



# STUDY ON SUSTAINABLE FUNDING OF CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT INSTITUTIONS

**Godwin Punungwe, Transport Advisor**

**Submitted by:  
The Services Group**

**Submitted to:  
USAID/Southern Africa**

**Gaborone, Botswana**

**August 2008**

**USAID Contract No. 690-M-00-04-00309-00 (GS 10F-0277P)**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS USED AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	iv
1. INTRODUCTION	
1.1. Background.....	1
1.2. Study Objective.....	1
1.3. Study Approach and Methodology .....	2
1.4. Structure of Report .....	2
2. CORRIDOR INSTITUTIONS AND FUNDING MECHANISMS	
2.1. Corridor Function .....	3
2.2. Corridor Management Institution Function.....	3
2.3. Beneficiaries of Corridor Institutions Interventions.....	3
2.4. Sustainable Funding of Corridor Institutions .....	4
2.5. Enabling Environment for the Application of the User-Pay Funding Mechanism ....	5
3. NORTHERN CORRIDOR (NCTTCA)	
3.1. Northern Corridor Institutional Background and Structure .....	7
3.2. Achievements of the NCTTCA and Benefits to Stakeholders .....	9
3.3. Funding Mechanism Background and Status .....	9
3.3.1. Background .....	9
3.3.2. How the Financial Mechanism Works .....	10
3.4. Successes and Challenges of the NCTTCA Funding Mechanism .....	11
4. HOW TO APPLY THE USER-PAY PRINCIPLE FOR SUSTAINABILITY	
4.1. Phase 1: Creating the Enabling Environment .....	13
4.2. Phase II: Implementation of the User-Pay Principle.....	13
5. The MAPUTO CORRIDOR (MCLI) CASE	
5.1. Introduction.....	15
5.2. Background.....	15
5.3. Institutional Structure .....	16
5.4. Funding Mechanism .....	17
5.4.1. Background .....	17
5.4.2. MCLI Membership Contributions.....	17
5.4.3. Consultations with MCLI Key Stakeholders on Funding Mechanism .....	17
5.4.4. MCLI Board of Directors Views .....	18
5.4.5. MCLI Financial Requirements.....	18
5.4.6. Conclusions from Consultations.....	19
5.4.7. Recommendations to MCLI.....	19
References .....	20
ANNEX 1 .....	21
ANNEX 2: LIST OF PEOPLE CONSULTED .....	22

## LIST OF ACRONYMS USED

DOT	South African Department of Transport
C&FA	Clearing and Forwarding Agencies
CFM	Mozambique Railways and Ports
CMI	Corridor Management Institution
COMESA	Common Market for East and Southern Africa
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
EAC	East African Community
Hub	Southern Africa Global Competitiveness Hub
KPA	Kenyan Port Authority
MCC	Maputo Corridor Company
MCLI	Maputo Corridor Logistics Initiative
MDC	Maputo Development Corridor
MFLF	Mpumalanga Freight Logistics Forum
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MZ	Mozambique
NCTTCA	Northern Corridor Transit Transport Coordinating Authority
NCTA	Northern Corridor Transit Agreement
PPP	Public-Private Partnership
SSATP	Sub-Saharan Africa Transport Policy Program
SW	Swaziland
TFR	Transnet Freight Rail
TRAC	Trans African Concessions
SA	South Africa

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

*The author would like to acknowledge with thanks all those who made themselves available for interviews and have contributed to the success of this study. Further the author greatly appreciates the support given by Godfrey Onyango and his team at NCTTCA and Brenda Horne and her team at MCLI. Lastly, the author is grateful to Charles Kunaka, the SSATP Regional Coordinator for East and Southern Africa, who reviewed and commented on an earlier draft.*

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The Maputo Corridor Logistics Initiative (MCLI) requested the Southern Africa Global Competitiveness Hub, hereafter referred to as the Hub, to fund or produce a study on a sustainable funding model for the MCLI based on the user-pay principle.
2. Cognizant of the challenges of sustainable funding of corridor management institutions and the fact that the Northern Corridor (NCTTCA) had overcome this challenge, the Hub embarked on this study to identify the characteristics and key factors for a sustainable corridor management funding regime.
3. The objectives of the study were to design a generic model or mechanism for sustainable funding of corridor management institutions such as the MCLI. The design was based on a literature review on corridor management and the mechanism used by the NCTTCA. The goal was to come up with a model that could be applied not only to MCLI but to other corridors that the Hub is working on such as the Dar es Salaam and Trans Kalahari Corridors. The study entailed both interviews and literature review.
4. It has been realized that corridors with corridor management institutions are better equipped to monitor corridor performance and address non-tariff barriers along the corridor in a proactive manner, through strategies for continued improvements of corridor performance. The coordination that the corridor management institutions has to undertake in the corridor requires a public-private partnership to address a wide range of issues including investment in infrastructure, regulation of transport and trade, and facilitate private sector participation and professionalism in the logistics industry.
5. The overarching goal of a CMI is to reduce the cost of doing business along the corridor in such a way that the cost of sustaining the institution is less than the cost-savings or benefits it provides to the corridor users. The CMI achieves these benefits through implementation of strategies and making interventions that: reduce transit times and cost of shipment through the corridor; improve the quality of service and infrastructure in the corridor.
6. However, at the inception of a CMI it is unlikely that the cost-benefit analysis for the CMI would be positive and this may be one of the reasons why donor funding is usually required at this stage. In the absence of donor funding at this stage a CMI is usually funded by governments or volunteers who are corridor champions such as ports authorities or major users of the corridor. Unfortunately these mechanisms for funding are not sustainable as donors and governments have other priorities and voluntary contribution is simply not reliable.
7. The shipper is the lifeline of the corridor who feeds it with the tonnage which enables all stakeholders along the corridor chain to be in business, by handling the shipper's tonnage. The shipper needs his/her consignment to be transported to its destination in the safest manner, shortest possible time and at least possible cost. The demand for services from all the players along the corridor chain are derived from this need and their performance (efficiency) is measured by the degree to which they meet these expectations of the shipper.
8. For effectiveness and efficiency corridor institutions need a sustainable and reliable source of income to enable them to plan and implement measures to improve corridor operations. From NCTTCA experience and from literature it seems the only way for reliable and sustainable funding of corridor management institutions is through the

“user-pay principle”, that is those who benefit from the activities and interventions of the CMI should pay for its sustainability. The tonnage levy used on the Northern Corridor (NCTTCA), although not a perfect mechanism has provided sustainable funding for the CMI i.e. NCTTCA.

