



**EXAMINING PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS IN SOLID  
WASTE MANAGEMENT**

**A STUDY OF A & M EXECUTIVE CLEANING SERVICES  
AND KAMPALA CAPITAL CITY AUTHORITY**

**BY  
AGUTI PATRICIA  
2010/HD10/2628U**

**SUPERVISOR:**

**DR. MOSES MUHWEZI**

**A RESEARCH REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
FOR A STUDY IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD  
OF A MASTERS OF SCIENCE IN PROCUREMENT AND SUPPLY CHAIN  
MANAGEMENT OF MAKERERE UNIVERSITY.**

**June, 2014**

**PLAN B**

**DECLARATION**

I Aguti Patricia, hereby declare that this copy is the original of my report. I further declare that it is being presented to Makerere University for the first time and that no other party has ever presented it in any other institution for whatsoever reasons.

Signed: .....

Date .....

**AGUTI PATRICIA**

**2010/HD10/2628U**

**APPROVAL**

This research report has been carried out under my guidance and supervision and has been approved under my authority as a Makerere University Business School Supervisor.

Signed: .....

Date .....

**DR. MOSES MUHWEZI**

Supervisor

## **DEDICATION**

The researcher dedicates this dissertation to the Almighty God, and my family who supported me in the best way possible during the course of my studies.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I thank my husband, most, for putting up with me throughout the time required to work and study.

I also thank God for blessing me in all my undertakings. My thanks and gratitude go to Dr. Moses Muhwezi for his tremendous support, encouragement, wisdom and guidance along the way; for his input in regard to the subject of study.

The study would not have been possible without the contribution of the employees of A & M Executive Cleaning Services and Kampala Capital City Authority who were the respondents. They were supportive in completing the questionnaires which formed the basis of the dissertation.

Finally, I thank all my family, course mates and friends for their support and guidance during my research study.

## TABLE OF CONTENT

DECLARATION .....	ii
APPROVAL .....	iii
DEDICATION .....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	v
TABLE OF CONTENT .....	vi
ABSTRACT.....	ix
CHAPTER ONE .....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Background to the study .....	1
1.2 Statement of the problem .....	3
1.3 Purpose of the study.....	3
1.4 Research objectives.....	4
1.5 Research Questions .....	4
1.6 Scope of the study.....	4
1.6.1 Geographical Scope .....	4
1.6.2 Content Scope .....	4
1.6.3 Conceptual Scope.....	5
1.7 Significance/Justification of the study .....	5
CHAPTER TWO .....	5
LITERATURE REVIEW .....	5
2.1 Public private partnerships efficiency in solid waste management .....	5
2.2 The challenges of public private partnerships in solid waste management.....	8
2.3 The Strategies that can be adopted to improve public private partnerships in solid waste management .....	12
CHAPTER THREE.....	16
METHODOLOGY.....	16
3.1 Research design .....	15
3.2 Study population .....	15
3.3 Sample size .....	16
3.4 Sources of data.....	16

3.4.1	Primary Sources .....	16
3.4.2	Secondary Sources .....	16
3.5	Data collection instruments.....	16
3.7	Validity and Reliability.....	17
3.8	Data analysis and Discussion.....	17
3.9	Limitations of the study .....	17
CHAPTER FOUR.....		18
PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS .....		18
4.0	Introduction.....	18
ii.	What are the challenges of public private partnerships and how do they affect solid waste management? .....	19
iii.	What strategies can be adopted to improve public private partnerships in solid waste management? .....	19
4.1	Sample Characteristics.....	19
4.2.1	Company name of the respondents .....	19
4.2.2	Education level attained.....	19
4.2.3	Work experience of the respondents.....	20
4.2.4	Position (Title) in the company.....	21
4.4	The level of efficiency of public private partnerships in solid waste management.....	21
4.5	The challenges of public private partnerships in solid waste management.....	23
4.6	The strategies to be adopted to improve public private partnerships in solid waste management.....	25
CHAPTER FIVE .....		28
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION .....		28
5.0	Introduction.....	28
5.1	Discussions .....	28
5.1.1	The level of efficiency of public private partnerships in solid waste management.....	28
5.1.2	The challenges of public private partnerships in solid waste management .....	29
5.1.3	The strategies to improve public private partnerships in solid waste management.....	29
5.2	Conclusion .....	30
5.3	Recommendations.....	30
5.4	Area for the further research .....	31

REFERENCES .....	32
APPENDIX.....	38
Questionnaire for Data Collection .....	38



## **ABSTRACT**

The study sought to evaluate public private partnerships in solid waste management. Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) refer to arrangements for the procurement of goods and services utilizing franchising and similar arrangement with the private sector, the private sector is contracted to provide goods and services on behalf of government (Regan 2005). This study was carried out at A & M Executive cleaning company and Kampala Capital City Authority. Therefore a total of 64 staff made the study population of this study. The sample size of 52 was determined based on Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table. Self-administered questionnaires were used to collect responses and measurements were done, subjected to rigorous data processing and analysis using statistical package for social scientists (SPSS). The results after examining public private partnerships in solid waste management revealed that the private sector is more efficient than the public sector in solid waste management though they both have to be committed to the partnership to successfully handle the challenges meaning that neither the public sector nor the private sector could do it alone successfully.

The recommendations were that Policy guidance on public private partnerships should be revised, the government should give tax incentives like tax holidays to private firms that are willing to get involved in public private partnerships, the government should properly oversee PPP projects, the private sector should provide technical support to government organizations, Capacity building of both public and private sector employees involved in PPPs should be provided, and there should be independence of departments handling public private partnerships and a clear decision making process and sensitization of management and other government bodies on the importance of PPPs.

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background to the study

Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) refer to arrangements for the procurement of goods and services utilizing franchising and similar arrangement with the private sector, the private sector is contracted to provide goods and services on behalf of government (Regan 2005).

Public- private partnerships (PPPs) have constituted a growing movement world wide for the past decade. Countries have been seeking private partners to finance, manage and maintain infrastructure serving public purposes in a growing range of areas. Transportation, hospitals, schools and prisons are among the leading candidates of private partnerships. Countries have increased their use and reliance on the private sector in the recent years to finance capital asset acquisition and operations (Tkachenko et al 2009). They have many reasons for pursuing partnerships with the private sector to deliver goods and services. Much of the move is political in nature, arising from constraints on governmental roles and spending. The argument is that the private sector can achieve equal or greater levels of service with lower costs than pure public sector provision (Posner et al 2009).

“When Museveni’s NRM guerilla movement took over power in 1986, it inherited 146 public sector enterprises, excluding banks” (Ddumba et al 2001). Majority of these enterprises performed poorly due to the fallen economy. The public sector enterprises suffered from low capacity utilization, high operating costs and low profitability, indebtness and so the government decided to ally with private provision. However this was done without critical analysis of the prevailing conditions like competition, property rights, management as outlined in Kirkpatrick (2003), and so not in line with Acarani (2003) who observed that there is need to be cautious when extending application of PPPs where both market and government regulatory capacity may be weak.

