AN EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP (PPP) FOR INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT ENUGU STATE

FRANCIS, FRANCIS JOSEPH; ACHI, H. C; & NWOSU V. O
Department of Quantity Surveying, AkanuIbiam Federal Polytechnic Unwana

ABSTRACT
This study is an evaluation of effectiveness of public-private partnership (PPP) for infrastructural development in Enugu state. Due to obvious reality that government alone can no longer finance the provision of infrastructural facilities. However, to address the problem of infrastructure in Nigeria, government requires collaboration which, PPP is the most appropriate to serve as one stroke. In that regard, the problem becomes how effective the option is practiced, and to identify the factors that influences the adoption of PPP in the development of infrastructures in Enugu state in particular. Therefore, primary and secondary sources were used to generate data. Data collected were presented in tables containing frequencies of the responses and their corresponding percentages. Relative important index (RII) was used to rank factors influencing the adoption and application of PPP in Enugu state. The result of the analyses revealed that: PPP is not making progress in Enugu, and in the last five years there is no significant improvement in PPP practice in the state; the study also discovered that corruption, Economic Instability and Multiple Taxation are most significant factors affecting the adoption of PPP for infrastructural development in Enugu state. The study concludes that collaboration with government is the order of the day.

Keywords: *Evaluation, Effectiveness, Public-Private Partnership, Infrastructural, Development, Enugu State.*

INTRODUCTION
The current global economic realities of the world is such that the managers of various National economies especially sub-Saharan Africa are increasingly

faced with the challenge of adopting management strategy or reform that will help them navigate their state out of economic crunch, cut the cost of delivering public services, legitimize the government by ensuring effective and efficient social service delivery and stable polity. Given the failure of state led and dominated development approach of Nigeria and most African states after independence, the need for ideological shift from a welfare or social state to a capital or market oriented economy where the private sector will play significant role in the economy began to emerge. This development was fast tracked by the eventual collapse of socialism with the disintegration of the Soviet Union and consequent dominance of capitalism as the world economic system. The collaborative management style between the private sector and public sector became much prominent with the New Public Management (NPM) approach that started to make waves in the 1980s and 1990s of which public-private partnership is a core feature. In sum NPM is nothing but private sought to remedy public sector problems. Hence,

Public-Private Partnership (PPP) is an arrangement between government and private sector entities for the purpose of providing public infrastructures, community facilities and related services. Such partnerships are characterized by the sharing of investment, risk, responsibility and reward between the partners. The reasons for establishing such partnerships vary but generally involve the financing, design, construction, operation and maintenance of public infrastructure and services Kwan (1999:5).

Objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of the study are:

1. To identify the level of awareness of PPP in Enugu
2. To identify the factors that influences the effectiveness of PPP in the development of infrastructure in Enugu state
3. To assess the level of PPP implementation concept for development in Enugu state

Public-Private Partnership (PPP)

The focus here is to explore views on Public- Private Partnership (PPP). PPP is an arrangement where private parties participate in or provide support for the provision of infrastructure or public sector provided facilities. It describes a government services venture which is founded and operated through a partnership between government and one or more private sector company. PPP is not only the procurement of an asset but also the payment of a stream of services under specified terms and conditions.

According to Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission (ICRC) of Nigeria, (2011), "A Public-Private Partnership is a contractual agreement between a public agency (Federal, State, or Local) and a private sector entity. Through 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 sharing of resources, each party shares in the risks and rewards potential in the delivery of the service and/or facility". The goal is to combine the best capabilities of the public and private sectors for mutual benefits. On the account of (Ministry of Municipal Affairs, British Columbia, 1999), PPPs are arrangements between government and private sector entities for the purpose of providing public infrastructure, community facilities and related services.

The bottom line of the preceding views gives credence to the fact that in this era of global economic crisis, PPP remains the most appropriate approach or arrangement that provides economic lifeline for the government in the face of its depleting resources, as it offers business opportunities for the private sector to be involved in social provisioning.

