



Navigating the Complexities of Public-Private Partnerships: A Critical Analysis of BOT and HAM Frameworks in the Indian Road Sector

¹ Vigneshlinga, ² Dr. G. Kumaran

¹Research Scholar, Department of Civil & Structural Engineering, Annamalai University, Chidambaram, TN-India.

²Professor & Head, Department of Civil & Structural Engineering, Annamalai University, Chidambaram, TN-India.

Email - ¹vigneshlinga@outlook.com, ²ganapathykumaran@rediff.com

Abstract: This article critically compares the structural and operational flaws of the Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT-Toll) and Hybrid Annuity Model (HAM) frameworks in India's highway sector. Using the Institutional Risk Allocation Perspective, the study illustrates how misaligned risk transfer causes systemic project distress. The legacy BOT model collapsed because it forced private developers to absorb uncontrollable macroeconomic demand risks, ultimately triggering banking sector distress. While the subsequent HAM framework resolved this by insulating developers from revenue volatility, it inadvertently replaced macroeconomic risk with micro-bureaucratic friction. Rigid milestone-linked disbursements and persistent land constraints now create severe working capital bottlenecks. Furthermore, HAM's financial de-risking dilutes the developer's "skin-in-the-game," threatening long-term asset quality. To ensure sustainable infrastructure financing, this paper recommends dynamically adjusting equity requirements based on technical capability and implementing technology-driven oversight to eliminate administrative delays.

Key Words: Public-Private Partnerships; Highway Infrastructure; Risk Allocation; Hybrid Annuity Model; Contract Administration; Project Financing.

1. INTRODUCTION

The trajectory of economic growth in emerging economies is inextricably linked to the robustness of their infrastructure, with transportation networks serving as the critical arteries for commerce, industrial mobility, and regional integration. In the Indian context, the road sector constitutes the undisputed backbone of the domestic transport network. Despite comprising a relatively small percentage of the global landmass, the Indian road network facilitates the movement of approximately 60% of total national freight and 85% of all passenger traffic. To accommodate this massive, sustained demand, the Government of India, operating primarily through the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH) and the National Highways Authority of India (NHAI), embarked on ambitious capacity augmentation programs. Initiated in the late 1990s with the National Highways Development Project (NHDP), the state sought to radically upgrade the arterial network connecting major metropolitan and industrial hubs. However, the sheer scale of capital required for such nationwide infrastructure expansion rapidly exceeded the fiscal capacity of traditional public exchequers. This stark fiscal constraint necessitated a strategic transition from conventional Engineering, Procurement, and Construction (EPC) contracts—where the government bears the entire financial and execution burden—toward various models of Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) [1, 2]. These models were theoretically designed to leverage private sector efficiency, mobilize non-sovereign capital, and integrate advanced technological expertise into public infrastructure delivery [3].

The initial phases of this privatization transition were characterized by the widespread adoption of the Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) model, predominantly in its toll-based iteration (BOT-Toll). Spanning the early 2000s to approximately 2013, this model experienced a massive deployment boom. It successfully attracted significant private investment and facilitated the rapid construction of critical highway stretches, fundamentally altering the Indian infrastructure landscape [2]. Under the BOT framework, private concessionaires assumed holistic responsibility for designing, building, financing, operating, and eventually transferring the asset back to the public authority after a prolonged concession period that typically spanned 15 to 30 years [4]. While the model theoretically optimized lifecycle costs and transferred



execution and revenue risk away from the public balance sheet, the practical execution in India revealed severe structural vulnerabilities [4]. By 2014, the sector was effectively paralyzed. A multitude of projects were stalled due to aggressive bidding, chronic land acquisition delays, insurmountable environmental clearance hurdles, and, most critically, massive shortfalls in projected toll revenues driven by highly optimistic traffic forecasting [5]. This culmination of unmitigated risks precipitated a severe crisis of Non-Performing Assets (NPAs) within the Indian banking sector, severely depressing private appetite for further infrastructure investment and forcing a temporary reversion to the fiscally straining EPC model [3].