9. A tonnage linked usage levy would ensure sustainability of the CMI while maintaining pressure on the CMI to continue delivering benefits if those who pay have influence on what the CMI does. Ideally a levy, based on the tonnage and distance can be introduced based on a rate per ton-km. Such a levy could be collected at the port by Port Authorities or by Customs at international borders and transferred to the CMI.
10. Ultimately though, it is the shipper who will pay for the sustainability of the CMI as any contributions by other key stakeholders are likely to be passed onto as charges to the shipper. It is therefore important to come up with a simple and practical method of calculating the tonnage levy that takes distance of the corridor used into account. It is also important to come up with a simple and practical mechanism for collecting the levy, preferably automated to avoid leakage, to minimize the cost of collection .and cover as many users of the corridor as practically as possible.
11. To apply the user-pay principle there are a number of conditions necessary to create the enabling environment. Hereunder are some of them:
  - a) There must be an understanding and acceptance among all key stakeholders of the corridor of the need to use the user-pay principle.
  - b) Application of the user-pay principle should be authorized by the governments concerned.
  - c) The timing of its introduction is crucial for its acceptance by the governments and other key stakeholders.
  - d) The resultant charges should be perceived to be lower than the benefits the shippers and other service providers obtain.
  - e) In order for shippers and corridor management institutions to assess costs and benefits, it is important to have an effective corridor performance monitoring system.
  - f) CMI funders must have a say on what the CMI does and how it spends the money.
12. The levy system of funding the Northern Corridor has been extremely successful in resolving the funding problems it faced in the 1990s and currently its budget of approximately US\$1.2m is met without much difficulties. This system has proven to be a sustainable and reliable way of funding this corridor management institution. However, there is need to improve this system so that those who fund the CMI have greater say in what it does; free-riders are eliminated; and that benefits are passed onto to shippers as the ultimate financiers of the CMI.
13. For other corridors to apply the user-pay principle for sustainable funding of their CMI such as the MCLI, they must first create the enabling environment for the use of this principle. Thereafter prepare a strategic plan approved by the key stakeholders from which the annual work plan and budget are based to determine the usage fee/levy and decide on the collection mechanism and framework to implement the mechanism.
14. MCLI is funded by annual membership contributions from its approximately 103 members. Membership contribution is mainly determined by the size of organization

measured in terms of number of employees a company employs. In addition, public listed companies pay more than non-listed companies.

15. However, the nine Founding Members of MCLI which now includes South African Department of Transport, that secures the difference between the general membership contribution and the operational budget, contribute 75% of MCLI funding and the rest of other categories of membership contribute only 25% of MCLI budget. Consequently the Founding Members are the Executive Members of the MCLI Board that directs what activities MCLI undertakes and approves its operating and capital expenditure.
16. Conclusions from consultations with the MCLI are as follows:
  - a) MCLI must be maintained and sustained.
  - b) The user-pay principle is supported for the long-term funding of the MCLI but it cannot be implemented now.
  - c) Government funding outside of direct funding MCLI membership funding cannot be relied upon for sustainability.
  - d) Membership funding will have to be secured and committed to for MCLI to continue beyond February 2009 until such time as the user-pay principle can be applied.
17. Recommendations to MCLI are:
  - a) For the immediate sustenance of the MCLI with effect from 1 March 2009, general members increase their contributions by 25% and Founding Members continue securing the difference to meet MCLI's operational budget based on Board approved strategy and operational activities.
  - b) MCLI embarks on program to implement the user-pay principle guided by the implementation approach discussed earlier in this report. This entails establishing the enabling environment for the implementation of this principle and steps in determining the usage rate and the collection mechanism.
  - c) The user-pay principle should be introduced as soon as practicable.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background

The Maputo Corridor Logistics Initiative (MCLI) requested the Southern Africa Global Competitiveness Hub, hereafter referred to as the Hub, to fund or produce a study on a sustainable funding model for the MCLI based on the user-pay principle. The Hub agreed to undertake the study culminating in this study on Sustainable Funding of Corridor Management Institutions (CMI).

In 2004 the Hub undertook the Dar es Salaam Corridor Institutional Sustainability Study as well as the Trans Kalahari Corridor Institutional Sustainability Study. A review of these studies revealed that membership contributions whether by the private or public sector were generally not viable in the long term for sustainable funding of corridor management institutions. Of all the corridor management institutions the studies had reviewed only the Northern Corridor Transit Transport Coordinating Authority (NCTTCA) had a sustainable funding mechanism through tonnage levy for traffic passing through the Mombassa Port. However, neither study described in detail how the funding mechanism used by the NCTTCA worked and how it could be applied to other corridors.

The Sub-Saharan Africa Transport Policy Program (SSATP) in a Working Paper entitled "*Institutional Arrangements for Transport Corridor management in Sub-Saharan Africa*"<sup>1</sup> also noted: "Funding arrangements for existing corridor groups include membership fees, contributions by governments, traffic-based fees or donor support. The sustainability of most corridor institutions is a challenge, though the traffic-based usage fee arrangement seems to be the most appropriate as it also places demands to deliver benefits to shippers who ultimately meet the costs." The only corridor institution using the traffic-based usage fee or tonnage levy is the NCTTCA. Yet again, the details of how this is applied in the Northern Corridor and how it could be applied to other corridors were not spelt out in this paper.

In this context, and cognizant of the challenge of finding a sustainable mechanism of funding corridor institutions and the fact that the NCTTCA had overcome this challenge, the Hub embarked on this study to identify the characteristics and key factors for a sustainable corridor management funding regime.

## 1.2 Study Objective

The objectives of the study were to design a generic model or mechanism for sustainable funding of corridor management institutions such as the MCLI. The design was based on a literature review on corridor management and the mechanism used by the Northern Corridor (NCTTCA); and to adapt and apply this mechanism to the Maputo Corridor for the sustainable funding of the MCLI. The goal was to come up with a model that could be applied not only to MCLI but to other corridors that the Hub is working on such as the Dar es Salaam and Trans Kalahari Corridors. However, the recommended mechanism/model would have to take into account the different backgrounds, legal and institutional arrangements in the various corridors as well as improve on any weaknesses observed in the mechanism used on the NCTTCA. In other words, the NCTTCA model will be modified and adapted to circumstances pertaining in each corridor.

---

<sup>1</sup> SSATP Working Paper No. 86: Institutional Arrangements for Transport Corridor Management in Sub-Saharan Africa.

### **1.3 Study Approach and Methodology**

Understanding the background to the NCTTCA and its funding mechanism, how the mechanism works and how it could be adapted to other corridor institutions was critical for this study. Consequently the study approach has been to consult extensively with the NCTCCA Executive Secretary and his staff, key stakeholders of the Northern Corridor such as the Kenya Transporters Association, Kenya Port authority and Kenya International Freight & Warehousing Association. After understanding how the mechanism works and the legal and policy environment necessary for it to work, literature review on funding of corridor management institutions was undertaken. Based on this information, initial views on how the MCLI could be funded on a sustainable basis was formulated and discussed with key stakeholders of the Maputo Corridor. These views were discussed with MCLI stakeholders and presented to a meeting of MCLI members at the meeting on July 30, 2008 in Nelspruit, South Africa. Based on all these inputs this report was drafted. The study approach entailed both interviews and literature review.

Visit to the NCTTCA in Mombassa and to other key stakeholders was undertaken June 12-17. Consultations with the Maputo Corridor stakeholders were held July 28 to August 1, 2008. The SSATP also contributed to the study by reviewing the proposals against the Program's experiences from other corridors in Sub-Saharan Africa.

### **1.4 Structure of Report**

The remainder of the report is in five sections. The next section discusses corridor institutions and funding mechanisms. The third section discusses the Northern Corridor (NCTTCA) and its funding mechanism background; and how the mechanism works. The fourth section deals with how to apply the user-pay principle for sustainable funding of corridor institutions. The fifth section discusses the MCLI case, both institutional and financial and concludes with some specific recommendations to the MCLI.

## **2. CORRIDOR INSTITUTIONS AND FUNDING MECHANISMS**

From the literature review and Northern Corridor experience one can attempt to define what transport corridors are, what the role and overarching goal of corridor management institutions should be; principles that should guide the sustainable funding of these institutions; and the enabling environment for sustainable funding. This section of the report attempts to do just that.

