# Leveraging PPPs for smart city infrastructure

July, 2018

# Core messages today

1	Smart cities are delivering measurable impact	<ul> <li>Layers of applications and new devices are being overlaid onto existing infrastructure</li> <li>Cities are applying this tech to mobility, security, and utilities</li> <li>Adoption and usage by citizens is enabling a better quality of life</li> </ul>
2	Many PPP models are feasible	<ul> <li>Powerful option to finance smart infrastructure</li> <li>Cities have to trade off control/ownership, transfer of risk, and capital requirements of projects</li> <li>More than 45 assets and services could be candidates for PPPs</li> </ul>
Ř		
3	Fast & effective is possible	<ul> <li>Pune is a leading example, successful at planning and execution</li> <li>Intensive and early vendor engagement led to minimal queries, no extension of deadlines, and large participation of private parties</li> <li>Be clear on scope, governance across departments, and impact</li> </ul>

Contents



Case study from Pune, India on smart elements PPP

Urban cities are rapidly embracing changes to conventional infrastructure assets and services to make cities smart

#### ILLUSTRATIVE SET OF SOLUTIONS



### Smart cities add digital intelligence to the urban world, raising quality of life Three layers of "smartness"



An overlay of technology & services improves the service delivery and efficiency, depending on the needs of the city



# Smart City technologies are being deployed in cities around the world to improve municipal management and services

#### Deployments of Smart City Technology Solutions,

Case Examples, Not Exhaustive



# With measurable impact for citizens

30–300

lives saved each year in a city of 5 million

30-40%

fewer crime incidents

8–15%

lower disease burden

# 15-30

minutes shaved off the daily commute

**25–80** 

liters of water saved per person per day

20-35%

faster emergency response times

Contents



Case study from Pune, India on smart elements PPP

## Public Private Partnership extends across a broad spectrum

Infrastructure asset procurement options					
Public	Public-Private Partnership				Privatization
<ul> <li>Restructuring &amp; corporatization</li> <li>Civil works contract: DBB &amp; DB</li> <li>Service contracts</li> </ul>	Management contracts	Operational/ Service concessions	Construction concessions		Full divestiture
			<ul> <li>BOT type</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>DBO type</li> </ul>	
Public ownership and finance			Mix of public and private ownership and finance		Private ownership and finance
Public operations	Private operations				
				Extent of private se	ector participation
DBB: Design Bid Build DB: Design Build BOT: Build Operate Transfer DBO: Design Build Operate DBFO: Design-Build-Finance-Opera	te				

SOURCE: United Nations, Press

# Level of private sector involvement and associated risk varies

	Management	Operating	Construction Concession	
Conditions	contracts	Concession	ВОТ	DBO
Duration	Short – 2-5 years	Long – 25-30 years	Varies	Varies – can be perpetual
Conditions	Input or output based	Output/ Performance Based	Focus on input	Focus on input
Payment	Government/fee payment	User fees (occasionally subsidized by grants)	Government – can be lump payment/fee payment	Government/fee payment
Construction Risk	N/A	N/A	Private sector	Private sector
Investment Risk	Public sector	Private sector	Private sector	Public sector
Operation Risk	Public sector	Private sector	Public/Private sector	Private sector
	Risk			

Numerous variants of PPP's can be used to crash execution timelines – choose model most suitable to meet the needs of the city and the project

Model type	s	Sub variants used	
1 Management contracts		<ul> <li>Long-term lease</li> <li>Management contracts</li> <li>Maintenance contracts</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Most of these type of contracts are termed</li> <li>PPP projects and involve</li> <li>Partial or full private</li> </ul>
Operational/ 2 Service concessions		<ul> <li>PFI Concessions</li> <li>PSA concessions</li> <li>OM concessions</li> </ul>	funding — Private delivery of a traditionally publicly provided service or asset
Cons- truction	A BOT type	<ul> <li>Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT)</li> <li>Build-Own-Operate-Transfer (BOOT)</li> <li>Build-Lease-Operate-Transfer (BLOT)</li> <li>Build-Own-Operate (BOO)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Sharing of risks in at least one part of the value chain</li> <li>The models can be consecutive as e.g. in the case of Turkish</li> </ul>
3) Concess- ions	B DBO type	<ul> <li>Design-Build-Finance-Operate (DBFO)</li> <li>Design-Build-Own (DBO)</li> <li>Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain (DBFOM)</li> </ul>	airports which were first BOT deals and when constructed tendered as OM-type concessions

# Suitable PPP model for city based infrastructure can be evaluated based on revenue earning potential and capex expenditure involved

Sweet spot for cities

		ure projects executed by ULB's	Revenue earning capability	
	l	<b>Low</b> [Public service projects] e.g., streets	<b>Medium</b> [Direct to citizen services] e.g., utilities	<b>High</b> [Livability focused projects with operations and land monetization potential]
Capex involvement and need of private sector partnership	High		<ul> <li>Solid waste management</li> <li>24/7 water supply</li> <li>Bus rapid transport</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Riverfront/public space development</li> <li>New bus/EV fleet</li> <li>Transit hub</li> <li>Affordable housing</li> <li>Optical fiber cable</li> <li>MRTS</li> </ul>
	Medium	<ul> <li>Security and surveillance</li> <li>Solar energy supply and installation</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Public bicycle sharing</li> <li>Waste to energy</li> <li>Smart street lights</li> <li>City hospitals</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Smart parking's (across city)</li> <li>Commercial sports complex/ Multidisciplinary sports stadium</li> <li>Meeting and convention centers/business parks</li> </ul>
	Low	<ul> <li>Placemaking and open spaces</li> <li>Fire stations</li> <li>Rain water harvesting</li> <li>Storm water and waste water recycling</li> <li>Public/service roads</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Integrated traffic management systems</li> <li>Smart metering</li> </ul>	
Typical (potential )PPP model		PP EPC + Service contract	Cost Rec + Annuity/Grant	BOT/Output based/ Revenue sharing

