

Public-Private Cooperation in the Eurasian Economic Union: Lessons for Belarus

Yuri Krivorotko¹, Alla Vysotskaya²

¹*Belarusian Private Institute of Jurisprudence*

Korolya str. 3, 220004 Minsk, Belarus

E-mail: kriff55@gmail.com

²*Belarusian State Economic University*

Partisanski ave. 26, 220072 Minsk, Belarus

E-mail: vysots99@gmail.com

The article has been reviewed.

Received on 8 September 2015, accepted on 9 November 2015

Abstract

Key success factors of public-private cooperation management in the Eurasian Economic Union countries are revealed in the paper. Key success factors of public-private cooperation (PPC) have been structured as follows: legislative base and the regulatory environment, partner relationship, risk management. The paper concludes that full presence of key success factors of PPC may significantly improve its functioning and efficiency. The study provides a methodological base that underpins PPC management by emphasizing partner interaction and relevant procedures and structures. Recommendations for PPC development in Belarus on the basis of public-private management experiences in some post-Soviet countries are presented.

The research methodology is based on the approaches of Rockart, Boynton, Zmud, Hardcastle, Edwards to key success factors of PPC, as well as on those proposed by Mouraviev, Kakabadse, Bazhenov from the Eurasian Economic Union, in empirical studies - opinion of experts, PPC project managers survey. Statistical data from official sources, the State Statistics Committee, Ministry of Economics, public private partnership centers in Kazakhstan, Russia and Belarus, databases, etc. were also used.

Keywords: public-private cooperation, public-private partnership, concession, legislative base, partner interaction, risk management, key success factors.

Introduction

The states of the Eurasian Economic Union¹ (EEU) are showing increased interest in public-private cooperation (PPC). Such interest is caused by a need to attract private investors and ensure funds for traditionally provided public services.

¹ *The Eurasian Economic Union includes four post-Soviet states: Russia, Kazakhstan, Belarus, Kyrgyzstan*

They include the development of public transport, housing, utility and communal infrastructure and services as well as of the public sector. The most perspective example of state-private partnership in the EEU is construction of schools, hospitals, toll roads, utility and communal objects. The main directions for authority-business cooperation are: comprehensive territorial planning, regional land use, asset, capital management regulations, tax reliefs and exemptions, public spending, provision of utility services, licensing of investment agreements.

When a private business builds or repairs a public object using its own funds or loans, i.e. financial resources other than of government, public-private cooperation is built. In the future the private or public partner will use that object for providing public services, the private contractor may be granted the right to operate and maintain that object for long time (up to 30 years and more). As a result of using that object, the private partner will get income in the form of payment from citizens or public agencies, earn back the funds put into investment, recover operating expenses and get profit (Osborn, 2000; Klijn and Teisman, 2003; Mouraviev and Kakabadse, 2012). The State represented by different level government usually builds partnership with the private sector in funding and providing public services for the following reasons: insufficient funding from the budget, low incomes of the population and its inability to pay, a need to use technologies and expert knowledge of private businesses (Grimsey and Lewis, 2004; Hall, 2008). Nowadays there are no doubts that the social infrastructure, especially in EEU states, is

lacking investment. By building business-authority cooperation, governments can implement large-scale transport and housing infrastructure modernization projects.

Huge efforts are put to develop public services, energy and social sectors through PPC. In Russia and Kazakhstan, national and regional governments have developed many PPC projects through concession. In Russia, over 200 concession contracts are being implemented at local level (Bazhenov, 2011). In Kazakhstan, six out of seven concession contracts have been implemented since 2005 (Proekty gosudarstvenno-chastnogo partnerstva v regionah, 2013a). In Belarus, eight PPC projects not linked to concession, are being implemented (Valuzhitskij, 2015). Despite considerable efforts of different levels of government to accelerate the development of public-private partnership, progress is slow. In Kazakhstan, only four of all developed partnership projects are in an active phase of development while other projects have been closed or suspended since 2014 (Proekty gosudarstvenno-chastnogo partnerstva v regionah, 2015b). Thus launching of large-scale PPC infrastructure projects has stopped. That might have been partly because PPC projects are not successful and partly because there is no understanding what factors are important in PPC. In Belarus, the majority of PPC projects are non-concessional and were launched in 2014. Although the pace and stages of PPC development differs in all EEU states, the identification of success factors is of great practical value since that could considerably facilitate building authority-business alliances for the development of social infrastructure and social policy in regions.