Characteristics of Public-Private Partnership

1. Basically, PPP is complementary in nature; that is, drawing on the strength of each of the dominant partners of the public and private sectors. This is why effective public-private partnership is only possible through mutually designed, analysed and accepted instruments of cooperation and collaboration.
2. The roles and responsibilities of the partners vary from project to project. The key consideration is the allocation of risk between the partners which affects other aspects of the partnership agreements, including rewards and investments. What should obtain in this regard is that the higher the risk, the higher the reward.
3. On the whole, while the roles and responsibilities of the private and public sector partners may differ on individual servicing initiatives, the overall role and responsibilities of government do not change because Public-

Private Partnership is one of a number of ways of delivering public infrastructure and related services. PPP does not substitute for strong and effective governance and decision-making by government. In all cases, government remains responsible and accountable for delivering services and projects in a manner that protects and furthers the public interest.

Public Sector Strengths

The public sector strengths lie on the result of serving the public trust. By this, we mean the exclusive right of government to determine the affairs of the economy. It is this prerogative disposition of the public sector that most critics point out as the limitation of PPP. However, with a well established legal framework, it does not deter the application and progress of PPP. More so, PPP is a solution seeking or problem solving strategy meant to address real and existing infrastructural deficiency, therefore, does not give room for any form of contractual imbalances or private-public suspicions. The following elements accounts for the strengths of the public sector:

- Legal authority.
- Protection of procurement policies.
- Broad prospective/balancing of the competing goals to meet public needs.
- Personnel – dedicated but constrained by rules and regulations.

On a final note, "the secret of successful partnership is to balance the strengths of sectors" (Izuwah 2011).

Private Sector Strengths

The private sector strengths lies on the result of market competition. The private sectors possess the skill, competence and techniques of profit making more than the public sector. The following elements of private sector give credence to the above facts:

- Management efficiency
- Newer Technologies
- Workplace Efficiencies
- Cash Flow Management
- Personnel Development
- Access to Diverse Sources of Capital

Classification of PPPs models

There are a number of models of private sector participation in infrastructure, primarily classified by three key factors:

(i) Levels of responsibility assumed by the public and private sectors;
(ii) The length of the contract period and
(iii) The degree of risk allocation between the public and private sectors.

Models of PPP includes:

- Build-and-Transfer (BT): A contractual arrangement whereby government undertakes the financing and construction of an infrastructure project and after its completion hands it over to the private sector for operation and management. This arrangement may be employed in the construction of any infrastructure project, including critical facility that will be difficult for both community and individuals.
- Build-Lease-and-Transfer (BLT): A contractual arrangement whereby the private party undertakes the financing and construction of an infrastructure project and upon its completion hands it over to the Government Agency on a Lease arrangement for a fixed period, after the expiry of which ownership of the project is automatically transferred to the government agency . This will ensure effective monitoring.
- Build-operate-and-Transfer (BOT): A contractual arrangement whereby the Government Agency contracts out an infrastructure project to the private party to undertake investments and operates the facility for a fixed period of time after which the ownership reverts to the public sector.A BOT models is generally used to develop a discrete rather than a whole network, for example, a road or a toll road. This structure provides the most freedom for the private sector partner during construction and the public sector bears the equity risk
- Design-Build (DB): The private sector designs and builds infrastructure to meet public sector performance specifications, often for a fixed price. Many do not consider DB to be within the spectrum of PPP, Canadian Council of Public-Private Partnership (2009). It is an aspect of contracting out and has been the oldest technique involving the private sector in implementing government projects. Most of the roads, building

and other infrastructure built even in non-liberal democratic countries are carried out through this method.