There are several public private partnerships models/ types that can be adopted by a country as clearly mentioned by the national council for public private partnerships; though many,

they can be summarized to contracting, franchising and lease arrangements. Operations and Maintenance, Operations, Maintenance & Management. Many local governments use this contractual partnership to provide waste water treatment services, National Water and sewerage Corporation in Uganda inclusive; Design-Build, Design-Build-Maintain; Design-Build-Operate; Design-Build-Operate-Maintain; Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain; Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain-Transfer; Build-Operate-Transfer; Build-Own-Operate; Buy-Build-Operate; Developer Finance; .Enhanced Use Leasing or Underutilized Asset is an asset management program in the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) that can include a variety of different leasing arrangements (e.g. lease/develop/operate, build/develop/operate); Lease-Develop-Operate or Build-Develop-Operate; Lease/Purchase; and turnkey

According to Grout (2003), government used to purchase physical asset, retain ownership, and use public sector employees to deliver the required service. However, this mode of procuring infrastructure and delivering public service proved impossible as it was characterized by inadequate government investments, budget deficits, inefficiencies, corruption, over staffing, poor pricing, mismanagement and stagnation (Harris 2003, Rwelamire 2004), thus no efficiency.

However, the Uganda Investment Authority has observed that some of the negative influence working against such public private partnerships is limited access to finance, lack of entrepreneurial skills, lack of general skills, marketing and financial planning, lack of business plans, lack of business records, poor banking and borrowing history and a culture that disrespects business contracts. This is mainly associated with issues related to risk bearing in commercial projects. It seems, nevertheless, that the ‘profit’ motive and its accountability and transparency along the lines of quality and ownership that are so much needed to fulfill those very demanding business activities are stumbling blocks to PPPs spreading widely.

Specific social economic conditions prevail in many developing countries including high population and concentration in urban areas which leads to insufficient funds for SWM

thus poor operations and low standards (Kironde et al., 1999; Spaagena et al.,2005). This includes unreliable and inadequate coverage with open dumping as the only disposal method available (Countreau- Levine, 1994). Insufficient collections, uncontrolled street collection points and improper disposal in open dumps allow room for informal refuse collectors to operate (Wilson et al., 2006). And these dumped waste anywhere so long as nobody was watching. And so SWM in Uganda finally got into the hands of the formal private sector which was first contracted by KCCA and by 2011 KCCA had registered 34 private solid waste management independent private firms. The road to embark on privatization of SWM was based on the fact that generators of the solid waste can pay for their solid waste management and that private companies would probably perform more efficiently than the public sector.

A & M Executive cleaning services had experience and capacity for over 10 years in solid waste management. It had been working along several government institutes including Kampala Capital City Authority. This was a clear demonstration of public private partnership that was assessed to check the value added in the previous public dominated governance system.

## **1.2 Statement of the problem**

The inability of the public sector to effectively handle Solid waste led to the formation of Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) in solid waste management (SWM) so that the private sector can combat this problem. However, it should be noted that there are no clear laws on PPPs established yet, though there are reasonable working arrangements to enable the good performance of PPPs in Uganda. Nevertheless, the good performance of SWM through PPPs arrangement in Uganda has not been realized as expected. Solid waste management remains a big challenge for both public and private sector. This study will analyse solid waste management by Public Private Partnership.

## **1.3 Purpose of the study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the role of public private partnerships in solid waste management.

#### **1.4 Research objectives**

- (i) To find out the level of efficiency of public private partnerships in solid waste management.
- (ii) To assess the challenges of public private partnerships in solid waste management.
- (iii) To recommend strategies for public private partnerships to improve solid waste management.

#### **1.5 Research Questions**

- (i) What is the level of efficiency of public private partnerships in solid waste management?
- (ii) What are the challenges of public private partnerships and how do they affect solid waste management?
- (iii) What strategies can be adopted to improve public private partnerships in solid waste management?

#### **1.6 Scope of the study**

This covered the geographical scope, content scope and conceptual scope.

##### **1.6.1 Geographical Scope**

The study was carried out at A & M Executive cleaning services located on plot No 38, Lumumba Avenue in Kampala Uganda and Kampala Capital City Authority.

##### **1.6.2 Content Scope**

This study was focused on the finding out the efficiency level of public private partnerships in solid waste management; assess the challenges of public private partnerships in solid waste management and the strategies that can be adopted to improve public private partnerships in solid waste management.

##### **1.6.3 Conceptual Scope**

The study considered public private partnerships as a concept and all its dimensions.

## **1.7 Significance/Justification of the study**

- (i) The study was of importance to the government in making the decision on whether to privatize or not.
- (ii) The findings were used by the private sector to increase their awareness of how best to improve their efficiency levels.
- (iii) The strategies enabled the public sector improve the performance of public private partnerships.
- (iv) The research enabled the government to combat the challenges of solid waste management of public private partnership.
- (v) The researcher was the primary beneficiaries of this research since it was to enable her complete her course of Masters of Science in Procurement and Supply Chain Management of Makerere University.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 Public private partnerships efficiency level in solid waste management**

The 1990s have seen the establishment of public private partnerships PPPs as a key mechanism of public policy across the world (Osborne, 2000). PPPs have become a regular practice across the diverse sectors of government service provision stretching from

construction of roads, telecommunication networks, prisons, hospitals, schools, universities, to manage these facilities (Ndandiko, 2006).

PPPs refer to arrangements for the procurement of goods and services utilizing franchising and similar arrangement with the private sector, the private sector is contracted to provide goods and services on behalf of government (Regan, 2005).

PPPs are increasingly becoming a method of procuring infrastructure and public services by government (Grimsey, 2002). In essence the private entity becomes the long term provider of services while government becomes the purchaser of the services (Grout, 2003: Ahadzi, 2004).

According to (Hodge and Greve, 2007), Public private partnerships have clear potential to promote greater efficiency and possible cost savings by involving the private sector. To achieve value for money in comparison to traditional capital, private efficiency must be sufficient to overcome the extra financing costs of using private interest rates and transaction costs.

The use of public private partnerships is a growing trend throughout the world; public private partnerships are used to meet a wide variety of public needs. Today, partnerships are used not only in transportation projects but also for water and waste systems, delivery of social services, building schools and a wide range of other applications.

Cities and countries are rapidly applying the experiences with PPPs learnt over the last few decades- experiences on how best to most effectively combine the strengths and resources of both the public and private sectors (Ndandiko, 2006).

According to (Greene, 1999), PPPs can be more difficult to execute than other types of procurement, however in many cases PPPs make possible the completion of projects that would be impossible using more traditional methods of economic development and that is why today PPPs are considered “creative alliances” formed between government entity and private developers to achieve a common purpose.

Some literature has painted a negative picture of service provision by the public sector saying that the public sector can never be expected to deliver services as efficiently as the private sector because the public agencies lack incentives to perform efficiently (Ndandiko 2006). They are inefficient because they address the objectives of politicians rather than maximize efficiency (Boycko et al, 1996); they provide services desired by politicians rather than by clients (Sheleifer et al 1994); and that they generally have no competitive pressures that would force them maximize efficiency since they tend to be monopolies.

