GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORKS AND LEGAL CHALLENGES IN INFRASTRUCTURE PPPS IN INDIA

Nandita Veeresh Mamani, School of Law, CHRIST (Deemed to be University), Bengaluru, Karnataka

Dr. Gopi Ranga Nath V, Professor, School of Law, CHRIST (Deemed to be University), Bengaluru, Karnataka

ABSTRACT

Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs), which combine the resources and knowledge of the public and private sectors, have become a crucial tool for completing infrastructure projects. However, these collaborations are frequently plagued by intricate legal issues and governance structures that might reduce their efficacy. With an emphasis on the consequences for sustainable development and economic progress, this article explores the complex governance frameworks and legal concerns related to infrastructure PPPs. Effective governance frameworks are necessary for PPP projects to be transparent, accountable, and risk-shared fairly. However, jurisdictional conflicts, delays, and inefficiencies frequently result from the interaction of several players, including government agencies, commercial companies, and financiers. PPP implementation and operation are further complicated by legal issues such as unclear contract terms, land acquisition disputes, and regulatory compliance. These problems are made worse by the absence of consistent legal frameworks among countries, which breeds uncertainty and deters involvement from the private sector. By tackling governance and legal obstacles, this study highlights how PPPs can hasten infrastructure development and support national economic objectives—as long as strong frameworks are implemented and upheld.

Keywords: Infrastructure, governance, legal issues, PPPs, sustainable development

I. INTRODUCTION

Infrastructure development is essential to social advancement, economic expansion, and national competitiveness. A country's economy is a foundation comprised of its roads, highways, bridges, airports, railroads, power plants, and water supply networks, which enable trade, investment, and industrialization. But for governments, especially in developing nations, such projects' size, complexity, and capital intensity present formidable obstacles. Due to bureaucratic hold-ups, ineffective procurement procedures, and financial restrictions, traditional public sector financing channels frequently fall short. As a result, governments everywhere have looked for creative ways to deal with these limitations, and Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) have emerged as a strong substitute**.** One of India's fastest-growing economies mainly depends on these collaborations to start the nation's infrastructure development. In terms of emerging countries, India has become the biggest market for PPP projects, according to the World Bank Report. Although the term "public-private partnership" is frequently used globally, there isn't universal agreement on what qualifies as a PPP. In its broadest sense, PPP refers to agreements, usually medium- to long-term, between the public and private sectors whereby the private sector provides some of the services that fall under the purview of the public sector, with a clear understanding of common goals for the provision of public services and/or public infrastructure. A thorough examination of the long-term development goals and risk distribution is necessary to establish a partnership. The legal framework must also be able to oversee and control the outputs and services rendered and sufficiently support this new form of service delivery. The PPP is frequently called a joint venture when the government and one or more private sector businesses collaborate to fund and run a government service or private business endeavor.

II. DEFINITION AND TYPES OF PPP MODELS

Although the term "public-private partnership" is frequently used globally, there isn't universal agreement on what exactly qualifies as a PPP. In its broadest sense, PPP refers to agreements, usually medium- to long-term, between the public and private sectors whereby the private sector provides some of the services that fall under the purview of the public sector, with a clear understanding of common goals for the provision of public services and/or public infrastructure. A thorough examination of the long-term development goals and risk distribution is necessary to establish a partnership[1].

The National Development and Reform Commission defines the PPP model in its "Guiding Opinions of the National Development and Reform Commission on Public-Private Partnership" (NDRC Investment No.2724, 2014). It refers to the long-term partnership, benefit sharing, and risk sharing formed by the government and social capital through franchises, service purchases, equity partnerships, and other means to increase the supply capacity of public goods and services and improve supply efficiency[2].

Types of PPP models:

The project's particular requirements, the way risk is distributed, and the partners' long-term goals all influence PPP models. The primary PPP model types and how they operate are listed below:

1) Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT)

For a predetermined amount of time, a private organization is given the authority to plan, develop, fund, run, and maintain a public infrastructure project. The commercial business turns over ownership and operations to the public sector at the end of the agreement's term, usually 20 to 30 years.

Design and Build: The private sector creates and builds the infrastructure.

Operate and Maintain: Throughout the contract term, the private sector operates and maintains the infrastructure, guaranteeing its sustainability and correct operation.

Transfer: The asset is given to the government after the contract time, typically subject to the terms of the agreement.

