PPPs in energy infrastructure: regional experiences in light of the global energy crisis



Experiences from Zimbabwe: The Kariba South Expansion Project

Author: AFRODAD

Executive Summary

Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) have been popularized as fulcra in the development of various infrastructure projects, although their efficacy seems to be case specific given their variant structuring. Accordingly, this study reflects on the risks and opportunities of PPP-financed energy projects, using the Kariba South Expansion Project (KSEP) as an illustrative case. The importance of PPPs as catalysts of infrastructure development in the energy sector is elaborated in the study, as is the alignment of PPPs to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) — particularly SDG 7, which is based on ensuring the universal access of affordable, reliable,







HEINRICH BÖLL STIFTUNG WASHINGTON, DC USA | Canada | Global Dialogue







sustainable and modern clean energy for all. In particular, Target 7.b of SDG 7 aims to increase infrastructure and the associated technology for the supply of clean, modern and sustainable energy in all developing countries. Within this context, this study unpacks the importance of PPPs by laying out the structuring and roles of different parties to a hydropower PPP, the different types of PPPs and how public entities can harness their potential and manage the probable risks. Using the KSEP, the research highlights some risks, such as contingent liability arising from unforeseen potential future losses and the associated equity in case the PPP fails. Other risks include corruption and opaque arrangements that fly under the parliamentary radar, coupled with the unavailability of viable legal and regulatory frameworks to guide the operation of PPPs, among others. All of which detracts from robust democratic governance of PPPs, thereby derailing intended strategies. The findings from the research note that the use of Environmental Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) speaks to the project's ability to integrate environmental considerations with regard to infrastructure investments. The KSEP was generally successful on account of the co-option of two Power Purchase Agreements (PPAs), namely NamPower and ZESA, and the equity investment by ZETDC, thereby scaling the bankability of the project. However, the fact that the contractor, SinoHydro, shouldered most of the engineering, procurement and construction (EPC) risks culminated in an uneven negotiation scenario. This study ends by providing consideration of other infrastructure investment alternatives that are calibrated to ensure project success whilst keeping the associated costs low. These include, but are not limited to:

The consideration of concessional financing from Development Financial Institutions (DFIs), such as AfDB, Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) and the World Bank (WB), to limit the financing costs.

The engineering of hybrid financing structures (debt and equity mix) to allow for dominant equity financing so as to limit the need to go through demanding processes of proving viability, as well as compensating all project risks, as is the case with debt financing.

The consideration of fully financing infrastructure projects where resources permit. This promotes the social model of solidarity meant to address inequality, non-discrimination and equal access, and promote universal social rights and shared values in line with international rights and obligations.

However, some of these alternatives do not speak to the situation of developing countries, whose financial resources are limited on account of either narrow fiscal space or limited credit lines, such as the Zimbabwean case. Therefore, Zimbabwe might need to take steps towards accessing part of the annual USD 100 billion concessional climate finance, as promised by the Global North under the Paris Agreement.



Introduction

Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 7 is premised on ensuring the provision of affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern clean energy for all. Accordingly, Target 7.b of SDG 7 aims to increase infrastructure and the associated technology for the supply of clean, modern and sustainable energy in all developing countries. Notably, hydropower is the largest form of clean renewable electricity to date, at 16% of the world's power needs and at an affordable price, hence its dominance in the renewable energy mix of most countries. The development of hydropower infrastructure/plants is predominantly and traditionally government-financed, but narrow fiscal space has created an avenue for a blended (public and private) funding approach in hydropower infrastructure development. The inclusion of the private sector in infrastructure development has been popularized as Public Private Partnerships (PPPs). Linh et al. (2018) note that PPPs have become a new and effective way of funding infrastructure development given a number of successful cases in the world, despite social, economic and environmental costs associated with hydropower PPPs.

Riding on the wave of other successful PPPs in the energy sector, such as the Mtwara Power Plant (Tanzania), the Kafue Gorge Project (Zambia), Chicapa Hydroelectric Dam (Angola) and the Lokoho Hydro for Rural Development (Madagascar), the Zimbabwe Power Company (ZPC), a public entity (under the Zimbabwe Electricity Supply Authority (ZESA) Holdings) was involved in a PPP to expand the installed capacity of the Kariba South Hydropower Plant by 300 MW. Prior to the Kariba South Expansion Project, Zimbabwe's gap between installed power capacity and the peak power demand used to be 1,200 MW, and the deficiency was covered either through power imports from Eskom (SA), Cahora Bassa (Mozambique) and SNel (DRC) or the execution of load shedding. The commissioning of the PPP-funded 300 MW at Kariba South in March 2018 was supposed to reduce the peak power shortage to 900 MW, but the inefficiency of the aged Hwange thermal power plant and the seasonal oscillation in hydropower generation associated with low water levels in the Kariba Dam imply that more sustainable power generation alternatives must be considered.

Central to the Kariba South Expansion Project (KSEP) are concerns of whether energy infrastructure projects financed by PPPs deliver on the promises of their proponents. The prime rationale behind this study is to assess how varied interests between the private and public sector entities in a PPP agreement play out with respect to:

- Cost-effectiveness and risk transfer mechanisms
- Development outcomes
- Impacts on democratic governance
- Integrating environmental considerations in infrastructure investments
- Other infrastructure investment alternatives



In setting up the tone for a robust discussion of these issues, this research uses secondary data and available literature on the KSEP to analyse the structuring and types of PPPs, as well as provide facts on the KSEP.