However, it was envisaged that private sector involvement enables competition which results in improved outcomes such as greater efficiency, higher quality of service; a clear focus on clients and better value for money (Parker 2000; Ancarani 2003).

While private provision arrangements of public services have received much publicity as efficient and effective modes of implementing public procurement policy in the developed world, little has been considered in the context of a developing country (Ndandiko, 2006).

Private firms are also noted for their efficiency and expertise, brought about by the competitive market forces to which they are subjected. Empirical evidence suggests that public-private partnerships have achieved a high level of efficiency and quality of service (Medalye 2006) Thus, proponents suggest that introduction of a private partner can bring about efficiency and expertise that would otherwise not be available to the public sector.

Public private partnerships have shown early gains in construction timeliness and costs. According to the United Kingdom National Audit office reports that PPPs are delivered on time and on budget more often than traditional agreements. Traditional infrastructure is on time and on budget 30% of the time, while PPP projects are on time and on budget over 75% of the time (Hodge and Greve, 2007). Politt, (2005), also concluded that PPPs deliver on time and on budget a higher percentage of the time. While public agencies could do this too, they needed PPPs to stimulate and innovate.

In aggregate, cost savings are achieved through PPPs only if their efficiencies outweigh the higher financing cost and transactions costs that private financing and partnerships



inevitably bring. Real cost savings can also be achieved if PPPs enable public officials to impose user charges by shifting potential blame from themselves to private firms who was responsible for managing the asset (Montein, 2007).

However in a study carried out in Brazil on sanitation operation fund, there is no significant difference between public and private operators in terms of the total variation and productivity. Regional operators have lower productivity levels than municipalities (Moreira et al 2004) researching private involvement in local government service provision exposes the gap between PPP policy expectation and outcome.

According to Hsu (2010), measurement of efficiency is especially relevant in setting constrained by scarce resources and given the recent economic and escalating costs. The literature on relative efficiency levels between private and public delivery of services show inconclusive evidence. This underscores that one cannot generalize which ownership model is best across countries or even within countries overtime. It is no longer a question of private versus public but rather “what is the best and most efficient mix for the local context.”

To sum up, PPPs discussions seem to be dominated by two currents: one group completely argues in favour of such projects and the other one shows entire hostility. On both sides, the evaluation of PPP is often highly ideological. What is more, a lack of objective empirical data supporting the pros and cons of PPP it very difficult to carry out a realistic assessment (Klatl 2009).

## **2.2 The challenges of public private partnerships in solid waste management.**

The welfare effect of carrying out PPP work is positive as it assists growth and progress. According to Palmer (2009), the improved economy, efficiency gains and the reduction in government overload are the arguments for PPPs for there are benefits like value for money, risk transfer, easing budget constraints and management and implementation of skills.

Quite often, some of the negative influence working against such projects is the limited interest shown by the private sector. This is mainly associated with issues related to risk

bearing in commercial projects. It seems, nevertheless, that the ‘profit’ motive and its accountability and transparency along the lines of quality and ownership that are so much needed to fulfill those very demanding business activities are stumbling blocks to PPPs spreading widely. The lack of knowledge on what public-private sector partnerships can actually do and other methods of control policy by major players can also contribute against the formation of PPPs. In this research, the intention is to identify and highlight the major current issues related to implementation of PPP; the two sector and tri-sector approach to efficiency, quality, outcome results, and policy efficiency, are developed into a brief macro-analysis of PPP. The choice of partners and issues related to PPP formation are considered carefully in order to create a better understanding of the importance of PPP for the politic-economic system to generate efficient change of economic growth and sustainable progress (Montanheiro 2004).

In an interview with the local papers the executive director of Kampala Capital City Authority (KCCA) admitted that SWM is a very big challenge facing Kampala due to the environmental and social implications. Previously Kampala City Council collected stored and disposed garbage however this was not effective and so the formal private companies were preferred.

In growing urban centres in Africa, solid waste management (SWM), remains one of the conspicuous and challenging environmental problem (Spaargaren et al.,2005). This has attracted many debates from scholars and practitioners on how best to organize SWM, especially in relation to whether it should be provided by the public sector or private sector. This is more complicated since different activities in SWM fall in different categories (Post, 2004). For example the sale of recyclables is a private good while maintenance of roads is a (collective) public good yet collection of house to house solid is between the two extremes since it has the nature of joint/ merit goods (Post et al.,2003, Post, 2004).

The co- existence of public and private service provider in SWM give an opportunity to examine the claim that private provision leads to higher efficiency than public service provision. This has made many governments in the recent years to involve the private

sector in their operations; and thus the need for research to find out whether the private sector is more efficient than the public sector since according to Ndandiko (2006), there is a pessimistic view which has painted a negative picture of service provision by the public sector, it says that the public sector can never be expected to deliver services as efficiently as the private sector because the public agencies lack incentives to perform efficiently. They are inefficient because they address the objectives of politicians rather than maximize efficiency (Boycko et al, 1996).

Risk usually arises from project operations and management. The risks include construction risk, delays and overruns, financial risk, increases in financial costs, availability risk, potential shortfalls in use of the asset by the public, force majeure from natural disaster or man-made disasters and war. The nature and degree of risks borne by the private sector is a key factor for government official in determining whether to engage in public private partnerships and how to price contracts to compensate private parties for increased risks (Posner et al 2009).

According to the world Health report 2010, several characteristics of public private partnerships make the relationship more complicated. First of all, the incentives of the service provider are very different from the client, a public entity. Secondly, when public and private parties agree to cooperate, they have to develop appropriate planning, procurement and management practices as well as organizational schemes and payment - methods. The pressures caused by ongoing budget constraints and exacerbated by the supreme mortgage crisis and the resulting rise in foreclosures are compounded by the demands of the citizens accustomed to a 24/7 information-transparent world. In short, at a time of shrinking government resources, citizens now want more than ever and government cannot afford to disappoint them.

According to Bovis (2010), United Nations defines Public Private Partnerships as innovative methods used by the public sector to contract with the private sector, who bring their capital and their budget to deliver projects on time and to budget, while the public sector retains the responsibility to provide these services to the public in a way that benefits

the public and delivers economic development and an improvement in the quality of life and he states that inefficient control systems operated by public authorities is another cause of inefficiencies in public private partnerships.

The lack of knowledge on what public-private sector partnerships can actually do and other methods of control policy by major players can also contribute against the formation of PPPs (Montanheiro, 2004). Insufficient communication and cooperation between private and government due to lack of information, poor record keeping and unreliable data can lead to failure of PPPs due to need for agreement on several resources to run the contracts successfully (Ndandiko, 2006).

The inability of private firms to effectively compete when it comes to response to request of proposals due to their limited skills and expertise is a big challenge (Ndandiko 2006). Competition leads to efficiency, innovation and lower costs yet there are very few private companies that can fairly compete and so developing government may not be able to benefit from competition in the PPPs arrangement due to lack of human capacity; this is because both the private and government managers lack the skills and commitment to operate the PPPs successfully (Grimsey, 2004).