Revenue: The private sector recoups its investment through revenue-generating mechanisms like government availability payments, user fees (like tolls on highways), or a combination of

[1] Mouraviev, N., Kakabadse, N.K., Mouraviev, N. and Kakabadse, N.K., 2017. PPP meanings and forms: A critical appraisal, Public–Private Partnerships: Policy and Governance Challenges Facing Kazakhstan and Russia, pp.1-16.
[2] Rashmi Nagpal, Governance in PPP Model of Infrastructure Projects in India: Issues and Challenges, 1 J. on GOVERNANCE 850 (2013). Available at https://heinonline-org-christuniversity.knimbus.com/HOL/License--

both[3]. In **Delhi-Noida Toll Bridge Company Ltd. v. Federation of Noida Residents Welfare Associations (2018)**[4]case held that the concessionaire running the Delhi-Noida toll bridge under a BOT deal was at issue. The toll collection was challenged by locals, who said it was too high and the project had already made a healthy profit.

After the concessionaire had recovered the project cost and made a reasonable profit, the Supreme Court ruled that it was unacceptable to continue collecting tolls.

The court emphasized the need to be open and honest about concession agreements and safeguarding the public interest. This case emphasized how BOT projects balance public interest and private profits.

2) Build-own-operate (BOO)

In a public-private partnership (PPP) framework known as the Build-Own-Operate (BOO) model, a private company assumes full responsibility for the development, ownership, and ongoing management of a project or facility. Ownership is not returned to the government or public body, unlike the Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) concept. The government provides regulatory control to guarantee the public interest, while the private sector finances, constructs, and runs the project. BOO projects are frequently found in industrial zones, telecommunications networks, and power plants.

In this arrangement, the private organization bears all operational and financial risks and makes money through user fees, service charges, or other means. Instead of funding the project or assuming control, the public sector establishes a favorable legal and regulatory environment.

<u>Eligibility of tax benefits</u>

GVK Industries Ltd. v. Income Tax Officer (2011)[5]

Under Section 80-IA of the Income Tax Act, GVK Industries Ltd., a private company running a power production facility using the BOO model, asserted tax benefits as an infrastructure

[3] Vasileva, A. and Ignjatijević, S., 2020. BOT (Build-Operatetransfer) Projects as a Successful Model of Public-Private Partnership. Revizor, *23*(91-92), pp.23-36.
[4] PIL No. 60214 of 2012
[5] (2011) 4SCC 36

developer in this historic case. This was challenged by the Income Tax Department, which claimed that ownership and operation under the BOO model were ineligible for these advantages.

The Supreme Court ruled in favor of GVK Industries, finding that if they meet the legal conditions, infrastructure projects developed utilizing the BOO model are eligible for tax benefits. This decision encouraged private sector participation in the construction of essential infrastructure by establishing that BOO operators may be regarded as infrastructure developers.

3) Build-develop-operate (BDO)

In a public-private partnership (PPP) arrangement known as the Build-Develop-Operate (BDO) model, a private company is responsible for building, developing, and running a project, usually involving real estate or infrastructure. The private partner maintains long-term operational control and frequently leases or owns an interest in the developed property, unlike the Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) model. According to this model, the private company builds the infrastructure or land, offers the related services, and makes money through lease payments, user fees, or profit-sharing agreements with the government. In addition to ensuring regulatory compliance, the public sector may contribute land or grant first approvals to support the project.

Requirement of BDO agreement

LIC Housing Finance Ltd. v. P.C. Suneja[6]

The development and operational management of a real estate project under a BDO arrangement were central to this case's conflict. To build and manage residential units, LIC Housing Finance Ltd. teamed up with a private developer; nonetheless, disagreements emerged over revenue-sharing and lease conditions. The Supreme Court stressed that the conditions of the BDO agreement must be clear, fair, and rigorously followed by all parties. It emphasized how crucial it is to ensure corporate interests don't override the public interest, particularly in housing projects or vital infrastructure.

[6] CS No.7268/16

4) Build-transfer-Operate (BTO)

One kind of PPP is the Build-Transfer-Operate (BTO) model, in which a private company finances, plans, and builds a project before handing it over to the government or other public authority. Following the handover, the private organization uses a long-term lease or concession agreement to run and maintain the facility. The government retains ownership while the commercial partner generates income through user fees, service charges, or annuities for project operations. The BTO model, which balances public ownership and private sector efficiency and knowledge, is frequently applied in industries like transportation, energy, and water supply.

