

Leveraging Public-Private Partnerships to Fund Infrastructure Projects in India

Sayan Basu

Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Sreegopal Banerjee College, West Bengal, India.

Abstract

India has been afflicted by a severe lack of infrastructure. Because it thinks the public-private partnership (PPP) model is the most effective way to bridge this gap, the Indian government has launched a number of projects in this area. This essay discusses the foundations of PPP and how it functions in India. One of the primary issues is funding for infrastructure. This research paper discusses some of the problems that beset infrastructure finance in India, including an over-reliance on commercial banks for debt repayment, a lack of funding from infrastructure finance firms, difficulties with external commercial borrowing, a lack of mezzanine financing, the partial availability of insurance, pension, and provident funds, and non-financing issues.

Other recent innovations like debt bonds for infrastructure, relaxed regulations for borrowing from the outside world, and equitable departure plans are all examined. The study suggests several financial changes that are required for PPP finance in India, such as raising the cap on funding for viability gaps, permitting balloon payments, permitting foreign direct investment, promoting corporate bonds, and creating infrastructure corps.

Keywords: Public-Private Partnership, Mezzanine Financing, Debt Bonds, Financial Changes, Balloon Payments
JEL Classification: G15, G19, O10, O20, Q15

Corresponding Author: Sayan Basu, Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Sreegopal Banerjee College, West Bengal India.
Email: basusayan19@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Basu S., (2024), Leveraging Public-Private Partnerships to Fund Infrastructure Projects in India., Commerce Research Review 2(1) 100-113.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21844/crr.v2i01.1126>

Source of support: Nil

Conflict of Interest: None

Received: 23-9-2024; **Accepted:** 11-12-2024; **Published:** 20-12-2024

Introduction

According to Goldman Sachs, between 2005 and 2050, the GDP growth rate per capita will be between 7.2% and 8.9%. But one major barrier to India's development has been its inadequate infrastructure. The cost of doing business for Indian manufacturing is increased by 3% to 6% due to inadequate infrastructure. Between 1998 and 2005, India's infrastructure investment averaged just four percent of GDP per year, according to the World Economic Forum.

Although the nation's infrastructure spending more than doubled to 8% of GDP between 2004–2005 and 2009–2010, it was still well below the lofty goal set for the 11th Five Year Plan (FYP) period, which ran from 2007–2012. In contrast, China invests over 20% of its yearly GDP in infrastructure. India's physical infrastructure is now incompatible with the planned expansion because of insufficient levels of infrastructure investment. This lowers capital productivity, increases production costs, and makes the

nation's productive sectors less competitive. As a consequence, India's economy has been and is anticipated to be supply-constrained for some time to come.

The private sector is expected to contribute half of the ambitious US\$1 trillion infrastructure plans for the 12th FYP, which runs from 2012 to 2017. India's infrastructure spending is expected to rise from 5% to 8% of GDP in the 11th FYP period and then to 8% to 11% in the 12th FYP era. Reaching the desired investment as stated in the 12th FYP period plan is fraught with difficulties. The quantity of funds available for infrastructure is constrained by the many demands on budgetary resources, especially in social sectors like basic and preventative healthcare and education. Involving the business community is the solution to this issue since, in addition to supplying the much-needed funding, it also helps to lower costs and boost productivity in an environment of competition.

The public-private partnership (PPP), its variations, and its functioning in India are covered in this article. It also talks about the challenges of funding PPP projects in India and the latest developments in PPP for infrastructure development. The essay ends by outlining the different financial changes required for PPP financing in India, following a discussion of the most recent advancements in infrastructure finance in that nation.

Finance for Infrastructure

Different Infrastructure Finance Types

There are three primary methods for funding infrastructure services: public, corporate, and project finance. Debt financing and equity investment, often known as seed capital, are included in public finance. The government provides these funds through fiscal transfers, general budget reserves, designated reserves, intergovernmental grants, and self-raised funds like licence fees. Fixed income products including revenue bonds and tax-secured bonds backed by project revenue streams, supplier credits, and concession-rate policy loans are used to fund debt. In some circumstances, governments may offer explicit or implicit guarantees for the financing of public debt.

