167, 168, 176
Index

Gershon Review (1999) 71
Good faith 130

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
PPPs 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
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 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
integrity 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
laissez faire policies 47
Lamont, Norman 62
Public–private partnerships and the law

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
legalist 66
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
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 see 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

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
contractual 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
PPFs 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
Index

risk 123–7
  allocation and sharing benefits 124–6
  and autonomy 124
  identification 124
  and solidarity 124–6
  trust
  link with cooperation and
  formalisation 104–6
  management and formalisation
  126–7
  value for money and trust 119–23
  whether exchange frameworks 117–19
  see also Private Finance Initiatives
  (PFIs); Public-Private
  Partnerships (PPPs)
pragmatism 1, 35, 60–77, 104, 134, 208, 240
PRG (project review group) 74
Price Waterhouse Cooper (PwC) 221
Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) 95
PRIME (Private Sector Resource
Initiative for the Management of the
Estate), 1998 7, 85, 86–90
changes and difficulties 89–90
features 86–7
flexible structuring 88–9
implementation 46
negotiation 87
relational nexus 123
value for money and risk allocation
  88–9
Priority School Building Programme
(PSBP) 218, 221, 248
Prison Ombudsman 190
prisons 86
private contractors, contracts awarded to
  13
Private Finance 2 (PF2) 3, 68, 70, 75, 76,
  97, 101, 261
formal public control from inside
  138–9
‘no service, no payment’ principle 118
PPP/PFI partners, organising long-term
relationships between 117, 118,
  119, 129, 138–9
public shareholding in 148
risk 125–6, 127
third parties, relationships with PPPs/
  PFIs 155, 173, 190
transition from SoPC4 129
Treasury consultation leading up to
  186–7
private 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
Public–private partnerships and the law

as tool for structuring public-private relationships 220–22
transversal policies 230–32
waste see waste PFIs
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
proceduralisation 41
of control 73–5
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
proceduralisation of 73–5
coordination techniques 25–30
competition, cooperation and authority 26–7
law 27–9
soft law and reflexive processes 29–30
developing supporting institutions 60–77
discretion see discretion
distinctiveness of English 270–71
duration 16
economic planning policy 13
English 1, 45–99
beyond 269–71
distinctiveness 270–71
illustrations from 84–96
evolution/introduction of 45, 46, 47
Executive 51–4
forms 2
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
302  

Public–private partnerships and the law

- working definition 2
  
  see also Private Finance Initiatives (PFIs)
- PUK (Partnerships UK) 40, 52, 70, 71, 72, 84, 94, 147
- third parties, relationships with PPPs/ PFIs 164, 165
- PwC (Price Waterhouse Cooper) 221
- Quality Management System, performance 133
- RAF (risk assessment framework) 241
- ratepayers, as third parties 19
- rationality, efficient, gaps in implementing 127–9
- redress, and third parties 188–90
- reflexive processes, and soft law 29–30
- 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
- communities in PPP regulatory space 260–63
- concept 21, 45
- and discretion 21–3, 96–9
- as dynamic 30
- English, prior to PPPs and PFIs 47–51
- external boundaries 21–3
- government and industry, cooperation between 49–50
- and law 59
- relational contract theory 16, 38
- relational distance
  
  concept 20, 24
  
  and internal organisation 24–5
- relational theory 102, 103, 117
- reliability 254–7
- re-regulation, UK 47
- research approach 6–8
- responsibility, and ethics 211, 212
- responsiveness
  
  and contracts 37–9
  
  and ethics 211, 212, 252
- issues raised by 195–6
- narrative of 194–6
- and transparency 198
  
  see also market-analogue model (focus on contract and responsiveness)
- restricted procurement 13
- Rethinking Construction (Egan Report), 1994 65, 144
- risk
  
  allocation 70
  
  and sharing of risks/benefits 124–6
  
  and value for money 77, 88–9, 101
- and autonomy 124
- clarification 123–7
- identification 124
- PPP/PFI partnership 123–7
- and solidarity 124–6
- risk assessment framework (RAF) 241
- Rule of Law 41
- Save Lewisham Campaign 263
- school refurbishment programmes 2, 7, 41, 218, 226
  
  see also Building Schools for the Future (BsF) programme
- Secretary of State (SoS) for Communities and Local Government 226–7
- Secretary of State (SoS) for Education 178, 179
- Secretary of State (SoS) for Health 236, 239, 263
- services 2, 67
- closure at Lewisham Hospital 238, 239, 243, 244, 269
  
  discontinuation 255–6
- public see public services soft 136–7
- SHA (Strategic Health Authority) 240
- SLHT see South London Healthcare Trust (SLHT) 236–40
- social values, fragmentation across 164–6
- soft law, and reflexive processes 29–30
- soft services, performance 136–7
- solidarity
  
  and autonomy, as contractual starting point 103–4
  
  and collective interests 221, 231, 251–4
- and interdependence 104, 115
- and judicial control 181–2
Index