Methodological approaches to the identification of key success factors of PPC

Many scientists define success in private-public cooperation (PPC) as favorable results in certain basic areas which are important for the achievement of administrative purposes (Rockart, 1982). There is a statement that success factors in some key areas are “dictated” by managerial success (Boynton, and Zmud, 1984).

The resonance of these positions is reflected by the factors of areas of organizational planning and influence which should be practiced began to act to reach efficiency (Saraph, Benson and Schroeder, 1989). From the administrative point of view, it is assumed that success factors are actions and methods aimed at effective management by the parties of PPC (Yang, Shen et al., 2009).

Summing up these points of view it is possible to conclude that defining the success factors of PPC

focus is on the areas where favorable results are to be achieved.

Let us analyze the methodology of identifying success factors. Hardcastle et al. instead of creating the list of success factors what is, of course, important in PPC, emphasize the relationship between a set of elements in each group of factors (Hardcastle, Edwards, Akintoye, Li, 2005).

Analyzing PPC in Kazakhstan and Russia, Mouraviev carried out surveys and interviewed experts and private-public partnership (PPP) project managers (Mouraviev, 2014).

On the basis of that, the following groups of success factors in PPC were identified:

Group I. Legal and regulatory framework

Group II. Relationship

Group III. Risk management

Most critical elements were identified in each group.

Legal and regulatory framework This group consists of four components:

a) Well developed legal framework

b) Simplified formation of PPP

c) Market discipline

d) Clear tariff policy

a) The development of carefully thought over legal framework is the prerequisite for all kinds of partnership activity (Pongsiri, 2002). The interviewed experts noted that there were no general law on public-private partnership or relevant law on a concession in Kazakhstan and Russia, what made PPP formation ambiguous. Besides, they also indicated some ambiguity in the privileges and obligations of regional and municipal government regarding support to a PPP. Laws and resolutions at national level, harmonization of regional and local legislation would bring clarity and increase investors’ interest in PPP. Non-concessional and concessional PPPs should be defined. An additional task for legislation is to create the legal base for the long-term financial obligations of public agencies to the private partner (Mouraviev, 2014).

b) PPP formation procedure should be simplified so as to considerably facilitate development in Kazakhstan and Russia. For example, a standard procurement contract should be used instead of separate contracts with various conditions and obligations, thus separate land, service, assets, etc. procurement contracts will accompany the standard contract. The interviewed experts were critical about excessive bureaucracy, complicated PPP formation procedure.

c) Market discipline is also a critical area. According to Jamali (Jamali, 2004) market discipline

requires that each partner controls payments, works schedules, other obligations set in the contract and regulations, the partner has to make payments to the other partner, subcontractors, workers and clients in full, on time, as set in the contract. Market discipline covers payment of interest, collecting penalties from the partner, etc.

d) Clear tariff policy will make PPC more transparent and attractive. A tariff setting policy should consider: conditions for setting new tariffs, tariff regulation mechanisms, transparency. The respondents noted that bureaucratic, complicated and long tariff regulation procedures are constraints in long-term planning.

