Public-Private Partnerships and Sustainable Development Goals in Nigeria

African Journal of Stability & Development
Vol 16 No. 2, Dec. 2024
pp. 390-417

Stephen Olufemi Obasa, *Ph.D* [1]
Oluwatosin Olatunji Oluyomi, *PhD* [2]

Abstract

The attempt by the United Nations (UN) to assist member states, especially developing countries with huge financing gaps, to meet the 17 sustainable development goals (SDGs) necessitated the need for public-private partnerships (PPPs) as a financing strategy. The PPP initiative is generated by the World Bank to give policy advice to developing economies on the need to involve the private sector in financing and operating infrastructure. The paradigm shift from traditional public service delivery to public-private partnerships (PPPs) is a modern financing strategy for mobilising resources so that developing countries characterised by constrained resources can optimise the public utilities, and more importantly, meet the SDGs targets by 2030. The study provides insights into the wide variety of PPP arrangements

1. Department of Business Administration, College of Humanities, Management and Social Sciences, Mountain Top University, Makogi, Ogun State, Nigeria; obasaoluwafemi@yahoo.com;
2. Department of Economics, College of Humanities, Management and Social Sciences, Mountain Top University, Makogi, Ogun State, Nigeria; oooloyomi@mtu.edu.ng;

and the sometimes rather diffused contractual framework under which PPPs take place. Due attention is given to the motives and rationale for relying on PPPs and the expected outcomes of PPP arrangements. A major conclusion derived from this study is that, for sustainable development goals to be achieved in developing economies, the partnership should not be limited to resource sharing, but also involve accountability, people-centredness, risk-sharing and revenue distribution between the public and private stakeholders. The study adopts a qualitative research method, encompassing the use of journals, books, internet materials and secondary data.

Keywords: 2030 Agenda, Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs), Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), Nigeria

Introduction

The attempt to rescue the public service from persistent dwindling in the 1980s has made scholars like Christopher Hood in 1991 and Osborn and Gaeber in 1992 initiate the New Public Management (NPM) to enable public service institutions to be more efficient by adopting the private-management approach, which encompasses: de-bureaucratisation, liberalisation, privatisation, transparency, decentralisation, and marketisation of public service; in the course of rendering goods and services to the citizens. The essence of this paradigm shift is to assist stakeholders to possess the requisite knowledge, skills, and strategies required to address public service problems, by meeting citizens' needs, handling public affairs, and creating a responsible, efficient, and fair government (Xiaoming Zhen, 2022). In recent years, the attempt by states to further improve the living standards of citizens through the execution of public projects that public budget cannot finance, led to the adoption of new policy approach called public-private partnership (PPP). No strategy has attracted greater interest than governance through public-private partnership, which effectively creates a cooperative institutional arrangement between public and private sectors (Bradford, 2003; Wang, Xion, Wu & Zhu, 2017). Many countries in developed and developing regions such as Britain, Spain, Portugal, Australia, South Africa, Nigeria, Egypt, and Morocco, among others, have successfully promoted PPP to overcome the traditional drawbacks in public procurement.

Before the 21st century, the burden of promoting economic and social development was borne majorly by the states through their commitment to programmes and projects that would alleviate the suffering of their citizens. However, the United Nations adopted the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development in 2015 to enable private investors to participate in the execution of public projects so as to reduce the financial burden initially borne by the states. Today, PPPs enjoy great popularity in developed as well as developing countries (Rybnicek, Plakolm & Baumgartner, 2020). In 2015, the aggregate value of PPP transactions that reached a financial close in the European market totalled EUR 15.6 billion, a 17% decrease from 2014 (EUR 18.7 billion) (EPEC, 2015). There has been a tendency towards a more intensive leverage of public funds with private finance through PPPs. For instance, the Europe 2020 strategy highlights the importance of PPPs. According to the strategy, leveraging financial means by combining private and public finance and creating innovative instruments to finance the needed investments are strategies for improving infrastructural provision in those countries (European Court of Auditors, EN, 2018). As of June 2020, East Asia and the Pacific showed PPP commitments of $4.4 billion (Asian Development Bank, 2020). Between 2009 and 2019, African countries had support from bilateral/multilateral institutions which led to the execution of 173 (64%) infrastructural projects out of 269 projects by PPPs (African Development Bank, 2015).

Nigeria's government in partnership with many private sectors and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) at bilateral and multilateral levels has executed numerous programmes and projects to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. The private sector's role has been instrumental in certain types of investment projects. The private sector contributes best to aid objectives by running responsible businesses but also plays diverse roles and engages directly in aid processes (Rasheed, Alam & Fahim, 2014; Davies, 2011). This is necessitated by the financial incapability of the governments in most developing countries to embark on infrastructural projects. Hence, the governments in developing countries have to choose which public infrastructural projects have to be developed. The Nigerian government under the Public-Private Partnership model (PPP) has been able to secure financial support to execute projects over the years. For instance, the concession of Lagos-Ibadan Expressway, Kuto-Bagana Bridge, Lekki-Epe Express Way, Maervis management of Airports, Murtala Muhammed Airport 2 between Bi-Courtney Limited and the Federal Government, delivery of 3.4bcf of Gas by 2020 between NNPC and Seplat Petroleum Development Company Limited were achieved through PPP.

According to the UN, SDG 17 aims to create an umbrella under which various forms of collaboration can occur (Dumitriu & Ahmed, 2018). The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development which has 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is meant to address the challenges encountered by individuals (Andries et al, 2019). Given limited government resources on the part of the states to execute those programmes and projects, a considerable amount of private finance will be required to fill this gap, and public-private partnerships (PPPs) have been seen as a possible modality through which to attract these additional resources (Sharma, 2016). PPP also ensures that citizens have value for money through the provision of quality public infrastructure by the construction industry of the partnership investors. PPP has been considered to be an effective tool in ensuring the sustainability of economic and social development (KS, Chowdhury, Sharma, & Platz, 2016; Mahmoud, 2018). To leverage on the PPP approach, Nigeria's government inaugurated the Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission (ICRC) with a clear mandate to develop the guidelines, policies, and procurement processes for PPP. The ICRC will collaborate with the states to promote an orderly and harmonised framework for the development of Nigeria's infrastructure and to accelerate the development of a market for PPP projects (The World Bank, n.d.).

A Compendious Review of the Models of Public-Private Partnership (PPP) with Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

Partnership is a relationship that exists between individuals, organisations or nations based on strict formalisation through an agreement between parties; the intention of which is to achieve a common goal. According to Mcquaid (2000), the relationship involves both development and delivery of a strategy or a set of projects or operations which may or may not involve equal participation in all stages. The PPP model involves infrastructure delivery, public procurement or public service delivery (Gultom, 2019; Reynaers & Paanakker, 2016; Diggs & Roman, 2012; Warner, 2010). Cooperation within a partnership is collaborative; it will be effective if the partners share a strategic vision, pursue compatible targets, and are all equal members in a predetermined organisational structure (OECD Leed Forum on Partnership and Local Governance, n.d.). Partnership is about sharing power, responsibility, and achievements (Farazmand, 2018). PPPs involve actors from the public and the private sectors who agree to cooperate and share different kinds of resources to achieve a certain public task (Peters, Minx, Weber & Edenhofer, 2011). According to the Guidelines on a principle-based approach to the cooperation between the United Nations and Business Sector, partnership is defined as

> voluntary and collaborative agreement or arrangement between one or more parts of the UN system and the business sector, in which all participants agree to work together to achieve a common purpose or undertake a specific task and to coordinate their respective responsibilities, resources, and benefits. Neither party has power to bind the other party to any specific course of action without that party's consent, or to contract in the name of the other party or to create a liability against the other in any manner whatsoever.