Corporate finance is the method by which companies issue equity financing using retained earnings and shareholders' equity. Commercial bank borrowing, private borrowing, the issuing of fixed income instruments, and subordinated debt, such as convertible debentures and preferred stocks, are all examples of debt financing. These investments, which include commercial paper, can be either short-term or long-term (like corporate obligations).

In essence, project finance consists of investments from companies, the government, and financial organisations that do not have sovereign guarantees, including the India Infrastructure Finance Company Limited (IIFCL) and the Infrastructure Development Finance Corporation (IDFC). The primary revenue source is the toll collected from infrastructure projects.

The majority of the time, project-specific businesses—also referred to as the "project company"—make project finance available, with sponsors holding shares in these businesses. Usually, sponsors provide equity by purchasing shares in the project firm. The debt is fully secured by the revenue stream from the

infrastructure project, which is distributed to lenders via security agreements with trustees.

While corporate and project finance programs benefit the private and club sectors, public finance plans serve the public interest.

Qualities of Infrastructure Financing

Infrastructure projects are not the same as industrial projects or business modernization and expansion initiatives. Fundamentally, infrastructure finance possesses the qualities listed below:

- According to the kind of undertaking, the gestation period for infrastructure finance might range from five to twenty years. The life cycle varies as well, lasting anywhere from 10 to 50 years. Lending institutions face difficulties in managing asset-liability mismatches, which usually persist for five to ten years.
- Despite rare exceptions, a mega-infrastructure project including a PPP necessitates a substantial financial outlay. The Hyderabad Metro Rail, for example, was created under the Public-Private Partnership (PPP) and cost Rs 118 billion during its 35-year licence duration.
- It is dangerous to encourage big investments to be made over extended periods of time. There are many different causes of risk. One instance of technology obsolescence is the state administration's reluctance to support toll collection efforts or to completely eliminate tolls for political reasons. Additional considerations include technology obsolescence (in some industries, such as the telecoms sector), demand uncertainty (as in transportation projects), and environmental changes (working from home made possible by improved information and communication technologies). In an assessment of 210 transport infrastructure projects (including 183 road and 27 rail projects) worldwide, Flyvbjerg discovered that actual traffic for rail projects was, on average, 39.5% less than planned traffic. The median cost escalation rates for rail, bridges and tunnels, and roads were 20.4%, 33.8%, and 44.7%, respectively.
- Exorbitant prices may discourage customers and have the unintended effect of undermining economic growth. Because the project's revenue streams frequently emphasize on the underlying rate of inflation, returns in the present case must be calculated in real terms. Additionally, a larger project returns during the project's first few years of operation decreased the risk for lenders.

Origin of Public-Private Partnership (PPP) and Its Branches

Even though the government has traditionally been in charge of developing infrastructure, the large and widening disparity between infrastructure needs and available resources has resulted in an artificial shortage of high-quality infrastructure facilities. Long phone wait times, inadequate waste treatment facilities, packed roads and bridges, sporadic electrical supply, a shortage of hospitals and educational institutions, and more were all consequences of this problem. These issues consequently result in an increase in accidents, a reduction in production and competitiveness, and substantial expenses for the community. India's then-finance minister stressed that the nation's infrastructure deficit was the most obvious one in the

2004–2005 budget speech. In the 11th FYP, the Planning Commission recognised that the public sector was unable to supply all of the resources required to bridge the infrastructural gap. Therefore, private investment was necessary to cover all of the investment needs. Even while PPPs have become more and more common since then, they are still only used in a select few industries, such as communications, ports, roads, and airports.

The PPP model was developed in the United Kingdom. The UK government developed infrastructure facilities through the Private Finance Initiative and collaboration agreements. A little more than ten years ago, PPPs hardly made an impression on the public. However, in 2004, between 10% and 13% of all public infrastructure funding in the United Kingdom was allocated to Private Finance Initiative projects. For the remainder of the globe, the UK established the standard. The private sector's participation in infrastructure creation, construction, financing, and operation was one of the most important tactics governments used to close the infrastructure gap.