Public Private Partnerships

PPPs are long-term contracts between public sector entities (central government, state-owned enterprises and provincial or local authorities) and the private sector actors, where the private sector entity undertakes to provide a public service or asset for a significant assumption of technical and operational risk, and management obligations, and where returns are linked to the performance of the earnings of the project over the long term.¹ The PPP model covers the design, construction, operation and servicing/maintenance of public infrastructure, as well as the management of such assets by the private entities (Linh et al., 2018). Procedurally, PPPs are a variant of the traditional government procurement tenders, where a public entity retains control over the ownership, designing, financing, operation, maintenance and management of the project. In the case of PPPs, private entities assume a key role in public projects compared to government institutions and might provide the financing as well (Loxley, 2013).

The growth of PPPs is closely linked to limited public resources given debt unsustainability and narrowing fiscal space for most developing countries, thereby stalling the development of key infrastructure supportive of the growth ambitions of these economies. Also, the general ideological shift in favour of the superior efficiency of private entities when compared to their public counterparts has led to a privatization wave, supported by the need to reverse prevalent crowding out of the private sector by the public sector. Effectively, PPPs have become a 'viable' alternative financing for infrastructure development.

Structuring of PPPs

In general, PPPs are complex as they include several stakeholders (connected by contracts) with vested interests and operational obligations in a project. A vanilla PPP consists of three parties, that is, the government, the private sector entity and the financial institutions (see Figure 1).

¹ World Bank Group (2020). What are Public Private Partnerships? <u>https://ppp.worldbank.org/public-private-partnership/overview/what-are-public-private-partnerships</u>





Figure 1: Stakeholders in a vanilla PPP project structure Adopted from Lihn et al. (2018)

The public entity is the initiator of a PPP agreement and acts as per advice from consultants regarding legal, financial and technical issues. The public entity also raises capital for the PPP project depending on the setup of the project, guides on investment, supervises the project and makes purchases of goods and services required in the execution of the project. The private sector entity does not directly enter a PPP setup but does so jointly with the public entity through a limited liability Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) — a Project Company/Concession Company responsible for designing, mobilization of capital, construction and operation of the project. The SPV is responsible for expediting transactions, instituting operational rules and regulations, management oversight, and the raising and signing of contracts.

Financiers in the form of commercial banks and other non-bank financial institutions provide non-concessional funding, whilst development finance institutions (DFIs), such as the WB, Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) and AfDB provide concessional finance. The inclusion of different financiers is a function of the funding needs of the project and usually more financing institutions are involved for capital intensive projects, and such funding consortia are effective in spreading funding risk. Since the SPV is a limited liability entity, it can operate with a capital structure that involves debt and equity capital. Debt is in the form of loans and bonds, whilst equity is derived from the public entity or other nonbank institutional investors (pension funds and insurance companies). The SPV is also responsible for serving the clients (electricity users), thus it collects payments for power supplied to clients. PPPs are mostly structured in such a way that the cashflows generated by the project are able to service the loans and bonds. At the same time, equity investors get dividends from the proceeds of the operation of



the project, and the earnings can be transformed into liquid assets through both securitization and financialization of the earnings and the infrastructure.

Types of PPPs

There are innumerable forms of PPPs designed to suit various construction, operation, ownership, and revenue—generating projects. These forms of PPPs are designed to suit the interests of both the public and the private sector entities for each unique infrastructure project, and, in most cases, the form of the PPP defines the contractual obligations for both parties. Figure 1 provides a summary of the different forms of PPPs.

Тур	es of PPP	Description of PPP				
identified						
1.		In a traditional PPP agreement, the public component of the partnership acts as a contracting				
		officer. It looks for funding and has overall control of the project and its assets. Almost any				
		partnership between a private contractor and a government entity can be considered a PPP,				
		but some of the most common examples are public road projects, maintenance of parks, and				
		construction of schools and other public buildings.				
2.	Operation and	With an operation and maintenance PPP, the private component of the partnership operates				
	maintenance	and maintains the project, while the public agency acts as the owner of the project. Examples				
	PPPs	of these contracts include bridges and toll-ways. Ongoing maintenance may provide revenue				
		for the private party through tolls or other fees paid through public use.				
3.	Design-built	A design-build PPP is similar to a client-contractor arrangement. The private partner designs				
	PPPs	and builds the facility, while the public partner provides the funds for the project. The public				
		partner retains ownership of the project and any assets generated through its use.				
4.	Design-Build-	Design-build-operate PPPs are similar to design-build P3s but include ongoing operation and				
	Operate PPPs	maintenance of the property facility or project by the private party. The public partner acts as				
		the owner of the installation and provides the funds for construction and operation. If				
		the private partner operates the project only for a limited time before the facility is transferred				
		to the public partner, the arrangement is known as a design-build-operate-transfer				
		agreement.				
5.	Design-Build-	A variation of the design-build-operate P3 includes the component of general financing				
	Finance-Operate	supplied by the private contractor. With a design-build-finance-operate arrangement,				
	PPPs	the private party provides financing and design, then builds, possesses, and operates the				
		facility. The public partner provides funding only while the project is being used or is active.				
6.	Build-Transfer-	Under a build-transfer-operate PPP, the private partner builds the facility and transfers it to				
	Operate PPPs	the public partner. The public partner then leases operation of the facility to the private party				
		under a long-term lease agreement				
7.	Build-Own-	Under a build-own-operate contract, the private contractor builds, possesses, and operates the				
	Operate PPPs	facility and also has control over profits and losses generated by the facility. This is similar to a privatization process				
		privatization process.				
8.	Build-Own-	In some cases, the public partner builds, possesses, and operates the project for a limited time,				
	Operate-	then the facility is transferred, free of charge and including ownership, to the public agency.				
	Transfer PPPs	This may be known as a build-own-operate, transfer P3.				
9.	Lease PPPs	A lease PPP involves the public owner leasing a facility to a private firm. The private company				
		must operate and provide maintenance for the facility per specified terms, including additions				
		or a re-modelling process.				
10.	Concession PPPs	With a concession PPP, the private agency operates and maintains the facility for a specific				
		period of time. The public partner has power over the ownership, but the private partner				
		possesses owner rights over any addition incurred while the facility is being operated under its				
		domain.				