In direct response to the collapse of the BOT-Toll model and the unsustainability of reverting entirely to government-funded EPC contracts, the NHAI introduced the Hybrid Annuity Model (HAM) in January 2016. Originating from the strategic recommendations of the Vijay Kelkar Committee on revitalizing PPPs, HAM was conceptualized as a middle-ground framework designed to optimize risk-sharing [6, 7]. It sought to amalgamate the upfront financial support characteristic of EPC contracts with the long-term operational accountability of the BOT-Annuity model [8]. Under the HAM architecture, the government contributes 40% of the project cost as a construction grant, which is disbursed in milestone-linked tranches. Concurrently, the private developer is mandated to finance the remaining 60% through a combination of equity and commercial debt. Crucially, under this model, the NHAI retains the traffic and revenue risk by directly assuming responsibility for toll collection. The private developer's investment is instead recovered through guaranteed, semi-annual annuity payments, which are indexed to inflation and benchmark interest rates over a 15-year operational period [8].

While HAM successfully catalysed a revival in bank lending and accelerated highway construction between 2016 and the present, it is increasingly evident that it is not a structural panacea. Beneath the surface of expedited project awards lies a complex web of operational, financial, and contractual challenges that threaten the long-term sustainability and asset quality of the model [9]. The blending of EPC and BOT elements has generated unique friction points, particularly concerning delayed government disbursements, highly complex contract administration, and persistent, unresolved land acquisition issues [5, 10]. Furthermore, the extensive de-risking of private developers under the HAM framework has raised profound academic and industry concerns regarding the dilution of "skin-in-the-game". This reduction in private equity exposure inherently impacts the incentives for quality construction and diligent lifecycle maintenance [2, 11].

This article delves deeply into the nuances of these financing frameworks, exploring the underlying tension between ambitious national infrastructure targets and the practical, ground-level challenges faced in project execution. By critically analyzing the structural shortcomings of both the BOT and HAM frameworks in the Indian road sector, this research aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of how suboptimal risk allocation continues to generate administrative inefficiencies, project delays, and systemic financial distress [12].

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 The Theoretical Underpinnings and Systemic Failures of BOT

The Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) model represents the classical paradigm of infrastructure privatization, theoretically designed to align the financial incentives of the private developer with the long-term performance and viability of the asset. Extensive literature has evaluated the risk allocation mechanisms embedded within BOT concession agreements [4]. It is widely acknowledged across global infrastructure studies that BOT frameworks excel in transferring construction, operation, and, crucially, revenue risks to the private sector, thereby shielding the public exchequer from demand volatility [3, 4]. However, the foundational flaw in the Indian implementation of the BOT-Toll framework was the stark misalignment between the allocation of systemic risk and the actual capacity of the private sector to manage, forecast, or mitigate that risk [2].

Research indicates that private developers in India were contractually forced to bear macroeconomic and systemic risks—such as GDP-linked traffic volume fluctuations, shifts in industrial corridors, and localized socio-political resistance to toll collection—that were entirely beyond their sphere of influence [4]. The phenomenon known as the "winner's curse" became intensely prevalent during the infrastructure bidding frenzy of 2010 to 2012. Driven by a highly competitive procurement environment, developers routinely submitted bids characterized by aggressively over-projected traffic demand and heavily under-projected capital costs to secure lucrative concessions. This created a structural inevitability of financial distress when actual toll revenues fell drastically short of the projections required to service the highly leveraged debt [3].



Furthermore, empirical studies focusing on project delivery performance have demonstrated that while the private sector is theoretically presumed to be more efficient in managing costs and timelines, Indian BOT projects suffered from severe overruns [5]. A seminal comparative analysis of national road projects revealed that 88.1% of PPP projects experienced cost overruns, compared to only 54.37% of traditional, non-PPP public procurement projects [13]. These cost escalations were primarily driven by delayed land acquisition and subsequent material price inflation during the prolonged pre-construction phases [5, 13]. The literature thus establishes that the BOT model in India collapsed not due to an inherent flaw in the concept of private operation, but due to a toxic combination of aggressive financial leverage, highly optimistic revenue modelling, and the sovereign state's persistent inability to ensure timely, encumbrance-free land handovers [4, 5].