A significant amount of the risk is assumed by the private sector, which is rewarded with performance-linked payments when predefined, quantifiable, and specified performance goals are met. PPPs are generally defined in India as an agreement between a government or statutory entity, government-owned entity, and a private sector entity for the predetermined period of time to provide public assets, related services, or both for the public's benefit through management-made investments or ventures carried out by the private sector entity, or both. Organising, finance, design, and even the upkeep of public infrastructure is more often handled by the private sector than by traditional procurement methods. According to a Deloitte poll, some of the most popular PPP models are as follows:

- Design-build or build-transfer. Under this structure, the government and a business partner sign a contract for the planning and building of a facility that conforms with legal requirements. The government will be responsible for the facility's management and maintenance after it is finished.
- Build, Lease, Transfer. A private sector organisation has a lease on the finished facility. At the conclusion of the lease term, the asset is given to the public sector entity without incurring any further fees. The public sector entity maintains operational control for the duration of the lease.
- Build-transfer-operate or design-build-operate. In this arrangement, the facility is designed, constructed, and run by the private partner for a predetermined amount of time. However, the public-sector organisation is granted title to the new facility after it is completed.
- Design-build-operate-maintain or build-operate-transfer. For a restricted period, this approach combines the build-transfer responsibilities with facility management and upkeep by a private sector partner. At the end of the period, operations responsibility is transferred to the public-sector organisation.
- Create, possess, manage, and distribute. In this instance, the government gives the private partner a licence to fund, plan, construct, and run a facility for a predetermined amount of time. At the conclusion of that time, the facility is returned to the public sector organisation.

- Develop, own, and run. Under this paradigm, the government gives the private sector the authority to own a project and to finance, plan, build, run, and maintain it.
- Create, put together, finance, manage, and keep up. This idea involves a private sector company designing, constructing, funding, running, and/or maintaining a new facility under a long-term lease. The facility is turned over to the public sector organisation at the conclusion of the lease tenure.

The following PPP models for currently available services and facilities were found by the same investigation:

- Get a place to rent. The government grants a leasehold interest in a possession to a private group. The asset is managed and controlled by the private partner in accordance with the terms of the lease.
- Allowing. For a significant period of time, the government gives the private organisation the exclusive right to supply, maintain, and manage an asset in compliance with the performance criteria it has established. Any enhancements made during the concession period are still owned by the private operator, while the asset itself is still owned by the public sector.
- Attitude. An asset may be transferred whole or in part by the government to a private sector organisation. Usually, the government places restrictions on sales that need asset improvements and service delivery.

PPP: Preferred Financing Mode

Under the PPP model, the private sector takes on a bigger part in the planning, funding, designing, building, running, and upkeep of public infrastructure. The individual best prepared to manage the project assumes the risk. Numerous efficiencies have been found in PPP initiatives. A list of a few of them is provided here.

- A decrease in cost surplus. PPP projects are less expensive than those carried out under engineering, procurement, and construction because the concessionaire is urged to employ cost-effective methods during implementation.
- Less distortion of the economy. Around the world, the idea that "user has to pay and polluter also has to pay" is gaining traction. People who do not use infrastructure services pay the same as those who do if they are kept as public commodities (with non-excludability and non-rivalry regulations in place). By allowing the commissioner to only collect fees from clients, PPP removes distortion.
- Efficiency in production and allocation. It is possible to use resources for a particular application more efficiently. By using tried-and-true techniques and offering incentives for innovation, infrastructure can be constructed and run faster, cheaper overall, or both. The most valuable infrastructure upgrades are prioritised over other projects since consumers pay for the services they utilise.
- The effectiveness of society and the economy. More projects can be supported on a fixed capital budget when there are more funds available. Infrastructure development accelerates the accrual of social benefits since the concessionaire is motivated to complete the project considerably ahead of schedule.

and commission it for income generating. Infrastructure accessibility is increased, which leads to an improvement in quality of life.

- Financial prudence. Because of their limited resources, governments tend to overlook fiscal deficit difficulties. As per the 2003 Budget Responsibility and Budget Management Act, a greater share of PPPs in infrastructure construction would aid in reducing the budget deficit.
- The release of entrepreneurial vigour. Nations undergoing transition possess a vast reservoir of untapped entrepreneurial potential. The collaboration between infrastructure service providers and users would promote the nation's economic growth.

PPPs' Operation in India

The Indian administration is currently trying to create the framework necessary for the private sector to make a substantial, either full or partial, contribution to infrastructure development. Concession agreements involving the government and the contractor form the foundation of PPP projects, such as those involving ports, airports, and toll highways. The market drives projects that are exclusively in the private sector, such as telecommunications and merchant power plants. Unless governments are better at implementing and administering PPPs, they don't benefit the system.