(Savas, 2000), observed that some critics see private sector involvement as a plot to create a free market that only the strong survive while the weak become even weaker. Other critics also interpret private involvement as a direct attack on government projects and its beneficiaries and they support these with arguments against private sector provision; private companies sacrifice quality for profit, reduced quality or efficiency of service, higher cost and less value. The public procurement practitioners find themselves being forced to use private provision instead of public provision based on minimum monetary threshold without any assessment whether in-house provision is an option, competition or even the availability of the service providers.

According to (IP3, 2000), an inadequate legal and regulatory framework has been the major cause of failure of PPPs. The weak laws, poor enforcement of contracts and inadequate

resolution mechanisms are a big challenge leading to failure of many projects since the existing legislations in many developing countries only describe public sector responsibility infrastructure.

In this research there will be need to find out if the influence of the private sector in public sector can improve efficiency levels because despite all these inefficiencies, it is the private sector firms entrusted with private provision especially in lower tiers of government (Ndandiko, 2006).

### **2.3 The Strategies that can be adopted to improve public private partnerships in solid waste management**

For PPPs to be successfully initiated and implemented, the presence of a conducive and enabling legal and regulatory framework is a critical pre-requisite (Bing, 2005; Zhang, 2005). Disputes are likely to occur and service delivery delayed and or impaired (IP3, 2000). The existence of a functioning legal and regulatory framework reduces opportunistic tendencies (Kuttner 1997), aligns the interest of partners and also provides confidence to the private partners as it acts as a buffer against political interference from government bodies since effective PPPs take time to establish and yield results (Pongsiri, 2002).

Another critical strategy is goal compatibility- both public and private sectors have a common goal of reducing risk and increasing certainty (Henderson, 2004): capacity of the common goal of reducing risk and increasing certainty.

There is need to strengthen further the commercial, financial and project management skills in the public sector, and the ability to adequately forecast and manage risks. A recent report from the House of Commons Public Accounts Committee suggested again that public sector staff do not always have the right experience to deal effectively with the private sector. This statement clearly indicates that there is need to train public sector staff since according to Wilson (2007), Public private partnerships play a vital role in the delivery of public services and, as public sector organizations further strengthen their commissioning

skills, they will rely more and more on a mixed economy of service providers, from private and third sectors.

Corrigan et al (2005), put forward the following as the ten principles for successful PPPs: Prepare properly for PPPs, create a shared vision, understand your partner and key players, be clear on the risks and rewards for all parties, establish a clear and rational decision making process, make sure all parties do their home work, Secure consistent and coordinated leadership, communicate early and often, negotiate a fair deal structure and finally build trust as a core value. These principles are not sequential though all are necessary for a successful partnership.

According to Summerton (1998), effective transfer of risk to the private sector can lead to an explicit transfer of risk since it is acceptable risk that gives the private entity a motivation to price and produce efficiently. Sharing risks promotes efficiency gains from PPPs. This implies that risks like construction risk, delays and overruns, financial risk, increases in financial costs, availability risk, potential shortfalls in use of the asset by the public, force majeure from natural disaster or man made disasters and war are shared between the public and private thus reducing the negative impact it can have on each. (Grout 1997, 2003, 2005) emphasizes information cost and the incentive structure created by the PPPs service payment mechanisms.

Increased competition would enable the government to negotiate the best value at lowest cost attained. Harnessing the social support, acceptability and participation is key to sustainable PPP (Oteng 2005).

According to the National conference of state legislatures, also the right partners ensure that services are delivered and also provide budget relief during a funding slow down. Given that the total investment over the last twenty-year period is approximately one-tenth of what is required, PPP needs to be considered as one of the key strategies to increase investment in the water and solid waste management sectors ( Kamal Nath 2003)

During tough economic situations, governments must focus on core competencies and mission critical responsibilities to make the most of limited financial resources. Non core, but essential functions maybe effectively managed and delivered by external technology and business process partners.

According to the National Governors Association partnering to leverage the power of strategic sourcing is another strategy. The ideal partner offers resources and experience to contribute specialized tools and technology, supplier industry expertise and rigorous measurements and analysis. Realizing procurement savings while enhancing the quality of services and goods; leveraging available e- procurement technology is also a way to improve efficiencies and to minimize operational expenses.

Government must become and remain responsive to changing constraints. Revenue need to be maximized, fixed and variable operating expenses minimized and service delivery offerings enhanced that the public sector can adopt to improve public private partnerships. Many of the nation's major developments are complex that neither a private developer nor a public entity alone can finance, design develop, construct, and operate them. Structuring genuine PPPs can enhance ability to implement these projects (Ndandiko, 2006).

Political leadership and commitment is another strategy as political leadership should be seen by the public on such partnership initiatives (Carley, 2006). Leadership controls the resources that are necessary for the implementation of the initiative. Sensitization helps those in leadership know the role to play meaningfully (Armistead & Pettigrew 2004; Carley, 2006)

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Research design**

This research study was cross sectional and descriptive in nature. It was employed mainly quantitative methods.

#### **3.2 Study population**

The study population was 64 staff members. This study was carried out at A & M Executive cleaning company and Kampala Capital City Authority. There were 18 staff members at A & M. (procurement department, legal department and top management) who had sufficient knowledge on the public private partnerships activities. There were 46 people in Kampala Capital City Authority (User departments / top management, Procurement and Disposal



Unit, Contracts Committee, supervisors and Engineers) who had sufficient knowledge in the Public Private Partnership activities. Therefore a total of 64 staff was the study population of this study.

### **3.3 Sample size**

The sample size of 52 was determined based on, Kreijcie and Morgan (1970) table. The sample of respondents was determined using random sampling to ensure un-biased responses. Respondents were randomly selected to ensure that the respondents had a common understanding of issues under discussion.

### **3.4 Sources of data**

Primary and secondary were the two sources of data that were used to carry out the study.

#### **3.4.1 Primary Sources**

Primary data was collected from respondents by using questionnaires following systematic and established academic procedures, Bernstein (1994).

#### **3.4.2 Secondary Sources**

Relevant literature was obtained from journals, dissertations and textbooks.

### **3.5 Data collection instruments**

Questionnaire was used to gather information from different respondents from the different employees of A & M Executive cleaning company and KCCA. The questionnaires adopted the like it scale with 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. Before actual data collection, instruments were developed and pilot tested, discussed with the supervisor and later actual research was conducted after obtaining a letter of introduction from the university.

### **3.6 Data presentation**

The researcher obtained a letter of introduction from Makerere University Business School to enable her seek for official permission to conduct this study. Before actual research, instruments were developed and pilot tested. The researcher discussed the instruments with her supervisor for professional advice. Later, the questionnaires were distributed to the

respective respondents, which were followed by conduct of interviews. After data collection, the researcher edited the questionnaire and interview responses

### **3.7 Validity and Reliability**

Validity was obtained through the development of the item scales with the help of experts in the field of procurement. Using the content Validity Index (CVI), the results on validity were generated. The reliability of instruments was ascertained using the Cronbach's coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1946).