Relationship. This group consists of four components:

- a) Clearly stated partners' obligations and goals
- b) Effective project management and dispute settlement mechanisms
- c) Government approach to PPC (PPP), incentives to ensure project continuity
- d) Ensurance of the partners' flexibility

a) Clearly stated project goals with regard to service quality, service provision period, priorities, etc. will allow the partners to avoid ambiguity in administrative matters and take on responsibility. The partners should monitor and evaluate each other's progress and provide relevant information. Thus they will keep the project on schedule, avoid waste of expenditure, additional constraints dealing with less important issues, micro-management, etc. Focus on project goals also means that the partners will be able to reduce costs and raise value for money.

b) The respondents noted that the existing project administration is confusing and bureaucratic, reporting requirements are rather ineffective. For example, no board or formal dispute settlement arrangements were in place in the studied PPPs (Mouraviev, 2014). By establishing rather simple and clear project administration procedures and bodies a reliable platform for partner interaction with minimum bureaucracy will be provided, the reporting and decision-making processes will be more efficient. Special attention should be paid

to dispute settlement arrangement since no such mechanism is in place in Kazakhstan and Russia.

c) The analysis of the information provided by the respondents showed that governments do not give any preference to the contractors engaged with PPPs. In general, governments should turn their attention to PPPs, promote and provide them with support.

d) Governments should avoid excessive regulation regarding decision-making within PPPs, striving for their better performance promote flexibility in, for example, public procurement, setting pay rates, etc. When the public sector plays a leading role in PPP that does not stimulate the private partner.

Risk management. This group consists of three components:

- a) Risk sharing between the parties
- b) Risk allocation and mitigation
- c) Financial incentives

a) The main goal of risk sharing is to ensure efficiency and value for money. To be the most effective, risk must be transferred to the party best able to carry it (European Commission, 2003). Effectiveness depends on sufficient transfer of risk to the private partner. However, risk sharing arrangements in place does not guarantee success of PPP especially speaking about hidden risks.

b) The parties may need to mitigate risk. The survey showed that PPP partners, the public and private sector, tend to pay insufficient attention to the creation of risk mitigation mechanisms in Russia and Kazakhstan thus increasing uncertainty and unplanned expenditures. Risk mitigation mechanisms being in place contribute to more effective risk management at the smallest costs.

c) Financial incentives are also important in seeking to achieve project goals. Besides, penalties imposed for unfinished works and delays will motivate the private partner to monitor its work. Government provided support should be grounded and promote trust.

The areas of key success factors are provided in Table 1.

Areas of key success factors

Area		
Legal and regulatory framework	Relationship	Risk management
Key success factors		
• <i>well developed legal framework</i>	• <i>clearly stated partners' obligations and goals</i>	• <i>risk sharing</i>
• <i>simplified formation of PPP</i>	• <i>effective project management and dispute settlement mechanisms</i>	• <i>risk allocation and mitigation</i>
• <i>market discipline</i>	• <i>government's approach to PPC (PPP) incentives</i>	• <i>financial incentives</i>
• <i>clear tariff policy</i>	• <i>ensuring partners' flexibility in business management</i>	

Source: author compiled, based on Mouraviev's study

Findings or lessons for Belarus

Key success factors of PPC are relevant to Belarus where PPC projects have been gaining increased importance. Currently only eight from 63

submitted PPC projects are being implemented: two for road infrastructure, two for thermal and electric energy, four for welfare (see Table 2)