5) Build-own-operate-transfer (BOOT)

A public-private partnership (PPP) structure known as the Build-Own-Operate-Transfer (BOOT) model assigns a private company the responsibility of funding, building, owning, and running a project for a predetermined concession time. The private partner makes money through user or service fees to recoup its investment and turn a profit during this time. At no extra expense, ownership of the infrastructure is passed to the public body after the concession period[7]. This strategy is frequently employed in infrastructure sectors where significant private investment is needed and ultimate public ownership is sought, such as power plants, highways, and airports.

Significance of concession agreements

Konkan Railway Corporation Ltd. v. Mehul Construction Co. (2000)[8]

In this instance, a BOOT agreement was signed by the Konkan Railway Corporation for the building and running of railroad lines. Conflicts emerged over revenue-sharing plans and construction delays. The Bombay High Court ruled that BOOT agreements must precisely specify timetables, revenue models, and risk-sharing procedures to prevent misunderstandings and disagreements. To maintain a just balance between the interests of the public and private

[7] Bashiri, M., Ebrahimi, S., Fazlali, M., Hosseini, S.J., Jamal, N. and Salehvand, P., 2011. Analytical comparison between BOT, BOOT, and PPP project delivery systems. In 6th International Project Management Conference.

[8] 2ooo (7) SCC 201

sectors, it underlined the significance of abiding by concession agreements and arbitration clauses for dispute settlement.

BOOT agreements

GMR Hyderabad International Airport Ltd. v. Union of India (2014)[9]

In this case, the Hyderabad International Airport was being developed through a BOOT project. The private concessionaire GMR contested certain government acts that affected the agreed revenue model. The court determined that the government must adhere to the contract's provisions and maintain the concessionaire's rights under the BOOT agreement. The ruling emphasized the value of a stable policy environment for private investors and reaffirmed the integrity of BOOT agreements.

III.REGULATORY AND LEGAL MECHANISMS GOVERNING PPPs IN INDIA

In India, public-private partnerships, or PPPs, have emerged as a key component of infrastructure development, allowing the public and private sectors to pool their resources, knowledge, and creativity to meet the country's expanding infrastructure needs. It takes a strong legal and regulatory framework to support these partnerships. An organized approach to project planning, execution, and conflict resolution is provided by this framework, which also outlines the roles, responsibilities, and obligations of stakeholders and creates risk-sharing systems.

PPPs in India are governed by a combination of sector-specific laws, model concession agreements (MCAs), regulatory guidelines, and constitutional provisions. Roads, railroads, electricity, airports, and urban development are just a few of the many industries it covers, guaranteeing harmony with both national aims and economic objectives. The Public-Private Partnership Appraisal Committee (PPPAC) and specialized PPP cells are institutional mechanisms that ensure the smooth implementation of PPP projects, while critical legal tools like the Indian Contract Act, 1872, Land Acquisition Act, 2013, and sectoral laws like the Electricity Act, 2003, serve as the foundation for PPP projects[10].

The intricacy of PPPs, however, calls for a flexible regulatory framework to handle issues,

---

[9] WP No. 3780

[10] Datta, A., 2009. Public-private partnerships in India: a case for reform?. Economic and Political Weekly, pp.73-78.

including funding risks, land acquisition conflicts, and adherence to social and environmental norms. India's framework also aims to attract foreign investment by offering incentives such as Viability Gap Funding (VGF) and integrating international best practices.

The framework for a more thorough examination of the governance procedures, legal subtleties, and regulatory obstacles that affect PPP project performance in India is established by this introduction.

The Model Concession Agreements (MCAs) and the National PPP Policy are essential to effectively executing PPPs in India's infrastructure industry. These tools give public authorities and private organizations the legal and administrative framework they need to work together, guaranteeing that projects are carried out effectively, openly, and sustainably[11].

The National PPP Policy is a thorough framework intended to direct the planning, execution, and administration of PPP projects. It eliminates uncertainty in project planning and execution by standardizing processes across multiple industries. The policy fosters engagement from the private sector by outlining roles, duties, and risk-sharing procedures. Furthermore, it encourages investment by providing financial incentives for economically necessary but financially unviable initiatives, such as Viability Gap Funding (VGF). The policy also highlights the necessity of capacity building through establishing PPP cells at the state and federal levels to improve institutional skills for project management and monitoring.