2.2 The Transition to the Hybrid Annuity Model (HAM)

The introduction of the Hybrid Annuity Model in 2016 marked a definitive paradigm shift in Indian infrastructure policy, moving from a rigid philosophy of risk-transfer to a more nuanced philosophy of risk-sharing [7]. Literature analyzing the genesis of HAM consistently highlights its roots in the Vijay Kelkar Committee's recommendations on revisiting and revitalizing the PPP model of infrastructure [3, 6]. The committee explicitly recognized that the Indian financial ecosystem—particularly the commercial banking sector—lacked the depth, liquidity, and risk appetite to continuously absorb the high-risk profiles associated with long-term BOT-Toll projects [6]. Consequently, HAM was engineered to systematically lower the upfront equity requirement for private developers. By reducing the capital barrier to entry, the model successfully expanded the pool of eligible bidders and immediately revived the flow of credit from risk-averse commercial banks [7, 8].

Academic assessments of HAM's core financial mechanics emphasize its inherently dual nature. By providing 40% of the total project cost as a direct government grant—disbursed in five equal tranches linked strictly to verified physical completion milestones—the model significantly reduces the developer's reliance on external debt. Concurrently, by shifting the highly volatile toll collection responsibility entirely back to the NHAI, HAM completely insulates the private concessionaire from commercial traffic and revenue risks [8]. The remaining 60% of the capital expenditure, which the developer initially finances, is systematically compensated through 30 semi-annual annuity installments over a 15-year concession period. These annuities are intricately structured to include amortized capital repayment, interest payments calculated on a reducing balance (typically linked to the Reserve Bank of India Repo Rate plus a predefined spread), and inflation-indexed Operations and Maintenance (O&M) payouts adjusted against the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and Wholesale Price Index (WPI) [8].

2.3 Emerging Discourse on HAM's Structural Shortcomings

Despite the initial policy euphoria and the undeniable acceleration in project awards surrounding HAM, recent empirical studies have begun to uncover systemic vulnerabilities deeply embedded within the model's architecture. Deep et al. (2024) [9] conducted a rigorous exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and second-order confirmatory factor analysis (SCFA) targeting the specific challenges faced by contractors executing HAM projects. Their findings quantitatively established that operational factors (recording an Effect Size [ES] of 0.81) and contract administration factors (ES = 0.78) are the most critical challenges severely impacting project delivery, followed closely by financial constraints (ES = 0.71) and external factors (ES = 0.58) [9]. These findings align with broader literature evaluating the impact of constraints on overall project success [10].

A highly critical theme dominating the contemporary literature is the concept of "skin-in-the-game" and its relationship to asset lifecycle quality [11]. While HAM successfully attracted private participation through the careful readjustment of risk allocations, it simultaneously brought about an extensive de-risking of the private sector. Researchers argue that this profound de-risking has allowed less capable, mid-tier developers to win bids without retaining sufficient financial exposure in the operational phase [2, 12]. This dynamic inherently compromises the fundamental PPP tenet of leveraging private sector efficiencies to ensure superior lifecycle asset quality [11]. Because the developer's capital at risk is substantially lower than in a traditional BOT model, the overarching incentive to ensure world-class construction quality—to minimize long-term maintenance liabilities—is proportionally diminished [11, 12].

Furthermore, recent literature highlights that HAM has not managed to escape the legacy execution issues of Indian infrastructure. Land acquisition hurdles protracted bureaucratic delays in issuing environmental and forest clearances, and complex utility shifting mandates continue to plague HAM projects [5, 8]. Although the revised Model Concession Agreement (MCA) for HAM introduced specific clauses allowing for the formal descope of land if the government fails to acquire it within 150 days of the appointed date, the practical execution of such clauses remains highly



ambiguous [8]. Authority reluctance to trigger descope often leads to protracted arbitration and stalled progress. Thus, the prevailing academic consensus suggests that while HAM serves as an effective financial bridge to mobilize capital, it remains administratively cumbersome and highly susceptible to the same systemic execution delays that ultimately derailed its predecessors [5, 9].

3. OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of this research is to critically evaluate the structural, operational, and financial shortcomings of the Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) and Hybrid Annuity Model (HAM) frameworks in the context of the Indian road sector. By deconstructing the specific risk allocation mechanisms and contractual obligations of each model, this study aims to identify the systemic administrative and financial bottlenecks that lead to persistent project delays, cost overruns, and developer distress.

A secondary objective is to evaluate how the policy transition from BOT to HAM has shifted the fundamental nature of infrastructure risks—specifically the migration from commercial and traffic-related risks to bureaucratic and contract administration risks—and to assess the long-term behavioural implications of this shift on the quality and sustainability of highway development in emerging economies.

4. ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK & METHODOLOGY

To comprehensively fulfill the research objectives, this study employs a critical, comparative analytical method grounded heavily in the synthesis of secondary empirical data, systematic literature review, and institutional framework analysis [6, 7]. The research design is structured to deeply dissect the functional mechanics of both PPP modalities through a non-experimental, qualitative, and quantitative data aggregation approach [1].

This method relies on an extensive synthesis of peer-reviewed journal articles, international conference proceedings, and macro-level government policy circulars (specifically those issued by the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways and the National Highways Authority of India). To establish a reproducible empirical baseline, a structured literature search was conducted across academic databases including Scopus, Web of Science, and the ASCE Library. The search targeted peer-reviewed publications spanning from 2006 to 2024, utilizing Boolean combinations of primary keywords such as "Public-Private Partnership," "Hybrid Annuity Model," "BOT-Toll," "Risk Allocation," and "Indian Highway Infrastructure." The data extraction process focused heavily on empirical studies that have quantitatively measured project overruns, identified risk factors through exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis (such as the specific Effect Size parameters for operational and administrative challenges), and documented the financial closure rates of road projects across different contracting regimes.

This method relies on an extensive synthesis of peer-reviewed journal articles, international conference proceedings, and macro-level government policy circulars (specifically those issued by the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways and the National Highways Authority of India). The data extraction process focused heavily on empirical studies that have quantitatively measured project overruns, identified risk factors through exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis (such as the specific Effect Size parameters for operational and administrative challenges), and documented the financial closure rates of road projects across different contracting regimes [9, 14].

The core analytical framework utilized to interpret the aggregated data is the Institutional Risk Allocation Perspective [6]. This theoretical perspective posits that for a Public-Private Partnership to be sustainable, efficient, and financially viable over its lifecycle, specific project risks (e.g., land acquisition, financing, construction delays, traffic demand, and inflation) must be unequivocally allocated to the stakeholder possessing the highest capability to manage, mitigate, and absorb them [2, 6]. By meticulously mapping the risk allocation matrices of the BOT-Toll and HAM contracts against the actual, ground-level realities of the Indian bureaucratic and macroeconomic environment, this method allows for a highly nuanced identification of exactly where and why these financing models experience failure [1, 6].

Data regarding cost and time overruns were evaluated by contrasting the performance metrics of PPP versus non-PPP projects [13]. This data was further disaggregated to compare the legacy BOT projects characteristic of the 2000–2013 expansion phase against the HAM projects initiated post-2016 [8]. Establishing this comparative baseline enables the derivation of second and third-order analytical insights regarding the continuously evolving nature of infrastructure execution constraints in the Indian context [5, 13].

5. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF FRAMEWORK VULNERABILITIES



The findings derived from this comparative analysis reveal that while both the BOT and HAM frameworks were introduced with the explicit intent of accelerating highway development and optimizing capital efficiency, each harbors profound structural and operational shortcomings. The failures of the respective models are distinct yet interconnected, stemming primarily from the severe friction between rigid contractual concession agreements and a highly unpredictable, dynamic execution environment [7, 12].

5.1 The Collapse of the Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) Framework

The findings definitively confirm that the BOT-Toll model, which dominated the Indian road sector during its initial boom phase (2000–2013), suffered from critical, systemic failures rooted deeply in demand risk misallocation and pre-construction contingencies [3, 4].