- Operation and Maintenance Contact (O and M): in an O and M contract, a private operator operates and maintains the asset for the public partner, usually to an agreed level with specified obligations. The work is often sub-contracted to specialist maintenance companies. The payment of this contract is either via a fixed fee, where a lump sum is given to the private partner, or more commonly a performance-base fee. In this situation, performance is incentivized using a pain share/gain share mechanism, which reward the private partner for over-performance (according to the agreed SLAs) or induces a penalty payment for work which has fallen short. Here, a private operator, under contract, operates a publicly owned asset for a specified term. Ownership of the asset remains with the public entity (CCPPP, 2009). A typical example was the tollgates, which was built by the federal government and contracted out to private companies to operate and maintain. But unfortunately, they failed to maintain
- Design-Build-Finance-Operate (DBFO): This model empowers the private sector to design, finance and constructs a new facility under a long-term lease, and to operate the facility during the term of the lease. The private partner transfers the new facility to the public sector at the end of the lease term or to have the lease renewed.
- Build-Own-Operate (BOO): The private sector finances, builds, owns and operates a facility or service in perpetuity. The public constraints are stated in the original agreement and through on-going regulatory authority. The deregulation of the communication sector in Nigeria serves as an example of this method. The key players in the sector, MTN, Globacom, Zain and the rest, build, own and operate their facilities. This is however done under the supervision and regulation of the National Communications Commission. The long-term entitlement to own and operate facility is incentive for developer to invest significant capital. But the private sector may not construct- operate the infrastructure and/or service in the public interest since what is left with the public sector may just be issuing of guidelines.
- Build-Own-Operate-Transfer (BOOT): A private entity receives a franchise to finance, design, build and operate a facility and to collect

user fees for a specified period to amortize investment. At the end of this fixed period, ownership is transferred back to the public sector authority even if operation remains with the private entity. This structure is suitable when the government has a large infrastructure financing cap as the equity and commercial risk stays with the private sector for the length of the contract. This models is often use for school and hospital contract.

Misconceptions about Public Private Partnerships

- **With PPP, private sector provides an alternate source of funding**: This is one of the most frequently quoted and misunderstood aspects of PPPs. Private sector does not FUND public infrastructure projects, rather they FINANCE them. It's important to understand the "subtle difference between infrastructure funding and financing". And private financing is just one aspect of a comprehensive PPP arrangement. In many large public infrastructure projects, financing could be from multiple sources and some PPP projects may not involve private financing. In summary PPP's are an alternate procurement model, not an alternate funding model.
- **PPP is a panacea for all public infrastructure challenges**: As much excitement as there is about the possibilities for private sector investment to help address the public infrastructure issues facing many countries, there are certain categories of projects that fit better into a PPP model. If private financing in a project will be expected, a key criteria will be to understand the project funding model i.e. how the investment will be repaid to the private investors along with a reasonable Return on Investment (RoI). If the project cannot generate sufficient revenue to meet the payment obligations, the possibility of attracting private investment is next to none. For PPP projects where private financing will not be involved, a clear understanding on the value private sector will bring in terms of innovation, operational efficiency, risk management or other best practices need to be clearly laid out.
- **By Entering into a Public Private Partnership Government Loses Control Over the Provision of Services**
  By entering into a public private partnership, government does not give up its ability to implement its policies or regulate the provision of

services. The government establishes the ground rules and has the ability to shape the public private partnership to reflect its own objectives, policies and regulations. While the partner make its profit which is the motive of entering into partnership. It can be argued that the government actually has more control; in that it has well-defined contractual remedies in a public private partnership arrangement that it may not have with its own management and staff.

- **Public Private Partnerships Apply Only to Infrastructure Projects**
  Public private partnerships can be an effective and innovative way of delivering a range of government services and facilities. While large infrastructure projects tend to capture the most public attention, public private partnership can also be used to deliver services that do not involve capital projects. Examples include provision of data services, refuse collection and road maintenance. For instance, "The 30-year-old Lagos-Ibadan express way has been handed over by the Federal Government to a concessionaries" Bi-Courtney Highway services Ltd, for effective management of the ever-busy 110 kilometer expressway Adekunle (2011:6).
- **The Cost of Service will Increase to Pay for the Private Partner's Profit**
  Governments sometimes resist public private partnerships because they believe that the cost of providing the service will increase to reflect the profits the private partner must realize to stay in business. While the private partner will need to make a profit, the profit must be earned within the existing or a lower price for the service. Presumably, government would only enter into a public private partnership if the price of providing a given service was lower than if provided by the government, or if a higher level of service could be provided for the same price by the private partner. (This assumes that the government is not subsidizing the cost of providing the service). The private partner's profit can only be realized through increased productivity or expansion of service, not through higher prices.