Figure 2: Types of PPPs, Source: JICA and SADC-DFRC (2020)

PPPs in hydropower generation

Whereas PPPs have been widely used in developing infrastructure such as roads, rail, seaports, airports telecommunications and water facilities, PPPs are also popular in the generation of hydropower — a key sustainable, renewable, modern and clean energy matching the SDG 7's pledge. Table 1 presents some of the PPP hydropower projects in southern Africa.

Country	Name of project		
Botswana	Orapa Emergency Power Plant (IPP project)		
Mozambique	ElectroTec (Mozambique) and Rural Maintenance and Siemens (South Africa)		
Tanzania	Mtwara power plant		
Zambia	Kafue Gorge		
Mauritius	Central Térmica de Ressano Garcia		
Madagascar	Lokoho Hydro for Rural Development		
Angola	Chicapa hydroelectric dam		

Table 1: Examples of PPPs in hydropower generation in southern Africa Source: Compiled by author

Success factors for hydropower PPPs

UN-Energy (2011) proposed a number of success factors for PPPs as provided hereunder.

- PPP legislative framework
- Cost recovery policies
- Adequate funding for research, development, demonstration and deployment
- Maximizing community benefits from hydropower generation
- Access to capital (provision of capital by different private sector actors)
- Setting effective partnerships with well-defined responsibilities for each party
- Clean energy national development goals

Based on these success factors, the next section provides the facts for the case of the Kariba South Expansion Project.

Kariba South Expansion Project: facts

Zimbabwe's energy mix consists of hydroelectric and thermal power, with hydropower being generated at Kariba and a number of thermal stations located in Hwange, Bulawayo, Munyati and Harare. However, these plants operate below installed capacity owing to outdated technologies. Hence the need for power importation to bridge the power deficiencies (AfDB, 2019). Although unpopular and undesirable with regard to the investment and growth potential of the economy, load shedding has been instituted for a long time in Zimbabwe to ease power shortages.

To address the low available capacity and power outages, the Zimbabwe Power Company rolled out a number of power projects in the country, such as the rehabilitation of the 920 MW Hwange Power Station, an expansion of the 600 MW Hwange coal power station,² the rehabilitation of the 700 MW Kariba South Hydro Power Station,³ and the expansion of the Kariba South hydropower station by 300 MW.⁴ Before the commissioning of the Kariba South Expansion Project, peak demand exceeded installed capacity by 1,200 MW and ZPC imported power from South Africa, Mozambique, Zambia and the DRC to address the power shortages.⁵

The expansion of the Kariba South Hydropower Plant was seen as a way of easing the persistent power outages. The project commenced in September 2014, and was commissioned in March 2018.

The ZPC initiated a PPP to expand Kariba South Hydropower Plant by 300 MW increasing the installed capacity to 1,050 MW at a cost of US\$533 million. The China Exim Bank provided a 20-year non-concessional loan amounting to US\$320 million for the project, with the remainder being funded by loans from commercial banks. As part of the financing structure, ZPC sought a US\$120 million loan from Stanbic Bank South Africa (lead bank) and Eastern and Southern African Trade and Development Bank (PTA Bank) as a co-funder for the expansion of the Kariba South hydropower station and rehabilitation of the Hwange Thermal Station. Part of the US\$20 million went to the rehabilitation of the Hwange Thermal Power Station and is supported by a power purchase agreement (PPA) between ZPC and the Namibia Power Corporation (NamPower) for 80 MW of the Kariba South capacity for 15 years. The Nampower PPA is subordinate to the US\$81 million PPA of the Zimbabwe Electricity Distribution and Transmission Company (ZEDTC) — further proving the profitability of the project. The ZEDTC is an offtaker in the setup of the PPP as it has a Zimbabwean market ready for electricity on account of persistent

² This is expected to be complete by September 2022 and will add 600 MW to the national grid.

³ The rehabilitation is expected to be complete by 2024.

⁴ This project was commissioned in 2018.

⁵ Norton Rose Fulbright advises on the expansion and rehabilitation of essential energy projects in Zimbabwe. https://www.nortonrosefulbright.com/en/news/64f1ce50/norton-rose-fulbright-advises-on-the-expansionand-rehabilitation-of-essential-energy-projects-in-zimbabwe

outages. Zimbabwe is involved in the Southern Africa Power Pool (SAPP), meant to smoothen cross-border power transmission capacity as a way of improving power supply. The PPA is a long-term agreement pre-arranging the sale of a stipulated amount of power to a client as a way of ensuring the financial certainty of the project (see Fact Box 1). The new hydropower plant is wholly owned and operated by ZPC's sister company — the Kariba Hydro Power Company (Pvt) Limited (KHPC).⁶

Fact Box 1: Power Purchase Agreement (PPA)

A power purchase agreement is a prime contract in a PPP which provides a 'primary revenue stream' thereby underwriting the PPP project. A PPA defines an undertaking by a third party to the PPP to buy a stipulated amount of energy once the hydropower generation PPP starts to operate.