### **2.1 Corridor Function**

From an economic perspective the function of a corridor is to promote both internal and external trade by providing more efficient transport and logistic services. Corridor focus is not only in improving routes that comprises it but also quality of transport and other logistics services aimed reduction of transit times and cost of shipment of goods and persons along the corridor. It has been realized that corridors with corridor management institutions are better equipped to monitor corridor performance and address non-tariff barriers along the corridor in a proactive manner, through strategies for continued improvements of corridor performance. The coordination that the corridor management institutions has to undertake in the corridor requires a public-private partnership to address a wide range of issues including investment in infrastructure, regulation of transport and trade, and facilitate private sector participation and professionalism in the logistics industry.<sup>2</sup>

### **2.2 Corridor Management Institution Function**

The overarching goal of a CMI is to reduce the cost of doing business along the corridor in such a way that the cost of sustaining the institution is less than the cost-savings or benefits it provides to the corridor users. Ultimately the cost-benefit analysis of sustaining a CMI should have net benefits, although it is not always easy to quantify the benefits. The CMI achieves these benefits through implementation of strategies and making interventions that: reduce transit times and cost of shipment through the corridor; improve the quality of service and infrastructure in the corridor.

However, at the inception of a CMI it is unlikely that the cost-benefit analysis for the CMI would be positive and this may be one of the reasons why donor funding is usually required at this stage. In the absence of donor funding at this stage a CMI is usually funded by governments or volunteers who are corridor champions such as ports authorities or major users of the corridor. Unfortunately these mechanisms for funding are not sustainable as donors and governments have other priorities and voluntary contribution is simply not reliable. In addition, there are usually free-riders who benefit from the corridor operations improvements without contributing to the sustenance of the CMI whose interventions are responsible for the improvements. Moreover, it is difficult to quantify and allocate these benefits to the different corridor stakeholders whose contribution for the sustenance of the CMI may be different.

### **2.3 Beneficiaries of Corridor Institutions Interventions**

Primary beneficiaries of corridor institutions interventions are the Shippers, Transporters, Clearing and Forwarding Agencies (C&FA), Customs Authorities, Port Authorities, Consumers and the Economy. The shipper is the lifeline of the corridor who feeds it with the tonnage which enables all stakeholders along the corridor chain to be in business, by

---

<sup>2</sup> SSATP Working Paper No. 86: Institutional Arrangements for Transport Corridor Management in Sub-Saharan Africa.

handling the shipper's tonnage. The shipper needs his/her consignment to be transported to its destination in the safest manner, shortest possible time and at least possible cost. The demand for services from all the players along the corridor chain are derived from this need and their performance (efficiency) is measured by the degree to which they meet these expectations of the shipper.<sup>3</sup> Transporters benefit from reduced truck turn round time and other operating costs on the route; C&FA benefit from reduction in operating costs and increased throughput; while Ports Authority benefit from increased competitiveness, throughput and utilization. Customs and Economy benefit from increased trade and duty collection; and Consumers from reduced cost of goods.

Benefit-based contributions have been suggested as a way for sustainable funding of CMI. This approach involves contributions from different stakeholders based on the benefits they derive from improved corridor performance. The main challenge with this approach is to demonstrate quantitatively to each stakeholder, the aspects of corridor improvement that can be attributed to the CMI interventions. As a corridor is in reality a system with various players, which can affect the performance of the others, it would also be difficult to allocate benefits such that different stakeholders would contribute different levels of support.<sup>4</sup>

## **2.4 Sustainable Funding of Corridor Institutions**

For effectiveness and efficiency corridor institutions need a sustainable and reliable source of income to enable them to plan and implement measures to improve corridor operations. A number of corridor institutions have been established with donor funding but this has not proved sustainable. Some have started with membership contributions or government contributions and this was generally viable for four to five years after which the corridor institutions start experiencing financial problems e.g. NCTTCA, MCLI.

From NCTTCA experience and from literature it seems the only way for sustainable funding of corridor management institutions is through the "user-pay principle", that is those who benefit from the activities and interventions of the CMI should pay for its sustainability. The tonnage levy used on the Northern Corridor (NCTTCA), although not a perfect mechanism has provided sustainable funding for the CMI i.e. NCTTCA.

A tonnage linked usage levy would ensure sustainability of the CMI while maintaining pressure on the CMI to continue delivering benefits if those who pay have influence on what the CMI does. Ideally a levy, based on the tonnage and distance can be introduced based on a rate per ton-km. Such a levy could be collected at the port by Port Authorities or by Customs at international borders and transferred to the CMI. User levies, when directly related to the benefits derived from enhanced corridor management are the most recommended mode of meeting management costs. However, for sustainability, the user contributions have to be less than the derived benefits. The mode of collection of any levy must be simple to administer so as not to impact negatively on the corridor transport operations.<sup>5</sup>

Ultimately though, it is the shipper who will pay for the sustainability of the CMI as any contributions by other key stakeholders are likely to be passed onto to the charges to the

---

<sup>3</sup> SA Trade Hub Trans Kalahari Corridor Institutional Sustainability Study 2004

<sup>4</sup> SSATP Working Paper No. 86: Institutional Arrangements for Transport Corridor Management in Sub-Saharan Africa.

<sup>5</sup> SSATP Working Paper No. 86: Institutional Arrangements for Transport Corridor Management in Sub-Saharan Africa.

shipper. It is therefore important to come up with a simple and practical method of calculating the tonnage or usage levy for all those using the corridor. It is also important to come up with a simple and practical mechanism for collecting the levy, preferably automated to avoid leakage and cover as many users of the corridor as practically as possible, to minimize the cost of collection.

## **2. 5 Enabling Environment for the Application of the User-Pay Funding Mechanism**

Except in the case of Kenya that pays direct from its Treasury for the sustenance of the NCTTCA, Burundi, DRC, Rwanda and Uganda are using the user-pay principle for funding the Northern Corridor institution (NCTTCA). Thus the funding mechanism for this corridor institution is based on the user-pay principle. The basic aspect of this principle is that those who benefit from the improvements in the corridor operations as a result of the interventions of the corridor institutions should pay for the sustenance of that institution. While a number of institutions benefit but do not pay for the sustenance of the NCTTCA, such as the KPA, Truckers, Customs, even if they paid, it would still be ultimately the shippers that would pay as these costs would be passed onto them. Thus the shippers are ultimately the users of the corridor and should and do pay for the improvements in the corridor facilitated by the corridor institution.

To apply this user-pay principle there are a number of conditions necessary to create the enabling environment. Hereunder are some of them:

- a) There must be an understanding among all key stakeholders of the corridor, including the governments concerned, of the need to use the user-pay principle such as tonnage levy for the sustainable funding of the corridor management institution.
- b) The user-pay principle such as tonnage levy should be included in an Agreement among the governments concerned for example a Treaty, MOU or Constitution of the Corridor Management Institution that authorizes the collection of the levy on all users as per agreed formula for the sustenance of the corridor institution.
- c) Even if (b) is fulfilled, it is necessary that there is acceptance of when the user-pay principle can be applied by all key stakeholders, especially the governments concerned. Thus it is not enough to have it in the Agreement/MOU for example, the timing of its introduction is crucial for its acceptance by the governments and other key stakeholders.
- d) The charges or tonnage levy should be seen to be lower than the benefits the shippers and other service providers obtain from the interventions of the corridor management institution aimed at improving corridor operations. In essence, the cost-benefit analysis, although not always easy to quantify, should be perceived to be positive i.e. with net benefits.
- e) In order for shippers and corridor management institutions to assess costs and benefits, it is important to have an effective corridor performance monitoring system. Such a system should have indicators agreed to by all stakeholders to monitor the impact of CMI interventions.
- f) Those who fund the corridor management institution most or their representatives should have the most influence on what the corridor management institution does and how it spends the money contributed if the charges or levy is not to be seen as just another government tax.