The traffic demand and revenue trap emerges as the most glaring shortcoming of the BOT model [4]. The framework allocated the entirety of traffic volume risk to the private concessionaire. In a rapidly developing and highly transitional economy like India, macroeconomic volatility, unpredictable changes in industrial supply chain corridors, and the sudden development of alternate transport modes rendered long-term, 20-year traffic forecasting highly inaccurate [4]. Developers, heavily incentivized by the competitive bidding process to win large portfolios, routinely over-projected traffic growth to justify higher debt leverage to their lenders. When actual traffic realization failed to materialize in the operational years, revenues fell sharply below minimum debt servicing requirements. This rendered the projects unviable and contributed massively to the Non-Performing Asset (NPA) crisis that subsequently crippled the Indian banking sector's ability to lend to infrastructure projects [2, 3].

Furthermore, contrary to the foundational theoretical assumption that private sector efficiency inherently minimizes project costs, empirical findings demonstrate that Indian BOT projects suffered disproportionately from cost overruns. Analysis of national datasets indicates that 88.1% of PPP projects experienced significant cost overruns, compared to 54.37% in traditional non-PPP public procurement [13]. The average project size for PPPs was also significantly larger (averaging \$76.49 million compared to \$50.78 million for non-PPPs) [13]. This vastly magnified the absolute financial impact of these overruns [10, 13].

These overruns were predominantly linked to land acquisition and pre-construction delays [5]. Concession agreements under BOT strictly required the government to hand over unencumbered land prior to financial closure. However, localized political resistance, complex legacy land titling issues, and protracted environmental litigation consistently delayed this process. Because the private developer had already achieved financial closure and mobilized resources, these delays led to idle capital, accumulated interest during construction (IDC), and severe inflationary impacts on raw material costs, fatally wounding the project's financial model before construction even commenced [5, 10].

5.2 The Structural and Execution Shortcomings of the Hybrid Annuity Model (HAM)

While HAM was engineered precisely to resolve the paralyzing equity and revenue risks of the BOT model, the findings indicate that it has introduced an entirely new paradigm of vulnerabilities centered on administrative friction [6, 8].

Contract administration and operational friction have emerged as the primary barriers to success. The blending of EPC and BOT components has resulted in highly complex contractual obligations [7, 14]. Based on second-order confirmatory factor analysis (SCFA) quantifying contractor perspectives on HAM projects, one primary finding is that operational factors (Effect Size [ES] = 0.81) and contract administration factors (ES = 0.78) represent the most critical challenges facing execution [9]. The government's 40% construction grant is released in tranches that are strictly linked to physical completion milestones [8]. However, discrepancies in verifying these milestones by Independent Engineers (IEs), coupled with deep-seated bureaucratic red tape, frequently delay disbursements [9]. This severe liquidity squeeze directly impacts the contractor's working capital cycle, often forcing work to stall [10, 14].

Additionally, the model suffers from the illusion of solved land acquisition. HAM attempted to administratively address land issues by mandating that 80% of the land must be physically available before the "Appointed Date" (the official start of the project) [8]. However, the remaining 20% often contains the most critical, complex bottlenecks, such as railway overbridges, religious structures, or dense urban utility networks. While the Model Concession Agreement (MCA) includes a specific clause allowing for the descoping of land if it is not acquired within 150 days, the



implementation of this descoping is highly ambiguous, fraught with administrative resistance from the authority, and ultimately serves to delay the project while negotiations stall [8, 9].

A major finding regarding the long-term sustainability of HAM is the dilution of "skin-in-the-game" and the resultant asset quality risk [11]. Because the government provides 40% of the capital upfront and guarantees the return on the remaining 60% via sovereign-backed annuities, the developer's actual capital at risk is minimized. This dynamic has allowed smaller, less financially robust, and less technically capable developers to win bids. With significantly reduced equity exposure, the fundamental PPP incentive to build a high-quality asset to minimize long-term O&M costs is severely compromised [2, 11]. Consequently, there is a heightened risk of premature asset degradation, which will ultimately burden the public authority upon the asset's eventual transfer [11, 12].