NOT EXHAUSTIVE

# 45+ assets and services are candidates for PPP in cities based on global evidences



1 Includes street fixing

2 Over the road bridges

Source: Press search, World Bank, Team analysis

Contents

3



Case study from Pune, India on smart elements PPP

Pune is the 9<sup>th</sup> most populous city in India; currently ranked 2<sup>nd</sup> in execution of its smart cities mission in India



Population growth rate (AEGR, 20012011) 2.1%







# Pune's project *Smart Element* comprises critical IT infrastructure, a Smart City Operation Centre, and third party applications



# Some of the key use cases from external & internal systems



# The tender followed a competitive bidding process over 3-4 months



A management contract model with upfront capex investment by the developer was finalized as the PPP structure for the project

#### **Vendor engagement**

0-2 months

- Pune Smart City Development Corporation ran multiple vendor engagement sessions with possible vendors across construction and IT players to find out:
  - Interest of participants
  - Feedback on execution timelines
  - Revenue potential of the project
  - Potential PPP models which can make the project viable
  - Service delivery model

# Economic structure incorporating market feedback

2-3 months

- Design, Build, Implement, Operate and Maintain for 5 years chosen as final execution model
  - Provision of network bandwidth for a period of 5 years
  - O&M of the entire ICCC for a period of 5 years
  - Capex payments on milestone basis
  - Opex payments on quarterly basis subject to SLA compliance

Intensive vendor engagement effort led to minimal queries, no extension of bid submission deadline, and large participation of private parties

# Targeted communication tackled three strategic audiences

Who	Why 🥠	What ???	Mow Q
Governmer entities and other ministries	Syndicate in order gain support in pushing PPP enablers	<ul> <li>Issues regulatory approval and exemptions</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>One-on-one meetings with key stakeholders</li> <li>Set up Supervisory Committee</li> <li>Communicated to Government committees/meetings</li> </ul>
Investors 2	Maximize investor excitement and participation in/ for PPPs	<ul> <li>Provide a comprehensive view of PPP strategy and project portfolio (pipeline)</li> <li>Provide project specific details</li> <li>Educate on process and levers available to engage in PPPs</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Investor conferences &amp; Investor roadshows</li> <li>Pre-bid conferences</li> <li>Business journals/Newspapers (online and paper)</li> </ul>
General Public 3	Inform on changes resulting from PPP and gain buy-in	<ul> <li>Share overall PPP strategy and objectives</li> <li>Educate on benefits reasons and expected changes resulting from engaging in PPPs</li> <li>Disseminate project specific information e.g. operational guidelines, benefits, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>TV news</li> <li>TV sponsored Ads</li> <li>Newspapers</li> <li>Billboards</li> <li>Universities</li> <li>Flyers</li> <li>Social Media</li> </ul>

PRELIMINARY

### Progress made in the last 1-1.5 years







# of Stakeholders met for external integration



# of use cases implemented



# of months since operationalization of SCOC

\* Stakeholders including Sinchan/dam authority, Disaster Management, Police/Traffic, Fire Department, Lights, Vehicle Tracking and Surveillance

# The implementation was not challenge-free

#### Scope of work unclear and too broad

- Unclear definitions of exact work to be implemented on physical construction and technology integration, leading to challenges on interface of installations and command center
- Pan city execution/big-bang execution approach led to distribution of resources and slow progress

#### Lack of accountability in governance

- Non-existence of clear list of approvals from the multiple government agencies involved [central, state government] delayed physical works
- Unclear project acceptance structure i.e., absence of a third-party evaluator to verify project delivered as per RFP condition

#### Did not consider how to measure impact early enough

- Absence of well-defined use cases for citizen impact
- Difficulty in evaluation of impact

Most challenges were due to 1<sup>st</sup> time execution of such a project in India, so no existing best practices to learn from

# Important lessons from the project



- Breaking silo based working is a huge challenge
- Extensive vendor engagement critical to designing the right
- Deliver 'quick wins' before addressing more complex landscapes by prioritizing projects appropriately

**Be citizen** centric

- Important to measure benefit to citizens from each initiative
- While quality of data is a key to success, privacy and confidentiality should not be compromised

3	Use tech
)	effectively

- Important not to underestimate revenue potential on visual messaging display units and WIFI
- System integrator essential to build sustainable capacity within the operator of the ICCC
- Use public infrastructure to create e-connectivity corridor at scale for the citizens

# Private participation enables 5 specific advantages to city leaders



## Read more in our recent reports from the McKinsey Global Institute (online)



# Thank you!



# **Paul JACOBSON**

Manager, Project Development T +1 (202) 662 0025 M +1 (202) 378-7995 paul\_jacobson@mckinsey.com