PPP has the following characteristics: it is a long-term cooperation and contractual relationship between the public and private sectors covering up to 30 years (Girth 2014; Hodge & Greve 2007). It has mutual goals that are beneficial to both the public and private sectors (Silvestre & Araujo 2012). It concentrates on how risks, costs, benefits, resources, and roles are shared between partners (Rybnicek, Plakolm & Baumgartner, 2020). It is a complex process in terms of design, build, operation, maintenance, strategies, unanticipated contingencies, institutional backgrounds, goals and the dynamic environment where the partners operate (Ross and Yan 2015). PPP introduces new technology and innovation by providing better public services through improved operational efficiency with projects delivered on time and within budget (The World Bank, n.d., Saeed et al., 2018). Its performance linked payment to private sector predetermined benchmark, and defined authority (Titoria & Mohandas, 2019). Profit maximisation is not the main target of PPPs, as they are also required to achieve other goals, such as innovation, job creation and social stability (World Bank, 2014; OECD, 2015; Bruton, Khavul, Siegel & Wright, 2014).

There is broad acceptance that Public-Private-Partnership (PPP) can improve cost-effectiveness and render more satisfactory performance of infrastructure projects (Essia & Yusuf, 2013). In adopting PPPs for SDGs, there should be proper evaluation for any specific SDG project to ensure that the cost element is competitive (Richards, 2021). PPP enables the government to focus more on facilitation and regulation and allows the private partners to build facilities or deliver services often on cost recovery terms. Public-private partnership programmes can be very effective, and there is evidence that they have outperformed public works on indicators such as cost overruns and delays (FAL Bulletin 383, 2020). Public-private partnership (PPP) is an approach adopted to enhance the economic value of infrastructure outputs, and it encompasses a broad spectrum of public sector infrastructure. This is especially true in developing countries where there is a significant infrastructure gap (AfDB, 2015). Infrastructures, publicly or privately provided, are widely believed to be the foundation for economic development (Ojo, 2021). PPP will allow for better service quality with the same amount of money or less than a traditional delivery approach (Manrique, 2011) as the private sector is viewed as being more efficient (Koppenjan, 2005).

Categorisation of Different Types of PPPs according to Different Intervention Strategies

The following types of PPPs can be distinguished:

i) **Service Contract:** By their very nature as long-term large infrastructure projects, public-private partnership (PPP) projects involve a vast array of interconnecting relationships. Core to any PPP project is the long-term contractual relationship between the government's procuring authority and the private party (the project company) (Global Infrastructure Hub, 2018). The terms of a PPP are typically set out in a contract or agreement to outline the responsibilities of each party and clearly allocate risk.

ii) Management Contract: Managing PPP contracts involves monitoring and enforcing the PPP contract requirements; and managing the relationship between the public and private partners. The contract management stage spans the lifetime of the PPP agreement from the effective date of the contract to the end of the contract period (Ingratubum, 2012).

iii) Affermage and Lease Contracts: An *affermage* is one type of a delegated management contract in the private-public partnership (PPP) spectrum. Under this type of contract, the operator is responsible for operations and maintenance An *affermage*/lease contractual framework typically features five contracts: (i) the delegated management contract; (ii) the concession contract; (iii) the performance contract; (iv) the technical assistance contract; and (v) the end-user contract (Janssens. 2011).

iv) Concession:
In this form of PPP, the government defines and grants specific rights to an entity (usually a private company) to build and operate a facility for a fixed period of time. The government may retain the ultimate ownership of the facility and/or rights to supply the services. In concessions, payments can take place both ways: the concessionaire pays to government for the concession rights and the government may also pay the concessionaire, which it provides under the agreement to meet certain specific conditions (ESCAP, 2008).

v) Build–Operate–Transfer (BOT): A build-operate-transfer (BOT) contract is a model used to finance large projects, typically infrastructure projects developed through public-private partnerships. The BOT scheme refers to the initial concession by a public entity such as a local government to a private firm to both build and operate the project in question. After a set time frame, typically two or three decades, control of the project is returned to the public entity (Haves, 2023). It is similar arrangements with Build-Transfer-Operate (BTO), Build-Own-Operate (BOO), Design-Build-Operate (DBO), and Design-Build-Finance-Operate (DBFO).

vi) Joint Venture: Joint venture is a contractual arrangement in which two or more individuals with similar interest and vision agreed or collaborates to engage in business or economic activity by sharing the risks, rewards, and also controlling the assets, operation and tasks equally among themselves. The partners are expected to enter into an agreement to guide against unprecedented development. Under PPP, the partners are expected to have equity stake in every project undertaken.

Sustainability

Several studies have been made by scholars on PPP and sustainability. Sustainability is not only concerned with the needs of several generations but is also related to the capacity of natural supporting systems to maintain the integrity of ecology, environment, and hydrology (Rijsberman & Van de Ven, 2000). In development literature, most academics, researchers and practitioners (Gray 2010; Tjarve, & Zemīte, 2016; Mensah & Enu-Kwesi, 2018; Thomas, 2015) apply the concept to connote improving and sustaining a healthy economic, ecological and social system for human development. Sustainability brings into focus human activities and their ability to satisfy human needs and wants without depleting or exhausting the productive resources at their disposal (Thomas, 2015). A conceptual model of sustainable infrastructural development to evaluate facility alternative decisions was proposed by Pearce and Vanegas (2002). The social sustainability of PPP was suggested as consisting of equal cooperation relationships (Chen, Li, et al., 2019). The environmental sustainability of PPP has been referred to as the ecological infrastructure and services provided for the conservation of natural resources and the environment, by PPP projects (Chen, Li, et al., 2019). The economic sustainability of PPP has been perceived as including economic growth, employment promotion, innovation, infrastructure construction, as well as industrial development through project delivery (Yuan et al., 2018). The social, ecological, and economic sustainability were also differentiated in the work of Koppenjan and Enserink (2010). A framework for assessing the sustainability of urban infrastructure systems that focuses on key interactions and feedback mechanisms between infrastructure and surrounding environmental, economic, and social systems was also proposed by Sahely et al. (2005).