### **3.8 Data analysis and Discussion**

After the sorting and editing of the questionnaires, the qualitative data was separated from the quantitative data based on content then analyzed thematically based on the objectives of the study, while the quantitative data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS). Analysis of means and standard deviation were used to verify the significance of the study variables. Frequency and Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the general information, which was presented using tables and figures.

### **3.9 Limitations of the study**

- (i) The finances to handle the whole research were limited; the research was expensive in terms of the time I had to put in to accomplish it and the finances as I moved about to and from consulting and getting guidance from my supervisors.
- (ii) The information was not readily available as some respondents were not willing to readily avail information due to the fear of loss of their jobs and most of them did not have time to fill in the questionnaire because their jobs were demanding.
- (iii) The given time frame was not enough to accomplish the research satisfactorily as I had to try to balance a very demanding job with tight schedules and deadlines with the research I had to carry out.
- (iv) Uncooperative respondents were a problem as some people needed to be seriously convinced of the importance of this research not only to the researcher but the whole Uganda as a whole.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS**

#### **4.0 Introduction**

This chapter details the presentation, interpretation and analysis of the research findings to solve the problem. The study was under taken to examine public private partnerships in solid waste management. The research interpretations took both cross sectional and descriptive form. The findings were declared from primary sources of data and are presented in tables showing frequencies, and percentages together with their discussions. The chapter also contained findings based on the responses obtained through the questionnaires as derived from the research questions which were:

- i. What is the level of efficiency of public private partnerships in solid waste management?

- ii. What are the challenges of public private partnerships and how do they affect solid waste management?
- iii. What strategies can be adopted to improve public private partnerships in solid waste management?

**4.1 Sample Characteristics**

This provides general characteristics in regard to client’s basic information like the Company name, level of education, work experience, and position (Title) in the company. The sample characteristics were presented basing on the responses from the respondents.

**4.2.1 Company name of the respondents**

The results showed that majority of the respondents were from Kampala city authority (KCCA) with 69.2% as compared to the A&M Executive cleaning company respondents who comprised of 30.8% as indicated in the table 1 below.

**Table 1: A Table Showing the Company name of respondents**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid A&M Executive cleaning company	16	30.8	30.8	30.8
KCCA Kampala city authority	36	69.2	69.2	100.0
Total	52	100.0	100.0	

**Source:** Primary data

**4.2.2 Education level attained.**

The results indicated that most of the A&M Executive cleaning company and KCCA Kampala city authority employees who participated in the study, had Bachelor’s Degree with 57.7%, these were followed by Master’s Degree with 34.6% respondents, diploma

were presented by 7.7%. This implied that the academic status of an individual had a bearing on what employee category they took up at work.

**Table 2: A Table Showing the Level of education of the Respondents**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Master's Degree	18	34.6	34.6	34.6
Bachelor's Degree	30	57.7	57.7	92.3
Diploma	4	7.7	7.7	100.0
Total	52	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary data

#### 4.2.3 Work experience of the respondents

From the table 3 below, majority of the respondents worked for A&M Executive cleaning company and KCCA Kampala city authority between three to four years with 51.9%, then followed by five to six years with 25.0%, One to two years with 13.5% and finally above seven years with 9.6%.

**Table 3: A Table showing the work experience of the respondents**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid One to two years	7	13.5	13.5	13.5
Three to four years	27	51.9	51.9	65.4
Five to six years	13	25.0	25.0	90.4
Above seven years	5	9.6	9.6	100.0
Total	52	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary data

#### 4.2.4 Position (Title) in the company

The results showed that majority of the respondents were the User departments (Top management) with 48.1%, Procurement and Disposal Unit with 25.0%, Engineers with 13.5%, Supervisors with 7.7% and finally Contracts committee with 5.8% as indicated in the table 4 below

**Table 4: A Table showing the Position (Title) of the respondents in the company**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid User departments (Top mgt)	25	48.1	48.1	48.1
Procurement and Disposal Unit	13	25.0	25.0	73.1
Contracts committee	3	5.8	5.8	78.8
Engineers	7	13.5	13.5	92.3
Supervisors	4	7.7	7.7	100.0
Total	52	100.0	100.0	

Source: Primary data

#### 4.4 The level of efficiency of public private partnerships in solid waste management

Results about the level of efficiency of public private partnerships conducted at A&M Executive cleaning company and KCCA Kampala city authority were generated and the items were rated on a four point likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1), Strongly disagree, disagree (2), uncertain (3), agree (4) and to strongly agree (5). The findings were shown in the table 5 below.

**Table 5: Table showing the descriptive statistics of the level of efficiency of public private partnerships in solid waste management**

	Min	Max	Mean	S. D
On average the private providers deliver service at a lower cost compared to public sector.	1	5	4.29	.605
On average the number of private providers participating in competing for procurements has increased.	1	5	3.73	.843
On average the private providers have been delivering service within the specified contract period.	1	5	3.67	.901
There is better value for money.	1	5	3.63	.793
On average the private providers have been complying with service levels set.	1	5	3.15	.998
On average the private providers have been delivering service within the specified contract budget.	1	5	3.10	.995
On average the private providers have been delivering service to new geographical areas of the government.	1	5	3.08	1.135
On average the private providers have been delivering service of better quality than when the government was providing.	1	5	3.04	1.154
On average the private provider have been delivering services that meet the government expectation.	1	5	2.63	1.085
On average the procurement process involving the use of private providers takes a shorter time than the public sector.	1	5	2.56	1.243
On average private providers are more likely to deliver their targets on time compared to public sector.	1	5	2.48	.852
There is usage of expertise thus better management of the service delivered by private sector.	1	5	2.10	.869
Valid N (listwise)			3.12	
Global mean				

**Source:** Primary data.

The results from the table 5: above indicated that the majority of the respondents agreed that on average that the private providers deliver service at a lower cost compared to public sector (Mean=4.29) and on average the number of private providers participating in competing for procurements has increased (Mean=3.37), the results too show on average the private providers have been delivering service within the specified contract period (Mean=3.67), There is better value for money (Mean=3.63), On average the private providers have been complying with service levels set (Mean=3.15), On average the private

providers have been delivering service within the specified contract budget (Mean=3.10), whereas On average the private providers have been delivering service to new geographical areas of the government (Mean=3.08).

The results again revealed that on average the private providers have been delivering service of better quality than when the government was providing (Mean=3.04), On average the private provider have been delivering service that meet the government expectation (Mean=2.63), On average the procurement process involving the use of private providers takes a shorter time than the public sector (Mean=2.56), On average private providers are more likely to deliver their targets on time compared to public sector (Mean=2.48), There is usage of expertise thus better management of the service delivered by private sector (Mean=2.10).

According to table 5, the global mean of the level of efficiency of public private partnerships in solid waste management was 3.12.

#### **4.5 The challenges of public private partnerships in solid waste management.**

Results for the challenges of public private partnerships operations in service delivery A&M Executive cleaning company and KCCA Kampala city authority were generated and the items were rated on a four point likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1), Strongly disagree, disagree (2), uncertain (3), agree (4) and to strongly agree (5). The findings are shown in the table 6 below.

