

What have we learned from the Era of Energy Liberalisation? *From Reform to Re-reform*

Michael Pollitt
Judge Business School

Ecole Des Mines, Paris
12th June, 2013

Background

“ Acknowledgments:

- . Peter Pearson and Roger Fouquet
- . Conference on ~~P~~ast and Prospective Energy Transitions: Insights from experienceq Cardiff, 18-20 April, 2011.
- . Not all literature was covered. Now Published in *Energy Policy*, November, 2012.

“ Economic Policy Analysts vs Economic Historians

“ The key issues are:

- . What has been learned from this recent period?
- . How significant is it in the light of an energy transition to low carbon energy system by 2050?

Outline

- “ Timeline of the energy liberalisation era
- “ Background to energy liberalisation
- “ Evidence on impact of energy liberalisation
- “ Assessment of its historical significance
- “ Relevance of period to low carbon economy
- “ UK Electricity Market Reform in context

Characterising the Era

- “ The energy sector substantially consists of oil, gas, coal, electricity and related emissions (of, for example, carbon and sulphur) markets.
- “ Liberalisation may be characterised as:
 - . The privatisation of state owned energy assets.
 - . The introduction of competition via structural changes to the organisation of energy sectors.
 - . The establishment of independent energy sector regulators.

Key Dates

- “ Oil and upstream gas:
 - . privatisation of BP, 1977. Major sales 80s-90s.
- “ Electricity and gas supply:
 - . Privatisation and reorganisation of Chilean electricity industry 1982, British Gas 1986.
- “ Coal liberalisation:
 - . run down in DE, PL, ES, UK (privatised 1994).
 - . privately owned coal from Australia and SA.
- “ Emissions markets:
 - . SO₂ in US from 1995, CO₂ in EU from 2005.

Liberalisation only partial

- “ NOCs in the Middle East dominate.
- “ 25 of 39 leading countries still have substantial state ownership within their electricity sectors.
- “ In the downstream gas sector, 16 out of 39 leading countries have public ownership of 50% or more in the largest gas distribution company.
- “ State ownership of coal remains significant in largest coal market, China.
- “ Some reform elements pre-existed (e.g. independent regulation in US), others co-exist happily (e.g. competition with public ownership in Norway, AUS, NZ).
- “ EUETS only max 5% of global CO₂ (from 2013).

The End of Liberalisation?

“ From Reform to Re-reform?

- . 1980s Thatcher . Reagan era important
- . By 2000 rising environmental concern
- . 2000-1 California Electricity Crisis
- . 2011 UK Electricity Market Reform

More Liberalisation?

- “ Oil and upstream gas markets continue to be extremely competitive and dynamic.
- “ China is an increasing participant in global coal markets.
- “ The promotion of competitive electricity and gas markets key issue in EU.
- “ EU Emissions trading market is due to be substantially extended in scope in 2013.
- “ The financial crisis means many governments may be forced to privatise.

The motivation for liberalisation

- “ Marsh (1991) and Moore (1992) give reasons for the UK privatisation (and liberalisation) programme:
- . the desire to reduce government involvement
 - . increasing the efficiency of the companies
 - . reducing public sector borrowing
 - . curbing trade union power by break up
 - . wider share ownership
 - . gaining political advantage for the government

Drivers of government involvement since 1945

- “ Rising oil import dependence and exploitation of domestic natural gas.
- “ Financing requirements of technological change in electricity generation and transmission.
- “ Network extension of local gas distribution.
- “ Mineworkers powerful, boosted by oil price hikes.
- “ Environmental regulation on rise, but early emissions trading from 1974.

Drivers of liberalisation

- “ Fiscal pressure and privatisation revenue:
 - . energy assets 60% of UK sales: 1979-96.
 - . electricity 1/3 of Argentine sales: 1990-94.
- “ Markets for Power possible:
 - . Joskow and Schmalensee, 1983
- “ EU single market 1986 consequences:
 - . recognition could be extended to energy 1988.
- “ Competitive markets with public ownership:
 - . increases private involvement e.g. NZ, France.