Table 2

PPC projects in Belarus

Description	Location	Expected outcomes	Worth	Government's contribution	Duration*
Road infrastructure projects					
Reconstruction of the highway M10	Russian Federation border – Gomel – Kobrin	Highway extended from 109.9 to 184.0 km	92.0 bn.USD*	Land	2017-2019
Construction of a through street in Gomel city, a bridge over the Sozh river and five overpasses	Gomel city	n/d	110.0 bn.USD*	Land	2019-2020
Energy efficiency projects in the utilities and communal sector					
Construction of a waste incineration plant	Mogilev city	Municipal solid waste utilized, thermal and electric energy produced	130.0 bn.USD	Land, municipal waste management	2014-2016
Construction of a hydro-electric power station on the Dvina river	Beshenkovich (Vitebsk oblast)	Electric energy produced and supplied in the region (33Mwt -130 mn. Kw/h).	320.0 bn.USD*	Land	2017-2020
Welfare projects					
Construction of two pre-school institutions	Minsk city and Minsk oblast	Number of places in pre-school institutions increased	72.0 bn.USD*	Land	2017-2019
Reconstruction of the block of buildings of Grodno hospital No. 3	Grodno city	Number of beds in the institution increased, new technology procured	83.0 bn.USD*	Land, infrastructure	2016-2019
Construction of the swimming pool in the Rowing Olympic Reserve Centre	Minsk city	Conditions for Olympic reserve preparation improved	90.0 bn.USD*	Land	2017-2019
Reconstruction of the museum, tourist and recreation complex	Brest city	Tourism infrastructure improved	85.0 bn.USD*	Land, infrastructure	2017-2020

*) *preliminary*

Source: author compiled, based on data provided by the Center for Public-Private Partnership under the Ministry of Economics of the Republic of Belarus

The projects started in 2014-2016 so it is too early to provide any comment on them but some preliminary analysis of success factors and components may be done.

Some progress in developing the legal and regulatory framework of PPP is evident - a draft law on public-private partnership passed hearings at the Parliament. The law on PPP foresees two new forms: a concession and an investment contract. Duration, risk sharing, obligations of the partners, funding sources (domestic and international financial and credit institutions such as the EBRD, IFC), involvement of both, national and international, investors, as well as the replacement of the private partner in case of his inability to fulfill his obligations without terminating the agreement have laid down in the law.

However, some shortcomings of the law should be highlighted. Firstly, forms, types, models of PPPs, a contract, a lease, a concession, a production sharing agreement, a joint venture, as well as long-term financial obligations of the partners have not not been defined. It is obvious that it is necessary to include the option of concluding an agreement between the private partner and the regional administration directly not only through the central and other vertical structures.

PPP formation procedures have been insufficiently accurately defined, tariff regulation rules need to be included in the normative acts.

It should be noted that the legal regulation of a concession contract has not been changed, and is regulated by the investment code through a specific concession agreement. That issue is particularly important for private partners and needs to be regulated

No progress in risk management has been noticed so far so it is difficult to speak about the improvement of the relationship between the partners. The rearrangement of the obligations and risks between the parties should not focus on support for the private partner. Government should not limit itself to land transfer for construction or supply of municipal waste, it should be involved in all cycles of production as an equal partner. The PPP project managers from Russia and Kazakhstan emphasized that a concession is the fairest model of PPP; guarantees good relationships between government and the private partner in terms of expenses and outcomes, for example, in sales, costs and profit sharing, tax, other payments. Legal basis of new forms of PPP will help better understand business needs, investment conditions, project attractiveness for investors, relationships between the public and private sector. Normative and legal acts adopted in

Belarus provide for flexibility and change so as to meet partners' needs.

Discussion

Analysis of PPP success factors in EEU states expands our knowledge of PPP. Summarized theoretical and practical aspects of PPP provided in the paper are an attempt to contribute to the concept of PPP and its role in developing the public sector. It is evident that PPP management and relationships are those factors that underpin success. Since the present analysis is based on real life examples the highlighted issues may be used by practitioners and experts so as to achieve better results in forming PPP and managing its projects.

It should be noted that the findings of this research are similar to those carried out abroad (Pongsiri, 2002; Jamali, 2004) and have been confirmed by other studies done in post-Soviet states (Mouraviev, 2014) The research has not identified any difference between the critical success factors of PPP projects carried out in Kazakhstan and Russia: both countries have similar experiences in dealing with obstacles to PPP development, and their success factors are also similar. Speaking about PPP development in Belarus, PPC has only started and provides for opportunities to learn from the mistakes of others.