The user-pay principle or usage levy per tone is a funding mechanism that can be applied to any corridor for sustainable funding of the CMI provided the above conditions can be met. However, how to apply this principle is discussed in the next section.

### **3. NORTHERN CORRIDOR (NCTTCA)**

#### **3.1 Northern Corridor Institutional Background and Structure**

The Northern Corridor comprises the transport facilities and infrastructure linking land-locked countries of East and Central Africa, namely: Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Rwanda and Uganda to the seaport of Mombassa in Kenya. The corridor also serves Northern Tanzania, Southern Sudan and Ethiopia.

It is very important to understand the background and institutional arrangements of the NCTTCA before understanding its funding mechanism. Prior to the breakup of the East African Community (EAC that comprised Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania) in 1977, other countries were trading with the EAC as it were one country. Burundi, for example, did not have to come all the way to Mombassa to collect its imports and exports. There were inland ports or facilities at the borders with the EAC to and from which other countries took their exports and imports.

With the breakup of the EAC land-locked countries such as Burundi, Rwanda, Uganda and DRC had to negotiate bilateral agreements with all other countries transited by their traffic to reach the Mombassa port. In some cases this entailed several bilateral agreements with different charges and allowances resulting in a complicated and costly trading system for the landlocked countries. Consequently a decision was made to negotiate a multi-lateral agreement, the Northern Corridor Transit Agreement (NCTA) that was signed by Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda in 1985 and DRC acceded to the Agreement in 1987.

The purpose of the NCTA is to:

- Promote the use of the Northern Corridor as the most effective route for the surface transportation of goods between the respective member countries and the sea; and
- Grant Member States the right of transit in order to facilitate movement of goods through respective territories and to provide all possible facilities for transit traffic between them, in accordance with the agreement.

Through the NCTA Member States are enjoined to pursue the following objectives:

- Expeditious movement of traffic, and avoidance of unnecessary delays in the movement of goods in transit through their territories;
- Minimal incidences of customs fraud and tax avoidance;
- Simplification and harmonization of documentation and procedures relating to the movement of goods in transit; and
- Cooperation in the development and improvement of transport and communication infrastructure and facilities.

The NCTA led to the establishment of the NCTTCA, which together with its various organs, are responsible for implementing the treaty/NCTA. The role of the NCTTCA is to:

- Ascertain smooth and safe passage of cargo along the corridor.
- Reduce transportation costs along the corridor.
- Simplify cargo clearance procedures.
- Simplify customs documentation.

- Harmonize transport policies.
- Enhance cooperation among member states.
- Facilitate trade among member states and between the member states and the rest of the world.
- Contribute towards sustainable development of the member states and poverty reduction.
- Promote the improvement of surface transport infrastructure.
- Encourage the major transport service providers (including ports, railways, truckers etc) to provide cost-effective services.

The NCTTCA functions through three main organs which work closely in realizing the objectives of the NCTA and these are:

The Authority: This comprises of the Ministers from the member states responsible for transportation. It is the highest organ that is responsible for overall policy direction and meets once a year.

The Executive Board: This is an Inter-Governmental Committee comprising Chief Executives of Ministries responsible for transport in member states. The Board assists the Authority in formulating strategies for transport and trade facilitation, infrastructure development and harmonization of national and regional policies. The Chairmanship of the Authority and the executive Board rotates among member states. The Executive Board meets twice a year.

The NCTTCA Permanent Secretariat: The Secretariat is responsible for coordinating the implementation of the NCTA and any decisions and resolutions made by the Authority and the Executive Board. The Secretariat is currently located in Mombassa, Kenya, and is headed by an Executive Secretary, supported by three Technical Experts and other non-technical staff.

The Technical experts are currently as follows:

- Customs Expert: Focuses of Customs and Trade Facilitation.
- Highway Engineer: Focuses on Infrastructure Development and Management.
- Transport Economist: Focuses on Transport Policy Development.

So far two specialized Committees have been established: one for Infrastructure Development and Management; and the other for Customs and Trade Facilitation. As a result of growing importance of the private sector to NCTTCA and the recognition that public-private sector partnership need to be integrated into the Authority's transit and trade policies if regional economic development is to be attained, a PPP Committee (the Northern Corridor Stakeholders' Consultative Forum) that brings together Chief Executives of public and private sector agencies has been established. In addition, National Trade and Transport facilitation Committees are in the process of being established.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> NCTTCA Strategic Plan 2007-2011

### **3.2 Achievements of NCTTCA and Benefits to Stakeholders**

Through the activities undertaken by the NCTTCA the following are some of the achievements to date:

- a) Simplification of Port Clearance Procedures including creation of one-stop centre for processing documents at the container terminal; joint verification of cargo; harmonization of working hours of all agencies at the port; and reduction in copies of documents and agencies required to stamp the Mombassa Port Release order.
- b) Simplification of Transit documentation by introducing a Single Administrative Document that replaced thirteen other documents.
- c) Considerable reduction in time, by on average 50%, and customs processing procedures. For example the Mombassa to Bujumbura road trip before NCTA took 25 to 30 days but after NCTA it takes 12 to 15 days. The impact of this, it is reported, was an annual savings of about US\$13.6m
- d) Elimination of transit and other taxes and reduction in payment for motor vehicle insurance and increase in the use of railways resulted in annual savings estimated at about US\$17.4m
- e) Better relationships and understanding among institutions and persons dealing with transit traffic such as Revenue Authorities, Railway Corporations, Trucking Organizations, Freight Forwarding and clearing Companies.<sup>7</sup>

The NCTTCA has contributed to the reduction of the cost of doing business in the Northern Corridor bringing benefits to shippers and other key stakeholders of the corridor.

### **3.3 Funding Mechanism Background and Status**

#### **3.3.1 Background**

At the establishment of the NCTTCA in the mid- 1980s as an inter-governmental body, its funding was wholly borne by the five governments who were signatories to the Treaty, each government paying 20% of the budget for the NCTTCA per year. However, the governments were not paying their contributions on time and NCTTCA was unable to pay its creditors or even salaries to its staff. Staff could go for six months without pay due to the failure of the governments to pay regularly and on time for the NCTTCA's sustainability. Typical of institutions funded through such mechanism in Africa, the NCTTCA started running into financial problems in the early 1990s.

Fortunately right at the onset the Agreement/Treaty specified three sources of funding the NCTTCA:

- a) Member states contribution;
- b) Donor support for project funding; and
- c) Contribution through tonnage levy/usage fees.

Attempts to institute a tonnage levy for all cargo passing through the port of Mombassa to improve the financial situation were however rejected in the 1992. This was despite that the principles of transport coordination fees were recommended in the original European Union funded study that recommended the establishment of the NCTTCA that were incorporated in the Treaty. The proposed tonnage levy was rejected because it was seen

---

<sup>7</sup> Trans Kalahari Institutional Sustainability Study 2004 by the Southern Africa Trade Hub

as just another form of government tax that would add to the cost of transport. Consequently the NCTTCA's financial problems continued until the early 2000s. The tonnage levy was eventually introduced in April 2007 but still with equal contribution by member states. It was only in 2003 that a more equitable formula for country contributions was introduced, and this coupled with the tonnage levy, plus increased traffic volumes, that led to better funding of the NCTTCA budget. Since then the tonnage levy has proven a sustainable mechanism for funding the Northern Corridor management institution (NCTTCA) with approximately US1.2m annual budget.