Measuring liberalisation impact

- “ **Performance metric regressions** examine the impact of privatisation/liberalisation variables on panel data of performance (e.g. Steiner, 2001).
- “ **Statistical tests of before and after performance** conduct a t-test for significant differences in performance metrics before and after privatisation (following D'Souza and Megginson, 1999).
- “ **Social cost benefit analyses** of reform (following Jones et al., 1990) look at reform as an investment which has costs and benefits.
- “ **Macro studies** of reform attempt to find impacts using general equilibrium models of the economy. These studies track the impact of lower prices and costs in reformed industries on GDP (e.g. Chisari et al., 1999).

Impact: Oil, upstream gas and coal

- “ Wolf and Pollitt (2008) look at a **sample of 60 privatisation events of 28 national oil companies**, between BP (UK) in 1977 and Inpex (Japan) in 2004. Comparing the 3 years after with the 3 years before privatisation. Profits, output, capital expenditure and labour productivity rise substantially, by 3.6 per cent, 40%, 47% and 50% respectively.
- “ Wolf and Pollitt (2009) conduct a **social cost benefit analysis of the partial privatisation of Norway's Statoil in 2001**. They find a substantially positive net present value from part privatisation.
- “ Bridgman et al. (2011) show that **the threat of liberalisation was significant for Brazil's Petrobras**. It lost its legal monopoly in 1995, but faced no effective competition, but TFP doubled in the following six years.

Downstream Gas

- “ Waddams Price and Weyman-Jones (1996) examined the effect of the **1986 privatisation on the productivity of the twelve regions of British Gas**, they found that productivity improved significantly.
- “ Rossi (2001) found **significant TFP growth following the breakup and privatisation of Argentine gas distribution.**
- “ Copenhagen Economics (2005) found **industrial prices fell across the EU by 1% in the short run and 4-5% in the long run following liberalisation.**
- “ Garcia (2006) show that the **margin paid by Spanish industrial customers fell by 50% following competition.**
- “ Brau et al. (2010) find **no household price reduction impact from reform in EU-15.**

Impact: Electricity

- “ Compared with oil and upstream gas, simultaneity of reforms makes assessing the impact difficult.
- “ For the EU: Steiner (2001), Hattori and Tsutsui (2004), Fiorio et al. (2007) find evidence of modest productivity improvements. However the impact on prices of the different reform elements is ambiguous.
- “ Jamasb et al. (2004) highlight the positive experiences of the UK, Chile, Argentina, Peru, Philippines, Brazil and Colombia with electricity reform.
- “ Pollitt (2009a), after examining the econometric studies from developing countries concludes that, in general:
 - . privatisation improves efficiency with independent regulation;
 - . privatisation/regulation have no significant effect on prices;
 - . private investment is stimulated by independent regulation.



Impact: Social cost benefit studies Electricity



<i>Authors</i>	<i>Reform and Company/Date/Country Studied</i>	<i>Measured NPV of reform (central estimate)</i>	<i>Key distributional impacts identified</i>
Galal et al. (1994)	Privatisation of CHILGENER – generation and transmission /1981-1986/Chile	Permanent gain in welfare of 2.1% of 1986 sales	2/3 of aggregate gains go to foreign share holders.
Galal et al. (1994)	Privatisation of ENERSIS – distribution /1986/Chile	Permanent gain in welfare of 5% of 1986 sales	Paying consumers gain an amount almost equal to the aggregate impact
Newbery and Pollitt (1997)	Privatisation and breakup of CEGB - Generation and Transmission monopoly/1990/UK	Permanent gain of 6% of 1995 turnover	Consumers lose initially and overall, CO ₂ and SO ₂ benefits significant
Domah and Pollitt (2001)	Privatisation of 12 Regional Electricity Distribution Companies/1990/UK	Permanent gain of 9% of 1995 turnover	Consumers lose initially

Impact: Social cost benefit studies Electricity 2Å

<i>Authors</i>	<i>Reform and Company/Date/Country Studied</i>	<i>Measured NPV of reform (central estimate)</i>	<i>Key distributional impacts identified</i>
Toba (2002)	Privatisation of distribution company – Meralco/1986/Philippines	Permanent gain of 6.5% of 1999 sales	Most of net gain is reduction in CO2 and NOX, consumers do gain by more than 50% of aggregate gain
Mota (2003)	Privatisation of distribution companies/1995-2000/Brazil	One off gain equal to 2.5% of GDP	Producers gain around 2/3 of aggregate benefit
Toba (2007)	Introduction of Power Purchase Agreements with Independent Power Producers by incumbent generator, NPC/1990-93/Philippines	One off gain of around 13% of GDP	Economy wide benefit due to earlier ending of power crisis
Anaya (2010)	Privatisation of 2 Distribution and Retailing Companies/1994/Peru	Permanent gain of 27% of costs when earlier connection included	Existing consumers lose, new consumers gain earlier connection