**Table 6: Table showing the descriptive Statistics of the Challenges of public private partnerships in solid waste management**



	Min	Max	Mean	S. D
There is political interference.	1	5	4.73	.448
There is lack of documentation.	1	5	4.21	.750
There is poor attitude of senior management.	1	5	4.15	.668
There is a long timescale involved in concluding a deal with private provider.	1	5	4.13	.841
There is lack of regulatory framework.	1	5	3.48	.960
There is incompetence of private providers.	1	5	3.48	.852
There is Shortage of private firms due to their limited interest in PPPs.	1	5	3.38	.867
There is poor revenue base, high budget constraints	1	5	3.18	.825
There are Likely higher costs.	1	5	3.04	1.120
There is lack of awareness.	1	5	2.77	1.277
There is loss of authority and responsibility	1	5	2.60	1.034
There is corruption	1	5	2.56	1.110
Valid N (listwise)				
Global mean			3.48	

**Source:** Primary data

According to the results in table 6: above, it was revealed that majority agreed that challenges of public private partnerships operations in service delivery A&M Executive cleaning company and KCCA Kampala city authority were, there was political interference. (Mean=4.73), and there was lack of documentation (Mean=4.21), There is poor attitude of senior management (Mean=4.15), There is a long timescale involved in

concluding a deal with private provider (Mean=4.13), There is lack of regulatory framework and there is incompetence of private providers (Mean=3.48), there was shortage of private firms due to their limited interest in PPPs (Mean=3.38), there was poor revenue base, high budget constraints (Mean=3.93), There are Likely higher costs (Mean=3.34), There was lack of awareness (Mean=2.77), There is loss of authority and responsibility (Mean=2.60) and there was corruption (Mean=2.56).

Therefore according to table 6, the global mean of the challenges of public private partnerships in solid waste management was 3.48

#### **4.6 The strategies to be adopted to improve public private partnerships in solid waste management.**

Results about the strategies to improve service delivery of public private partnerships were generated and the items were rated on a four point likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1), Strongly disagree, disagree (2), uncertain (3), agree (4) and to strongly agree (5). The findings are shown in the table 6 below.

**Table 6: Table showing descriptive Statistics of the strategies to improve public private partnerships in solid waste management.**

	Min	Max	Mean	S. D
The government ensures that the private providers are aware of the expected service outcome.	1	5	4.19	.445
The government has in place a mechanism for involving stakeholders in decisions concerning the service to be contracted to private providers.	1	5	4.13	.817
Relevant information required by the private providers and public providers is easily accessed.	1	5	3.96	.522
The government has clear guidelines (rules of the game) publicly known on how to relate with private providers.	1	5	3.81	.687
The private providers have the necessary facilities/ Equipment resources required to accomplish contractual obligations.	1	5	3.67	.879
The government has a common tool for assessing performance of private providers.	1	5	3.46	1.056
There is improved technology.	1	5	3.38	.932
The government structures payments to provide incentives to private providers.	1	5	3.04	1.066
The private providers value their relationship with the local authority.	1	5	2.94	1.092
The public sector is clear on who is to enforce the contract.	1	5	2.90	1.225
The local authority ensures compatibility of goals for entering the contractual relationship.	1	5	2.63	1.155
The private providers have the necessary managerial skills required to accomplish contractual obligations.	1	5	2.62	.993
There is healthy competition for contracts involving private providers.	1	5	2.54	1.056
The government utilizes a legal framework that is dedicated (special) to contracts for private provision.	1	5	2.29	1.091
There is constant and coordinated leadership and communication.	1	5	2.21	.997
The private providers have necessary financial resources to accomplish contractual obligation.	1	5	1.85	.849
Valid N (listwise)			3.10	
Global mean				

**Source:** primary data

The results in the table 6 revealed that all the respondents agreed on strategies that, the government ensures that the private providers are aware of the expected service outcome (Mean=4.19), The government has in place a mechanism for involving stakeholders in

decisions concerning the service to be contracted to private providers (Mean=4.13), Relevant information required by the private providers and public providers is easily accessed (Mean=3.96), The government has clear guidelines(rules of the game) publicly known on how to relate with private providers (Mean=3.81), The private providers have the necessary facilities/ Equipment resources required to accomplish contractual obligations (Mean=3.67), The government has a common tool for assessing performance of private providers (Mean=3.46).

The results further revealed that there was improved technology (Mean=3.38), The government structures payments to provide incentives to private providers (Mean=3.04), The private providers value their relationship with the local authority (Mean=2.94), The public sector is clear on who is to enforce the contract (Mean=2.90), The local authority ensures compatibility of goals for entering the contractual relationship (Mean=2.63), The private providers have the necessary managerial skills required to accomplish contractual obligations (Mean=2.62), There was healthy competition for contracts involving private providers (Mean=2.54), the government utilizes a legal framework that is dedicated (special) to contracts for private provision (Mean=2.29) There was constant and coordinated leadership and communication (Mean=2.21) and lastly The private providers have necessary financial resources to accomplish contractual obligation (Mean=1.85).

The global mean of the strategies that can be adopted to improve public private partnerships in solid waste management was 3.10.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

#### 5.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the discussion, conclusion, and recommendation arising out of the research findings in chapter four.

#### 5.1 Discussions

##### 5.1.1 The level of efficiency of public private partnerships in solid waste management.

The results show that the efficiency of public private partnerships were that on average the private providers deliver service at a lower cost compared to public sector and there was better value for money. Similarly according to Hodge and Greve (2007), public private partnerships have clear potential to promote greater efficiency and possible cost savings by involving the private sector. To achieve value for money in comparison to traditional capital, private efficiency must be sufficient to overcome the extra financing costs of using private interest rates and transaction costs.

The results further indicated that on average the number of private providers participating in competing for procurements had increased, the private providers have been delivering service within the specified contract period and the private provider have been delivering service that meet the government expectation. This also supported by the statement that “Public private partnerships have shown early gains in construction timeliness and costs.” According to the United Kingdom National Audit office reports that PPPs are delivered on time and on budget more often than traditional agreements. Traditional infrastructure is on time and on budget 30% of the time, while PPP projects are on time and on budget over 75% of the time (Hodge and Greve, 2007). Politt, (2005), also concluded that PPPs deliver on time and on budget a higher percentage of the time.

It also shows that on average the private providers had been delivering service of better quality than when the government was providing. According to (Parker, 2000; Ancarani 2003), supports the statement that it was envisaged that private sector involvement enables

competition which results in improved outcomes such as greater efficiency, higher quality of service; a clear focus on clients and better value for money.

### **5.1.2 The challenges of public private partnerships in solid waste management**

The results show that the challenges of public private partnerships in service delivery were; there were political interferences and lack incentives to perform efficiently. This is also supported by Ndandiko (2006) that public private partnerships operations lack incentives to perform efficiently. They are inefficient because they address the objectives of politicians rather than maximize efficiency (Boycko et al, 1996); they provide services desired by politicians rather than by clients (Sheleifer et al 1994).