### **3.3.2 How the Financial Mechanism Works**

The underlining principle that permeates and guides the funding mechanism is that the NCTTCA is an intergovernmental institution whose funding is essentially from the member states which are signatories to the Treaty. The NCTTCA is answerable to the five governments. Instead of equal contributions by the member states as was the case at the inception of the NCTTCA, it was decided in 2003 to have more equitable criteria for determining contributions that took into account: (a) traffic volume for each country using the corridor; (b) each country's GDP; (c) COMESA contributions formula; and (d) the extent to which each country benefits from intra-regional trade, inter alia.

The revised contribution formula is Burundi 10%, Rwanda 15%, DRC 20%, Uganda 25% and Kenya 30%. Based on the budget allotted to a particular state, using the contribution formula above, each country's levy rate per tone is then determined, taking into account the projected traffic. The determination of levy rate is supposed to be done every year once the NCTTCA budget has been determined, approved and allotted to the five countries. However, in the last five years these the levy rates have not taken reviewed and consequently there has not been a change in the levy or contributions.

Here are some of the key features of the funding mechanism:

- a) Every year the Secretariat is supposed to establish the NCTTCA budget to which member states must contribute.
- b) Based on the criteria discussed above each of the five member states contribute the following percentages of the budget: Kenya 30%; Uganda 25%; DRC 20%; Rwanda 15%; and Burundi 10%.
- c) There are three modes of payment of contribution: (i) direct from Treasury; (ii) tonnage levy only; and (iii) combination of the two. Only Kenya chose to continue to contribute direct from the Treasury.
- d) Burundi, Rwanda, DRC and Uganda opted for the levy method. However, the levy agreement provides for topping up through direct contribution, in case the amount collected is less than the budgetary allocation. This need arises due to small cargo volumes, especially for Burundi. Of late, the cargo volumes for Rwanda and DRC are adequate to cover their annual budget allocations. Uganda's cargo volumes have always been more than adequate. Rwanda was paying both through levy and direct contribution, in order to clear arrears, which accumulated during the years of civil strife.
- e) The current rates of levies are as follows in US cents per tone: Uganda 12; Rwanda 60; DRC 91; Burundi 135; and Kenya 0.
- f) The levy amount charged per tone is based on the understanding between the government concerned and its business community.

- g) Through a Memorandum of Understanding between the Kenyan Port Authority (KPA) and the NCTTCA the KPA collects the levy on behalf and as an agent of the NCTTCA.
- h) KPA collects the levy at a fee of 2.5% of funds collected to cover its administrative costs and remits the levy collected to the NCTTCA account every month. The fact that the levies per tone are different for each country does not add any additional burden to KPA as the collection system is automated.
- i) The Current Agreement limits tonnage levy to exports and imports in and out of the region not within the region like exports from Kenya to other Member States and vice versa. The New Agreement (October 2007) that has been signed but will come into effect when ratified by at least three countries will levy all traffic using the corridor. Thus other collection agents would have to be identified other than KPA such as Customs at borders. A system will have to be put in place to ensure no double payment of levy at the port and border.
- j) Once levy has been reduced it is difficult to increase it so the strategy has been to leave the levy at high levels and any surplus is put in the next NCTTCA budget. As a result of this strategy and the fact that the levy has not been reviewed for the last five years, Uganda which used to have large arrears was fully paid on its contributions for the next three years.
- k) At the moment, the levy contributions go towards funding NCTTCA Secretariat. There is, however, no reason why levy funds could not be used for other activities, such infrastructure development projects.
- l) As a result of this funding mechanism the NCTTCA financial problems were resolved and in fact, the Secretariat managed to move to better offices and were planning to move to even better offices to accommodate additional staff under recruitment at the time of the visit to the NCTTCA.

### **3.4 Success and Challenges of the NCTTCA Funding Mechanism**

The tonnage levy system of funding the NCTTCA has been extremely successful in resolving the funding problems that it the NCTTCA faced in the 1990s and currently it does not have any funding problems. This system has proven to be a sustainable and reliable way of funding this corridor management institution. With Uganda contributing three years in advance through this mechanism the improvement in the NCTTCA financial position is not surprising.

However, there are a number of challenges with this system discussed below.

- a) NCTTCA is an inter-governmental organization directed in its activities and its budget approved by an-intergovernmental Executive Board while its funding is largely through the tonnage levy paid by the shippers or cargo owners. This means that the main financiers of the NCTTCA have no direct control on how the money is spent to make sure they get value for the money. There is a real possibility that the NCTTCA might focus on activities that might not be high priority to the shippers, but the governments. Indeed, the shippers have been demanding for more influence on what the NCTTCA Secretariat does and for the Secretariat to be more involved in day-to-day operational issues on the corridor but the Secretariat has resisted this as this is not its mandate from the contracting governments. However, there is some effort to take on board the shippers and other key stakeholders' concerns through the Stakeholders Forum inputs into the Secretariat's activities.

- b) There are some free riders on the corridor who are not contributing to the financing of the corridor institution. For example, Southern Sudan, Ethiopia and Northern Tanzania use the Northern Corridor but because their countries are not signatories to the Treaty, these countries do not contribute anything to the NCTTCA budget. However, it is reported that Sudan might soon be accede to the Treaty and thereafter contribute to the financial support to the NCTTCA. The NCTA and in particular the levy agreement gives the NCTTCA authority to levy traffic from all countries using the corridor but the strategy has been to encourage the countries to join the NCTTCA rather than levy charges, as there is no uniform levy per ton, it is difficult to determine the levy to be charged per tone.
- c) Currently intra-regional trade among the five countries that uses the corridor does not contribute to the NCTTCA budget as the traffic does not pass through the Mombassa port. However, the new revised Treaty that was signed in October 2007 but is still to be ratified to come into effect, allows collection of tonnage levy anyway along the corridor. Customs may be the vehicle through which the levy on this traffic may be collected once the revised Treaty comes into effect. Thus the revised Treaty implementation may eliminate this group of free riders on the corridor.
- d) Other than shippers or cargo owners, a number of other key stakeholders such as the Mombassa Port, Transporters, Clearing and Forwarding Agents, Customs Authorities and other Service Providers benefit from NCTTCA interventions but they do not contribute financially for the sustenance of the NCTTCA through this financing mechanism. However, it could be argued that whatever they could contribute would be eventually passed onto the shippers and therefore the shippers ultimately pay anyway.
- e) While costs could be automatically passed onto shippers by the various service providers in the corridor there is no evidence to suggest that also cost savings due to the NCTTCA interventions are also automatically passed onto shippers as direct reductions in transport costs. Rather, the reductions in transit time and improvements in convenience are some of the more visible indicators of impact. The NCTTCA is now undertaking a study to establish why it appears their interventions have apparently not resulted in lower transport costs to the shippers.

## **4. HOW TO APPLY THE USER-PAY PRINCIPLE FOR SUSTAINABILITY**

All corridors that have corridor management institutions that are not yet using the user-pay principle for sustainable funding of these institutions are encouraged to consider the following approach for implementation of this principle. The approach involves two phases. The first phase entails creating the enabling environment while the second phase entails the actual implementation steps.