The PPA is often between a public sector purchaser 'offtaker' (especially in countries where the energy sector is controlled by the government) and a privately owned power producer. A PPA acts a viability guarantee to the private sector actor in an energy PPP, thus motivating the participation of the private entity in that a PPA allows for the recovery of capital costs by the private sector, as well as the earning of a return on equity by equity holders in the PPP.

A PPA is thus a major driver for the viability of an energy PPP and private sector actors require a long-term PPA to ascertain economic viability and bankability of the energy PPP.

The Kariba South Hydropower Expansion Project was anchored by a PPA with the Namibia Power Corporation to purchase 80 MW of the Kariba South generation capacity at a load factor of 50% for 15 years, starting in 2015. The PPA was valued at US\$50 million, implying that ZPC would sell power to NamPower and payment is made as per consumption. The PPA motivated the Stanbic Bank of South Africa to provide bridging finance worth US\$50 million to kick start the project.

The Nampower PPA iced the ZETDC PPA worth USD\$81 million backed by a domestic market ready for the Kariba South Expansion PPP, given the power shortage in the country.

Whereas the total project cost is valued at US\$533 million, the contribution for engineering, procurement and construction (EPC) was valued at US\$354 million, a deal won by Sino Hydro, a state-owned Chinese company. The Stanbic loan was for development costs for the expansion of Kariba South. Development costs include funding a trust account for servicing the loan from state-owned China Exim

⁶ DBSA takes \$150m ZPC, Nampower deal to the board. Newsday. https://www.newsday.co.zw/2015/11/dbsa-takes-150m-zpc-nampower-deal-to-the-board/

Bank, funding the cost of EPC, technical consultancy fees, ZPC's contribution to the project (equity) and regulators license fees. The EPC varies with the execution of project management and the exact EPC amount at the end of the project might be different from the initial estimate. Global consultancy firm KPMG's initial project costing was US\$700 million, but the accurate determination of the EPC brought down the total cost to US\$533 million.⁷

The development costs for the Kariba South Expansion Project included US\$5 million inflation adjustment, US\$48 million for improving the existing Kariba South plant infrastructure, US\$28 million for the escrow account and US\$15 million for advisors (legal, financial and technical). Further costs include US\$53 million loan interest during construction, US\$4.4 million for the Parks and Wildlife Management Authority, US\$1.2 million licensing fees by the Zimbabwe Energy Regulatory Authority and US\$15 million in ZPC costs.⁸ Whereas official sources point to a project cost of US\$533 million, other sources place the cost at US\$508 million (IDBZ, 2019). Revelations by the former finance minister (Mr. Biti) allege that the KSEP deal was initially sealed at US\$355 million during the Government of National Unity (GNU), and the project's cost was inflated to US\$533 million.⁹ The project is thus shrouded in controversy, which has impacted its initiation, structuring and costing.

The Development Bank of Zimbabwe (2019) notes that the project was largely successful as the structuring managed to address most of the risk factors, as summarised hereunder.

- The project operated with a two-year warranty from the commissioning date
- The tender process looked for an EPC contractor who could raise the financing
- The EPC funding comprised of a hybrid finance structure (debt and equity), thereby reducing risk
- The SPV (KHPC) owned the land on which the project was to be implemented and resettlement was effected where settlements were along the power lines
- Authority to use the Kariba waters was received from the Zambezi River Authority
- The use of modern power generation technology ensured cost-efficient electricity
- The tenure of PPAs was aligned to that of loans to reduce the possibility of loan defaults
- The risk associated with the primary offtaker (ZETDC) was cushioned by the credible Nampower PPA, which provided foreign currency
- The SPV (KHPC) is the one responsible for settling all project obligations as it has direct control over all electricity sales revenue
- ZPC contributed 10% equity, thereby making the investment appealing

⁷ Zesa seals deal with Nampower. The Herald. <u>https://www.herald.co.zw/zesa-seals-deal-with-nampower/amp/</u>

⁸ Zesa seals deal with Nampower. The Herald. <u>https://www.herald.co.zw/zesa-seals-deal-with-nampower/amp/</u>

⁹ Muzulu, P. Kariba power expansion project cost inflated: Biti. Zimbabwe Situation. https://www.zimbabwesituation.com/news/zimsit-m-kariba-power-expansion-project-cost-inflated-biti/



• The government provided guarantees for the loans, a stance that unlocked investor confidence

Having profiled the KSEP, the discussion turns to key questions relating to PPPfinanced hydropower generation projects.

Issues arising from the KSEP

Cost-effectiveness and risk transfer mechanisms

The cost-effectiveness of the KSEP is subject to a number of factors that affect the cost structure of the project. Whereas ZPC entered the PPP with the intention of solving the power shortages in the country, it did not have the requisite capital to fund the project, thereby limiting its negotiation power with China Exim Bank, Sino Hydro and Stanbic Bank of South Africa. It is apparent that potential funders were concerned about the profitability of the project and made sure that all possible risks were provided for in the pricing of the project (Stein, 2007).