The results further revealed that there was poor revenue base, high budget constraints and more costs but not considering the procurement plans. According to the world Health report 2010, the pressures caused by ongoing budget constraints and exacerbated by the supreme mortgage crisis and the resulting rise in foreclosures are compounded by the demands of the citizens accustomed to a 24/7 information- transparent world. In short, at a time of shrinking government resources, citizens now want more than ever and government cannot afford to disappoint them.

### **5.1.3 The strategies to improve public private partnerships in solid waste management**

The results shows strategies to improve solid waste management of public private partnerships where; Effective PPPs should take time to establish and yield results and the government utilizes a legal framework that is dedicated (special) to contracts for private provision. This is supported by Bing (2005); Zhang, (2005), that effective PPPs take time to establish and yield results and that PPPs to be successfully initiated and implemented, the presence of a conducive and enabling legal and regulatory framework is a critical pre requisite. Disputes are likely to occur and service delivery delayed and or impaired (IP3, 2000).

Results further show that the government has in place a mechanism for involving stakeholders in decisions concerning the service to be contracted to private providers. According to Kuttner (1997) and Pongsiri (2002), indicate that the existence of a functioning legal and regulatory framework reduces opportunistic tendencies aligns the interest of partners and also provides confidence to the private partners as it acts as a buffer against political interference from government bodies.

The results further indicate that there were improved technology and communication skills to improve on the efficiency of service delivery. This is in line with Henderson (2004) that essential functions maybe effectively managed and delivered by external technology and business process partners. According to the National conference of state legislatures, also the right partners ensure that services are delivered and also provide budget relief during a funding slow down. According to the National Governors Association partnering to leverage the power of strategic sourcing is another strategy (Ndandiko 2006), the ideal partner offers resources and experience to contribute specialized tools and technology, supplier industry expertise and rigorous measurements and analytics. Realizing procurement savings while enhancing the quality of services and goods; leveraging available e- procurement technology is also a way to improve efficiencies and to minimize operational expenses (Grout 1997, 2003, 2005).

## **5.2 Conclusion**

In conclusion, the private sector is more efficient than the public sector in solid waste management though they both have to be committed to the partnership to successfully handle the challenges meaning that neither the public sector nor the private sector could do it alone successfully.

## **5.3 Recommendations**

Basing on the results of the study, recommendations were made that could help improve service delivery of public private partnerships. These recommendations were drawn from the findings of the study. In light to the research findings on the challenges of public private partnerships operations in service delivery mainly; The complicated relationship of public private partnerships, political interference, and poor attitude of senior managers, long time

scale, higher costs and budget constraints and lack of regulatory providers, the following recommendations were made by the researcher.

- Policy guidance on public private partnerships should be revised to include defining which sectors are eligible for PPPs as well as which PPP methods and schemes can be carried out successfully.
- The government should give tax incentives like tax holidays to private firms that are willing to get involved in public private partnerships so as to increase the involvement of more private sector firms in public private partnerships.
- The government should properly oversee PPP projects i.e. playing a gatekeeper role that can occur at any stage of the process that is at the initial planning stage or at the final approval stage.
- The private sector should provide technical support to government organizations at the project identification, evaluation, procurement or contract management phase so that there is goal compatibility.
- Capacity building of both public and private sector employees involved in PPPs. That is there is need for training of public and private sector officials that are involved in PPP programmes or are interested in the PPP process.
- Promote PPPs within the private sector. There is need for PPP market development so that the private sector becomes more interested in public private partnership.
- The departments handling public private partnerships should be allowed to be independent so that political interference is greatly reduced.
- There should be a clear decision making process and sensitization of management and other government bodies on the importance of PPPs so as to improve on PPP for effective management.

#### **5.4 Area for the further research**

- i) Innovative cooperation in a public-private partnership.
- ii) Identifying the Forms of Public-Private Partnership.



## REFERENCES

- Ahadz, M. Bowles, G (2004). Public- Private Partnerships and contract negotiations: an empirical study. *Construction Management and Economic* 22, 967- 978.
- Ancarani, A. (2003). The Impact of Public Firms Commercialisation on Purchasing Management. *Journal Public Procurement*, Volume 3, Issue 3, 357- 369.
- Armistead, C. and Pettigrew, P. (2004). Effective partnerships: Building a SUB- regional network of reflective practitioners. *The International Journal of Public Sector of Public Sector Management*, 17 (7), 571-585.
- Barrett, K. and Greene, R. (1999). The Government Performance Project: Grading the States—A Management Report Card. *Governing Magazine*, February.
- Bing, L. Akintoye, A. Edwards P. J., Hardcastle, C. (2005). The Allocation of risk in PPP/ PFI construction projects in the U. K. *International Journal of Project Management* 23 25-35
- Bovis, C. (2010). Public Private Partnerships in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.
- Boycko, M, Shleifer A, and Vishny R (1996). A Theory of Privatisation, *The Economic Journal*, 106 (March), 309- 19.

- Carley, M. (2006). Partnership and Statutory local government in a devolved Scotland. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* Volume 19 Number 3.
- Cointreau- Levine, S. (1994). Private sector participation in Municipal Solid Waste Services in Developing Countries. Volume 1, Formal Sector, Urban Management Programme, UNDP/ UNCHS/ World Bank, Washington D.C.
- Corrigan M. B. et al. (2003). Ten Principles for Successful Public/ Private Partnerships. Washington, D.C.: *the Urban Land Institute*.
- Dumba, S. and Mugume, A. (2001). The Privatisation Process and its Impact on Society. *Makerere University Institute of Economics*.
- Grimsey, D. and Lewis M. K. (2002). Evaluating the risks of Public private partnerships for Infrastructure Projects, *International Journal of Projects Management* 20 107- 11.
- Grout, P. (1997). The Economics of Private Finance Initiative. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 13(4) 53-56
- Grout, P. (2003). Public and Private Sector Discount Rates in Public – Private Partnerships, *The Economic Journal*, 113 C62- C68.

Grout P. (2005). Value for Money measurement in Public Private Partnerships. *EIB papers* 10(2)  
pp 32- 56.

Harris, C. (2003). Private Participation in Infrastructure in Developing Countries: *Trends, Impacts  
and Policy Lessons*, IBRD/WB.

Henderson, J and McGloin P. (2004). North/ South Infrastructure Development via Cross- border  
PPP Mechanism. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, vol. 17 No. 5, 389-  
413.

Kampala City Council (2002) Kampala Solid Waste Strategy, *Ministry of Local Government*,  
Kampala.

Kampala City Council (2006) Kampala Solid Waste Strategy, *Ministry of Local Government*,  
Kampala.

Kampala City Council (2007) Public Procurement and Disposal Compliance Check Report,  
Kampala: *Kampala City Council*, Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets  
Authority.

Kirkpatrick, C. and Parker, D. (2003). Privatisation in Developing Countries. A Review of The  
Evidence And The Policy Lessons, Centre on Regulation and Competition, *Institute for  
Development Policy And Management*. University of Manchester.