### **4.1 Phase I: Creating the Enabling Environment**

In this phase the Corridor Management Institution has to:

- a) Build an understanding among all key stakeholders of the corridor, including the governments concerned, of the need to use the user-pay principle such as tonnage levy for the sustainable funding of the corridor management institution.
- b) If not already in place, secure the necessary consensus to incorporate the user-pay principle such as tonnage levy in an Agreement among the governments concerned such as a Treaty, MOU or Constitution of the Corridor Management Institution that authorizes the collection of the levy on all corridor users for the sustenance of the corridor institution.
- c) Identify the appropriate timing when the user-pay principle can be applied by all key stakeholders, especially the governments concerned. Thus it is not enough to have it in the Agreement/MOU for example, the timing of its introduction is crucial for its acceptance by the governments and other key stakeholders.
- d) Ensure the charges or tonnage levy should be seen to be lower than the benefits the shippers and other service providers obtain from the interventions of the corridor management institution aimed at improving corridor operations. In essence, the cost-benefit analysis, although not always easy to quantify, should be perceived to be positive i.e. with net benefits, by all key stakeholders.
- e) Establish an effective corridor performance monitoring system in order for shippers and corridor management institutions to assess costs and benefits of the CMI. Such a system should have indicators agreed to by all stakeholders to monitor the impact of CMI interventions.
- f) Ensure those who will fund the corridor management institution most or their representatives should have the most influence on what the corridor management institution does and how it spends the money contributed.

### **4.2 Phase II: Implementation of the User-Pay Principle**

This phase is to be undertaken once Phase I is completed and in this phase the CMI:

- a) Must prepare a five-year strategic plan from which results-oriented Annual Action Plans are derived that have to be approved by all key stakeholders especially those expected to contribute to the funding of the CMI.
- b) Annually prepare Action Plans with result-based budgeting with clear targets for deliverables that has to be approved by an Executive Board with good representation of the main contributors.

- c) Based on the annual budget and expected tonnage to be moved in the corridor, determine the usage levy per tone for all traffic moving in the corridor. The total usage levy to be collected should be enough to cover the approved budget.
- d) Determine a mechanism for collecting the levy at the port, international borders and/or other points that minimizes the cost of collection. As far as possible the mechanism should be automated to minimize leakage.
- e) Enter into contractual arrangements for collecting the levy with the relevant institutions such as Port Authorities and/or Customs Authorities. There maybe need to enter into an MOU with these institutions to collect and transfer the funds to the CMI on a monthly basis, at an agreed collection fee probably.
- f) Monthly reconcile between what is collected and what is transferred to the CMI with the relevant collecting institution.
- g) Secure an agreement among stakeholders on how excess funds collected maybe used, especially in cases where, for whatever reason, the usage levy is not reviewed annually.
- h) Ensure actions (b) and (c) are done annually.

The more traffic moved the smaller the usage levy and the smaller the levy the better, since overall objective is to reduce the cost of transport in the corridor in addition to improving the quality of transport.

## 5. THE MAPUTO CORRIDOR (MCLI) CASE

### 5.1 Introduction

As mentioned earlier in this report this study was undertaken at the request of the MCLI. However, because the problem of sustainable funding of corridor management institutions is a common one in many corridors, the approach taken in this study was to first, based on the NCTTCA experience and literature review, identify a mechanism for sustainable funding of CMI and how this mechanism could be applied to other corridors. Now this section looks specifically at the Maputo Corridor and its CMI, i.e. the MCLI, its background, institutional and financial arrangements, and how the user-pay principle could be applied for the sustainable funding of MCLI. This section concludes with recommendations on immediate funding and long-term sustainable funding of the MCLI.

### 5.2 Background

The Maputo Corridor connects the Port of Maputo in Mozambique to Gauteng, the industrial heartland of South Africa. It comprises a concessioned road, a railway line and a gas pipeline. It was launched as a Spatial Development Initiative in 1996 as the Maputo Development Corridor (MDC) with Maputo Corridor Company (MCC) as the legal corridor management entity to engage the public and private sector players in the corridor.

The aims and objectives of the MDC were to:

- Rehabilitate, in partnership with the private sector, the primary infrastructure network along the Corridor, including road, rail links between South Africa and Maputo, the border post between the two neighbors, and Maputo Port.
- Maximize investment in the Corridor area using added opportunities that infrastructure rehabilitation would create.
- Maximize social development and employment opportunities, and increase participation of historically disadvantaged communities.
- Develop policies, strategies and frameworks to promote holistic, participatory and environmentally sustainable approaches to development.

Once the investments had been made in the corridor, MCC ceased to exist and as a result the corridor lacked planning focus and action plan.<sup>8</sup>

Maputo Corridor Logistics Initiative (MCLI) was established largely by the private sector in response to this situation and as a platform to engage the public sector on high level constraints affecting the Maputo Corridor such as border and rail operational problems; lack of information to stakeholders on developments on the corridor; and need to attract more cargo in order to attract more shipping lines to the Port of Maputo. It was mainly the shippers and investors who took the initiative to establish MCLI because they had so much at stake if the governments did not address these serious issues on the corridor.

The initial strategic focus of MCLI is to engage the relevant governments to reinforce the Public-Private Partnership in the arena of freight logistics, to ensure the remaining constraints are resolved and the Maputo Corridor becomes the first choice of the Corridor region's importers and exporters.

---

<sup>8</sup> SSATP Working Paper No. 86: Institutional Arrangements for Transport Corridor Management in Sub-Saharan Africa.

### 5.3 Institutional Structure

MCLI is incorporated in South Africa as a Section 21 Company membership organization on March 14, 2003 with membership from South Africa and Mozambique. It now includes members from Swaziland. MCLI is a group of Infrastructure Investors, Service Providers and Users, focused on the promotion and further development of the Maputo Corridor, as a contribution to the aims and objectives of the Maputo Development Corridor. These members cooperate closely with organized business, engage relevant authorities, and represent the combined views of all users of the Corridor and all parties involved in the provision of services in the Corridor. MCLI was established in the true spirit of Public-Private Partnership to promote greater utilization of the Corridor by current and future investors and users.

MCLI strategic objectives are to:

- Coordinate the view of service providers and users of the Corridor to promote development and change, making the MDC the first choice of the region's importers and exporters alike.
- Inform the market about the Corridor and to market the strategic benefits and opportunities offered by the corridor.

In an effort to achieve these objectives MCLI is engaged in the following activities:

- Coordinating initiatives and engaging the relevant authorities to contribute to the planning of services and infrastructure improvements.
- Organizing events, fact-finding missions, forums and meetings.
- Communicating progress and developments through electronic newsletter and media.
- Promoting positive attitudes and perceptions towards the MDC and logistical benefits offered by the Corridor.

Where necessary in order to undertake these activities the MCLI may establish Workgroups and Committees.<sup>9</sup>

The Board of Directors: This is the highest decision-making body of the MCLI comprising nine Executive Directors and seven non-Executive Directors. The Executive Directors are eight MCLI Founding Members from the private sector and the South African Department of Transport that joined later as a Founding Member while the non-Executive Directors are invited from organized business bodies from the three countries. The Board promotes MCLI objectives; provides direction to MCLI; monitors implementation, operating structure, finances, and administration; and determine and approve the operating and capital budget of MCLI.

MCLI Staffing: MCLI is headed by a Chief Executive Officer supported by a Chief Operating Officer as well as three support staff.