Development

Development as a concept is associated with economics, social, political, human, industrialisation, technological, and infrastructural advancement and transformation that exist in a state (Dolgoff 2012; Lorenzo 2017). It involves the application of certain economic and technical measures to utilise available resources to instigate economic growth and improve people's quality of life (Rabie, 2016). Development consists of more than improvements in the well-being of citizens, even broadly defined: it also conveys something about the capacity of economic, political and social systems to provide the circumstances for that well-being on a sustainable, long-term basis (Centre for Global Development, 2012). Development is a process that creates growth, progress, and positive change in economic, environmental, social and demographic components without damaging the resources of the environment (Maya, n.d.). Development means creating the conditions for the realisation of the human personality. Its evaluation must therefore take into account three linked criteria: whether there has been a reduction in (i) poverty, (ii) unemployment, and (iii) inequality (Seers, 1972, Oladipo et al., 2023).

Sustainable Development

Structurally, the concept can be seen as a phrase consisting of two words, "sustainable" and "development." Just as each of the two words that combine to form the concept of SD, has been defined variously from different perspectives, the concept of SD has also been looked at from various angles, leading to a plethora of definitions of the concept (Mensah, 2019). The concept of sustainable development advocates that development must be planned in order to "meet the necessities of the present generation without harming the future generation's capacity to meet their own" (Brundtland & Khalid, 1987). Sustainable development criticises short-sightedness about the means for achieving development hurting nature, humans, distant persons, and future generations. It is the pursuit of economic development without depletion of natural resources so that when the future generations come, they will have access to the resources. Sustainable development aims at finding sustainable patterns and processes of development. It is advocated for so that certain policies, programmes, and traditions of doing things which are destroying the environment and affecting the future can be abandoned (Oladipo et al., 2023).

The three main pillars of sustainable development include economic growth, environmental protection, and social equality. The origins of the 'three-pillar' paradigm have been variously attributed to the Brundtland Report, Agenda 21, and the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development (Moldan et al. 2012). These three elements are contained in three intersecting circles (Purvis, Mao & Robinson, 2019). Acknowledging the pervasiveness of WCED's definition, Cerin (2006) as well as Abubakar (2017) argue that SD is a core concept within global development policy and agenda. A development path is sustainable if it meets needs of the present without compromising the ability to do the same in future. There are three crucial elements in this short statement. "The first is the concept of needs, the second is the ability to meet these needs and the third is the link between the present and future capacity to satisfy needs" (Borowy, 2013). Sustainable development as an integrated concept involves: i). aims to improve the quality of life of both current and future generations, while safeguarding the earth's capacity to support life in all its diversity; ii). basis established on democracy, the rule of law and respect for fundamental rights including freedom, equal opportunities and cultural diversity; iii) . promotion of high employment levels in an economy whose strengths are based on education, innovation, social, and territorial cohesion; and iv) the protection of human health and the environment (Sustainable Development Policy and Guide, 2006).

Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

The SDGs represent a top-down approach designed by the political elite based on the objectives created during the United Nations' summits and conferences in the 90's (Brolan et al., 2014). The concept seems to have attracted the broad-based attention that other development concepts lack(ed), and appears poised to remain the pervasive development paradigm for a long time (Scopelliti et al., 2018; Shepherd et al., 2016). Generally, researchers agreed that the 17 SDGs are indivisible, inclusive, and interactive (DasGupta, et. al., 2019; McGowan, et al., 2019; Oliveira, et al, 2020). Different goals and targets are closely linked, including environment and human health, policy and education, peace and business, among others

(Alcamo, Thompson, Alexander et al., 2020). Ability to reach one goal has the potential to influence the progress of achieving other goals, either positively or negatively (Weitz, et al, 2019). The recently adopted global Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) will have significant implications for national development planning in both developed and developing countries in the post-2015 period to 2030 (Allen, et al., 2016). The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), also known as the Global Goals, were adopted by the United Nations in 2015 as a universal call to action to end poverty, protect the planet, and ensure that by 2030 all people enjoy peace and prosperity (UNDP, n.d.). The Sustainable Development Goals are the blueprints to achieve a better and more sustainable future for all. They address the global challenges we face, including poverty, inequality, climate change, environmental degradation, peace and justice. The 17 Goals are all interconnected, and in order to leave no one behind, it is important that we achieve them all by 2030 (UN, n.d.). In order to fight the global problems of humanity, decision-makers and stakeholders in society should consider these 17 SDGs as viable for development (Kleespies & Dierkes, 2022). The SDG Compass published by the Global Compact provides a good guideline for companies on how to integrate SDGs into their business strategy (Sengupta, 2021). These common goals require the active involvement of individuals, businesses, administrations and countries around the world.

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), were launched by the United Nations in a blaze of publicity in 2015, as a 17-point agenda. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, adopted by all United Nations Member States in 2015, provides a shared blueprint for peace and prosperity for people and the planet, now and into the future. In June 1992, at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, more than 178 countries adopted Agenda 21, a comprehensive plan of action to build a global partnership for sustainable development to improve human lives and protect the environment (UN, n.d.). The SDGs were developed in the Post-2015 Development Agenda as the future global development framework to succeed the Millennium Development Goals which were ended in 2015 (Schleicher, Schaafsma, & Vira, (2018). To leave no one behind, 2030 Agenda has defined 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with 169 targets (Ghorbani, 2020), and 232 indicators in 193 countries (Tavanti, n.d.). The SDG pillars consist of people, planet, prosperity, peace, partnership, and commitment to their principles and practices in our inter-personal relations, inter-sector organisations and international institutions (Tavanti, n.d.).

The 17 SDGs are summarised and grouped in this study based on their similarities. For instance, Goals 1 and 2 involve eliminating poverty and hunger respectively. Poverty and hunger can be eliminated through rapid and sound economic growth policies, food security and mechanised farming. Goals 3 and 6 contain good health and well-being of citizens as well as clean water and sanitation. Good health is achieved globally through the reduction of the maternity ratio to less than 70% per 1000 live births caused by neonatal maternity, epidemics of AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria, water-borne and communicable diseases. Goal 4 involves making quality education available to people. Since education is a critical component of human development indices, to achieve this, it must be inclusive and equitable and also create future opportunities for all by 2030. Goals 5 and 10 cover gender equality between men and women, and reduced inequalities respectively. The two goals can be achieved with zero discrimination, absence of violence against women, value of unpaid work, the existence of participation in public life, assurance of equal economic resources and promotion of women's empowerment (UN Women, 2022). Goal 7 consists of affordability and clean energy. The business of water and sustainable development aims to illustrate the range of approaches that will be necessary if the percentage of the global population having access to adequate and safe water and sanitation is to increase (Chenoweth & Bird, 2005). Goals 8 and 9 address decent work, economic growth; industry; innovation, and infrastructure. While Goals 11, 12, 13, 14, 15,16 and 17 focus on sustainable cities and communities; responsible consumption and production; climate action; life below water and life on land; peace, justice and strong institutions; partnership that would enhance a universal, rule-based, open, non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system under the World Trade Organisation by 2030.

All the above 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) offer a "roadmap to a better and more sustainable future for all." ((Friedman, York & Graetz, 2020).