Benefits/Advantages of Public-Private Partnerships

PPPs provide an opportunity to:

1. Improve service delivery by allowing both sectors to do what they do best. Government's core business is to set policy and serve the public. It is better positioned to do that when the private sector takes responsibility for non-core functions such as operating and maintaining infrastructure.
2. Increased investment in public infrastructure. Investments in hospitals, schools, highways and other provincial assets have traditionally been funded by the State and, in many cases, have added to levels of overall debt. PPPs can reduce government's capital costs, helping to bridge the gap between the need for infrastructure and the State's financial capacity.
3. In essence, a PPP is a form of collaboration or joint endeavour between the public and private sectors for the purposes of implementing a project, whereby the resources, strength and capabilities of each party are brought together. This is done in a way which allocates risks and responsibilities between them in a rational manner designed to achieve the optimum balance from each perspective.
4. In practice, PPP structures usually involve the transfer of much of the responsibility for financing, designing, constructing and operating the project and most of the risks associated with these activities to the private sector- whilst allowing certain (often residual) responsibilities and risks to be retained by the public sector.

   Effective education can best be achieved when government collaborates with a range of other actor's in private sector, civil society, independent experts, communities and families.
5. Deliver capital projects faster, making use of the private partner's increased flexibility and access to resources.
6. Improve budget certainty. Transferring risk to the private sector can reduce the potential for government cost overruns from unforeseen circumstances during project development or service delivery. Services are provided at a predictable cost, as set out in contract agreements.
7. Governments benefit from PPP by gaining access to corporate expertise in management, strategic planning, innovative solutions, labour market expertise, skills development, efficient delivery of services, project development, and logistics support.

Challenges of Public-Private Partnership in Enugu State and Nigeria

1. **Corruption:** corruption is a major problem in Nigeria. As a respected elder statesman once lamented, it is not just that officials are corrupt but

corruption has almost become official. However, much has been made of the issue of corruption. Corruption is not exclusive to Nigeria. Many monumental corruption cases making headlines around the world today do not involve Nigerians. Two agencies (EFCC and ICPC) are also combating corruption in Nigeria full time.

2. **Multiple Taxation:** A curious tax regime, internal revenue generation competition, and the multiplicity of Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) in Nigeria often result in multiple taxes which take a heavy toll on business and investment.
3. **Political Instability:** Political instability and insecurity was more prevalent in the period before Sullivan's administration. This raises the risk of administrative expropriation by successive government. It also often results in fear of the ability of government to honour its contractual obligations or counterpart funding obligations. This discourages private investors.
4. **Economic Instability:** Economic instability which is the cumulative effect of political instability, inflation and/or policy inconsistencies for which our country is known also raises the red flag in the minds of serious investors and constitutes a bad advertisement for prospective investment in a capital intensive area like infrastructure.
5. **Insecurity:** Insecurity remains a major challenge. Nigeria is a huge country with a turbulent political history. Although the country has enjoyed relative stability since 1999, religious intolerance, intense competition for political power, Niger Delta militancy, kidnapping for ransom, road safety issues and, more recently, terrorist-style bombings have led to substantial unease among the citizens and consternation among prospective investors. Although this has not been experienced in Enugu State, but it has generally affected investment climate in Nigeria especially when foreign partners are involved.
6. **Lack of Investment Awareness and Information:** There is lack of international awareness of investment opportunities in Nigeria. The ICRC Act 2005 only allows the Commission to publish the list of projects eligible for infrastructure concession contracts in the Federal Gazzette and three national newspapers having wide circulation in Nigeria and such other means of circulation‖. Invariably, the international media on which

most prospective foreign concessionaires depend for information are ignored.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In the course of this study, the entire questionnaire was collected and analyzed based on simple percentages. Relative Important Index (RII) was used to rank the factors influencing the adoption and application of PPP in Enugu state.