link with autonomy and trust 33–5, 36, 37, 98
link with value for money and risk allocation 128
meaning 33
and risk allocation 124–6
subsidiarity and proximity 251–4
and third parties 181–2, 191
and value for money 122–3, 167
South London Healthcare Trust (SLHT), financial problems 12, 235, 236–40, 263
Ipsos/Mori consultation 237–8, 239
special purpose vehicle (SPV) 117, 125, 173
spending
control over spending taxpayers’ money 160–68
public spending and financial crises 1–3
Treasury and spending powers 51–4
SPV (special purpose vehicle) 117, 125, 173
Standardisation of PFI Contracts (SoPC) Version 3 (SoPC3) 75, 76
Standardisation of PFI Contracts (SoPC) Version 4 (SoPC4) 75–7, 97
BsF programme and waste PFIs 214
‘no service, no payment’ principle 118
performance 133, 134, 139
PPP/PFI partners, organising long-term relationships between 101, 117, 118–19, 125, 126, 127, 133
risk 125, 126, 127
third parties, relationships with PFIs 155, 173, 190
transition to PF2 129
state reduction, US 49
state-analogue model (focus on public law and accountability) 9, 10, 14, 39–41, 207, 257
limitations 208
and market-analogue model 40, 45, 46, 84, 98, 101, 206
summary 43
third parties, relationships with PFIs 153
STEPS (Strategic Transfer of the Estate to the Private Sector), 2001 7, 85, 86–90
changes and difficulties 89–90
features 86, 87
flexible structuring 88–9
implementation 46
negotiation 87
value for money and risk allocation 88–9
Strategic Health Authority (SHA) 240
Strategic Transfer of the Estate to the Private Sector see STEPS (Strategic Transfer of the Estate to the Private Sector), 2001
‘Strategy for Growth,’ UK 64
structured arrangement 2
structuring role in PFIs 39, 59
disappearance for PFIs 220–21
subsidiarity, and proximity 251–4
systemic trust 33, 35
third parties
accountability
and regulation 157–9
through multi-centred conversations 160–64
control over spending taxpayers’ money 160–68
courts 168–82
and ethics 41–2
fragmentation and intermediaries 204–6
hybridity, fragmentation and intermediaries 204–6
as individuals 19
information, limited access to 175–7
judicial control 154, 181
lacking relationships with 10
legal protection, limits to 168–82
deference principle 177–81
extremes 182
funding, termination 177–81
information, limited access to 175–7
intermediation 182
judicial control 181
procurement 170–73
self-interest as norm and public interest as exception 170–73
unlikely safety net for contractual performance 173–5
looking for alternative relationships with 155–7
Public–private partnerships and the law

narratives and communities, tensions 192–204
ambiguous means 197–202
communities without shared aims 202–4
contracts 194–6
public services as narrative beyond contracting state’s shortcoming 192–4
transparency 197–202
omitting of interests 166, 208
and participation 159
public authorities as 17
regulation
and accountability 157–9
through VfM expertise and fragmentation across social values 164–6
relationship with PPPs/PFIs 152–206
based on public or private law/ procedural nature 157
lack of contractual relationship 155–7
lack of integrative relationship 153–4
as taxpayers 156
value for money (VfM)
limits of expertise in 167–8
regulation through expertise 164–6
voices 183–92
complaints and redress 188–90
intermediaries 190–92
involvement and consultation 184–8
vulnerability of special groups 156
see also community-analogue model (focus on third parties and ethics)
transparency 115, 203
as ambiguous 201–2
implementation within public sector 201
narrative of 197–202
Transport Committee, House of Commons 90
Transport for London (TfL) 91
transversal pubic policies 230–32
Treasury, British 1, 12–13, 46
and accommodation PFIs 87
consultation leading up to PF2 186–7
and institutionalisation 70–73
and practical issues 111–12
and spending powers 51–4
Taskforce 70, 71
trust 10, 11, 32
and collective interests 221–2, 231–2, 254–7
consequences for PPPs and PFIs 34–5
developing 106
ethic of care 267–9
formalisation 35, 126–7
importance in PPPs and PFIs 105
and judicial control 182
levels of 33, 35
link with autonomy and solidarity 33–5, 36, 37, 98
link with cooperation and formalisation 104–6
link with reliability and integrity 254–7
link with value for money and risk allocation 128–9
meaning 33
sources 34
and third parties 191
and value for money 119–23
TSA (trust special administrator) 236, 238, 239, 242, 255
Tube Lines 6, 12, 91, 92, 93, 98, 135, 162
ultra vires concept, public law 4
underground transportation, adaptations 17
see also London Underground PPPs (LU PPPs)
Unison 233
upwards accountability 158
users, looking for alternative relationships with 155–7
VfM (value for money) 2, 10, 19, 70
as answer mechanism 120–21
and audit 58–9
and autonomy 120–21
concept as benchmark to control public spending 167
economy, efficiency and effectiveness of decisions 58
expertise, regulation through 164–6
limits of expertise in 167–8
and public authorities, assessing 153
as question-raising 122–3
and risk allocation 77, 88–9, 101
and solidarity 122–3, 167

Yseult Marique - 9781781004555
Downloaded from Elgar Online at 05/13/2019 11:40:31AM
via free access
Index

structuring role in PPPs/PFIs 59

taxpayers’ money, use of 58, 60, 207, 259

and trust 119–23

whole-life-cycle notion 122

Vincent-Jones, P 4–5, 7, 8, 38, 39, 41, 103, 104, 105, 158, 194, 195

Waste Infrastructure Delivery Programme (WIDP) 214, 215, 267

waste PFIs 7, 12, 262, 269

and BsF programme 213–22

disclosure of information 176

implementation at local level 59

landfill targets 213–14, 216, 219

trust, fostering of 221–2

withdrawal of projects 53

zero waste policy 219, 220

Whole of Government Accounts (WGA) 198

whole-life-cycle notion, VfM 122

Williamson, O 38

win-win logic 62, 142, 143, 231

Yeung, K 27