Finally, HAM exposes developers to interest rate and inflationary mismatches. Under HAM, the annuity payments include an interest component calculated on a reducing balance, typically pegged to the RBI Repo Rate plus a predefined spread (e.g., 3%) [8]. However, during periods of rapid monetary tightening or macroeconomic stress, the actual commercial borrowing rates for developers may significantly exceed this predefined spread, leading to a negative carry [8]. Furthermore, while O&M payouts are indexed to the CPI and WPI, sudden geopolitical surges in specific maintenance materials (like modified bitumen or steel) frequently outpace broader inflation indices, severely squeezing developer operating margins over the 15-year lifecycle [8].

5.3 Comparative Summary of Model Mechanics and Constraints

To effectively synthesize the operational variances and the resulting execution shortcomings inherent to both models, the following table maps the fundamental risk allocations against their observed outcomes [1, 6].

Risk Parameter / Characteristic	Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT-Toll)	Hybrid Annuity Model (HAM)
Capital Financing Risk	100% Private (High equity/debt burden)	Shared (40% Govt Grant, 60% Private)
Traffic & Revenue Risk	Borne entirely by the Private Developer	Borne entirely by the Government (NHAI)
Primary Financial Failure	Aggressive bidding & traffic shortfalls leading to NPAs	Working capital constraints due to delayed milestone payments
Pre-Construction Risk	Devastating impact of land acquisition delays	Persists (utility shifting), despite 80% land availability rule
Contractual Complexity	High (focused on tolling rights & operational concessions)	Very High (complex integration of EPC milestones & Annuities)
Asset Quality Incentive	High (Developer must minimize long-term O&M to protect toll profits)	Moderate/Low (Reduced "skin-in-the-game" due to guaranteed annuities)
Critical Execution Challenge	Cost overruns (impact heavily skewed to pre-construction delays)	Operational / Contract Administration friction (ES = 0.81 / 0.78)
O&M Responsibility	Borne entirely by the Private Developer	Borne entirely by the Private Developer
Government Fiscal Burden	Low (Revenue generating)	Medium to High (Deferred Annuity Trap)
Private Sector Exposure	Extremely High	Medium (Insulated by Annuities)

Table 1: Comparative Risk Matrix of Prevailing Highway Procurement Models.



6. DISCUSSION / ANALYSIS

The empirical findings regarding the shortcomings of the BOT and HAM frameworks can be most effectively analyzed through the theoretical lens of the Institutional Risk Allocation Perspective [6]. The fundamental premise of any successful, sustainable Public-Private Partnership is that a specific risk should be allocated directly to the party best equipped to control, mitigate, or absorb it [1, 2]. When this core economic principle is violated—either by forcing the private sector to absorb sovereign risks or by shielding the private sector from efficiency risks—the resulting misalignment inevitably breeds project distress, litigation, and systemic financial failure [6, 12].

6.1 The Misallocation of Macroeconomic Risk in BOT

The comprehensive collapse of the BOT-Toll model in India represents a textbook case of misallocated macroeconomic risk [4]. By forcing private concessionaires to assume 100% of the traffic and revenue risk, the state effectively tasked infrastructure developers with hedging against national GDP fluctuations, global industrial policy shifts, and localized socioeconomic resistance to tolling infrastructure [4]. A private engineering developer possesses profound, highly specialized expertise in procurement, construction efficiency, and project management; however, they possess absolutely zero control over the macroeconomic drivers of highway traffic volume.

When the 2008 global financial crisis and subsequent domestic economic slowdowns depressed commercial freight movement, the rigid revenue models of BOT projects shattered [3]. Because the concession agreements were inflexible by design, there was no institutional mechanism to recalibrate the revenue expectations in real-time. This structural rigidity forced developers to absorb massive, unmitigated losses, ultimately transferring the distress to the public banking sector in the form of devastating NPAs [2, 3]. Furthermore, the state retained the sovereign responsibility for land acquisition—a task it routinely failed to execute within stipulated timelines [5]. The private sector was thus heavily penalized (via mounting interest during construction and material cost inflation) for the public sector's administrative inefficiencies [5, 13]. The BOT model failed because it privatized uncontrollable macroeconomic risks while socializing the inevitable losses through the collapse of banking sector liquidity [3].