The mathematical operation for the calculation of the sample percentage is indicated below,

$$P = \frac{N}{T} \times \frac{100}{1}$$

Where

P = percentage

N =Observed frequency or number in the considered category

T = Total number or value of all category

While RII is

$$RII = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f} \times \frac{1}{H}$$

Where; $\sum fx$ = is the total weight given to each attributes by the respondents

$\sum f$ = is the total number or respondents in the sample.

H = is the highest weight on the likert scale.

The ranking was based on their RII values. The item with the highest RII value is ranked first (1) and the next (2) and so on.

FINDINGS

Table 1.1: Level of respondents' awareness of PPP models as an option for infrastructural development in Enugu state.

Types	***Frequency Response***					***No***	***Total Score***	***Score***	***RII***	***Rank***
	1	***2***	***3***	***4***	***5***					
Build-operate-and-Transfer (BOT)	3	4	7	35	63	112	487	4.35	0.87	1
Build-Lease-and-Transfer (BLT)	3	6	6	38	59	112	480	4.28	0.86	2

Build-and-Transfer (BT)	5	7	3	36	61	112	477	4.26	0.85	3
Design-Build (DB)	5	4	9	49	45	112	461	4.12	0.82	4
Operation and Maintenance Contact (O and M)	6	9	14	28	55	112	453	4.04	0.80	5
Operation License	4	8	15	46	39	112	444	3.96	0.79	6
Design-Build-Finance-Operate (DBFO)	8	9	11	50	34	112	429	3.83	0.77	7
Build-Own-Operate (BOO)	7	13	10	51	31	112	422	3.77	0.75	8
Build-Own-Operate-Transfer (BOOT)	13	17	15	45	22	112	382	3.41	0.68	9
Buy-Build-Operate (BBO)	15	20	18	46	13	112	358	3.20	0.64	10

Source: fieldwork 2019

Table 1.1, shows the Level of awareness of PPP models for infrastructural development in Enugu state and has been ranked accordingly. The highest ranked model with the values of RII ≥ 0.80, regarded as a model with very high level of awareness because the relative important index (RII) is greater than 0.8 was Build-operate-and-Transfer (BOT), which ranked highest with relative performance index (RII) of 0.87. While Build-Lease-and-Transfer (BLT) having a relative Performance Index (RII) of 0.86 ranked second. Build-and-Transfer (BT) and Design-Build (DB) were ranked third and fourth with values of relative important index (RII) of 0.85 and 0.83 respectively. Operation and Maintenance Contract (O and M) was ranked fifth with values of relative important index (RII) equal to 0.80 having high level of awareness. Operation License, Design-Build-Finance-Operate (DBFO), Build-Own-Operate (BOO), Build-Own-Operate-Transfer (BOOT), Buy-Build-Operate (BBO) were ranked sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth tenth respectively with value of relative important index (RII) < 0.80 regarded as models with low level of awareness. Based on the above results of the study, it can be seen that Build-operate-and-Transfer (BOT) is the most commonly known PPP model adopted as an option for infrastructural development in Enugu state.

Table 1.2: Respondents perspective of the factors affecting the adoption of PPP as an option for infrastructural development in Enugu state.

Types	*Frequency Response* 1	2	3	4	5	*No*	*Total Score*	*Score*	*RII*	*Rank*
Corruption	4	9	11	32	56	112	463	4.13	0.83	1
Economic Instability	7	13	10	34	48	112	454	4.05	0.81	2
Multiple Taxation	3	10	18	35	46	112	447	3.99	0.80	3
Political Instability	5	12	8	47	40	112	441	3.94	0.79	4
Negative perceptions	3	10	15	49	35	112	439	3.92	0.78	5
Good governance	4	12	14	52	30	112	418	3.73	0.75	6
Lack of Access to Financing	9	12	7	55	29	112	419	3.74	0.75	6
Crime	14	20	13	35	30	112	383	3.42	0.68	8
Insecurity	24	29	5	33	21	112	334	2.98	0.60	9

Source: fieldwork 2019

Table 1.2, shows the factors affecting the adoption of PPP as an option for infrastructural development in Enugu state and has been ranked accordingly. The highest ranked factor with the values of RII ≥ 0.80, regarded as a factors with very high significance because the relative important index (RII) is greater than 0.8 was Corruption, which ranked highest with relative performance index (RII) of 0.83. While Economic Instability having a relative Performance Index (RII) of 0.81 ranked second. Multiple-Taxation was ranked third with values of relative important index (RII) equal to 0.80 having high significance. Political Instability, Negative perceptions, Good governance, Lack of Access to Financing, Crime, and Insecurity were ranked fourth, fifth, sixth, sixth, eighth and ninth respectively with value of RII < 0.80. Based on the above results of the study, it can be seen that Corruption is the key challenging factor affecting the adoption of PPP as an option for infrastructural development in Enugu state.