Criteria Framework for Evaluating How PPP-Related Policies Contribute to Sustainable Development

The last SDG is how Public-Private Partnership can positively impact the sustainability of development till 2030. This study focuses on the impact of PPP on the sustainability of development in Nigeria. This part discusses the need to engage the private sector in resource mobilisation to fund Nigeria's sustainable development goals (SDGs). Public–Private Partnerships (PPPs) seem to offer a lot of hopes in providing efficiency where government management is not good enough. Some African nations have turned to PPP to solve troublesome developmental issues (Odum et al., 2021).

The criteria framework for evaluating PPP-related policies in this study is EASIER model, which is an acronym for the Engagement of Stakeholders; Access; Scalability and Replicability; Inclusiveness; Economic Impact; Resilience and Environment. *Engagement of stakeholders* involves the participation of relevant stakeholders. A sustainable development that considers value for the people, and therefore includes the social dimension of sustainability, requires the participation of all relevant stakeholders (Freeman, 1984). PPP projects are, in essence, cooperation between the private and public sectors (Berrone, 2019). The importance of stakeholder engagement is that it mitigates the issues in PPP projects and its related strategies (Jayesury, et al., 2020). Researches by various authors suggest that the major factor militating against the successful growth and development of PPP projects in Nigeria and other developing countries of the world is the marginalisation of end-user stakeholders in PPP projects (Toriola-Coker, et al. 2020). Neglect of the interest of stakeholders has been identified as a major factor that undermines the success of PPP projects in Nigeria (Amadi, et al., 2019). The report showed that the government's investments in the provision of public infrastructures and other services in the country, contributed very little to the development of public facilities, and the implementation of PPP infrastructure projects has recorded very low performance in Nigeria (Awodele, Ogunlana & Akinradewo, 2012). Public participation at the early stage of planning ensures that all parties can influence decisions and outcomes and offers direct contact and interaction between the public, non-governmental organisations, other stakeholders and the government rather than the elected representatives (Alexander, 2008).

Access is another measuring model for PPP performance in sustaining development. It refers to the extent to which the PPP is oriented toward increasing access to social interest services to the population. *Scalability and Replicability* regards the degree to which a PPP can achieve profitable growth and be copied to other geographies (Berrone, 2019). A network estimation procedure for SDGs should be easily scalable to incorporate as many socioeconomic indicators as possible. The techniques through which information is obtained and processed should be accessible to third parties who wish to verify or refine an estimated network.

Inclusiveness refers to the level of coverage that a PPP offers on a non-discriminatory ground (Berrone, 2019). This consists of three types. Input inclusiveness, which involves the inclusion of the poor and marginalised in the design of partnerships; throughput inclusiveness, which is the inclusion of the poor and marginalised in decision-making processes of a partnership; and output inclusiveness, which involves the inclusion of the poor and marginalised in the benefits resulting from partnerships in terms of income and access to resources (Hospes et al., 2016). *Economic Impact* involves the main attributes of PPP in offering instrumental economic value and creating potential social values that have been strategically aligned with the requirements for achieving SDGs (Berrone et al., 2019; Yuan, Li, Guo, Zhao, & Skibniewski, 2018). SDG 17 is also evaluated by *Resilience and Environment* which focuses on how resilience thinking is open to changes and uncertainties, which superiority in a continuously changing world compared with risk-based approaches shows its great prospect in sustainability assessment (Jozaei et al., 2020). The core mechanism of assessing system resilience is to measure its ability threshold tolerating pervasive risks (Standish et al., 2014).

Critique of PPP Practice and Sustainable Development in Nigeria

Nigeria is one of the developing nations that have appreciated the need for sustainable development through the partnership of the public and private sectors in the provision of infrastructure. However, despite the link between infrastructure availability and economic growth, Nigeria is yet to achieve adequate infrastructure provision to assist the quest for economic growth. The practice of PPP for the purpose of achieving SDG 17 is criticised in Nigeria on the following premises:

The first critique relates to inadequate cooperation between the public and private sectors with a common (development) goal. A clear agreement between the public and private parties on the goal(s) of the PPPs that will sustain development in infrastructural projects is criticised. Lack of goals usually affects the quality of contracts executed. According to Dechev (2015), the inconsistency between funds and the quality that the service provides appears to be another significant problem in the implementation of PPPs. Maurya and Srivastava (2018) opined that details of outcomes, outputs, and quality are incomplete in the agreement of some PPP projects, although the inputs and processes are extensively described. Thus, parties reduce the quality of deliverables, as the quality is inadequately monitored.

Endemic corruption also affects PPP in Nigeria. The existence of PPP and its ability to sustain development till 2030 in emerging economies such as Nigeria is affected by corrupt practices such as the absence of transparency and accountability. The implication of these two components is that local and foreign investors are refraining from engaging in partnering with the government to execute important infrastructural projects that would enhance development. According to the indexing of Transparency International, construction is one of the most corrupt industries among the various economic sectors (Owusu, & Chan, 2018; Le, Shan, Chan, & Hu,2014). For instance, the award of Murtala Mohammed Airport to Bi-Coutney Limited (BCL), as a joint contract with the Federal Government, and the Lekki Toll-Road Concession, between the Lagos State Government and Lekki Concession Company (LCC) were bedevilled by lack of transparency (Economic and Policy Review, 2017).

The third criticism is directed at the finance structure for PPPs. Low financial capacity to implement projects serves as a gap between infrastructural provision and sustainable development. Given this, a combination of public and private funding has to be channelled into the execution of projects. One of the fundamental reasons responsible for the low utilisation of PPPs in Nigeria is predicated on the unavailability of a developed capital market. This factor makes it difficult to raise sufficient money for projects. The cost of operating PPPs in Nigeria continues to rise due to rising transaction and administrative fees for managing PPP transactions. The state of Nigeria's economy has made it difficult for the government to secure financial support from private collaborators.

There are also issues having to do with risk allocation. The fundamental principle of any PPP is the risk allocation to the stakeholder best able to manage it at minimal cost. The aim is to optimise rather than maximise risk transfer, to ensure that the best value is achieved. According to Huque (2021), technical and organisational challenges occur for some PPP partners, including unclear agreements on risk and responsibility sharing, insufficient procedures for dealing with disputes and disagreements between partners, and the lack of agreement on ways to deal with risks of failure. Carbonara and Pellegrino (2018) suggested that managing the risks in PPPs need an accurate formulation of the rules between two parties and the specification of mechanisms for their implementation. PPPs system has been criticised in Nigeria because the government usually transfers risk to the private collaborator, instead of bearing it together. The revenue protection clause agreement is always sidelined by the government, thereby creating financial challenges for the private sector. Murtala Mohammed 2 Airport and Azura-Edo Independent Power Plant, located in Benin are classic examples of PPP transactions.

Issues bordering on the environmental and social impact constitute another set of critique against PPPs in Nigeria. The PPP model is criticised by scholars on the impacts of the environment and society on the proper execution of contracts. The absence of a strong institutional environment leads to the failure of PPP programmes (Gobikas & Čingienė, 2021). Casady et al. (2020) suggested that public agencies in governments must establish clear, foreseeable, and legitimate institutional frameworks by promoting legitimacy, trust, and capacity in the PPP model and developing a robust PPP market.