The profitability of the KSEP was defined by creditworthiness, acceptability of the project's financing structure, project feasibility and contractual and legal provisions/agreements, as well as the risk-sharing arrangements (IDBZ, 2019). Accordingly, the contractor (Sino Hydro) was responsible for raising the funding — making the negotiation process inflexible given the high stakes on the contractor's side. Effectively, the success of the KSEP was dependent on the contractor, as the contractor was involved in both the raising of funds and the EPC. This gave the contractor the power to negotiate from a favourable position and it priced all risks associated with EPC, such as construction, performance and project-specific risks. Although ZPC provided some equity for the project, the equity was financed through borrowed funds, an extra cost on the part of ZPC. As much as the provision of equity instilled confidence with regard to the financiers, it would have been preferable if the equity had been paid out of ZPC's own resources instead of the borrowing-to-contribute setup.

At the onset of the KSEP in 2014, Zimbabwe was using the US dollar as the official currency. Effectively, the earnings from ZETDC from the local sale of electricity were to be denominated in US dollars, a currency that could be used to settle debt obligations without having to manage currency and exchange rate risks. A year after the commissioning of the project, currency reforms were initiated and ZWL was introduced, meaning that local power sales were now in ZWL, yet loan obligations require that KHPC settle the loans in USD, thus exposing the project to unforeseen policy changes. This risk has seen ZETDC revising the ZWL power charges a number of times to generate enough revenue to settle USD-denominated debt obligations. With the current volatile exchange rates, servicing debt remains affected by exchange rate risk, which did not exist at the inception of the project.



Some of the KSEP costs emanated from the absence of in-house experts at ZPC with respect to the setup and execution of PPPs, leading it to incur extraneous costs related to technical support (Hatch Africa Private Ltd), financial advice (KPMG) and legal assistance (Norton Rose Fulbright). Since ZPC is involved in power-generating PPP deals, it is strategic to internalize experts as a way of lessening consultancy fees. It is worth noting that the coming on board of the NamPower PPA not only ensured roject financial recoupment, but reduced the probable financial risk associated with the project, thereby decreasing the borrowing costs, especially from commercial lenders. NamPower being a credible regional offtaker for the KSEP furthered the confidence in the project and potentially reduced viability doubts, hence reducing the funding costs. The NamPower PPA was coupled with a Zimbabwe Electricity Transmission and Distribution Company PPA, further demonstrating the viability of the KSEP. The KSEP was also structured to align the NamPower PPA with the loan tenure, thereby reducing mismatches in financial obligations and earnings. It is notable that the use of efficient technology in power generation is translating into cheap and sustainable energy. To ensure quality of the new power plant, the KSEP was on a two-year warranty, a sign of lessened service costs on the part of the SPV (KHPC). These project attributes contributed to lessening the financing costs of the project.

However, the currency exposure from the ZETDC PPA sales of local power denominated in ZWL against loan-servicing costs denominated in US dollars translates into a cost for KHPC that has to be managed continuously over the debt/loan servicing tenure. Whilst the NamPower PPA provides foreign currency, such amounts might not be adequate to cover KHPC's open foreign currency position, calling for foreign currency exposure management strategies. These strategies might be expensive as the local financial market is deficient of such services. Further engagement with the government might be required to secure US dollar allocations from the auction market to service the loans. The ZETDC PPA, as much as it guarantees demand for generated power, also introduces a long-term exposure that might affect the ability of KHPC to meet its debt servicing timeline, thereby tainting the credit worthiness of the SPV.

Development outcomes

The KSEP presents a case of both success and challenges with respect to development, expressed hereunder:

- The PPP project enabled a fiscally constrained government to upgrade its energy infrastructure.
- Despite the fact that the expanded capacity still does not fully match the peak power demand in the country, the KSEP generates clean and modern energy congruent to the expectations of SDG 7. The generation of hydropower reduces the use of fossil fuels and mitigates the emission of greenhouse gases, thereby contributing to the mitigation of climate change. The KSEP ticks a number of boxes with regard to SDG 7, such as increasing the share of renewable energy

in the global energy mix (Target 7.2), enhancing international cooperation to facilitate access to clean energy and promote investment in energy infrastructure and clean energy technology (Target 7.a), and is premised on upgrading technology in the supply of modern and sustainable energy services for all developing countries (Target 7.b).

- Despite these positives, the project seems to have gone against SDG 7 Target 7.1 on ensuring universal access to affordable, reliable and modern energy services as the cost of power is beyond the reach of many Zimbabweans. Power tariffs have been revised innumerably, outpricing many Zimbabweans through a pricing system meant to ration power to households. This opposes the universal access to affordable, reliable and modern power services. It is notable that the KSEP did not resolve the power shortages, though it is a step in the right direction.
- The KSEP expanded the number of households with electricity, thereby empowering women through alleviating time poverty, limiting exposure to toxic indoor pollutants, advancing employment opportunities, improving maternal health and increasing the safety of women, as well as the changing of social norms.
- The KSEP supports the growth prospects of the country by powering industries, agro-processing and the mining sector, as well as amplifying employment creation.
- The generation of hydropower is environmentally friendly as it reverses deforestation and advances the fight against climate change.
- The provision of electricity enables the uptake of technology across the different facets of the economy as electricity is critical in powering machines, equipment and computers, thereby enhancing innovation. For instance, climate-smart agriculture requires the use of electricity in monitoring the water needs of plants and also the plant-based irrigation practices.
- The structuring of the KSEP has the China Exim Bank as a chief financier, and Sino Hydro as the prime contractor thereby side-lining local contractors in the project. With such Chinese control over the project, developmental issues arguably could not be pursued religiously as the foreign firms receive prime state consideration.