Impact: US electricity reforms

- “ Fabrizio et al. (2007) use time series econometrics of US power plants to show that **reform is associated with up to 5% reduction in plant level non-fuel generation costs.**
- “ Joskow (2006b) used time series econometrics to find that competitive wholesale and retail markets **reduced prices (relative to their absence) by 5-10% for residential customers and 5% for industrial customers.**
- “ Barmack et al. (2007) look at the **wholesale power market in New England and find a net gain of 2% of costs.**
- “ Kwoka and Pollitt (2010) show that **unbundling appears to raise electricity distribution costs**, relative to not unbundling.
- “ Triebs et al. (2010) show **losses on distribution unbundling are more than offset by gains on generation costs.**

Reform remains unpopular

- “ Both in Europe and in Latin America **dissatisfaction with privatisation remains strong** (Fiorio and Florio, 11, Checchi et al., 09).
- “ Ugaz and Waddams Price (2003) note that in Latin America there was substantial tariff rebalancing post privatisation which led to **significant price increases for the poorest customers**.
- “ Zelner et al. (2009) find that for a sample of 62 developed and developing countries over the period 1989-2001, there is a **positive correlation between increased negative sentiment and the renegotiation of the terms of private power generation projects** (i.e. reduction in the rate of return).
- “ Nagayama (2009) examines the behaviour of prices from 1985-2003 the finding of a **positive correlation between reform and prices** suggests a background of rising prices.
- “ There have also been **some very well publicised failed reforms** such as in the Ukraine or California (see Besant-Jones, 2006).

Impact: Emissions Markets

- “ Ellerman et al. (2003) on US sulphur dioxide scheme
 - . reduced capped annual emissions by 60% in 10 years
 - . saved around \$350m p.a. on command and control alternative
- “ The EU Emissions Trading market for CO₂ has had a much more colourful experience since it began in 2005.
- “ During the first period 2005-2007 the initial allocation of permits was too generous and prices fell to close to zero by the end of the first trading period.
- “ Demonstrated the value of a market based instrument in facilitating area wide agreement on environmental targets.
- “ Contrast with the failure of any country, with the possible exception of Sweden (shortly, Australia), to implement a reasonably comprehensive carbon tax.

Putting it in historical context

- “ Fouquet and Pearson (2006) examine the price of lighting services from the 1300s to 2000 in England and Wales.
 - . The technology of production changes significantly: it changes from candle power, to kerosene, to gaslight and finally to electricity.
 - . In 2000 the real price per lumen was 1/3000 what it had been in 1800.
 - . The demand for lighting (lumens per capita) had risen 6500 times.
 - . **Technological progress was key to both.**

- “ Key issue for liberalisation . its impact on longer run technological progress. Clearly, **the impact on this *could significantly outweigh the short run impact on efficiency.***
 - . Jamasb and Pollitt (2008) show that theoretically liberalisation could be expected to reduce research and development (R&D).

- “ Note: Renewable subsidies substantially worsen TFP in electricity, even if long run impact positive.

Putting it in historical context

- “ Millward (2010) reviews the history of public and private ownership in utility sectors in the western world over the period c.1830 to 2000. He notes that the period of public ownership in the post-World War 2 period was characterised by rapid productivity growth and that *there is no evidence that privatisation raised productivity*(p.17).
- “ Problems with the argument:
 - . Millward’s **basic counterfactual is that TFP growth should have been the same** between 1950-73 and the later period 1973-95.
 - . **TFP trend is a suspect measure to look for performance impacts of liberalisation.** If revenue is falling due to increased competition or regulation then falling input growth (due to efficiency) may be offset by falling revenue growth and TFP may appear to grow slowly, when efficiency is accelerating.
 - . **environmental benefits need to be accounted for** in any assessment of liberalisation (Newbery and Pollitt, 1997 in SCBA and Sueyoshi et al., 2010, US power plant efficiency).

Conclusions: what have we learned?