Table 1.3: PPP is effectively practiced for infrastructural development in Enugu State

Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Strongly Agree	11	9.7%
Agree	15	13.4%
Undecided	6	5.4%
Disagree	31	27.7%

Strongly Disagree	49	43.8%
Total	**112**	**100%**

Source: fieldwork 2019

Table 1.3, indicates that greater percentage of the population are of the contrary opinion that PPP is effectively practiced for infrastructural development in Enugu State. 49 respondents, representing (43.8%) of the population strongly disagreed to the above fact. 31 of them, representing (27.7%) of the population disagreed as well. A total of 80 respondents representing (71.5%) of the population, are of contrary response the fact. The response of these contrary respondents could be based on the fact that there are no massive implementations of PPP approach to infrastructural development in transport sector, Health sector, agricultural sector, etc. However, 6respondents, representing (5.4%) were undecided, 15 respondents, representing (13.4%) of the population agreed with the above assertion, followed by other 11 respondents, representing (9.7%) of the population also strongly agreed. These responses of respondents could be based on personal evaluation, since there exists physical effort of the government towards improving the welfare of the inhabitants of Enugu State.

Summary of the Findings

The summary of the results of this study are as follows.

1. Reduction of corrupt practices: Corruption in the case of Nigeria is a national phenomena. It is seen as part of our national life and every state is involved including Enugu. Part of the improvement that PPP could have brought into the public sector management of Enugu State is accountability which is the hallmark of the private sector. Table 1.2, shows that Corruption is the most significant factor affecting the adoption of PPP as an option for infrastructural development in Enugu state with the values of RII of 0.83.

2. Efficiency: Public sector in Nigeria and Enugu State in particular is usually characterized by inefficiency due to poor management. As such, the introduction of private initiative in the public sector management of the state could improve the quality of its output. Table 1.3, indicates that greater percentage of the population are of the opinion that PPP is not effectively practiced for infrastructural development in Enugu State with 49 respondents, representing (43.8%). That means PPP approach can actually address the issue of inefficiency in the public sector in Enugu State if effectively adopted and its evident could be seen in the various sectors, such as transportation, health, ICT, etc.

Conclusion

The fundamental responsibility of good government is service delivery. When any government becomes incapable of delivering services to its citizens that implies its expiration. Therefore, Government endlessly seeks for the most cost-effective means of delivering services to the people while keeping afloat. As such, successful governance in this 21st century requires every hand on the desk i.e. partnership where possible and at all levels. This why it has become old fashioned to argue whether public ownership was always the best or whether privatization was the only answer. Despite all this, the Level of awareness of PPP models for infrastructural development in Enugu state Government is still wavering around Build-operate-and-Transfer (BOT), Build-Lease-and-Transfer (BLT) and Build-and-Transfer (BT). It is firmly believed that PPP for infrastructural development will not only deliver the modern, high quality public services that the public want but its increasingly expected to draw the best from both public and private sector in the State but some factors hindered it effective implementation. What matters most to the government is the approach that will most likely deliver the peoples' needs. Following the daunting recurring political and economic challenges to the government both at state and federal level, collaborative government has become the order of the day and good Enough, Enugu state is updated with the trend but not in adequate state.

REFERENCES

Adekunle, A. M. (2011). *Public-Private Partnership as a policy strategy of infrastructure financing in Nigeria*. www.google.com. (Accessed October 09, 2018).

Ajai, A. (2006). *Causes of corruption in public projects and solutions*: Daily Independent (Real-estate), May 2nd.