Governments must take the initiative to address issues with the PPP model and develop the necessary framework and resources. When switching from the previous procurement paradigm to PPPs, there is a change in attitude, beliefs, and procedural formality. If PPPs were seen as a fair and honest way to attract private investment into public projects that aim to enhance the well-being of all stakeholders, they would be more universally embraced. Over the past ten years, the Indian ministry has made a number of efforts and actions in this field. A discussion of some of them is given below. The information on these efforts comes from the compilation of PPP infrastructure projects and the midterm review of the 11th FYP.

The Committee on Infrastructure's Constitution

The Prime Minister chaired the Committee on Infrastructure when it was established on August 31, 2004. In 2009, it changed its name to the Cabinet Committee on Infrastructure (CCI). The CCI's objective includes creating bodies to maximise the role of PPPs, passing legislation to guarantee the prompt delivery of first-rate infrastructure, and keeping an eye on the status of important projects. Additionally, CCI has started to alter institutions, rules, and procedures.

Announcing Funding for Viability Gaps

To increase the financial sustainability of competitively tendered infrastructure projects and determined to be economically and otherwise justifiable but whose financial returns fell short of the typical threshold, the viability gap funding (VGF) plan was established in 2006. Up to 20% of the capital expenses of PPP projects managed by government agencies may be funded by the central government under the VGF. Up to 20% of the project's running costs may also be reimbursed by the sponsoring organisation. The full VGF for national highway building is provided by the National Highways Authority of India, which gets transfers of excess

cash from the central government. Competitive bidding is supposed to determine each project's VGF support. If all other conditions were met, the project would go to the bidder with the lowest VGF quote.

Committee Empowerment–Institutional Empowerment

An interministerial committee was formed to examine and approve projects in order to receive the VGF grant for PPP projects. The concessionaire's primary financial institution receives the VGF to prevent them from misappropriating the cash or tainting the award process.

The establishment of the India Infrastructure Finance Company Limited took place. Due to the high cost of this kind of financing and the lack of market benchmark rates for obtaining long-term debt, private companies carrying out infrastructure projects under the PPP mode have restricted access to debt funds with longer maturities.

In 2006, IIFCL was founded as a nonbanking organisation to offer long-term loans with the goal of funding infrastructure projects with protracted gestation periods. Up to 20% of the project's costs may be financed by IIFCL through direct lending and refinancing. Subordinated debt, a form of quasi-equity, may make up half of this lending.

Development Fund for Infrastructure Projects in India

Funding is required for preparatory work in the form of advisory services, which include project agreement preparation, project structuring, development costs, and consultant engagement, even though the concessionaire of a PPP initiative bears all project costs (except from VGF). The Indian government's Ministry of Finance established the India Infrastructure Project Development Fund to provide funding for these kinds of uses.

Structure and Example Papers

For a predetermined amount of time, known as the concession period, the concessionaire in PPP projects is granted permission by the government to supply public goods. Generally speaking, this approach included sharing risk and possible liability, operating public utilities and services in a monopolistic manner, leasing or transferring public property, and granting the government additional authority to collect user fees. Due to the involvement of numerous stakeholders, project agreement conditions and the concession awarding bidding process were typically complicated. Decision-making is streamlined and accelerated by standard documents, which also guarantee that the procedure is carried out impartially, openly, and without bias. The planning commission's model concession agreements, which are accessible for various businesses, offer this structure.

New Developments in PPP for Infrastructure Improvement

PPPs are quickly taking the place of other methods as the go-to method for managing and building economically feasible infrastructure projects. However, several Indian sectors, including irrigation projects, healthcare, education, and the upkeep and enhancement of water bodies, have yet to adopt the PPP

model.

States and countries as a whole are still in varying stages of PPP implementation and comprehension. Despite having a thorough framework for PPPs and fifteen years of experience, India's PPP market maturity curve is still in its initial phases. The UK and other nations that have not yet initiated extensive PPP agreements for infrastructure related to defence, healthcare, and education could serve as a model for governments.

Some of the typical mistakes made in the initial stages of the maturity curve, like the tendency to apply the same model to all infrastructure projects, can be avoided.