---

<sup>9</sup> Maputo Corridor Logistics Initiative

## **5.4 Funding Mechanism**

### **5.4.1 Background**

From its inception the MCLI was funded by annual contributions from eight Founding Members who must assumed, and reasonably so, that as MCLI membership increased their annual contributions would be reduced. Indeed their annual contributions declined from R183000 to R30000 in 2004 and 2007 respectively due to increased membership. One of the major reasons for this decline in contribution was that the South African Department of Transport (DOT) joined as a Founding Member in 2006/2007 by back-paying annual contributions to the time of MCLI inception to date. The other reason was that a Memorandum of Understanding was signed through which the DOT would make financial contribution to MCLI for the latter to provide secretarial services to the South African Province of Mpumalanga bordering Mozambique for the Mpumalanga Freight Logistics Forum (MFLF) project. This was all in the spirit of PPP on the corridor.

Unfortunately in late 2007 it became clear that due to some procedural problems the DOT could not pay for the services the MCLI was providing to the MFLF project and this put the MCLI in a serious financial position. MCLI could not continue functioning without additional resources being made available to it after the default by the DOT, for various technical and procedural reasons. The only way MCLI could continue was by asking the Founding Members to contribute an additional R150000 each to the R30000 they had already contributed. Some of the Founders Members paid and some could not pay. In 2008, instead of their contributions decreasing, they actually increased to R228000, for six of the Founding Members.

It is at this point that the Board decided that they could only sustain MCLI at this level of contribution only up to 28 February 2009. MCLI was directed to find another mechanism of sustainable funding possibly based on the user-pay principle.

### **5.4.2 MCLI Membership Contributions**

MCLI is funded by annual membership contributions from its approximately 103 members. Membership contribution is mainly determined by the size of organization measured in terms of number of employees a company employs. However, the nine Founding Members of MCLI which now includes South African Department of Transport, that secure the difference between the general membership contribution and the operational budget, contribute 75% of MCLI funding and the rest of other categories of membership contribute only 25% of MCLI budget. Consequently the Founding Members are the Executive Members of the MCLI Board that directs what activities MCLI undertakes and approves its operating and capital expenditure.

### **5.4.3 Consultations with MCLI Key Stakeholders on Funding Mechanism**

Consultations with key stakeholders of all categories revealed that everyone was of the view that MCLI was making valuable contribution to the success of the corridor and should continue to exist and therefore should continue to be funded. Almost all the stakeholders consulted were of the view that the user-pay principle was the best way to go for sustainability of the MCLI but could not be introduced now due to the politics that

surrounded the scanner fees at the Maputo Port and the difficulty already being experienced in increasing the road toll fees, especially in Mozambique. There was a clear understanding among stakeholders that:

- a) Funding mechanism had to found urgently to ensure MCLI continues beyond February 28, 2009 the deadline given by Founding Members that they would not continue funding at 2008 levels of R228000 per annum but 2007 level; and
- b) In the long-term funding using the user-pay principle or usage levy was the only way for sustainable funding of the MCLI but there was need to create the enabling environment for the application of this principle discussed above before it can be implemented.

Discussion with a representative of the Mpumalanga provincial government shared these views and offered to take up with the government the possibility of providing a grant to MCLI to make up the difference between the contributions by members at the 2007 levels and the MCLI budget. This view was presented to a meeting of MCLI members held on July 30, 2008 in Nelspruit and there was a mixed reaction on this suggestion. Some welcomed the idea but doubted that the typical government bureaucracy could be able to make funds available by March 1, 2009. Others did not welcome the idea as this meant being dependent on government whose funding was unreliable and offered to increase their contributions by up to 25% to ensure MCLI continued. The latter view was more generally acceptable. However, latest information seems to indicate that it is very unlikely that the provincial government would make a grant available for MCLI operations as suggested by the representative.

#### **5.4.4 MCLI Board of Directors Views**

Consultations with Board Members revealed that they want the following:

- a) Founding Members contribution to be reduced from their current level of R228000 to 2007 level of R30000 adjusted for inflation.
- b) User-pay principle to be used for sustainable funding of the MCLI but not now given the current sensitivities on any additional charges.
- c) MCLI must continue as a private sector platform for engaging the governments on Maputo corridor issues.
- d) With the experience they had with the DOT MFLF Project, government funding will not be relied on for sustenance of MCLI.
- e) MCLI to work with governments but not for governments to ensure results are achieved.
- f) Whatever funding is secured for MCLI to continue beyond February 2009, the Board must still have influence on what MCLI does.

#### **5.4.5 MCLI Financial Requirements**

The SSATP has estimated that the cost of maintaining a corridor management institution ranges from about \$500000 to about \$1000000 per year, however, as activities of the institutions expands expenses may pick up to 3 to 5 fold. MCLI budget is only about \$300000 which is less than the estimated minimum. This is a budget that really should still be within the capacity of members to fund, especially if they want to decide what MCLI should do. It seems it was the sudden increase in funding contributions required after the

DOT Project funding withdrawal that really put off the Founding Members as this was unplanned.

#### **5.4.6 Conclusions from Consultations**

- a) MCLI has a valuable role to play on the Maputo Corridor and must therefore be maintained and sustained.
- b) The user-pay principle is supported in essence for the long-term funding of the MCLI but it cannot be implemented now as the enabling environment for its implementation does not exist right now. Creating this environment will take some time and therefore this approach cannot be used for MCLI funding from March 1, 2009.
- c) Government funding outside of direct funding MCLI membership funding cannot be relied upon for sustainability. Any government grant funds if received will be treated as project funds to be applied as and when received for the specific project and not for MCLI sustenance.
- d) Membership funding will have to be secured and committed to, early enough for MCLI to continue beyond February 2009 and thereafter, until such time as the user-pay principle can be successfully implemented with the mandate from the governments.
- e) General members (currently contributing 25% of MCLI operating costs) indicated that they were willing to absorb a potential 25% increase in their membership fees with effect March 1, 2009 to ensure MCLI continues its role on the Maputo Corridor.
- f) For MCLI to continue the Founding Members will have to continue to secure the difference between the MCLI budget and what the general members will contribute to ensure the continuation of MCLI activities, based on a Board approved operational budget that is also based on a Board mandated strategy of MCLI operational activities.

#### **5.4.7 Recommendations to MCLI**

- a) For the immediate sustenance of the MCLI with effect from 1 March 2009, general members increase their contributions by 25% and Founding Members continue securing the difference to meet the MCLI's operational budget based on Board approved strategy and operational activities.
- b) MCLI and its membership embarks on program to implement the user-pay principle guided the implementation approach discussed earlier in this report. This entails establishing the enabling environment for the implementation of this principle and steps in determining the usage rate and the collection mechanism. This means other than securing the buy-in of the user-pay principle by the key stakeholders the MCLI will have to engage the three governments of Mozambique, South Africa and Swaziland to obtain their written authority to apply this principle on this corridor. Alternatively, the MCLI could wait for the adoption of this principle for funding CMIs by SADC and then implement it, but is likely to take longer than the direct engagements with the three governments concerned.
- c) The user-pay principle should be introduced as soon as practicable.
- d) Consider how to address issues raised in Annex 1 that compares Northern and Maputo Corridor institutions.

