

## **INFRASTRUCTURAL GOVERNANCE IN LAGOS STATE: ANALYSING COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT IN THE PPP IMPLEMENTATION POLICY FRAMEWORK.**

**Oladimeji A. Ashade**

University of KwaZulu-Natal

E-mail: 216066737@stu.ukzn.ac.za

Orcid ID: 0000-0001-8296-7976

**Sybert Mutereko**

University of KwaZulu-Natal

E-mail: Sybert@ukzn.ac.za

Orcid ID: 0000-0001-7490-5943

### **—Abstract —**

At the dawn of the millennium, government across the globe embrace public-private partnership (PPP) as a policy tool for public infrastructural financing, optimization and maintenance. The policy framework of PPP is expected to promote collaborative governance through democratic values in the partnership agenda. Collaborative governance depicts more extensive collaborations, legitimacy and shared governance. Using Lagos State, Nigeria as a case study, the authors draw substantially from collaborative governance theory to examine how the PPP implementation framework of Lagos State policy on PPP accommodates the host communities in the project governance. In line with the pragmatists' research philosophy. Information was sourced from both primary and secondary sources. Field data were gathered through a purposive sampling technique. Data from the field survey was presented and analysed using descriptive and inferential statistical methods using SPSS. Both qualitative and quantitative data were integrated using the exploratory sequential mixed method. The interpretation was thus drawn based on the combined strength of both sets of data. Research findings upon the triangulation of both qualitative and quantitative analysis indicated that the host communities, beyond compensation and resettlement, wish to be part of the institutionalized arrangement of the PPP policy framework. Synthesis of research findings suggests that a key policy priority should be accorded the host communities by the government that has prioritized PPP as a viable option to infrastructural project financing and management to mitigate unfavourable policy outcomes.

**Keywords:** PPP, collaborations, infrastructural governance, public policy.

**JEL Classification:** D78 Positive Analysis for policy formulation and implementation

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The public-private partnership has emerged as a policy tool for infrastructural development globally. Lagos State adopts public-private partnership (PPP) as a policy tool for infrastructural development under a National Policy on Public-Private Partnership framework. The policy formulation and implementation are enabled by the extant laws and legislative framework captured in The Procurement (PPP) Act, 2007 and Lagos State PPP Act, 2011. These Acts serve as a broad policy framework expected to promote democratic values of all stakeholders in the partnership agenda through wider collaborations, legitimacy, shared governance and accountability (Bamidele et al., 2016). These democratic ideals have positively impacted the design, implementation and successes recorded by the PPP programmes in the developed nations like UK, USA, Canada and Australia (Leigland, 2018; Gaventa & Barrett, 2012).

Inspired by the virtues of PPP in the developed nations and the exigencies of meeting its massive infrastructural deficit, Lagos State adopts PPP as a collaborative strategy with private investors for infrastructural development. Therefore, the Lagos State PPP law (LSPPP Law) was enacted in 2011. The Law significantly instigates and institutionalizes the establishment of the Lagos State Office of Public-Private Partnership (LOPPP). The function of the LOPPP is to work out every modality for PPP policy framework and infrastructural governance in Lagos State. The Office has the mandate to execute successful PPP infrastructural projects. The policy proposes that every implementation agency for PPP should develop an investment strategy with state and non-state actors to “avert undesirable consequences in policy implementation”. The policy also recognizes the host communities as stakeholders in the collaborative arrangement (ICRC, 2013: 3, 12). Since the emergence of the fourth republic, the government of Lagos State always reiterates its commitment to inclusive governance. The present Governor of Lagos State, Mr Babajide Sanwo-olu maintains that the state policy thrust shall revolve around *infrastructural renewal and development*. He further reiterates that his policy focus shall be *PPP, good governance and participatory planning* (LSG, 2020). Unfortunately, the incidents and reactions to PPP project governance in Lagos State have been generating concerns of every

stakeholder. The concerns were informed by various protests, confrontations and demonstrations, often, from the host communities. These occurrences have always created an elitist and exploitative image for the policy.