In addition to the theoretical contribution the paper also contributes to practices in Belarus by focusing on obstacles to PPP formation and PPC management:

1. There is no financial market in Belarus. Most of PPC projects face funding difficulties by private investors, government, international financial institutions. All PPP partners must be provided with financial instruments.
2. Belarus has not attained sovereign credit rating assigned by international rating agencies. That is a prerequisite seeking to obtain long-term debt financing instruments in the international bond market. Funding by international financial institutions is a good instrument seeking to promote PPP.
3. Risk insurance is problematic. Lending risk assessment in Belarus, carried out by some authoritative insurance agencies, show that the country belongs to group seven, i.e. high lending risk countries.
4. Long-term budget planning is important in long-term contracts therefore it is necessary to reconsider an approach to budget planning and allow drawing up plans for 3-5 years. A high inflation rate (25%-30%) makes long-term planning complicated.

5. Efficient spending (value for money) depends on several factors, such as the chosen funding model, the selected private partner, etc.
6. There are no competent local specialists and experts in PPC in Belarus able to control fulfillment of contractual obligations of the private partner regarding works, costs, quality, services, efficiency, etc. Such experts should be recruited by each ministry engaged with PPC projects.
7. There is no law governing a concession in Belarus and that is a serious obstacle to PPP development. A concession agreement allows attracting investment into many spheres, first of all, into the infrastructure which lacks public funds, not only to minimize budget spending but also to raise revenues through taxes, to use and develop the latest technologies. The first reason why there are not many concession contracts in Belarus is that the central government is unwilling to lose control over its assets, another is that there are no regulations protecting the interests of the parties. Belarusian government needs a consistent and scientifically grounded strategy for concession development.
8. PPP project administration should be decentralized. PPC projects are developed by the central government and controlled by the ministries. It is no news that power and administration are centralized in Belarus, projects are considered and approved by the central government, and the public as well as local authorities have no voice in decision-making although projects are implemented in their territories. Problems in and obstacles to PPC in Belarus are provided in Table 3.

Table 3

Problems in and obstacles to PPC development in Belarus

Problem/obstacle	Shortcoming
Financial market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>weak financial market</i>
Sovereign credit rating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>absence of sovereign credit rating</i>
Risk insurance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>country's high lending risk</i>
Long-term budget planning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>planning for 1 year only</i> • <i>complicated long-term planning because of a high inflation rate (25%-30%)</i>
Efficient spending (value for money)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>lack of advanced technologies because of the chosen financial PPC model</i> • <i>lack of technologiesiques of the partners' choice</i>
Local specialists and experts in PPC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>absence of local specialists and experts in PPC</i>
Concession legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>absence of concession legislation</i> • <i>unwillingness of the central government to lose control over its assets</i> • <i>absence a legal system protecting the interests of concessioners</i>
Centralised management of PPC projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>centralized administration of PPC projects</i> • <i>overemphasized role of the central government and ministries</i> • <i>absence of local community influence</i> • <i>absence of local authority opinion</i>

Source: author compiled

Conclusions

Analyzing PPC development in Belarus and in other post-Soviet countries the following conclusions have been drawn:

The definition of PPP within the legal framework should not be limited to the general concept of cooperation between the public and private sectors. Definition has to include key elements of PPP, such as a joint contribution of resources, joint responsibility for providing services, risk distribution between partners, (instead of risks transfers from the public to private partner).

Simplification of PPP formation procedures can considerably raise the interest of investors in them. The government has to foresee project bidding procedures. Partners have to be able to create PPP using a standard contract instead of a set of contracts for different activities.

Speaking about market discipline, clauses regarding timely completion of the project at its all stages and penalties for failure to do that have to be defined in a contract.

Partners should pay special attention to developing a PPP management structure, for example, representatives of the interested groups of

the community and/or consumer associations should be included in PPP management board alongside representatives of a public institution and a private partner. Regulations regarding project management and dispute settlement procedures and mechanisms should be worked out.