Impacts on democratic governance

The Development Bank of Zimbabwe (2019) notes that Zimbabwe does not have a substantive PPP legislative framework and does not have a PPP Government Unit, as PPP projects are implemented through the Ministry of Finance and relevant line ministries and state enterprises, as is appropriate. Tax and customs incentives relating to PPPs were implemented by the Zimbabwe Investment Authority outside the legislative framework — making the provisions ultra vires. The PPPs in Zimbabwe are guided by the Joint Venture Act of 2016 and the act directs different types of PPPs, such as BT, BLT, BOT, BOO, BOOT, BTO, CAO, DOT, ROT and BOOM contracts, lease management contracts, management contracts, service contracts, contract for services and SOT. Other outdated, but seemingly relevant, legislations

include the Public Private Partnership in Zimbabwe Policy (2004), the Public Partnership Guidelines (2004) and the PPP Bill from 2013, which has not been finalized. This places the governance of PPP projects at the discretion of the concerned public entity — hence, there is no set standard to referee the propriety of the governance of the KSEP.

In addition, there is a strong correlation between PPPs and governance, although the impact and structural agreement of the PPP determines whether this correlation is positive or negative. The dimension of good governance in PPPs has taken centre stage across the globe due to the growing interest in promoting infrastructural development that promotes national growth. Many African countries have embraced PPPs as development catalysts that bridge infrastructural backlogs, and this underscores the need for good governance, as it is indispensable in ensuring value for money, transparency, accountability and avoiding policy errors and associated fiscal costs.

A baseline survey of the administration of PPPs in Zimbabwe, using the Kariba South Expansion Project (KSEP) as a case study, reveals that PPP infrastructure has not given adequate attention to the principle of governance as the project was not debated or tabled in the parliament.¹⁰ The parliament serves as an integral governance institution, with an ombudsman role that seeks to hold the executive to account by fostering transparency and responsibility, ensuring optimum utilisation of public resources through value-for-money debates, and airing the views of the citizens. Thus, the failure by the government to have the KSEP pass through parliamentary scrutiny was a direct violation of the constitution, as well as the fiduciary responsibility of the state that is anchored on the proliferation of horizontal accountability.

To this end, the failure of the government to provide granular project details to the public through the parliament makes it difficult for the citizens to make comprehensive ex-post evaluation, as they do not have the primary data (agreement) to do so successfully. It is critical to note that Zimbabwe has been accused of being engaged in opaque mega-deals¹¹ that are flying under the parliamentary radar as they are come with rent-seeking, cronyism and questionable tendering processes. This takes away the whole concept of effective project management as issues related to feasibility studies, project selection criteria, project implementation and project financing are not open for parliamentary debate. This is aggravated by the fact that the project did not pass through the surveillance of the State Procurement Board (SPB), now known as the Procurement Regulatory Authority of Zimbabwe (PRAZ), a clear indication of disregard of statutory provisions governing projects of such magnitude.

¹⁰ Kariba South power deal is unconstitutional. The Zimbabwean. <u>https://www.thezimbabwean.co/2014/01/</u> kariba-south-power-deal-is/

¹¹ ZIMCODD, 2021.

An assessment of the KSEP in terms of the G20 Principle for Quality Infrastructure Investment,¹² which includes openness, transparency, economic efficiency in view of life-cycle cost and debt sustainability, to mention but a few, shows that the entire project is wanting. Although Zimbabwe is not a member of the G20, the abovementioned principles still speak to the principles of good governance, as enshrined in the Zimbabwean constitution, Public Entities Corporate Governance Act (Chapter 10:31) and the Zimbabwe National Code of Corporate Governance (ZIMCODE). The alleged project cost inflation indicates governance weaknesses in the PPP contract setup.

The non-transparent nature of the debate surrounding the cost of the KSEP is another governance miscarriage of justice, the impact of which cannot be underestimated as it speaks to possible fraud, corruption and patronage, as well as weak transparency and accountability mechanisms. The state's mouthpiece, the Herald,¹³ and the Zimbabwe Power Company (ZPC)¹⁴ both noted that the total cost of the project was US\$533 million. In contrast, the Infrastructure Development Bank of Zimbabwe (IDBZ) notes that the total cost of the project was US\$508 million, giving a discrepancy of US\$25 million.¹⁵ The US\$533 million is even a long way from the US\$355 project cost alleged by the ex-finance minister Mr Biti. Transparency International Zimbabwe (2021) noted that poor accountability and transparency mechanisms, coupled with weak ombudsman institutions, have opened havens for financial leakages in national projects. The project cost variation shows possible economies of affection and tenderpreneurship, a common cancer in public sector management in Zimbabwe.¹⁶ Relatedly, Zimbabwe's corruption ranking continues to worsen as the country was ranked 157 on the 2020 corruption index,¹⁷ which attests to its weak governance system. Another governance anomaly to note is the fact that the Zimbabwe Energy Regulatory Authority (ZERA), which is the regulatory authority for energy, received US\$1.2 million in licensing fees for the KSEP, an unjustified additional cost to the project as ZERA gets a national budget vote yearly. It would have been expedient for the nation if such fees had either been eliminated or reduced, and be considered after the project's completion.

