Ownership, governance and reform

Doug Andrew douglasandrew @btinternet.com

My experience

- NZ SOE policy
- UK CAA regulating
- Government-owned Manchester airport
- □ 50:50 air traffic control PPP
- Privately owned BAA London airports

Key messages

- RG objective
- ☐ Suggest 1. adoption of an economic efficiency objective, given
 - efficiency/fiscal trade-off
- 2. Develop/implement SOE policy
- 3. Consider PSP to maintain & boost efficiency and improve government BS
- But reforms usually driven by fiscal rather than efficiency imperatives

Efficiency objective

- □ Productive: least cost
- □ Allocative: value-for-money
- Dynamic: profitable investment
- De-regulation, industry structure, competition, CP and regulation => better allocative efficiency
- Ownership, using governance, key for PE and DE

An SOE policy

- Clear core SOE commercial objective
- Competitive neutrality
- SOE autonomy and accountability
- Appropriate incentives
- □ SOE mission, max. gearing, dividend policy
- Need hard budget constraint
- □ Role of board versus
- Role of government e.g. owner, policymaker

PSP

- ☐ Given SOE policy, why "hold" or why "sell"?
- SOE policy implementable/sustainable?
- Broader government management issue
- PSP superior?
- Empirical evidence
- ☐ Fiscal benefits?
- □ Evidence => NPV(PSP)>NPV(SOE)?
- □ Government share of increment?

PSP part 2

- Credible policy environment necessary
- Range of options and degrees
- Polar position, sell all SOE shares to highest bidder via open sound process (FDI)
- Capture any control premium
- □ Necessary to capture expected efficiency gains and improve government BS
- □ Intermediate options => smaller BS gains
- Risks: govt. process, winner's curse, excess leverage

Conclusion

- Ownership/governance important for efficiency
- Sound policy/regulatory environment
- MoF-led SOE policy necessary
- PSP via sound process, with OK political economy, offers gains
- Communication important