Government's tariff policy should be clear and regulated, the private partner should know when it may raise public service tariffs, how often, to what extent taking into account the inflation rate, etc.

This paper can serve as useful guidance developing PPP and seeking effectiveness and efficiency of PPC projects in post-Soviet countries. The identified PPP and PPC success factors can significantly contribute to the development of the public sector and improve practices to achieve greater value for money.

References

1. Bazhenov, A. (2011). Zadachi Vnesheconombanka po razvitiyu rynka proektov G.Ch.P. v 2011 godu, (in Russian) (Vnesheconombank' tasks in 2011 regarding developing the market of PPP projects), paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the PPP Centre and Representatives of Regions of the Russian Federation regarding Implementation of the PPP projects, 26–27 January 2011, Moscow. Retrieved 3 June 2011 from <http://www.pppinrussia.ru/main/publications/articles>.
2. Bovaird, T. Public–private partnerships: From contested concepts to prevalent practice. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 2004, Vol. 70, No. 2, pp. 199-216.
3. Boynton, A.C., Zmud, R.W. (1984). An assessment of critical success factors. *Sloan Management Review*, Summer, 17–27; Saraph J.V., Benson ,G.P., Schroeder, R.G., Bult-Spiering, M., Dewulf, G. *Strategic Issues in Public–Private Partnerships: An International Perspective*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, 2006.
4. European Commission. (2003). *Guidelines for successful public–private partnerships*. Retrieved 14 November 2012 from http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/guides/ppp_en.pdf.
5. Grimsey, D., Lewis, M. *Public Private Partnerships: The Worldwide Revolution in Infrastructure Provision and Project Finance*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, 2004.
6. Hall, D. Public–private partnerships (PPPs). Summary paper, 2008. Retrieved 4 February 2015 from <http://www.epsu.org/IMG/PDF>.
7. Hardcastle, C., Edwards, P. J., Akintoye, A., Li, B. (2005). Critical success factors for PPP/PFI projects in the UK construction industry: A factor analysis approach. *Construction Management and Economics*, Vol. 23, No. 5, pp. 459-471.
8. Jamali, D. (2004). A public-private partnership in the Lebanese telecommunications industry: Critical success factors and policy lessons. *Public Works Management and Policy*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 103-119.
9. Klijn, E.-H., Teisman, G.R. (2003). Institutional and strategic barriers to public–private partnerships: An analysis of Dutch cases, *Public Money & Management*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 137-146.
10. Mouraviev, N. (2014). Breaking the barriers between partners from the public and private sectors: Success factors for effective public-private partnership governance. E-publication from 22-nd NISPAcee Annual conference, May 22-24, 2014, Budapest, Hungary.
11. Mouraviev, N., Kakabadse, N.K. (2012). Conceptualising public–private partnerships: A critical appraisal of approaches to meanings and forms. *Society and Business Review*, 20126 Vol. 7, No. 3, 260–276.
12. Mouraviev, N., Kakabadse, N., Robinson, I. (2012). Concessionary nature of public-private partnerships in Russia and Kazakhstan: A critical review. *International Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 35, No. 6, pp. 410-420.
13. Osborne, S. P. (Ed.). *Public–Private Partnerships: Theory and Practice in International Perspective*. Routledge, London, 2000.
14. Pongsiri, N. (2002). Regulation and public-private partnerships. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Vol. 15, No. 6, 487-495.
15. Proekty gosudarstvenno-chastnogo partnerstva v regionah (2013a) [PPP projects in regions], Dannye Kazhstanskogo tsentra gosudarstvenno-chastnogo partnerstva. Analitika. Retrieved 3 January 2013 from <http://www.kzppp.kz/ru/project/table>.
16. Proekty gosudarstvenno-chastnogo partnerstva v regionah (2015b) [PPP projects in regions], Dannye Kazhstanskogo tsentra gosudarstvenno-chastnogo partnerstva. Analitika. Retrieved 9 February 2015 from <http://www.kzppp.kz/ru/project/table>.
17. Rockart, J.F. (1982). The changing role of the information systems executive: A critical success factors perspective, *Sloan Management Review*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 3-13.
18. Saraph J.V., Benson, G.P., Schroeder, R.G. (1989). An instrument for measuring the critical factors of quality management. *Decision Sciences*, No. 20, pp. 810-829.
19. Valuzhitskij, V.I. (2015). *Razvitie gosudarstvenno – chastnogo partnerstva v Respublike Belarus: ot teorii k practice*[Public – private partnership's development in the Republic of Belarus: from theory to practice]. Sbornik nauchnyh statej XI mezhdunarodnoj nauchno – prakticheskoy konferentsii“ Gosudarstvennoe regulirovanie ekonomiki i povyshenie effektivnosti deyatelnosti sub'ektov hozayistvovaniay. 16-17 aprelya 2015. Minsk, Akademia upravleniay pri Prezidente Respubliki Belarus.
20. Yang, J., Shen, G.Q., Ho, M., Drew, D.S., Chan, A.P.C. (2009). Exploring critical success factors for partner management in construction projects. *Journal of Civil Engineering and Management*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 337-348.