- “ Energy liberalisation is a large part of economy wide liberalisation.**
- “ Small overall welfare benefits but not, perhaps, for households.**
- “ Associated improvements in governance, competition, innovation and environment.**
- “ Liberalisation not as historically significant as historians would expect.**
- “ Not clear liberalisation is key issue in transition to low carbon economy.**

The case for liberalisation

- “ Grubler (2011) suggests keys to effective energy policy are patience, predictability, credibility, alignment and documentation of success.
- “ Well functioning energy and emissions markets look better at delivering desirable policy outcomes than, the mostly, poorly thought out and implemented government strategies for energy.

Research Gaps

- “ Apparently, few studies of coal reform impacts (only comparisons for Chinese coal).
- “ Little work done on impact of gas reform, relative to electricity. More needed on oil and upstream gas.
- “ Price impacts of reforms poorly understood, but clearly worthy of more study and linkage to tax system.
- “ Counterfactuals of what would have happened in absence of reform need to be better formulated.
- “ What combination of policies works best in what context is not understood and needs to be linked up with new institutional economics understanding of second best policy (Roderik, 2004).

UK Electricity Market Reform (EMR)

- “ Four elements proposed in December 2010:
 - “ 1. Fixed prices for low carbon generation (CfD-FiTs)
 - “ 2. Carbon Price Support (CPS)
 - “ 3. Capacity Market (CM)
 - “ 4. Emissions Performance Standard (EPS)

- “ Draft Energy Bill issued in May 2012, in Parliament November 2012, due to be legislated in 2013.

Origins of EMR proposals

- “ Nov 2008: Climate Change Act (passes 463-3 on third reading in HoC).
- “ December 2008: First report of Committee on Climate Change:
 - . sets up electricity as lead sector for decarbonisation, with 90% per kWh decarbonisation by 2030.
 - . Electricity identified as key to decarbonising heat and transport.
- “ 12 October 2009: Committee on Climate Change First Progress Report details key EMR elements.
- “ May 2010: Coalition Agreement, somewhat surprisingly, specifies 4 elements of EMR.
- “ Dec 2010 DECC publishes EMR proposals
- “ It is absolutely clear that motivation for EMR lies with Committee on Climate Change, 5 year carbon budgeting and the Climate Change Act.

How the four EMR elements fit together

- “ Need to achieve carbon and renewables targets. Electricity is first sector in line for large scale decarbonisation.
- “ CfD-FiTs offer price (energy+carbon) certainty and are high enough to support low carbon generation such as nuclear etc.
- “ CPS needed to raise price of carbon for fossil generation to encourage switching and have added benefit of reducing CfD payments *and* raising some tax revenue.
- “ Under CfD-FiTs and CPS, fossil generation gets pushed to margin and has low plant utilisation, but is needed to back up intermittent sources such as wind, therefore needs an availability payment, via capacity market.
- “ Then just in case, we don't get price based incentives right, EPS ensures that high CO2 fossil plants do not get built.
- “ There is a logic, is it good economics?

Is EMR consistent with history?

- “ EMR is a high cost pre-crisis policy being implemented in a time of austerity.
- “ Overall welfare benefits substantially negative, especially for households.
- “ Associated with problematic governance, competition impact, negative innovation and questionable environmental impact.
- “ EMR, probably, more significant than privatisation in UK, if fully implemented.
- “ Inconsistent with UK's historical commitment to liberalisation.

Is EMR consistent with history?

- “ Following Grubler (2011) we can ask if EMR exhibits:
- . Patience with respect to EUETS?
 - . A more Predictable approach to policy?
 - . Is more Credible than liberalisation?
 - . Shows Alignment with other policies?
 - . Is based on documentation of success?
- “ Even higher cost policies with low overall impact on climate look less attractive than the well functioning energy and emissions markets that economists have always recommended.