6.2 The Bureaucratic Friction of Risk-Sharing in HAM

The policy evolution toward the Hybrid Annuity Model was a direct institutional acknowledgement of the BOT model's risk misallocation [6, 7]. By assuming the traffic risk (via direct toll collection by the NHAI) and providing 40% of the capital upfront to lower the debt burden, the government theoretically realigned the financial risks with its own sovereign capacity to absorb them [8]. However, analyzing the ground realities of HAM through the same risk allocation framework reveals a deeply troubling second-order effect: while HAM solved the commercial revenue risk, it severely amplified administrative, operational, and contract management risks [7, 9].

The HAM framework requires an unprecedented degree of symbiotic administrative efficiency between the public authority, the Independent Engineer (IE), and the private developer [6]. The 40% construction grant is disbursed in exact tranches only upon the strict certification of physical milestones [8]. In the highly rigid Indian bureaucratic context, this creates a profound structural bottleneck [6]. The Independent Engineers, often constrained by fears of governmental auditing and vigilance inquiries, routinely display extreme risk aversion in certifying completion milestones [9]. Even minor discrepancies or delays caused by external factors (such as unshifted electrical utilities, local right-of-way disputes, or delayed municipal approvals) can halt a milestone certification entirely [8, 14].

Consequently, the private developer is starved of the anticipated, contractually mandated cash flow, forcing them to draw heavily on expensive, short-term commercial debt to keep the project moving and laborers paid [10]. This operational dynamic explicitly explains why the SCFA results identified contract administration ($ES = 0.78$) and operational constraints ($ES = 0.81$) as the apex challenges in HAM projects [9]. The government has essentially substituted the macroeconomic risk of the BOT model with the micro-bureaucratic risk of the HAM model [6]. For a private developer, navigating a complex, multi-tiered bureaucracy to unlock legitimate grant tranches has proven to be as unpredictable and perilous as forecasting 20-year traffic volumes [4, 9].

6.3 The Long-term Behavioural Implications of De-Risking

A deeper, third-order implication of the HAM framework involves behavioural economics and the concept of moral hazard [11, 12]. The fundamental genius of a pure PPP is the alignment of lifecycle incentives [1]. In a traditional BOT model, a developer who cuts corners during the construction phase to save initial costs will suffer immense



financial losses during the 20-year operation period due to exorbitant, recurring repair costs eating directly into their toll revenues [4]. The risk of asset degradation is borne by the entity responsible for building it [11].

In HAM, this risk profile is heavily truncated. Because the government injects 40% of the capital as a non-refundable grant and guarantees the return on the remaining 60% via sovereign-backed annuities regardless of traffic volume, the developer's exposure to catastrophic financial ruin is highly mitigated [8]. While this successfully lured private capital back into the sector, it structurally altered the profile of the participating firms. The market is witnessing the aggressive entry of mid-sized EPC contractors into the HAM space—entities that possess short-term construction expertise but completely lack long-term asset management pedigrees [2, 12].

This extensive de-risking removes the punitive economic deterrent against sub-optimal construction quality [11]. If the asset degrades prematurely, the developer is still entitled to their capital annuity payments; only the relatively smaller O&M annuity is at risk of deduction [8]. Therefore, while HAM accelerates the sheer quantity of highway construction, the institutional framework arguably incentivizes a dilution in the lifecycle quality of the asset [2, 11]. This structural flaw holds the potential to generate a massive, unfunded rehabilitation burden for the state once the 15-year concession expires and the degraded asset is transferred back to the government [11, 12].

7. CONCLUSION

The trajectory of India's highway infrastructure development demonstrates that theoretical financial engineering cannot succeed in a vacuum of operational friction. While the Hybrid Annuity Model (HAM) successfully insulated developers from the macroeconomic vulnerabilities that crippled the BOT-Toll era, it fundamentally replaced revenue risk with micro-bureaucratic paralysis. When subjective milestone certifications or localized right-of-way disputes delay disbursements, they trigger severe working capital constraints that starve active construction sites. Crucially, the extreme de-risking of private capital inadvertently dilutes the incentive for rigorous, lifecycle engineering quality. This structural flaw allows mid-tier contractors to prioritize short-term construction margins over long-term structural resilience, ultimately generating a massive, unfunded rehabilitation burden for the state.