Model Concession Agreements (MCAs) further enhance the PPP system, which offers standardized templates for PPP contracts. These agreements address the unique requirements of different infrastructure sectors while guaranteeing consistency and legal accuracy across projects. By outlining crucial parameters, including project scope, payment procedures, termination clauses, and dispute resolution procedures, MCAs expedite the project creation process. Their focus on fair risk distribution reduces disputes and increases stakeholder trust. MCAs improve project implementation efficiency by reducing the time and expense of contract negotiations.

The foundation of India's PPP framework comprises the National PPP Policy and MCAs, which together address the issues of funding, risk management, and regulatory compliance. In the

[11] Xu, Y., Skibniewski, M.J., Zhang, Y., Chan, A.P. and Yeung, J.F., 2012. Developing a concession pricing model for PPP highway projects. International Journal of Strategic Property Management, *16*(2), pp.201-217.

end, they support the country's economic growth and development by boosting investor confidence and fortifying governance in the infrastructure sector.

IV. CHALLENGES IN THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Although PPPs are essential for meeting infrastructure demands, their legal framework frequently faces obstacles that could make them less successful. These difficulties result from intricate structural, procedural, and regulatory issues that impact risk management, stakeholder coordination, and project execution.

-The absence of consistency in the rules governing PPPs between states and sectors is one of the main obstacles. The lack of specific national PPP legislation results in inconsistencies, which cause jurisdictional conflicts and procedural ambiguities, even if the Indian Contract Act of 1872 and sector-specific laws provide a foundation. The approval and execution of projects are frequently delayed due to this ambiguity[12]. Multiple government authorities' permissions are frequently needed for PPP projects, which causes bureaucratic delays. The absence of a simplified approval process raises transaction costs and deters involvement from the private sector.

-PPP contracts are long-term arrangements frequently needing to be renegotiated because of shifting political and economic circumstances. However, numerous conflicts and stopped projects are caused by inadequate enforcement mechanisms and a lack of standardized contractual clauses.

-In India, PPPs are governed by several regulatory bodies, which causes jurisdictional overlaps and a lack of cooperation. Decision-making is delayed and inefficient when there is no one nodal entity to supervise PPP projects.

-PPP success depends on transparency, but infrastructure projects are frequently beset by corruption and opaque decision-making procedures. The legal framework does not sufficiently protect favoritism, unfair bidding procedures, and conflicts of interest in PPP agreements.

-Due to political and administrative meddling in contract negotiations, approvals, and

[12] Batjargal, T. and Zhang, M., 2021. Review of key challenges in public-private partnership implementation. Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development, *5*(2), p.1378.

implementation, PPP projects encounter obstacles. The legal framework's insufficient protection against politically influenced agreement modifications impacts the durability of projects and investor trust.

-Another significant obstacle is acquiring land. The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation, and Resettlement Act, 2013 was passed, yet land-related conflicts are still common. These disagreements discourage the private sector from participating in projects by raising costs and delaying schedules.

-The lack of efficient dispute settlement procedures. Delays in settlement frequently irritate project stakeholders despite the Arbitration and Conciliation Act of 1996 providing a framework for arbitration. Many judicial and arbitral organizations lack sector-specific competence, which exacerbates this problem.

-The unequal distribution of risk between public and private partners is another important problem. Model Concession Agreements (MCAs) and other standardized contracts frequently overlook dynamic risks like shifting laws, economic situations, or unanticipated catastrophes like pandemics. This deters private investment and produces financial uncertainty.

-The need for social and environmental compliance also makes PPP projects more complex. Even though these rules are necessary for sustainable development, it can be difficult and time-consuming to go through several approvals and environmental clearances[13].

-Finally, the lack of institutional capacity at the state and municipal levels impacts the design and implementation of PPP projects. Project governance is inefficient because many agencies lack the resources and experience necessary to create and oversee complicated contracts.

A comprehensive strategy is needed to address these issues, including creating a specific national PPP law, efficient dispute resolution procedures, fair risk-sharing schemes, and capacity-building programs. Implementing such measures is the only way to strengthen the legislative framework for PPPs in the infrastructure sector and satisfy India's developmental goals.