Above all, the KSEP has political connotations for the relationship between Zimbabwe and the Republic of China, thereby defining the vested interest of the executive in the Chinese-funded PPP. China has funded a number of projects in Zimbabwe, such as the expansion of the R. Mugabe International Airport and

¹² Ministry of foreign affairs of Japan. G20 Principles for Quality Infrastructure Investment. https://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/gaiko/oda/files/100161763.pdf

¹³ UPDATED: ED commissions \$533m Kariba project. The Herald. <u>https://www.herald.co.zw/just-in-president-</u> commissions-kariba-south-station/

¹⁴ Zimbabwe Power Company. Kariba expansion project begins. <u>https://www.zpc.co.zw/articles/2014/09/05/</u> kariba-expansion-project-begins

¹⁵ Infrastructure Development Bank of Zimbabwe (2019). Analysis of factors that affects the bankability of infrastructure in Zimbabwe with special reference to energy.

¹⁶ Chilunjika / Mutizwa (2019). Exploring factors militating against the performance of parastatals in Zimbabwe: the case of the national railways of Zimbabwe from 2008 to 2016. Journal of Public Administration and Development Alternatives (JPADA), 4(2):41-60.

¹⁷ Trading economics. Zimbabwe Corruption Rank. https://tradingeconomics.com/zimbabwe/corruption-rank



construction of the new parliament building, as well as the construction of a number of dams across the country. Most such projects are marred in controversy as procurement irregularities negatively affect the public's trust in Chinese-funded projects. One case in point is the tendering process of the Kunzvi Dam Project, where a cost-inefficient bid was offered to a Chinese company and no action was taken to redress the anomaly.

Integrating environmental considerations with regard to infrastructure investments

Whilst the KSEP provided resources for environmental considerations, there is no evidence of how the resources were deployed, except to note that an Environmental Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) was conducted by the Environmental Management Agent (EMA). ESIA refers to a mechanism that is used for the examination of the impact and effects that the infrastructure project has on the community and the environment. ESIA is effective if undertaken prior the execution of the project so as to enhance decision-making and profitability. Thus, ESIA is vital in safeguarding the environment and preventing execution methods that are damaging to it. To this end, after a successful environmental scanning by EMA, it was noted that the communities surrounding the power plant were going to be affected by the construction of transmission lines. A resettlement plan was executed, as well as strategies to protect the wildlife as the project approached into the jurisdiction of the Parks and Wildlife Management Authority. This led to the payment of US\$4.4 million by KHPC to the Parks and Wildlife Management Authority as compensation.

In addition, the construction of a hydropower plant is in alignment with the call for smart energy in the international community. The recent 26th UN Climate Change Conference of the Parties (COP26), hosted by the United Kingdom from 31 October to 12 November 2021, underlined this gain. The KSEP brings in a plethora of climate friendly advantages, such as:

- Renewable energy hydropower is renewable and will never run out, unless climate change affects water levels.
- Reliable power the Zambezi catchment area is expansive, and thus power generation is ascertained.
- Efficiency the technology used in the KSEP is cost efficient and can be adjusted to suit the flow of water as water levels change.
- Emission free the generation of hydroelectricity does not release emissions into the atmosphere that are responsible for climate change.

Furthermore, the climate advantages of the project go beyond power generation. This is because the construction of the 300 MW generation facility has helped mitigate against deforestation, as it reduced electricity blackouts, thereby reducing the number of those who cut down trees for firewood. The reduction in the use of fossil fuel for energy is of paramount importance in the promotion of clean energy. Thus, the KSEP represents one of the milestones towards sustainable power generation and clean energy. However, although the KSEP added 300 MW to the national grip, electricity blackouts still persist. This points to insufficient hydropower being generated, and thus more expansive hydroelectric generation projects ought to be considered. Currently, Zimbabwe is in talks with Mozambique and South Africa in order to import electricity.

A closer scrutiny of Zimbabwe's energy investments shows that the country's energy policy is still dependent on coal energy. In July 2020, President Emmerson Mnangagwa visited eight companies that had just acquired a coking coal plant and coal mines in Hwange. During the tour, a local firm (Western Areas) announced plans to establish a 300 MW coal plant, and the Zimbabwe Gas and Coal Company also announced plans to construct a 750 MW plant. This brings into question the government's commitment to renewable energy. However, the cancellation of the US\$1.5 billion funding for Hwange Coal Power Plant expansion by the Chinese is a welcome development in respect to climate change. Among other disadvantages, coal leads to the emission of harmful gasses that affect the ozone layer. Whilst coal mining destroys habitat and scenery, displaces local people, and threatens animals, just as hydropower projects do, the water harnessed from the latter can be used for various life-supporting activities compared to the threats of coal mining activities in Hwange National Park, which also leads to desertification and environmental degradation.

To this end, the government must invest in clean and renewable energy such as solar, wind and hydropower. Zimbabwe's region 5 is exposed to sunlight throughout the year, and this can be harnessed to the benefit of the country.

Other infrastructure investment alternatives

With respect to hydropower generation through PPPs, the profitability of the project is at the core of the development plan as private sector actors ought to recoup their investment via foregone public service delivery and other developmental interventions. Typically, the private sector makes more out of a PPP and undoing such limitations requires agile processes by the public entity of proving viability to the satisfaction of private players and eliminating all probable risks on the part of the public entity. To deal with these challenges, the following options might be considered in funding hydropower generation:

Public entities might consider cheaper financing from DFIs, such as AfDB, MDBs and the WB, as the interest on such loans are mostly concessional. However, in the case of Zimbabwe, unlocking such funding requires the government to pay off its loans first.

The use of hybrid financing structures (debt and equity mix) might require engineering towards dominant equity financing and less debt financing, so as to



limit the exposure of compensating for all project risks, as is the case with debt financing.