Государственно-частное партнёрство в Евразийском экономическом союзе: уроки для Беларуси

Резюме

Исследования развития государственно-частного партнёрства (далее – ГЧП) в Беларуси и в постсоветских странах позволяют сделать следующие выводы:

Правовые рамки в любой из стран постсоветского пространства должны предполагать определение ГЧП, которое не должно ограничиваться общим сотрудничеством между государственным и частным секторами. Определение должно включать такие ключевые элементы ГЧП, как: совместные инвестиции, солидарная ответственность за предоставление услуг, распределение рисков между партнерами вместо передачи рисков государственного партнёра частному.

Упрощение порядка формирования ГЧП может значительно повысить интерес инвесторов к данному партнёрству. Правительство должно проектировать процедуру торгов, а партнёры, в свою очередь, должны быть в состоянии сформировать ГЧП, используя единый контракт вместо набора контрактов, касающихся разных направлений деятельности.

В целях обеспечения рыночной дисциплины контракт партнёрства должен предусматривать стимулирование своевременного завершения определённых стадий проекта, а также штрафы за нарушение установленного срока выполнения работ. Кроме того, контракт должен включать штрафы или процентные платежи, которые должны распространяться на государственного партнёра наряду с платежами концессионеров.

Партнёры должны обращать особое внимание на создание структур по управлению ГЧП. Например, Совет ГЧП должен объединять как представителей государственных учреждений и частных партнёров, так и заинтересованных групп общества и/или потребительских ассоциаций. Партнёры также должны разрабатывать процедуры и создавать структуры для урегулирования споров.

Правительство должно одобрять прозрачную тарифную политику, предусматривающую обстоятельства, при которых частные партнёры вправе увеличивать тариф на общественные услуги, устанавливая норму подобного повышения с учётом инфляции, а также периодичность корректирования тарифов.

Факторы успеха ГЧП в Казахстане и в России, безусловно, являются актуальными и для Беларуси, где проекты в данной сфере только стартуют. На сегодня в Беларуси принято 8 проектов из 63 поданных проектов ГЧП: 2 проекта касаются дорожной инфраструктуры, 2 - энергетики и 4 - сектора социальной услуг. Хотя проекты стартовали только в 2014-2016 годах, уже сейчас можно сделать некоторые предварительные выводы относительно ключевых факторов успеха в партнёрстве.