References

- " Anaya, K. (2010), *The Restructuring and Privatisation of the Peruvian Electricity Distribution Market*, Electricity Policy Research Group Working Paper No.1010.
- " Barmack, M., Kahn, E. and Tierney, S. (2007), "A cost-benefit assessment of wholesale electricity restructuring and competition in New England" *Journal of Regulatory Economics*, 31 (2): 151-184.
- " Besant-Jones, J. (2006), *Reforming Power Markets in Developing Countries: What have we learned?*, Mining and Energy Board Discussion Paper, No.19, World Bank.
- " Boubakri, N., Cosset, J-C. and Guedhami, O. (2009), "From state to private ownership: Issues from strategic industries" *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 33: 367-379.
- " Brau, R., Doronzo, R., Florio, C.V., and Florio, M. (2010), "EU Gas Reforms and Consumers' Prices" *The Energy Journal*, 31(4): 167-182.
- " Bridgman, B., Gomes, V. and Teixeira, A. (2011), "Threatening to increase productivity: evidence from Brazil's Oil Industry" *World Development*, 39(8): 1372-1385.
- " Checchi, D., Florio, M. and Carrera, J. (2009), "Privatisation Discontent and Utility Reform in Latin America" *Journal of Development Studies*, 45 (3): 333-350.
- " Chisari, O., Estache, A., and Romero, C. (1999), "Winners and Losers from the Privatization and Regulation of Utilities: Lessons from a General Equilibrium Model of Argentina" *World Bank Economic Review*, 13(2): 357-378.
- " Copenhagen Economics (2005), *Market Opening in Network Industries: Part I: Final Report*, Brussels: European Commission.
- " Domah, P. D. and Pollitt, M.G. (2001), "The Restructuring and Privatisation of the Regional Electricity Companies in England and Wales: A Social Cost Benefit Analysis" *Fiscal Studies*, 22 (1): 107-146.
- " D'Souza, J. and W. L. Megginson (1999). "The financial and operating performance of privatized firms during the 1990s." *Journal of Finance*, 54(4): 1397-1438.
- " Ellerman, D., Joskow, P.L. and Harrison Jr, D. (2003), *Emissions Trading in the U.S.: Experience, Lessons and Considerations for Greenhouse Gases*, Arlington VA: Pew Center on Global Climate Change.
- " Fabrizio, K., Rose, N. and Wolfram, C. (2007), "Do Markets Reduce Costs? Assessing the Impact of Regulatory Restructuring on U.S. Electric Generation Efficiency" *American Economic Review*, 97 (4): 1250-1277.
- " Florio, C.V., Florio, M. and Doronzo, R. (2007), *The Electricity Industry Reform Paradigm in the European Union: Testing the Impact on Consumers*, Paper delivered at Consumers and Utility Reforms in the European Union Conference, Milan, June 8-9, 2007.

References

- “ Fiorio, C.V. and Florio, M. (2011), «Would you say that the price you pay for electricity is fair?» Consumers' satisfaction and utility reforms in the EU15q *Energy Economics*, 33 (2): 178-187.
- “ Fouquet, R. and Pearson, P.J.G. (2006), Seven Centuries of Energy Services: The Price and Use of Light in the United Kingdom (1300-2000), *Energy Journal*, 27(1):139-177.
- “ Galal, A., Jones, L., Tandon, P. and Vogelsang, I. (1994), *Welfare consequences of selling public enterprises: an empirical analysis*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- “ Garcia, L.A.R. (2006), «The Liberalisation of the Spanish Gas Marketq *Energy Policy*, 34(13): 1630-1644.
- “ Hattori, T. and M. Tsutsui (2004), «Economic Impact of Regulatory Reforms in the Electricity Supply Industry: A Panel Data Analysis for OECD Countriesq *Energy Policy*, 32(6): 823-832.
- “ Jamasb, T., Mota, R., Newbery, D. and Pollitt, M. (2004), *Electricity sector reform in developing countries: a survey of empirical evidence on determinants and performance*, Cambridge Working Papers in Economics, No.0439.
- “ Jamasb, T. and Pollitt, M. (2008) "Liberalisation and R&D in network industries: the case of the electricity industry." *Research Policy*, 37(6-7): 995-1008.
- “ Jones, L. P., Tandon, P. and Vogelsang, I. (1990), *Selling Public Enterprises: A Cost-Benefit Methodology*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- “ Joskow, P.L. and Schmalensee, R. (1983). *Markets for Power: An Analysis of Electric Utility Deregulation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- “ Joskow, P.L. (2006a), «Introduction to Electricity Sector Liberalization: Lessons Learned from Cross-Country Studiesq in Sioshansi, F.P. and Pfaffenberger, W. (eds.), *Electricity Market Reform: An International Perspective*, Oxford: Elsevier.
- “ Joskow, P. (2006b), Markets for Power in the United States: An Interim Assessment, *The Energy Journal*, 27 (1): 1-36.
- “ Kwoka, J. and Pollitt, M. (2010) "Do mergers improve efficiency? Evidence from restructuring the US electric power sector." *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 28(6): 645-656.
- “ Marsh, D. (1991) «Privatisation under Mrs Thatcher: Review of the Literatureq *Public Administration*, 69 (Winter): 459-480.
- “ Millward, R. (2010), *Public Enterprise in the Modern Western World: An Historical Analysis*, Milan European Economy Workshop, University of Milan, Italy, Working Paper 2010-26.
- “ Mota, R. (2003), *The Restructuring and Privatisation of Electricity Distribution and Supply Business in Brazil: A Social Cost-Benefit Analysis*, DAE Working Paper No. 309 (January), Department of Applied Economics, University of Cambridge, Cambridge.
- “ Moore, J. (1992), *Privatisation Everywhere: The World's Adoption of the British Experience*, London: Centre for Policy Studies.
- “ Nagayama, H. (2009), «Electric power sector reform liberalization models and electric power prices in developing countries . An empirical analysis using international panel dataq *Energy Economics*, 31: 463-472.