India is now ready to move into the second stage of the PPP maturity curve thanks to the creation of a robust and all-encompassing framework that includes entities like PPPAC, CCI, and an institution empowered by a committee, as well as clear processes and documentation like model concession agreements, financial institutions and funds like IIFCL, and the India Infrastructure Project Development Fund. Countries in Stage 2 of the PPP market maturity curve are creating dedicated PPP units within their agencies and new hybrid delivery techniques.

A variety of projects and industries are now included in the PPP industry's growth and expansion. Countries are also using new stock market funding sources.

Using increasingly complex risk models, nations at the third stage of the PPP market maturity curve innovate, improve, and sharpen their attention to the undertaking's lifespan chain. Provident funds, insurance companies, pension funds, and private equity firms all contribute to the growth of the intricate infrastructure industry. These changes have not yet been observed in India.

Problems with PPP Project Financing in India

Insufficient Financial Support from Infrastructure Financing Firms

The PPP model's financing of private actors still has a lot of unanswered questions. The private sector borrows more than 70 percent of its resources. To bridge that gap, bank loans need to be made more accessible. The IDFC and IIFCL are thought to be insufficient to meet the sector's expanding financial demands, despite the fact that they are intended to offer long-term financing for infrastructure development.

Insufficient Asset-Liability Analysis and Excessive Reliance on Commercial Banking

Commercial banks increased their financing to the infrastructure sector from thirteen percent of their loan portfolio in 2000 to a third in 2009. Since infrastructure debt financing is usually used for long-term projects, the main issue is the asset-liability mismatch. This issue also affects the private vendor. The developer transfers the burden to the end user due to the project's lengthy gestation period and brief payback period.

Examining certain regulatory concerns related to borrowing from financial institutions and banks is also necessary. Banks are unable to finance long-term financing since they are largely financed by short-term

deposits. Interest rate risk and liquidity risk are two potential consequences of this mismatch. The bank's interest rate risk can be reduced by financing on an ongoing basis; however, the owner of the concession would not be able to assess the project's long-term viability. Additionally, banks and other financial organisations find it difficult to evaluate the reliability of such projects. Furthermore, managing the debt component only through commercial banks is not a smart approach.

As with the manufacturing and agricultural sectors, the banks' credit programs need to take the infrastructure sector's needs into account. Furthermore, it is well understood that long-term responsibilities should be used to finance long-term assets in order to lessen the mismatch between assets and liabilities. Derivative markets are essential for effectively managing the risks connected to long-term infrastructure projects. The derivatives markets in India haven't grown yet, though.

Absence of Mezzanine Funding for Infrastructure Initiatives

In India, mezzanine financing—also known as quasi-equity funding—is still relatively new. Compared to senior lender loans, mezzanine loans have a somewhat higher interest rate. Owing to PPP projects' average debt-to-equity ratio of 70:30, the concessionaire could be charged with using loans to leverage the project. Mezzanine finance has the potential to buck this trend and increase concessionaire accountability. For some Indian private equity firms, mezzanine financing is a novel approach.

Additional Concerns Regarding Infrastructure Financing

The concessionaire, banks, government, project authority, and all other partners face significant challenges when a project is delayed. The erroneous financial projections are caused by various factors, including the lack of prompt redress procedures resulting from project planning and execution delays, the irregularities and delays in policymaking that cause policy paralysis, and the delays in environmental clearance and land acquisition. It has no beneficial effect on stakeholders and raises service rates for end customers. Construction expenses rise because of delays, endangering the ROI. As a result, the project that was before profitable would no longer be feasible.

Recent Advances in India's Infrastructure Finance

The following discusses several recent government-introduced initiatives for improved financing of infrastructure.

Debt Fund For Infrastructure And Takeout Financing

The asset-liability mismatch prevents commercial banks from funding PPP infrastructure projects with 15–20 years payback horizons. The asset-liability mismatch may be resolved if commercial banks are permitted to transfer the loan to another financial institution after five to six years, which often coincides with the project's construction phase. Takeout financing is the term for this strategy. To guarantee that the project receives long-term finance from several lenders, the loan is moved from the financing bank's books to another financial institution (second lender) within the allotted duration, let's say a year from the COD. The money is transferred from the second lender to the first lender.