For emerging economies to sustain their logistical competitiveness, infrastructure policy must actively bridge the gap between sovereign finance and site-level engineering realities. Achieving a sustainable equilibrium requires a dual mandate: structural financial reforms that dynamically adjust a developer's upfront equity based on their proven structural quality and technical track record, paired with the integration of objective, technology-driven oversight—such as automated physical milestone verification. By eliminating the administrative bottlenecks that starve project cash flows, public-private partnerships can move beyond mere capital mobilization to ensure that both financial risk and technical, structural accountability are equitably shared and transparently enforced.

REFERENCES

1. Cherkos, F. D., Jha, K. N., & Singh, A. (2020). Framework to select public–private partnership modalities. *Journal of Legal Affairs and Dispute Resolution in Engineering and Construction*, 12(4). [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)LA.1943-4170.0000425](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)LA.1943-4170.0000425)
2. Patil, N. A., & Laishram, B. (2016). Public-private partnerships from sustainability perspective - a critical analysis of the Indian case. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 16(2), 161-174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2016.1146113>
3. Jagannathan, M. (2016). Public private partnerships in India: Problems and solutions. In *Urbanization Challenges in Emerging Economies* (pp. 84-93). <https://doi.org/10.1061/9780784482025.052>
4. Thomas, A. V., Kalidindi, S. N., & Ganesh, L. S. (2006). Modelling and assessment of critical risks in BOT road projects. *Construction Management and Economics*, 24(4), 407–424. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01446190500435275>
5. Prasad, K. V., Vasugi, V., Venkatesan, R., & Bhat, N. S. (2019). Critical causes of time overrun in Indian construction projects and mitigation measures. *International Journal of Construction Education and Research*, 15(3), 216-238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15578771.2018.1499569>



6. Devkar, G., Palliyaguru, R., & Oyegoke, A. S. (2020). The effects of institutional frameworks on implementation of PPP projects: A comparative perspective in Australia and India. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 20(6), 720–736. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2020.1769255>
7. Dhanshyam, M., & Srivastava, S. K. (2021). Governance structures for public infrastructure projects: Public–private management regimes, contractual forms and innovation. *Construction Management and Economics*, 39(8), 652–668. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01446193.2021.1938162>
8. Koirala, S. (2024). Hybrid Annuity Model: Implications in Nepalese Highways. *Samsad Journal संसद जर्नल*, 1(1), 67-77. <https://doi.org/10.3126/sj.v1i1.75904>
9. Deep, S., Singh, S., Jha, K.N., Uggina, V.S., & Vishnoi, S. (2024). Critical challenges in execution of hybrid annuity model construction projects: Understanding the contractor's perspective. *Journal of Infrastructure Systems*, 30(3). <https://doi.org/10.1061/JITSE4.ISENG-2395>
10. Deep, S., Bhoola, V., Vidhani, J., & Hampannaver, P. R. (2022). Evaluating the impact of constraints on project success: Empirical study of highway projects. *Built Environment Project and Asset Management*, 12(4), 684–700. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BEPAM-05-2021-0074>
11. Casady, C. B., & Peci, F. (2021). The institutional challenges of public-private partnerships (PPPs) in transition economies: lessons from Kosovo. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 34(1), 1949–1965. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2020.1860791>
12. Sehgal, R., & Dubey, A. M. (2019). Identification of critical success factors for public–private partnership projects. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 19(4). <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.1956>
13. Rajan, T. A., Gopinath, G., & Behera, M. (2014). PPPs and project overruns: Evidence from road projects in India. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 140(5). [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CO.1943-7862.0000797](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000797)
14. Akhtar, M., Mufti, N. A., Mubin, S., Saleem, M. Q., Zahoor, S., & Ullah, S. (2023). Identification of various execution modes and their respective risks for public–private partnership (PPP) infrastructure projects. *Buildings*, 13(8). <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13081889>