## References

1. Chemonics International Inc., *Dar es Salaam Corridor Institutional Sustainability Study*, August 2004.
2. Chemonics International Inc, *Trans Kalahari Corridor Institutional Sustainability Study*, August 2004.
3. Sub-Saharan Africa Transport Policy Program (SSATP) Working Paper No. 86 *Institutional Arrangements for Transport Corridor Management in Sub-Saharan Africa*, October 2007.
4. Northern Corridor Transit Transport Coordinating Authority (NCTTCA) Strategic Plan, 2007-2011.
5. Memorandum of Understanding between the NCTTCA Secretariat and the Kenya Ports Authority (KPA), Regarding Collection of the TTCA Levy by KPA on Behalf of the NCTTCA Secretariat, January 2007.
6. Northern Corridor Transit and Transport Agreement (NTCA), 1985.
7. Northern Corridor Transit and Transport Agreement, 2007
8. Permanent Secretariat of the Transit Transport Coordination Authority of the Northern Corridor: 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Executive Board; *Study on the Various means for Achieving Financial Self-Sustenance of the Permanent Secretariat of the Transit Transport Coordination Authority of the Northern Corridor; Kigali, Rwanda 27-30<sup>th</sup> July, 1002*
9. Constitution of the Maputo Corridor Logistics Initiative
10. Maputo Corridor Logistics Initiative (Association Incorporated under Section 21.
11. MCLI Minutes of the Meeting of Foundation Members, Thursday, 22 November 2007, MIPS, Maputo.
12. MCLI Report of the Chief Executive Officer to the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors, 11 April 2008.

## ANNEX 1: Northern and Maputo Corridor Comparison

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Northern Corridor</b>	<b>Issues for Maputo Corridor</b>
<b>Legal framework</b>	Treaty – 5 signatories Revised 2007 not yet in force	Section 21 company: MZ, SA, SW MDC established by MZ and SA
<b>Policy organs</b>	Authority – ministers Executive board – permanent secretaries  Weak link between policy decision making and financiers	Board of Directors - predominantly private sector Executive Committee - financial management of the company Opportunity for the ideal link between financing and decision making
<b>Stakeholder involvement</b>	Stakeholders consultative forum in place	MCLI is by definition a PPP, driven by private sector. Involvement of stakeholders is key to adoption and success of usage levy.
<b>Location of CMI</b>	Kenya, also place of collection of levy	South Africa, levy will have to be collected in SA, SW and MZ; by rail, road and port?
<b>Collection agents</b>	Ports Authority plus Customs under revised agreement. MoUs signed, with provision of collection fee.	DP World, TRAC, CFM, and TFR. Will have to sign MoUs. Do concession agreements or framework allow for this?
<b>Equity</b>	Traffic to Treaty non-signatory states not covered presently.	Port is in major point of demand in MZ, will traffic be excluded? Design system to capture traffic even to non-MCLI member countries such as Zimbabwe?
<b>Funding</b>	Mixture of contribution and levy	Have contributions by state departments and levy for traffic?
<b>Review of levy</b>	Provides for annual review but not being done	Design system to allow for annual review, with commitment to reduce levy levels as traffic rises. Leave infrastructure development to dedicated entities (concessionaires).
<b>Indicators of performance</b>	System under development, presently unquantified link between interventions and impacts	Establish robust performance measurement system to monitor impact of interventions

## **ANNEX 2: LIST OF PESONS CONSULTED**

1. Jerome Ntibarekerwa  
Secretary General, Port Management Association of Eastern and Southern Africa.
2. Brenda Horne  
Director General, Maputo Corridor Logistics Initiative
3. Pedro Pena  
Director de Operacoes, MIPS Terminal de Contentores Porte de Maputo
4. Lucas J. Nhamizinga  
ANE Board Member, Adminstracao National De Estradas
5. Louis Nel  
Business Development Manager, Manganese Metal Company
6. Osorio Sales Lucas  
Adminstrador Executivo, Portos E Caminhos De Ferro De Mocambique Ep
7. Adelino Mesquita  
Executive Board Director, Mozambique Ports and Railways
8. Thandi Lujabe Rankoe  
High Commissioner, South African High Commissioner-Maputo
9. Rui Santana Afonso  
Cordenador do Plano Estrategico, Maputo Port Development Company
10. Fernando J. Mause  
Operations and Commercial Advisor, Mozambique Ports and Railways
11. Arthur Coy  
Chief Executive Officer, Trans African Concessions
12. Leon Arthur  
Managing Director, Manganese Metal Company
13. Andre Botes  
Managing Director, King and Sons Ship's Agents ( Mozambique) Ida
14. Jans Bekker  
New Business Development, Manager MIPS Container Terminal Port of Maputo
15. Bent Christofferse  
Manager Traffic and Supply Chain Hoegh Autoliners
16. Catherine N.Mturi-Wairi  
Manager Financial Accounting, Kenya Ports Authority
17. Eunice Mwanyalo  
Executive Officer, Kenya Transport Authority

18. Godfrey Matata Onyango  
Executive Secretary, Northern Corridor Transit Transport Coordination Authority
19. Jean Kizito Kabanguka  
Transport Economist, Northern Corridor Transit Transport Coordination Authority
20. Venant Ntahonsigaye  
Highway Engineer, Northern Corridor Transit Transport Coordination Authority
21. Lisumbu Eliombo  
Customs Expert, Northern Corridor Transit Transport Coordination Authority
22. Mubarak Adam Sodha  
IT Officer, Port Management Association of Eastern and Southern Africa
23. July 30, 2008 Consultation meeting with organizations that are members of the MCLI, in Nelspruit attended by the following persons:
- Jan Bekker, New Business Development Manager, MIPS.
  - Vania Bule, General Manager, Nomad Freight
  - L. Avis, Nomad Freight.
  - Andrew Buter, Trade Promotion Manager, MEGA.
  - Bent, Christoffersen, Manager Traffic and Supply Chain, Hoegh Autoliners.
  - Rodney Cresswell, Branch Manager, Rohlig Grindrod.
  - Banie De Lange, General Manager Reinhardt Transport.
  - Philippe De Maeyer, Operations Manager, Matola Cargo Terminal
  - Johan Erwee, Director Marketing & Logistics, Lukas Potgieter Transport (Pty) Ltd.
  - Eddie Ferreira, Marketing Manager, Delta Clearing.
  - Hermann Fourie, Commercial Manager, Transnet Freight Rail.
  - Brenda Horne, Chief Executive Officer, MCLI.
  - Rob Lindsay-Rea, Regional Manager Mozambique, Grindrod Terminals.
  - Eben Mare, Manager Contract, TSB Sugar.
  - Alex Masianoga, Executive Manager: Sales & Marketing, Transnet Freight Rail.
  - Fernando Mause, CFM South Railways Director, CFM.
  - Jackie McGee, Logistics Manager, Manganese Metal Company.
  - Joao Morgado, Key Account Manager-Mozal, UTI-Mozambique.
  - John Muller, Manager, Grindrod Corridor Management.
  - Danie Parsons, Managing Director, Shurrock Focus Clearing (Pty) Ltd.
  - Pedro Pena, Operations Manager, MIPS.
  - Stan Rakumako, Investment Services Manager, Trade and Investment Limpopo.
  - Peter Rissik, Group Business Development Manager, Reinhardt Transport Group.
  - Rui Santana, Strategic Planning, MPDC.
  - Natasha Turton, Manager Account Solutions, UTI-Mozambique.
  - Anand Moobliar, Director, Grindrod Group Management.
  - Michal Prinsloo, Outbound Logistics Manager, Columbus Stainless.
  - Piet Cronje, Gijima Supply Chain.
  - Velile Romphele, Executive Chairman, Gijima Supply Chain.
  - Ivor Masher, ITC, MCLI.
  - Barbara Mommen, COO, MCLI.