Generally speaking, IDF makes roughly 10% more than it pays its investors in interest. After deducting operating expenses, the remaining sum is kept as a corpus to pay for any debts arising from nonperforming assets. When lending to project firms, IDF pools all of the bonds; they are not project-specific. IDF was limited to PPP projects that had finished a full year of business operations. Commercial banks would be spared the asset-liability mismatch issue by IDF funding one year after the COD, since PPP projects (like roads) take approximately four to six years to start operating commercially. This is because loans can be shifted from commercial financial institutions to IDF one year after the COD. IDF bonds have been marketed by several financial institutions since 2011. In 2011–2012, the first year of deployment, Rs 30,000 was raised; in 2012–2013, it was roughly Rs 25,000; and in 2013–2014, the target is Rs 500 billion. However, India's Rs 500 billion is not enough to meet the US\$1 trillion infrastructure investment target for the 12th FYP.

Relaxation of External Commercial Borrowing Regulations

The central bank of India relaxed the conditions for construction finance firms looking to get credit from outside commercial sources in January 2013. The amount of money that an infrastructure finance business can borrow abroad without the Reserve Bank of India's approval has increased from 50% to 75%. Additionally, they decreased the percentage of their currency risk exposure that needed hedging from 100% to 75%. However, between March and October 2013, the Indian rupee's increase in value relative to the US dollar would have outweighed the benefit of the trading requirement's lowering.

Secured Credit for the Development of Infrastructure

The Central Bank of India declared in March 2013 that loans owed to borrowers in public-private partnerships (PPPs) might be categorised as secured under certain conditions. The conditions include the requirement that user fees and toll payments be held in an escrow account where senior lenders have priority over concessionaire withdrawals, the right of the senior lender to substitute in the event of concessionaire default, and a predetermined increase in user fees or an extension of the grace period in the event that projected profits fall short of projections.

Reasonable Ways to Leave

The B.K Chaturvedi Committee suggested fair ways of leaving for the concessionaire in PPP road projects in 2009. The idea was to accelerate the capital rotation for construction companies, which would draw more investment for infrastructure projects under the PPP, if the owner companies were permitted to sell their stock holdings to upkeep and operation companies at the end of the construction phase without any lower limit. The same Committee read the ownership change to suggest that the bidders' equity part could drop below 51% at any time up to two years after COD. It further said that each consortium member evaluated for prequalification and short listing in response to the qualification request must hold at least 26% of this equity during the two years following COD. The B K Chaturvedi Committee eased the requirement that the bidder hold any stock after COD, but it still required the bidder to hold 51 percent of the shares for two years after that date. In the end, it was decided that the bidder would keep at least 26 percent of the concession for the two years after COD. In June 2013, the Indian government announced that the bidder for ongoing and completed projects might forfeit all rights.

India Needs Financial Reforms for PPP Financing

Employing Home Savings

More than 30% of India's GDP comes from gross savings at home. In this country, the majority of low-risk, low-return investments are held in bank deposits. The newest choice for investing in assets with a medium risk to return ratio is mutual funds. The stock markets are a high-risk, high-reward investment.

In 2012–2013, household savings amounted to about Rs 10.9 trillion, or seven percent of GDP. It is challenging to promote free investments in IDF bonds when real estate investments are anticipated to generate a high return and mutual funds, which are a little riskier and return-oriented, are predicted to generate a 15% annual return.

Given that equities investors expect a 20% to 25% return on their shares, it becomes fair to assume that household users in construction endeavours expect an income of eight percent plus inflation. Interest rates on IDF bonds could be changed for inflation and a roughly 15-year maturity duration to increase their attractiveness. This would allow for the long-term funding of infrastructure from domestic savings.

Raising the VGF Ceiling

At the moment, VGF may account for as much as forty percent of the project's total cost. The first two phases of the National Highways Development Project, which include high-density routes, are essentially complete in terms of road construction. Compared to the projects in its first two phases, the National Highways Development Project's later phases do not provide as much financial benefit. Only 20,000 km of the approximately 35,000 km of roads were awarded prizes. Just 787 km were awarded in 2012–2013, and not a single kilometre was awarded between April and October of that year. For example, rail and energy projects require significantly longer construction timeframes, significant financial investments, and a long-expected return on investment (about 30 to 40 years). Given this, the project authority would like to enhance concessionaire equity and boost the VGF ceiling from the existing forty percent of the total expense of the project to 49 percent. Indeed, the VGF should be linked to the concessionaire's equity. When there is little ownership component, there is less stake in the outcome. The concession contract should include clauses that ensure a just division of the advantages between the concessionaire and the authority for projects that access the VGF and are anticipated to generate windfall profits.