В Беларуси наблюдается определённый прогресс в области законодательной базы ГЧП в части подготовки прошедшего парламентские слушания проекта закона о ГЧП, который Парламент Республики Беларусь планирует в ближайшей перспективе принять. В качестве позитивного момента следует отметить, что в проекте закона декларируются новые формы ГЧП: концессионный и инвестиционный договоры, отличающиеся от традиционных способов взаимодействия с инвесторами долгосрочностью контракта, распределением рисков и ответственности, проектным финансированием, включающим отечественные и международные финансово-кредитные институты (ЕБР, МФК). В белорусском законодательстве не дифференцируются национальные и международные инвесторы, вследствие чего проект закона предусматривает равнозначное участие национальных и иностранных инвесторов в ГЧП. Целью нового закона о ГЧП является привлечение инвесторов, способных нести экономическую ответственность по заключённым инвестиционным соглашениям. При этом в случае невозможности продолжения инвесторами исполнять их договорные обязательства предусматривается уникальный механизм по замене частных партнёров без прекращения данного соглашения. Последующая реализация нового закона и новых форм ГЧП в Беларуси приведёт к более глубокому пониманию нужд предпринимательства, условий привлечения инвесторов и путей взаимодействия между государством и частными партнёрами.

Несмотря на указанные достоинства, проект закона имеет ряд недостатков. В первую очередь, это касается отсутствия в нём законодательного разъяснения таких традиционных форм, типов и моделей ГЧП, как: контракт, аренда, концессия, соглашение о разделе продукции, совместные предприятия. Не прослеживается правовая база для долгосрочных финансовых обязательств партнёров. Очевидно, что законодательство следует дополнить предоставлением частным партнёрам права на заключение соглашений непосредственно с региональными администрациями, минуя центр и сложившуюся в данной системе вертикаль.

В области нормативного регулирования сотрудничества между предпринимательством и государством недостаточно чётко прописаны процедуры формирования ГЧП; не установлены правила тарифного регулирования.

Следует отметить, что юридическое регулирование концессионных договоров осталось без изменений. Они регламентируются Инвестиционным кодексом, хотя специфика концессионных соглашений требует разработки отдельных нормативных актов.

В Беларуси пока не наблюдается определённого прогресса в области формирования партнёрской среды и управления рисками, совершенствования партнёрских взаимоотношений, поскольку проекты ГЧП находятся в стартовом режиме. Вместе с тем, основная задача партнёрства не должна сводиться к передаче обязанностей и рисков государства частным партнёрам. Не следует допускать того, чтобы партнёрские обязательства государства ограничивались предоставлением частным партнёрам земли под застройку и сырья в виде природных ресурсов и отходов. Государство должно солидарно участвовать во всём цикле производственных отношений. По названной причине российские и казахские участники проектов ГЧП настаивают на наиболее справедливой модели ГЧП – концессии, которая чётко устанавливает пропорции между затратами и результатами государственных и частных партнёров при получении выручки от реализации, отнесении затрат на себестоимость, получении прибыли, уплате налогов и других платежах.

Наиболее слабыми местами Беларуси в реализации проектов ГЧП по сравнению с другими странами Евразийского экономического союза являются сле-

дующие: отсутствие финансового рынка; крайне низкий суверенный кредитный рейтинг страны; высокая степень кредитного риска; неразвитость долгосрочного бюджетного планирования; отсутствие методики обоснования эффективности расходования средств; отсутствие специалистов в области ГЧП в регионах.

Таким образом, результаты проведённого анализа могут стать руководством для других стран, вовлечённых в управление ГЧП. В дальнейшем учёные должны объединить свои усилия для изучения эффективных схем управления сотрудничеством и для индикации дополнительных факторов, гарантирующих успех ГЧП на практике. Они могут исследовать положительный опыт в следующих секторах социальных услуг: в строительстве и в дошкольных, школьных, медицинско-оздоровительных учреждениях. Всё это позволит сократить операционные издержки в управлении ГЧП и, следовательно, предложить обществу лучшее соотношение цены и качества.

Ключевые слова: государственно-частная кооперация, государственно-частное партнёрство, концессия, законодательная база, взаимодействие партнёров, риск-менеджмент, основные факторы успеха.