Moreover, the PPP model may also be criticised when it comes to the sharing of resources and tasks. A clear agreement between the public and private parties on the sharing of resources is another major area where the PPP model in Nigeria is criticised. According to PPP- Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Concession, established by the Federal Government of Nigeria, this agreement, the skills and assets of each sector (public and private) are shared in delivering a service or facility for the use of the general public. In addition to the distribution of resources, "each party shares in the risks and rewards potential in the delivery of the service and/or facility." In effect, the key defining elements of a PPP are the focus on service delivery and a real partnership that involves the sharing of risks and rewards (ICRC manual, n.d.).

Added to the above is the problem of limited capacity building. PPPs system in Nigeria is seriously criticised as a result of limited capacity building existing among the staff of Ministries, Departments and Agencies who lack the requisite skills to handle public projects, particularly as it concerns the procurement of project materials, project analysis, and technical aspect of a project as well as the legal and management areas. The external consultants sometimes refrain from transferring knowledge to public servants to prevent them from discovering their gimmicks during the implementation of the projects.

Politicisation of PPP projects is yet another plague battling with PPP in Nigeria. The practice of PPP model in Nigeria is affected by consistent interference in the activities of stakeholders and the negative impact of such on the realisation of sustainable development goals proposed for 2030. Aside from this, the political instability, political barriers and political violence, as well as poor governance and recurrent change of government have a major impact on the implementation of PPP infrastructural projects in Nigeria. Sometimes, this politicisation results in administrative bureaucratisation, which contributes to delay. According to Sadeghi et al., (2020). Poor legal and political frameworks are regarded as one of the most critical challenges to the implementation of the PPP model. For instance, the fear of having projects cancelled by the Federal Executive Council (FEC) at the last stage normally dissuades investors from taking a risk. Sometimes, the cancellation of such a project at the beginning or midway by the government is unjustifiable.

There is also focus on legal and regulatory framework. The legal framework at the federal level for PPPs in Nigeria comprises a confusing and conflicting web of regulations and policies. Currently, a potential PPP project may be regulated by either the Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission Act (the ICRC Act), the Public Enterprises (Privatisation and Commercialisation) Act or the Public Procurement Act (Nwangwu, 2021). It is obvious that any investor wishing to invest in PPP projects in Nigeria will be wary of the great regulatory risks, which it is likely to face in the country. The major problem will arise from the responsibility given to the

ICRC under the ICRC Act to monitor PPP contracts. There will arise manifest conflict between the Bureau of Public Enterprises (BPE) and ICRC over which of the two agencies should monitor and enforce particular PPP projects (Nwangwu, 2021).

Finally, there are issues relating to cultural differences. The impact of the PPP model on development in Nigeria is very slow, due to the perception of public and private organisations on the implementation of infrastructural projects because they have different orientations towards efficiency. Unethical conduct such as bureaucratic delays, mediocrity, and poor leadership styles that are associated with public servants are less common with private organisations. Reich (2018) stated that PPPs often bring together organisations with strikingly different cultures, including different interests, values, and views, and these cross-sector collaborations between the public and private sectors are complex and time-consuming. According to Suebvises (2014), it is clear that public organisations are very different from those in the private sector in terms of organisational structures, missions, processes, cultures, and communication styles.

Conclusion

In spite of the federal government's efforts to implement the public-private partnership (PPP) model in Nigeria, the reality of achieving SDGs of 2030 is quite bleak, considering the various challenges facing its implementation. While PPP is a good model of sustaining development in various countries of the world, it is equally important to say that its impact on Nigeria's infrastructural development is very low due to different challenges affecting its implementation such as lack of proper contract management and monitoring framework by the public sector, poor legal and regulatory framework, undue political intervention and political pressure, financial challenges, improper and inadequate project management, poor project planning and management, corruption, and poor feasibility analysis.

To enhance better performance of PPP model in Nigeria, those aforementioned fundamental factors must be resolved by the government to make its adoption more impactful on the country's infrastructural development.

References

Ademola Eyitope Ojo. (2022). Sustainable Infrastructure for Nigeria's Sustainable Economic Development: Whither Transportation or Electric Power Supply?, *Journal of Mega Infrastructure & Sustainable Development*, DOI:10.1080/24724718.2021.2012 364.

Africa Development Bank (AfDB) (2015). Financing Africa's Infrastructure: New strategies, Mechanisms, and Instruments. Retrieved from: https://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents /Publications/ 2018AEO/African_Eco nomic_Outlook_2018_-_EN_Chapter4.pdf

Leiringer, R. & Hughes, W., eds. Procs 4th West Africa Built Environment Research (WABER) Conference. Abuja, Nigeria, 24-26 July 2012. pp.329-44.

Alexander, E. (2008). Public participation in planning— a multidimensional model: The case of Israel. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 9(1), 57-80.

Alcamo J, Thompson J, Alexander A et al (2020) Analysing Interactions among the Sustainable Development Goals: Findings & Emerging Issues from Local and Global Studies. *Sustain Sci* 15:1561–1572. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-020-00875-x

Allen, C., Metternicht, G. & Wiedmann, T. (2016). National Pathways to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): A Comparative Review of Scenario Modelling Tools. *Environmental Science & Policy,* 66:199-207, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2016. 09.008.

Amadi, J., Carrillo, M. & Tuuli, M. (2019). "Stakeholder Management in Public Private Partnership Projects in Nigeria: Towards a Research Agenda". figshare. https://hdl. handle.net/2134/26126.

Andries, A., Morse, S., Murphy, R., Lynch, J., Woolliams, E., & Fonweban, J. (2019). Translation of Earth Observation Data into Sustainable Development Indicators: An analytical Framework. *Sustainable Development*, 27(3), 366–376. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.1908.

Awodele, A., Ogunlana, O. & Akinradewo, F. (2012). Evaluation of Public Private Partnership as Alternative Procurement Route for Infrastructure Development: Case of Nigeria Mega City.

Berrone, P. et al. (2019). EASIER: An Evaluation Model for Public-Private Partnerships Contribution to sustainable Development Goals. *Sustainable*, 11(8). 2339; https://doi.org/10.3390/su11082339.

Borowy, I. (2013). The Brundtland Commission: Sustainable development as health I*ssue. Michael Journal,* 10:195-208.

Bradford, Neil. "Public-Private Partnership? Shifting Paradigms of Economic Governance in Ontario." *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue*

Canadienne de Science Politique, vol. 36, no. 5, 2003, pp. 1005–33. *JSTOR*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/3233388. Accessed 9 Sep. 2022.

Brolan, C.E., Lee, S., Kim, D., & Hill, P. (2014). Back to the Future: what would the Post-2015 Global Development Goals look like if we replicated methods used to construct the Millennium Development Goals? *Global Health* 10, 19. https://doi.org/10.1186/17 44-8603-10-19.

Brundtland, G. & Khalid, M. (1987). *World Commission on Environment and Development Our Common Future.* Oxford University Press, New York.