References

- " Pollitt, M. (1999) "The survey of the liberalization of public enterprises in the UK since 1979." In Kagami, M. and Tsuji, M. (eds.): *Privatization, deregulation and institutional framework*. Tokyo: Institute of Developing Economies, pp.120-169.
- " Pollitt, M. (2009a), "Evaluating the evidence on electricity reform: Lessons for the South East Europe (SEE) market" *Utilities Policy*, 17 (1), pp.13-23.
- " Pollitt, M.G. (2009b), *Electricity liberalisation in the European Union: a progress report*, EPRG Working Paper No.0929.
- " Pollitt, M. (2012), "The Role of Policy in Energy Transitions: Lessons from the Energy Liberalisation Era" *Energy Policy*, 50, Nov: 128-137.
- " Pollitt, M. (2012), *Electricity Market Reform: Will it work and, if so, how?*, Beesley Lecture, 8 November. Available at www.eprg.group.cam.ac.uk
- " Rodrik, D. (2004), *Getting Institutions Right*, Harvard University, Mimeo.
- " Rossi, M. (2001), "Technical change and efficiency measures: the post-privatisation in the gas distribution sector" *Energy Economics*, 23(3): 295-304.
- " Steiner, F. (2001), "Regulation, Industry Structure and Performance in the Electricity Supply Industry" *OECD Economic Studies*, No. 32 (1): 143-182.
- " Sueyoshi, T., Goto, M., Ueno, T. (2010), "Performance analysis of US coal-fired power plants by measuring three DEA efficiencies" *Energy Policy*, 38(4): 1675-1688.
- " Toba, N. (2007), "Welfare Impacts of Electricity Generation Sector Reform in the Philippines" *Energy Policy*, 35(12): 6145-6162.
- " Toba, N. (2002), *Welfare Impacts of Electricity Sector Reform in the Philippines*, PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge.
- " Triebs, T., Kwoka, J. and Pollitt, M. (2010), *The Direct Costs and Benefits of US Electric Utility Divestitures*, Electricity Policy Research Group Working Paper No.1024.
- " Ugaz, C. and Waddams Price, C. (Eds.) (2003), *Utility Privatisation and Regulation - A Fair Deal for Consumers?* Cheltenham: E. Elgar.
- " Waddams Price, C. and Weyman-Jones, T.J. (1996), "Malmquist indices of productivity change in the UK gas industry before and after privatization, *Applied Economics*, 28 (1): 29-39.
- " Wolf, C. and Pollitt, M.G. (2008), *Privatising national oil companies: Assessing the impact on firm performance*, Electricity Policy Research Group Working Paper No.0805.
- " Wolf, C. and Pollitt, M.G. (2009), *The welfare implications of oil privatisation: a cost-benefit analysis of Norway's Statoil*, Electricity Policy Research Group Working Paper No.0905.
- " Zelner, B.A., Henisz, W.J. and Holburn, G.L.F. (2009), "Contentious Implementation and Retrenchment in Neoliberal Policy Reform: The Global Electricity Power Industry 1989-2001" *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54: 379-412.