---

[13] Antara Mishra, Issues and Challenges in Infrastructure Project Based on PPP Model, 2 JUS CORPUS L.J. 88 (2022). Available at https://heinonline-org-christuniversity.knimbus.com/HOL/License--

V. JUDICIAL INTERVENTION AND PRECEDENTS

- **Delhi Airport Metro Express Pvt. Ltd. v. Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Ltd.[14]**

  Facts: A concession agreement was made between the government-owned Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Ltd. (DMRC) and Delhi Airport Metro Express Pvt. Ltd. (DAMEPL), a division of Reliance Infrastructure, for the planning, building, running, and upkeep of the Airport Metro Line in Delhi using a PPP model.

  Issue: The main question was whether Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Ltd. (DMRC), the public partner, had violated the concession agreement by neglecting to provide a civil structure free of defects, compromising the PPP model's core risk-sharing principles.

  Decision: The Supreme Court of India established a precedent for upholding private party autonomy in PPPs by ruling that contractual provisions shall be enforced unless they conflict with public policy.

- **Bangalore International Airport Limited v. Karnataka State Industrial Investment and Development Corporation [15]**

  Facts: The Kempegowda International Airport in Bengaluru was developed, run, and managed by Bangalore International Airport Limited (BIAL), a PPP organization. The Karnataka State Industrial Investment and Development Corporation (KSIIDC) and other government and business organizations were among the players in the project.

  Issue: The main concern was whether BIAL, a PPP organization overseeing public funds and investments, followed the rules of accountability, transparency, and equity in its actions and choices.

  Decision: The Karnataka High Court underlined that PPP organizations in charge of public resources must maintain decision-making processes' transparency and be held to higher levels of responsibility and further held that the choices involving public funds had to be in line with the expectations of stakeholders and the general public. It ordered

---

[14] AIRONLINE 2021 SC 708

[15] AIR 2010(NOC) 729 (KAR),2010 (2) AIR KANT HCR 381

BIAL to reply to KSIIDC's concerns and guarantee adherence to governance standards.

- **Reliance Airport Developers Pvt. Ltd. v. Airports Authority of India [16]**

  Facts: To modernize Delhi and Mumbai airports using a PPP model, the Airports Authority of India (AAI) requested bids.

  The tendering procedure was contested by Reliance Airport Developers, who claimed procedural errors, partiality, and lack of openness.

  Issue: Whether the tendering and bidding process for PPP projects adhered to fairness, transparency, and competitive neutrality principles.

  Decision: The process was affirmed by the Supreme Court, which confirmed that the AAI complied with transparency regulations and followed the correct procedures. The Court stressed the importance of keeping the playing field equal in PPPs.

- **Narmada Bachao Andolan v. Union of India[17] (2000)**

  Facts: The Sardar Sarovar Dam project, carried out under a PPP model, encountered difficulties concerning environmental issues, displaced people, and rehabilitating those impacted. The initiative, according to activists, broke human rights and environmental laws.

  Issues: Whether the PPP project balanced development goals with environmental sustainability and social justice.

  Decision: The Supreme Court emphasized the necessity of balancing public and private interests in PPPs by permitting the project to move forward while requiring strict adherence to environmental protections and appropriate rehabilitation measures.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **The Kelkar Committee**

[16] 2006(10) SCC 1
[17] AIR 2000 SC 3751

The Kelkar Committee, formally called the Committee on Infrastructure, was established in 2012 to make recommendations for Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) and other actions to enhance infrastructure development in India[18]. The following are the leading suggestions about PPP governance structures and legal issues:

1. To reduce delays and enhance project execution schedules, the committee suggested streamlining and expediting the federal and state approval processes for PPP projects.

2.It highlighted a transparent and equitable distribution of risk between the public and private sectors. While the private sector should face the risks associated with building and operations, the public sector should bear the risks associated with land acquisition and regulatory changes.

3. To attract private investors to infrastructure projects—especially those that are not commercially viable but are crucial for the general welfare—the committee suggested expanding Viability Gap Funding.

4.It recommended establishing a centralized PPP unit to expedite project management, policy creation, and capacity building, and it called for bolstering PPP-related organizations like the PPP Appraisal Committee (PPPAC).

5. The committee suggested creating a model PPP law that would serve as a template for all infrastructure projects, eliminate legal ambiguities, and create a clear, open, uniform legal and regulatory framework for PPPs.