Ake, C. (2009). *Democracy and Development in Africa*, Ibadan: Spectrum. Books Limited

Assibey-Mensah, A. O. (2009). *Progressive Pathways towards Sustainable Growth in Developing Countries,* Journal of International Politics and Development, Volume 7 No. 2, 65 – 82.

Bureau of Public Enterprises (2000). *Privatization Handbook,* Abuja:

Bureau of Public Enterprises (2002). Enugu State Government (ENSG, official website).

Canadian Council for Public-private partnership (2009). About PPP – definitions and Models. Available at: http://.www.pppcouncil.ca on (Accessed 16/09/2018).

Egbo, P.T. and Chukwuemeka, S.N. (2012). *Governance and infrastructural development challenges and prospects*, Awka: Nico and sons.

Federal Government of Nigeria (2004). National Economic Empowerment Strategy (NEEDS), Abuja. National Planning Commission.

Federal Republic of Nigeria (2000). Obasanjo's Economic Direction: 1999 – 2003, Abuja, The Presidency.

Fadahunsi, A. (2005). The Obasanjo Administration, 1999 – 2003: *An appraisal of the Economy and the proposed Redirection*. New Jeresey: Africarus Multimedia.

Fashola, B. R. (2007). Public private partnership initiative in Lagos state, 5th Nov. 2007. Available at: www.google.com.

Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission (ICRC) (2005): *ICRC Handbook*, Abuja:

Izuwah, C. (2011). *Vision Led Infrastructural Development for Nigeria Via PPPs – Principles and framework outline.* Available at: www.google.com. (Accessed September 9, 2018).

Kwan, J. (1999). Public-Private Partnership, a guide for local government. Available at: www.google.com, (Accessed 05/10/2018).

Mbanasor, J. A. and Nwachukwu, I. (2011). *Public-private partnership in Agribusiness Development in Nigeria.* Department of Agribusiness and Management, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike, Abia State, Nigeria.

Minett, C. (2012). Nigerian partnership for Transforming Health systems. Available at: www.google.com. (Accessed 27/09/2018).

Nebo, C. (2011): Enugu State – *The Evolution of Good and Responsive Governance*. Available at: www.google.com. (Accessed 27/09/2018).

Nwodu, L. (2006). *Public enterprises management and privatization*: 6th edition; New Delhi: Chan & Co. Ltd.

Obasi, M. I. (2004). *Foreign Capital Flows and External Debt: Perspectives on Nigeria and the LDCs Group*, Lagos: Broadway Press Ltd.

Obozuwa, D. (2011). *PPP as a tool for infrastructure development in Nigeria (1).* Available at: www.businessdayonline.com, (Accessed 18/09/2018).

Ohia, U. (2011). *Infrastructure Concession in Nigeria: Challenges and Opportunities*. Available at: www.google.com. (Accessed 18/09/2018).

Okorie, N.E. (2005). *Corporate governance in Nigerian public enterprises, problems and prospects:* Unpublished M.Sc. (Management) dissertation, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

Olukoshi, A. O. (1993). *General introduction: from crisis to adjustment in Nigeria*. The politics of structural adjustment in Nigeria, London: James Currey.

Sampson, E. (2008). *Global Financial Crisis: Recession, Depression and Other Threats*. Zenith Economic Quarterly, Vol. 3 No. 4, 68 – 75.

Sobechi, L. (2011). How Enugu Plans to revive comatose industrial firms, Industry watch. Available at: www.google.com, (Accessed 25/09/2018).

Ugwu, A. O. (2012). *Assessing the viability of PPP as an option for infrastructural development in Nigeria*: Unpublished M.Sc. dissertation, University of Nigeria, Nsuka.

United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (1995). States of Disarray: The Social Effect of Globalization, Report for the world summit for social development, 1995.

World Bank (1994). *World Report 1994*, New York: Oxford University Press.

World Bank (2000). *Entering the 21st Century: World Development Report 1999/2000*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wikipedia (2009). International health care programmes considers public-private-partnership http://www.googles: public private partnership retrieved on Sept. 17th, 2018