Bruton, G., Khavul, S., Siegel, D., Wright, M. (2014). New Financial Alternatives in Seeding Entrepreneurship: Microfinance, Crowdfunding, and Peer-to-Peer Innovations. *Entrep. Theory Pract.,* 39, 9–26. [CrossRef].

Carbonara N. & Pelligrino R (2018). "Revenue guarantee in public-private partnerships: A win-win model". *Construction Management and Economics*, 36(10): 584–598. https://doi.org/10.1080/01446193.2018.1467028.

Casady CB, Eriksson K, Levitt R.E. & Scott R. (2020). "Re-Defining Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) in the New Public Governance (NPG) Paradigm: An Institutional Maturity Perspective". *Public Management Review,* 22(2): 161–183. https://doi.org/10.1080/ 14719037.2019.1577909.

Center for Global Developemnt (CGD, 2012). What is Development? https://www.cgdev .org/blog/what-development

Chen, C., Li, D., & Man, C. X. (2019). Toward Sustainable Development? A Bibliometric Analysis of PPP-related Policies in China between 1980 and 2017. *Sustainability,* 11(1), 142. https://doi.org/10.3390/su1101014.

Chenoweth, J. & Bird, J. (2005). *The Business of Water and Sustainable* Development. Routledge, p.277, ISBN 9781874719304.

Chowdhury, A., Sharma, K., & Platz, D. (2016. March). Public-Private Partnerships and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Fit for purpose? (DESA Working paper Series No. 148).

DasGupta R, Hashimoto S, Gundimeda H. (2019). Biodiversity/Ecosystem Services Scenario Exercises from the Asia–Pacific: Typology, Archetypes and Implications for Sustainable Development goals (SDGs). *Sustain Sci*. 14:241–257. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-018-0647-1.

Diggs, S. & Roman, A. (2012). Understanding and Tracing Accountability in the Public Procurement Process. Public Perform. *Manag. Rev.* 2012, 36, 290–315. [CrossRef].

Dechev D (2015). "Public-private partnership—A new perspective for the transition countries". Trakia Journal of Sciences, 13(3): 228–236. https://doi.org/10.15547/tjs.2015.03.005.

Designing the African Development Bank's PPP Framework (n.d.). Private Sector Infrastructure and Industrialisation Complex, Whitepaper for discussion, African Development Bank.

Dolgoff, R. 2012. *Understanding Social Welfare: A Search for Social Justice*. 9th ed., 1–465. Pearson Publishers. Maryland. [Google Scholar].

Dudley Seers (1972). What are we trying to Measure? *The Journal of Development Studies,* 8:3, 21-36, DOI: 10.1080/00220387208421410.

Dumitriu, P. & Ahmed, A. (2018). Public-Private Partnership for the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Conference: Public private partnerships for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development At: Geneva, Palais de Nations Project: The United Nations System – Private sector partnership arrangements in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, JIU/REP/2017/8.

Making Public-Private Partnership Work in Nigeria. NESG Research: Policy Brief for August 2017.Economic and Policy Review (2017), Vol. 16 (2).

Essia, U. & Yusuf, A. (2013). Public-Private-Partnership and Sustainable Development of Infrastructure in Nigeria. Advances *in Management & Applied Economics,* vol. 3, no.6, 2013, 113-127 ISSN:1792-7544 (print version). 1792-7552 (online) Scienpress Ltd.

Freeman, R. (1984) *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*; Pitman: Boston, MN, USA. [Google Scholar].

Friedman, J., York, H. & Graetz, N.*et al.* (2020). Measuring and forecasting progress towards the education-related SDG targets. *Nature*, 580: 636-639.

Ghorbani, S. (2020). The History of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). https://thesustainablemag.com/environment/the-history-of-sustainable-development-goals-sdgs/

Girth, A. M. 2014. "What Drives the Partnership Decision? Examining Structural Factors Influencing Public–Private Partnerships for Municipal Wireless Broadband." *International Public Management Journal* 17 (3): 344–364. doi:10.1080/10967494.2014.935240. [Taylor & Francis Online], [Web of Science ®], [Google Scholar].

Gobikas M & Čingienė V (2021). "Public-Private Partnership in Youth Sport Delivery: Local Government Perspective". *Journal of Physical Education and Sport* , 21(2): 1185–1190. https://doi.org/10.7752/jpes.2021.s2150.

Gray, R. (2010). Is accounting for sustainability actually accounting for sustainability … and how would we know? An exploration of narratives of organisations and the planet. Accounting, Organisations and Society,35(1), 47–62.doi:10.1016/j. aos.2009.04.006.

Gultom, Y. (2019). Transaction Costs and Efficiency in Design-Build Contracting: Empirical Evidence from the Transportation Infrastructure Sector in Oregon. *Public Perform. Manag. Rev.,* 42, 1230–1258.

Haque, M. N., Saroar, M., Fattah, M.A. and Morshed, S.R. (2020), "Public-Private Partnership for Achieving Sustainable Development Goals: A Case Study of Khulna, Bangladesh". *Public Administration and Policy: An Asia-Pacific Journal*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 283-298. https://doi.org/10.1108/PAP-04-2020-0023.

Huque A. S (2021). "Infrastructure, Political Conflict, and Stakeholder Interests: The Case of a Public-Private Partnership in Bangladesh". *Public Works Management & Policy*, 26(2): 75–94. https://doi.org/10.1177/1087724X19895281.

Hodge, A. & Greve. C. (2007). "Public–Private Partnerships: An International Performance Review." *Public Administration Review* 67 (3): 545–558. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00736.x.

Hopes, O., Dewulf, A. & Failing, M. (2016). Inclusiveness in Public-Private Partnerships: NGO for the Netherlands Environmental Agency (PBL), *Public Administration and Policy Group,* Wageningen University, Wageningen.

Jayasuriya, S., Guomin Zhang, G. & RYang, R. (2020). Exploring the Impact of Stakeholder Management Strategies on Managing Issues in PPP projects, *International Journal of Construction Management,* 20:6, 666-678, DOI: 10.1080/15623599.2020.1753143.

Le, Y., Shan, M., Chan, A. P., & Hu, Y. (2014). Overview of Corruption Research in Construction. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 30(4),02514001.

Jozaei, J. Mitchell, M. & Clement, S. (2020). Using a Resilience Thinking Approach to Improve Coastal Governance Responses to complexity and uncertainty: a Tasmanian case study, *Australia. J. Environ. Manag.,* 253 (2020), Article 109662, 10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.109662.

Kleespies, M. & Dierkes, P. (2022). The Importance of Sustainable Development Goals to students of environmental and sustainable studies- a global survey in 41 countries. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun* 9 (218). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-022-01242-0.

Koppenjan, J. (2005). The Formation of Public-Private Partnerships: Lessons from nine transport infrastructure projects in the Netherlands. Public Administration, 83(1), 135-157.

Lorenzo, F. 2017. *Wellbeing Economy, Success in a World without Growth*, 2nd ed., 1564. Lagos, Nigeria: Pan Macmillan Johannesburg.