Kironde, J. M. L. and Yhdego M., (1997). The Governance of Waste Management in Urban Tanzania: *Towards a Community Based Approach, Resources, Conservation and Recycling*. 21(4) 213- 225.

Kuttner, R. (1997). Everything for sale: The virtues and Limits of Markets. *Knopf, New York*.

Mazzi, L. K. N. (2007). Balancing Information Requirements with Data Availability: *A case of Transport Planning*, Kampala, Uganda.

Moriera, R. Seroa, R. (2004). Efficiency and Regulation in the Sanitation Sector in Brazil. *IPEA Discussion Paper* No. 1059.

National conference of state Legislature (2007), *state budget and tax action*.

National Governors Association. (2007) *State Beginning to experience tighter fiscal conditions according to latest report*

Ndandiko, C. (2006). Private Provision of Public Services in Developing Countries. *The Case of Uganda's Local Governments*. University of Twente.

Osborne, P. (2000). Public Private Partnerships Theory and Practice in International Perspective. *Routledge*, London.

Oteng- Abaho, M. (2010). Private Sector Involvement in Solid Waste Management in Greater Accra Metropolitan Area in Ghana. *Waste Management Research* 28, 322.

Palmer, G. (2009). *Aid Delivery Methods Programmes*.

Pongsiri, N. (2002). Regulation and Public Private Partnership. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, vol. 15, No. 6, 487-495.

Posner. P. Ryu S. K and Tkachenko (2009). Public Private Partnerships: *The Relevance of Budgetting*.

Post, J. (2004). Evolving Partnerships in the Collection of Urban Solid Waste in Developing World in Solid Waste Management and Recycling; *Actors, Partnerships and Policies in Hyderabad, India and Nairobi Kenya*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.

Post, J. Broekema, J. and Obrih, O. N. (2003). Trial and Error in Privatisation: *Experiences in Urban Solid Waste Collection in Accra (Ghana) and Hyderabad (India)*. *Urban Studies* 40(4) 835-852.

Regan, M. (2005). Public Private Partnerships: *Do they Add Value to Infrastructure Procurement?* Melbourne University.

Rwelamira, P. D. (2004). Enhancing Development in Africa; Public- Private Partnerships. *Pressgroup Holdings Group S.A.; Valencia Spain.*

Savas , E. S. (2000). Privatisation and Public- Private Partnership. *New York, NY : Chantam House.*

Shleifer, A, and Vishny R. W (2004). Politician and Firms. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 109(4), 995- 1025.

Sparagarem, G., Oosterueer, P., Bureen, J. V., Mol, A. P. (2005). Mixed Modernities: Towards Viable Urban Environmental Infrastructure Development in East Africa. *Environmental Policy Group, Wageningen University.*

Wilson, J. Q. (2006). Bureaucracy: *What Government Agencies Do and Why They Do It.* Basic Books Classic

World Bank (2009). World Development Indicators Data Base, The World Bank.

World Development Report (2005). A Better Investment for Everyone, World Bank.

Zhang, Y. F. Parker, D. and Kirkpatrick, C. (2002). Electricity Sector Reform in Developing Countries: An Economic Assessment of the Effects of Privitisation, Competition and Regulation. *Centre on Regulation and Competition, Institute for Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester. Working Paper No.31*

## APPENDIX

### Questionnaire for Data Collection

#### INTRODUCTION

I am a Ugandan Masters' student at Makerere University Business school of Makerere University conducting a study on Partnerships between Public sector and Private sector in solid waste management.

The objective of the study is to find out the level of efficiency in public private partnerships, challenges and strategies to overcome the challenges.

As part of the study, I am conducting a survey in A & M Executive Cleaning Services and other government institutions. I kindly request you to respond to this questionnaire. You do not have to indicate your name, be assured that your responses shall be treated with strict confidentiality

#### BACK GROUND

Please fill in and where there is a box please use a tick to indicate your response.				
1.	Company			
2.	Position (Title) in the company			
3.	Highest education qualification	Master's Degree Bachelor's Degree Diploma Secondary School Primary School Other (specify) .....		
4.	Professional training (e.g CIPS, CPA, CPS, ACCA, NEVI)			
5.	How long have you worked with current institution			
6.	Company's population size			
7. Company's Total Annual Revenue generated		2010	2011	2012
8. Company's Total Annual Expenditure		2010	2011	2012

### EFFICIENCY LEVEL OF PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP

Please indicate (tick)appropriately your view with respect to the statement 1=Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Not sure, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree						
CODE	STATEMENT	1	2	3	4	5
1	On average the procurement process involving the use of private providers takes a shorter time than the public sector.					
2	On average private providers are more likely to deliver their targets on time compared to public sector					
3	On average the private providers have been delivering service within the specified contract period					
4	On average the private providers deliver service at a lower cost compared to public sector					
5	On average the private providers have been delivering service within the specified contract budget					
6	On average the private provider have been delivering service that meet the government expectation					
7	On average the private providers have been delivering service of better quality than when the government was providing					
8	On average the private providers have been delivering service to new geographical areas of the government					
9	On average the private providers have been complying with service levels set					
10	On average the number of private providers participating in competing for procurements has increased.					
11	There is usage of expertise thus better management of the service delivered by private sector					
12	There is better value for money					

### CHALLENGES OF PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

Please indicate (tick)appropriately your view with respect to the statement 1=Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Not sure, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree						
CODE	STATEMENT	1	2	3	4	5
1	There is poor attitude of senior management					
2	There is lack of regulatory framework					
3	There is lack of documentation					
4	There is lack of awareness					
5	There are Likely higher costs					
6	There is a long timescale involved in concluding a deal with private provider					
7	There is political interference					
8	There is corruption					
9	There is loss of authority and responsibility					
10	There is incompetence of private providers					



11	There is Shortage of private firms due to their limited interest in PPPs					
12	There is poor revenue base, high budget constraints					

### STRATEGIES TO OVERCOME THE CHALLENGES OF PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

Please indicate (tick)appropriately your view with respect to the statement 1=Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Not sure, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree						
CODE	STATEMENT	1	2	3	4	5
1	The government has clear guidelines(rules of the game) publicly known on how to relate with private providers.					
2	The government has in place a mechanism for involving stakeholders in decisions concerning the service to be contracted to private providers					
3	There is improved technology					
4	The government structures payments to provide incentives to private providers					
5	There is healthy competition for contracts involving private providers					
6	There is constant and coordinated leadership and communication					
7	The government utilizes a legal framework that is dedicated (special) to contracts for private provision					
8	The government has a common tool for assessing performance of private providers					
9	The public sector is clear on who is to enforce the contract					
10	The private providers have necessary financial resources to accomplish contractual obligation					
11	The private providers have the necessary facilities/ Equipment resources required to accomplish contractual obligations					
12	The private providers have the necessary managerial skills required to accomplish contractual obligations					
13	The private providers value their relationship with the local authority					
14	The local authority ensures compatibility of goals for entering the contractual relationship.					
15	The government ensures that the private providers are aware of the expected service outcome					
16	Relevant information required by the private providers and public providers is easily accessed					