6. To resolve conflicts between public and private partners promptly and effectively, the committee recommended establishing specialized dispute resolution procedures, such as Arbitration Tribunals.

7. The committee emphasized the necessity of reforming land acquisition legislation to speed up procedures while guaranteeing just compensation and rehabilitation, acknowledging the difficulties in land acquisition.

[18] Supra note 13

8. To draw in long-term investments in infrastructure, the committee suggested looking at cutting-edge financing options such as Public Debt Market instruments and Infrastructure Investment Trusts (InvITs).

2. Guidelines of the Planning Commission (Twelfth Five-Year Plan):

To minimize duplication and optimize utility, integrated planning strongly emphasized matching PPP projects with regional and national infrastructure priorities. Building Capacity: It is advised that government representatives receive training to assess and oversee PPP projects more effectively.

Standardized Agreements: To reduce uncertainty in contract terms, it was recommended that Model Concession Agreements (MCAs) be used consistently throughout sectors.

Monitoring and Evaluation: Promoted independent monitoring systems to guarantee on-time project completion and conformity to quality requirements.

3.PPP Reports from NITI Aayog:

Sector-Specific Regulations: promoted PPP policies designed to address the particular difficulties industries face, like urban development, energy, and transportation. Frameworks for Risk Assessment: To increase project viability, it is advised to create strong risk assessment and allocation frameworks.

To address the problems of underfunding and financial distress, financial resilience advocated for improved financial structuring, particularly hybrid annuity models (HAM).

CONCLUSION

The legal framework and governance challenges in Indian infrastructure Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) are dynamic yet complicated. As PPPs have come to the forefront as an essential vehicle for infrastructure development, such partnerships' success relies heavily on a sound legal and regulatory framework that is balanced to meet both public and private interests. India has made significant progress in creating a formal PPP governance framework, including institutional procedures, policy directives, and legislative actions. Nevertheless, regulatory ambiguities, contract disagreements, and worries about risk distribution and project viability are still obstacles. Investor confidence and project success are impacted by inefficiencies and protracted litigations frequently resulting from the lack of a comprehensive PPP statute and sector-specific legal discrepancies.

Furthermore, problems, including budgetary limitations, bureaucratic inefficiencies, and difficulties in acquiring land, prevent PPP projects from being implemented smoothly. To maintain PPPs' long-term survival, it is still essential to have a straightforward dispute resolution procedure, open procurement procedures, and improved stakeholder participation. Reforms must prioritize promoting public accountability, expediting regulatory approvals, and guaranteeing the fair allocation of risks and benefits to fortify the governance structure. The effectiveness and appeal of PPPs in India can be significantly increased by implementing international best practices and creating a unified legal framework.

References

Antara Mishra, Issues and Challenges in Infrastructure Project Based on PPP Model, 2 JUS CORPUS L.J. 88 (2022). Available at https://heinonline-org-christuniversity.knimbus.com/HOL/License

Bashiri, M., Ebrahimi, S., Fazlali, M., Hosseini, S.J., Jamal, N. and Salehvand, P., 2011. Analytical comparison between BOT, BOOT, and PPP project delivery systems. In 6th International Project Management Conference

Batjargal, T. and Zhang, M., 2021. Review of key challenges in public-private partnership implementation. Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development, *5*(2), p.1378.

Datta, A., 2009. Public-private partnerships in India: a case for reform?. Economic and Political Weekly, pp.73-78.

Mouraviev, N., Kakabadse, N.K., Mouraviev, N. and Kakabadse, N.K., 2017. PPP meanings and forms: A critical appraisal, Public–Private Partnerships: Policy and Governance Challenges Facing Kazakhstan and Russia, pp.1-16.

Rashmi Nagpal, Governance in PPP Model of Infrastructure Projects in India: Issues and Challenges, 1 J. on GOVERNANCE 850 (2013). Available at https://heinonline-org-christuniversity.knimbus.com/HOL/License

Vasileva, A. and Ignjatijević, S., 2020. BOT (Build-Operatetransfer) Projects as a Successful Model of Public-Private Partnership. Revizor, *23*(91-92), pp.23-36.

Xu, Y., Skibniewski, M.J., Zhang, Y., Chan, A.P. and Yeung, J.F., 2012. Developing a concession pricing model for PPP highway projects. International Journal of Strategic Property Management, *16*(2), pp.201-217