Odum, C., Onwudufor, F. & Arene, U. (2021). *Public-Private Partnership: A Problem Panacea for Ecotourism Development in Anambra State. In Capacity Building Through Heritage Tourism.* 1st Edition, Apple Academic Press, p.23.

eBook 9781003034391 https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.1201/9781003034391-7/public%E 2%80% 93private-partnership-probable-panacea-ecotourism-development-anambra-state-nigeria-chigozie-jude-odum-onwudufor-uchenna-ngozi-arene.

OECD LEED Forum on Partnerships and Local Governance at the Centre for Social Innovation, Vienna. https://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/36279186.pdf

Oktavinus, A., Mahani, I., & Meifrinaldi, M. (2018). A Global Review of Public Private Partnerships Trends and Challenges for Social Infrastructure. MATEC Web of Conferences 147:06001 DOI:10.1051/matecconf/201814706001.

Oliveira GM, Vidal DG, Viterbo LMF, Maia RL. (2020). Measuring the implementation of sustainable development goals at a local level: the WeGIx Index. In: Leal Filho W, Tortato U, Frankenberger F (eds) Universities and sustainable communities: meeting the goals of the agenda 2030. World Sustainability Series, 1st edn. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp 215–245.

Owusu, K.. & Chan, A. (2018). Barriers Affecting Effective Application of Anti-corruption Measures in Infrastructure Projects: Disparities Between Developed and Developing countries. *Journal of Management in Engineering,* 35(1), 04018056.

Public Private Partnerships in the EU: Widespread shortcomings and limited benefits. European Court of Auditors, EN, 2018 (09). https://www.eca.europa.eu/Lists/ECADocuments/SR18_09/SR_PPP_EN.*pdf*

Marques, R.C. & Berg, S. (2011). Risks, Contracts and Private Sector participation in Infrastructure. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management,* 137(11), 925-932.

Mahmoud, M. (2018). SDGs and PPPs: What's the connection? Retrieved from https://blogs.worldbank.org/ppps/sdgs-and-ppps-whats-connectionMakovsek.

Market Update Review of the European Marketin 2015. European PPP Expertise Centre (EPEC, 2015). https://www.eib.org/attachments/epec/epec_ market_ update_2015_en.pdf

Maya, S. (n.d.). The Concept of Development. http://ideku.net/resources/pptSG1542.pdf

Maurya DS and Srivastava AK (2018). "Managing Partner Opportunism in Public-private partnerships: The dynamics of governance adaptation". Public Management Review, 21(10): 1420–1442. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2018.1559341.

McGowan PJK, Stewart GB, Long G, Grainger MJ. (2019). An Imperfect Vision of Indivisibility in the Sustainable Development Goals. *Nat Sustain* 2:43–45. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0190-1.

Mcquaid, R.W. (2000). ‘’The Theory of Partnerships - Why have Partnerships’’, in: S.P. Osborne (ed.), *Managing Public-Private Partnerships for Public Services: an international perspective* (Routledge, London) pp. 9-35.

Mensah, J., & Enu-Kwesi, F. (2018). Implication of Environmental Sanitation Management in the Catchment Area of Benya Lagoon, Ghana. *Journal of Integrative Environmental Sciences*. doi:10.1080/1943815x.2018.1554591.

Mensah, J. | (2019) Sustainable Development: Meaning, History, Principles, Pillars, and Implications for Human Action: Literature review, *Cogent Social Sciences*, 5:1, 1653531, DOI: 10.1080/23311886.2019.1653531.

Mohamed Rabie, M. (2016). *Meaning of Development.* In a Theory of Sustainable Socio-cultural and Economic Development, ISBN : 978-1-349-88759-0.

Moldan B, Janoušková S, Hák T. (2012). How to Understand and Measure Environmental Sustainability: Indicators and Targets. *Ecol Indic* 17:4–13. https://doi.org/ 10.106/j. ecoind. 2011.04033.

Nwangwu, G. (2021). Public-Private Partnerships in Nigeria: The Journey so far. Nnamdi *Azikwe University Journal of Commmercial and Property Law,* NAUJCPL Vol. 8.

OECD (2015) Guidelines on Corporate Governance of State-Owned Enterprises; OECD Publishing: Paris, France, 2015.

Oladipo, T.D., N.O. Balogun, I.E. Oladipo. 2023. *GST 202: Philosophy, Environment and Sustainable Development*. Ado-Ekiti: ABUAD Open and Distance Learning Centre.

Peters, G., Minx, J., Weber, C. & Edenhofer, O. (2011). Growth in Emission Transfers via International Trade from 1990 to 2008. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* USA 2011, 108, 8903–8908.

Public-private Partnerships under the ‘’People-first’’ approach, FAL Bulletin NO. 384, Number7, 2020, ISSN: 1564-4227. https://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/46538/1/S2000676_en.pdf

Purvis, B., Mao, Y. & Robinson, D. (2019). Three Pillars of Sustainability: in Search of Conceptual Origins. *Sustain Sci* 14, 681–695. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-018-0627-5.

Public–Private Partnership as a Tool for Sustainable Development – What Literatures Say?. Available from:https://www.researchgate.net/publication/34573 5858_Public-private _partnership_as _a_tool_for_ sustainable_development_-_What_literatures_say [accessed Sep 13 2022].

PPPLRC Public-Private Partnership Legal Resource Center (n.d.). Government Objectives: Beneficials and Risks of PPPs. The World Bank.https://ppp.worldbank.org/public-private-partnership/overview/ppp-objectives.

Sadeghi A, Bastani P and Barati O (2020). "Identifying Barriers to Development of the Public-Private Partnership in Providing of Hospital Services in Iran: A qualitative study". Evidence Based Health Policy, Management and Economics (EBHPME), 4(3): 162–171. https://doi.org/10.18502/jebhpme.v4i3.4162.

Saeed, A., Duffield, C. & Hui, F. (2018). Innovation in Publicly Operated Public-Private Partnerships. *Infrastructure Asset Management,* 6(3):1-43.DOI: 10.1680 jinam.18.0 008.

Standish, J., Hobbs, J., Mayfield, M., Bestelmeyer, T., Suding, N., Battaglia, L., (2014). Resilience in Ecology: Abstraction, Distraction, or where the action is? *Biol. Conserv*., 177:43-51, 10.1016/j.biocon.2014.06.008.

Suebvises P (2014). "Public-private Partnerships and Governance Challenges in Thai Municipalities: Perspectives of Chief Administrators (palat thesaban)". *Journal of African & Asian Local Government Studies* , 3(2): 72–79.

Rashed, M.A., Alam, M.M. and Fahim, F. (2014), "The Performances and Challenges of Public-Private Partnership (PPP) Projects in Bangladesh", *Journal of Bangladesh Studies,* Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 67-71.

Reynaers, A. & Paanakker, H. (2016). To privatize or not? Addressing public values in a semi privatized prison system. *Int. J. Public Adm*., 39, 6–14.