Permitting Payment by Balloon and Payment by Delayed

Industrial bank loans typically last seven years, therefore the concessionaire must repay both the principal alongside interest within seven years of the project's start date. Rather than searching for takeout funding when the commercial bank loans' terms were up, project finance organisations may decide to fund the project initially while allowing a concessionaire to postpone repayment until the commercial loans are paid off in full. Furthermore, the repayment may be delayed if an inflated payment is used.

Motivation for Corporate Bonds

The 2011 census indicates that, thirty percent of Indians live in cities, and by 2030, that number is predicted to rise to forty percent. However, the current state of the infrastructure—roads, power, drinking water, sanitation, and other amenities—remains well short of the increasing demand. The urban local bodies can only cover less than one-third of the entire funding requirements for the development of infrastructure with their current revenue streams. The stimulus for corporate bonds would supply the required funding for VGF when PPP projects pertaining to urban infrastructure are awarded.

Developing Financial Capability for Government: Requirement for a Transport Infrastructure Corpus

More than half of the cost at the store of petrol and diesel in India is covered by taxes, which are distributed fairly evenly between the federal and state governments. The federal government received Rs 748 billion in revenue from the federal excise tax on petroleum products in 2012–2013. The high petroleum product tariffs should ideally go towards building sustainable, environmentally friendly, and fuel-efficient transportation infrastructure as well as programmes to mitigate the effects of climate change, improve transportation safety, and other related issues. At the federal and state levels, a transport corpus that is largely funded by petroleum product taxes is required in order to supply the monies required for VGF of major transportation projects.

A Comprehensive View of PPP and Its Finance

The state and federal governments share a contemporaneous list of departments and ministries that are primarily in charge of infrastructure; both could make simultaneous contributions. Even while any state government can easily replicate the PPP project framework and boost their investments in Few state governments possess a variety of social and physical infrastructure sectors used PPPs to build infrastructure thus far.

PPP financial concerns are intimately related to many additional problems that impact PPPs and the administrative system in general. Unless succeeding elected governments preserve policy continuity and treat developers properly, developers that invest in long-term PPP projects face a substantial risk. When the government violates the mutually agreed-upon concession agreements without cause, developers must seek immediate remedies in arbitration or court.

Conclusion

PPPs have definitely grown in India. According to the World Bank's PPP Data Update Note 68A, India has consistently ranked highly among countries that receive investment from private parties in infrastructure since 2006. In the first semester of 2011, 43 new projects in India provided over fifty percent of the funding for new business involvement in infrastructure projects for countries that are developing.

The 12th FYP, which runs from 2012 to 2017, has a higher acceleration rate established by the Indian Planning Commission. An estimated ₹ 65 trillion in overall funding will be needed for the 12th FYP, with

roughly ₹ 14.6 trillion in funding shortfalls. The PPP model's structure is quite well-developed, while certain modifications are still necessary. The primary concern has been how to finance infrastructure, aside from the overall slump in the economy. PPPs are increasingly being utilised to award larger contracts, according to recent trends. For instance, the Golden Quadrilateral's current four-lane highways would be converted to six-lane roads under PPP, a difference of several hundred km from the road portions that were previously granted. Railroads, which were previously not included in comprehensive development plans, must be included in the PPP reforms.

When railroads use PPPs, the overall project cost is nearly always far higher than that of road projects. Therefore, better financing mechanisms for infrastructure must be created. Additionally, in order to move on to the subsequent phase of the PPP maturation curve, India must prepare PPPs to address previously unaddressed industries like water supply, building and maintaining bodies of water, collecting rainwater, education (especially elementary and secondary education), power, river linking, the development of fresh rivers and inland waterways, elementary and preventive medical care, and speciality hospitals. A range of financial tools are needed to satisfy the massive financial needs, and this article's suggestions will help achieve that goal.