Given the trend of reverting back to public ownership, especially in developed economies, the public sector entities might consider fully financing their projects where resources permit. This would promote the social model of solidarity meant to address inequality, non-discrimination and unequal access, as well as promoting universal social rights and shared values.

However, some of these alternatives do not speak to the situation of developing countries, whose financial resources are limited on account of either narrow fiscal space or limited credit lines, such as the Zimbabwean case. This encourages public entities to consider PPPs, even though such deals might be unfair from a risk-sharing perspective.

Conclusion

PPPs are popular in the development of various infrastructure projects as they allow private sector financing to bridge the infrastructure financing gaps prevalent in most developing economies, owing to either narrow fiscal space or unsustainable debt that limits the further acquisition of debt. To cater for the different financing needs of various infrastructure projects, different forms of PPPs have been designed accordingly. In determining whether PPPs in the energy sector perform as per their proponents, the case for the KSEP was considered. Although the project is considered a success, innumerable provisions were made to reduce default risk on the non-concessional loans. The inclusion of PPAs from ZETDC and Nampower, government guarantees, and the provision of equity capital by ZPC, all encouraged investor confidence.

The high stakes for the contractor meant that the ZPC had less negotiating space and such rigidity affected fairness in risk sharing. The project's SPV (KHPC) faces currency risk associated with the 2019 currency reforms that made the ZWL the only acceptable legal tender. Electricity sales in ZWL will require to be converted to the US dollar for the servicing of the project's loans amidst unstable exchange rates. Also, poor governance structures and the unavailability of unambiguous legislative and regulatory frameworks that govern PPPs complicate their administration. Horizontal accountability is further undermined by the exclusion of parliament in the project's life cycle. The project was, however, considerate of the environment as such a robust ESIA was carried out. Although the project is in alignment with the current global trend of smart energy, the electricity output of the KSEP is still inadequate to bridge the national power generation gap.



Acronyms

BLT	Build, Lease and Transfer
B00	Build, Own and Operate
BOOM	Build, Own, Operate and Manage
BOOT	Build, Own, Operate and Transfer
вот	Build, Operate and Transfer
BT	Build and Transfer
BTO	Build, Transfer and Operate
CAO	Contract Add and Operate
DOT	Develop, Operate and Transfer (same as BOT)
ESIA	Environmental Social Impact Assessment
KSEP	Kariba South Expansion Project
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
PPP	Public Private Partnership
ROT	Rehabilitate, Operate and Transfer
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
ZESA	Zimbabwe Electricity Supply Authority
ZPC	Zimbabwe Power Company

References

AFDB (2019). Zimbabwe Infrastructure Report 2019. African Development Bank.

AFDB (2018). Financing Africa's Infrastructure: New Strategies, Mechanisms, and Instruments. African Development Bank.

Chilunjika / Mutizwa (2019). Exploring factors militating against the performance of parastatals in Zimbabwe: the case of the national railways of Zimbabwe from 2008 to 2016. Journal of Public Administration and Development Alternatives (JPADA), 4(2):41-60.

Infrastructure Development Bank of Zimbabwe (2019). Analysis of factors that affects the bankability of Infrastructure in Zimbabwe with special reference to Energy, IDBZ.

JICA / SADC-DFRC (2020). Best Practices on PPP Infrastructure Development in SADC Countries. South African Institute of International Affairs.

Linh / Wan / Thuy (2018). Financing a PPP Project: Sources and Financial Instruments—Case Study from China. International Journal of Business and Management; Vol. 13, No. 10; 2018.

Loxley, J. (2013). Are public-private partnerships (PPPs) the answer to Africa's infrastructure needs? Review of African Political Economy, Vol. 40, No. 137.

Stein, P. (2007). PPP for Infrastructure financing – evolving good practices. MENA-OECD Investment Programme, Amman, 2007-0-05.



Transparency International Zimbabwe (2021). A report on the public health sector in Zimbabwe, Harare.

UN-Energy (2011). Strengthening Public-Private Partnerships to Accelerate Global Electricity Technology Deployment: Recommendations from the Global Sustainable Electricity Partnership Survey.

ZIMCODD (2021). The bane of resource-backed loans in Zimbabwe: Implications for debt sustainability. ZIMCODD, Harare.





OVERVIEW SUMMARY PAPER AND REGIONAL REPORTS

For access to the summary paper and regional reports please scan the QR codes.

Summary paper	PPPs in energy In Regional experie	frastructure: nces in light of the global energy crisis	
1	Cameroon	Experiences from Cameroon: The Kribi Power Station	
2	Ghana	Experiences from Ghana: The Sankofa Gas Project	
3	India	Experiences from India: The 1200 MW Teesta III Hydroelectric Project in Sikkim	
4	Indonesia	Experiences from Indonesia: The Central Java Power Plant	
5	Kenya	Experiences from Kenya: The Kipeto Wind Power Project	
6	Peru	Experiences from Peru: The Moyobamba-Iquitos Transmission Line Project and Associated Substations in the Peruvian Amazon	
7	The Philippines	Experiences from The Philippines: The Malampaya Deep Water Gas-to-Power Project	



Author information

This report was produced by the The African Forum and Network on Debt and Development (AFRODAD). AFRODAD is a civil society organisation established in 1996 as a regional platform and organisation for lobbying and advocating for debt cancellation and addressing other debt related issues in Africa. AFRODAD aspires for equitable and sustainable development leading to a prosperous Africa.

Disclaimer

This report represents the opinions and views of the authors, and is the product of their research. They do not necessarly reflect the official policy or position of the publishers.