Reich MR (2018). "The core roles of transparency and accountability in the governance of global health public-private partnerships". Health Systems & Reform, 4(3): 239–248. https://doi.org/10.1080/23288604.2018.1465880.

Richards, N. (2021). *SPGs and Private Public Partnerships*. In Implementing the Sustainable Development Goals in Nigeria. 1st Edition, Routledge, p.15, eBook ISBN 9781003133469.https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781003133469-14/sdgs-private-public-partnerships-nigeria-newman-richards?context=ubx

Ross, T. W., and J. Yan. 2015. "Comparing Public–Private Partnerships and Traditional Public Procurement: Efficiency Vs. Flexibility." *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis* 17 (5): 448–466. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9299.2010.01877.x.

Rybnicek, R., Plakolm, J. & Baumgartner, L. (2020). Risk in Public-Private Partnerships: A Systematic Literature Revirew of Risk Factors, Their Impact and Risk Mitigation Strategies. *Public Performance & Management Review*43(5) https://www.tandfonline. com/doi/full/10.1080/15309576.2020.1741406.

Sahely, H., Kennedy, C. & Adams, B. (2005). Adams, "Developing Sustainability Criteria for Urban Infrastructure Systems," *Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering*, 32(1), pp. 72–85.

Schleicher, Judith; Schaafsma, Marije; Vira, Bhaskar (2018). ”Will the Sustainable Development Goals Address the Links Between Poverty and the Natural Environment?”. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*. 34: 43–47.

Scopelliti, M., Molinario, E., Bonaiuto, F., Bonnes, M., Cicero, L., DeDominicis, S., & Bonaiuto, M. (2018). What makes you a “hero” for nature? Socio-psychological profiling of leaders committed to nature and biodiversity protection across seven; EU countries. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 61, 970–993. doi:10.1080/09640568.2017.1421526.

SDG Zone (n.d.). What are Sustainable Developments Goals? https://sdgzone.com/learn/what-are-the-sdgs/

Sharma, K. (2016). Public- Private Partnerships and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. *Getting Infrastructure Finance Right*, World Banl Blog.https://blogs.worldbank.org/ppps/public-private-partnerships-and-2030-agenda-sustainable-development.

Sengupta, S. (2021). The Revenue of the Sustainable Development Goals for Companies. Seventeen Goals Magazine. https://www.17goalsmagazin.de/en/the-relevance-of-the-sustainable-development-goals-sdgs-for-companies/

Shepherd, E., Milner-Gulland, E. J., Knight, A. T., Ling, M. A., Darrah, S., Soesbergen, A., & Burgess, N. D. (2016). Status and trends in global ecosystem *Molinario et al*. 29 services and natural capital: Assessing progress toward Aichi Biodiversity Target 14. *Conservation Letters*, 9, 429–437. doi:10.1111/conl.12320.

Silvestre, H., & Araujo, J. (2012). “Public–Private Partnerships/Private Finance Initiatives in Portugal.” *Public Performance & Management Review* 36 (2): 316–339. doi:10.2753/PMR1530-9576360208.

Solicitorshttps://www.mondaq.com/nigeria/government-contracts-procurement-ppp/789438/public-private-partnerships-the-prospects-for-standard-infrastructural-developments-in-nigeria

Sustainable Development Policy and Guide for EEA Financial Mechanism & The Norwegian Financial Mechanism (2006). Available at http://www. eeagrants.org/asset 341/1/ 341_1.pdf, assessed 22 September2022.

Tavanti, M. (n.d.). The Sustainable Development Goals: A Brief History and Progress Overview. https://www.sdg.services/uploads/9/9/2/1/9921626/brief_history_of_sdgs.pdf

Thomas, C. F. (2015). *Naturalizing Sustainability Discourse: Paradigm, Practices and Pedagogy of Thoreau,* Leopold, Carson and Wilson: Ph.D Thesis: Arizona State University.

Titoria, R. & Mohandas, A. (2019). A glance on public private partnership: an opportunity for developing nations to achieve universal health coverage. *International Journal of Community Medicine and Public Health* 6(3):1353DOI: 10.18203/2394-6040.Ijcm ph20190640.

Tjarve, B., & Zemīte, I. (2016). The Role of Cultural Activities in Community Development. *Acta Universitatis Agriculturae et Silviculturae Mendelianae Brunensis*, 64 (6), 2151–2160. doi:10.11118/ actaun20166406215.

Toriola-Coker, L., Alaka, H.,Agbali, M., Bello, W., Pathirage C.& Oyedele, L. (2022) Marginalization of end-user stakeholder's in public private partnership road projects in Nigeria, *International Journal of Construction Management*, 22:11, 2098-2107, DOI: 10.1080/15623599.2020.1766189.

United Nations Development Programme (n.d.). Sustainable Development Goals: The SDGS in Action.https://www.undp.org/sustainable-development-goals.

United Nations (2019). Citing $2.5 Trillion Annual Financing Gap During SDG Business Forum Event, Deputy Secretary-General says Poverty Falling Too Slowly. https://press.un.org/en/2019/dsgsm1340.doc.htm.

United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (n.d.). Take Action for the Sustainable Development Goals.https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/ sustainable-develop ment-goals/

United Nations (n.d.). Do you know all 17 SDGs. Sustainable Development Goals. https://sdgs.un.org/goals

United Nations Women (2022). Explainer: Sustainable Development Goals 5. https://www.unwomen.org/en/news-stories/explainer/2022/09/explainer-sustainable-development-goal-five? gclid= CjwKCAjwm8WZBhBU EiwA178UnIlwUmFaB9Tk 0C63Q Vh 6opZxM5SiyzsDrWupup7CdtXrQAbmDSGT2RoCtNwQAvD_BwE

Value for money in Public-private Partnerships: An Infrastructure Governance Approach. Asian Development Bank (ADB), March 2020 . https:// www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/783341/ value-money-public-private-partnerships.pdf.

Wang,H., Xiong, W., Wu, G., & Zhu, D. (2018). Public–Private Partnership in *Public Administration* discipline: A Literature Review, Public Management Review,20:2, 293-316, DOI: 10.1080/14719037.2017.1313445.

Warner, M. (2010) The Future of Local Government: Twenty-First-Century Challenges. *Public Adm. Rev.,* 70, s145–s147.

Weitz N, Carlsen H, Skånberg K, et al (2019). *SDGs and the Environment in the EU: A System View to Improve Coherence.* Stockholm Environment Institute, Stockholm.

World Bank (2014). The World Bank Annual Report 2014; World Bank: Washington, DC, USA, 20:15.

Zheng, X. (2022). "The Trend Prediction of the New Public Management Model Based on the Discrete Dynamic Evolution Model", Security and Communication Networks, vol. 2022, Article ID 3398392, 14 pages, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/3398392

Yuan, J. F., Li, W., Guo, J. Y., Zhao, X. B., & Skibniewski, M. J. (2018). Social Risk Factors of Transportation PPP Projects in China: A Sustainable Development Perspective, *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health,* 15(7), 1323.https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph150713.