References

- Arezki, R., P. Bolton, S. Peters, F. Samama, and J. Stiglitz (2017) 'From Global Savings Glut to Financing Infrastructure', *Economic Policy*, 32(90), pp. 221–261, DOI: 10.1093/epolic/eix005
- Ariyo, A., and A. Jerome, (2004). Utility privatization and the poor: Nigeria in focus. Global Issue Papers No. 12 The Heinrich Böll Foundation, July http://www.boell.de/downloads/global/GIP%2012%20Nigeria_Engl.pdf
- Bhattacharyay, B. (2010). Financing Asia's Infrastructure: Modes of Development and Integration of Asian Financial Markets. *ADB Working Paper Series. No. 22*. <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1654255>
- Bradley, John, et al. (1995) *Regional aid and convergence: Evaluating the impact of the structural funds on the European periphery*, Aldershot, U.K.; Brookfield, Vt. and Sydney: Ashgate, Avebury. p xiv, 299.
- Carvalho, C. (2004). Cross-Border Securities Clearing and Settlement Infrastructure in the European Union as a Pre-requisite to Financial Markets Integration: Challenges and Perspectives. Hwwa Discussion Paper 287
- Comptroller and Audit General of India. Report No. 17 of 2013, Chapter 1 Central Excise and Service Tax Revenues. http://saiindia.gov.in/english/home/Our_Products/Audit_Report/Government_Wise/union_audit/recent_reports/union_compliance/2013/INDT/Report_17/chap_1.pdf. Accessed Nov. 02, 2023.
- Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu India Private Limited. Funding the Infrastructure Investment Gap, March 2013. http://www.deloitte.com/assets/Dcom-India/Local%20Assets/Documents/Thoughtware/Funding_the_InfrastructureInvestment_Gap.pdf. Accessed Oct. 10, 2023.
- Fayolle, J., Lecuyer, A., (2000) *Croissanceregionale, appartenancenationale et fonds structurelseuropeens: Un biland'etape*, Revue de L'Ofce, Vol. 0(73), p. 165-96.
- Fernandez Martinez, P.,(1999). *Los nuevosreglamentos de losfondosestructurales y elFondo de Cohesion para elperiodo 2000-2006*, InformacionComercial Espanola, Vol 0(776), p. 73-83.
- Izaguirre, A.K. PPI Data Update Note 68. Private Participation in Infrastructure Database. Public Private Infrastructure Advisory

Facility, World Bank Group, 2012. <http://ppi.worldbank.org/features/December2011/2011-Global-update-note.pdf>. Accessed Nov. 05, 2023.

Jacobson, C. & Tarr, J. (1995). Ownership and Financing of Infrastructure - Historical Perspectives. Policy Research Working Paper 1466

Jaffae, David. (1998). Levels of Socio-economic Development Theory. Press: Greenwood Publishing Group Inc.

Jerome, A. (2008). Private Sector Participation in Infrastructure in Africa.

Mondal, D. May Not Always Bond. Business Today, Feb. 2011. <http://business.today.intoday.in/story/infra-bonds-may-not-be-good-choice-of-investment-for-all/1/12660.html>. Accessed Oct. 10, 2023.

Subbarao, D. Should Banking Be Made Boring—An Indian Perspective. RBI Bulletin, Dec. 2009. <http://www.rbi.org.in>. Accessed Aug. 10, 2023.

Sheik, S., and M.G. Asher. A Case for Developing the Municipal Bond Market in India. *ASCI Journal of Management*, Vol. 42, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1–19. 34.

Wilson, D., and R. Purushothaman. Dreaming with BRICs: The Path to 2050. Global Economics Paper No. 99. Goldman Sachs, Oct. 1, 2003. <http://www.goldmansachs.com/our-thinking/brics/brics-reports-pdfs/brics-dream.pdf>. Accessed Oct. 15, 2023.

Winston, C. (1993), “Economic Deregulation: Days of Reckoning for Microeconomists”, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 31: pp.1263-89

Winters, A., & Schiff, M. (2002). REGIONAL COOPERATION, AND THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND REGIONAL INTEGRATION. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 2872*. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=636236>

Zhu, Jieming. (2004). “From Land Use Right to Land Development Right: Institutional Change in China's Urban Development,” *Urban Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 7, pp. 1249-68.