Hence, the problem has drawn considerable attention from scholars. Recently, scholars across the sub-Saharan Africa region identify poor stakeholders' management as a major challenge bedevilling projects in African countries (Mapfuno & Mutereko, 2020; Jordhus-Lier, 2015). Their studies recognize the importance of the communities as stakeholders in project implementation, albeit, scantily. Except for the study which was carried out more recently by Bekele (2019), most literature on community involvement in the infrastructural development of African communities is largely descriptive (Di Maddaloni & Davis, 2018). Rarely do we found any systematic study that has addressed community participation within the context of a policy framework for infrastructural governance. Our understanding of this matter is sketchy based on scant attention that was given to the subject in the existing literature. It is against this background that this study employs the theoretical lenses of collaborative governance and citizenship participation, to advance the knowledge of community stakeholding in PPP project governance, looking at how the institutionalized framework and governance arrangement accommodate the host communities. In this paper, we argue that PPP implementers (the bureaucrats) and the community members need to be re-orientated trained and be re-trained regarding the processes and dictates of infrastructural governance.

Having presented the background to this study in this section, the next section presents the literature and theoretical framework of the study. Section three describes the data collection and analytical methods. The finding is subsequently discussed in chapter four and the conclusion was made in the final section.

## **2. LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

A review of scholarly works in respect of this study is presented in this section. This is a patchwork that is required to explain concepts and constructs upon which the study is framed to situate this study amid existing literature. Theories that form the basis of this study are also presented.

### **2.1 Conceptual Framework and Reviews**

Public-private partnerships (PPP) is a concept that should capture the whole essence of inclusive governance if well implemented because a good policy establishes the framework for good governance and such framework must

accommodate every stakeholder. Based on the literature, we perceive governance as those interactions and relationships which give attention and respond to citizens and stakeholders' interests (Moynihan & Ross, 2014; Hodge & Greve, 2016). A report of an evaluation conducted recently by the Centre for Ethics and Sustainable Development, Lagos, Nigeria (CESD) in collaboration with the Centre for Public Policy Alternatives (CPPA) rates Lagos State very low in the overall assessment of the state's policy environment, administrative processes and policy framework for the implementation of PPP. The evaluation which was conducted with other stakeholders drawn from Ministries, Department and Agencies (MDAs), community-based associations (CBAs), academics, professionals and other practitioners use measuring indices which include: (1) affected community engagement, (2) strategic communication, (3) PPP project governance variables (CESD, 2019). However, an array of Literature has shown that the problem is not restricted to Lagos State but most developing societies that have to embrace PPP as a policy tool for infrastructural development. Consequently, the report reflects that the implementation of PPP is still facing some adversarial challenges driven by "interest representation" and non-conformity with the "ideals of collaborative governance" (Leigland, 2018). This development has been generating growing concern amongst scholars.

Quite recently, a few systematic studies have emerged across sub-Saharan African countries to address the problems of stakeholders in government programmes and project execution. The works of Mapfumo & Mutereko (2020); Bekele (2019); Maddaloni & Davis (2018); Stammier & Ivanova (2016) and Jordhus-Lier (2015) lay credence to this fact. While these studies centre on the need for the government to allow contributions from stakeholders; community stake-holding receives scant attention. A more recent study that examined community participation in urban infrastructure project was carried out by Bekele (2019). Findings of this study suggest that communities are now being involved in a window-dressing sort of arrangement in urban projects in Ethiopia. He further noted that the communities were involved simply to fill financial gaps; therefore, their involvement was not institutionalized which has led to other problems like poor communication and relationships. A similar finding was reported in a study carried out earlier in Romania (Haruta & Radu, 2010) Hence, there is a level of community participation but the participation is not "authentic" going by King, Feltey & Susel (1998) who posit that true participation is a dual function of the people and public managers with the managers playing a dominant role. The conclusion, therefore, suggests that authentic participation is a function of the role of administrators and public managers. Taken together, the combination of these

findings provide some support for the conceptual premise that community participation in respect of PPP implementation is still far from the ideal in the developing countries (Leigland, 2018;).

Largely most studies on PPP in are theoretical with less or no attention on its governance arrangement regarding public involvement. Few empirical works that were found in the literature on community stake-holding in infrastructural projects development in the Nigeria context focus more on land governance, customary rights, expropriation and compensation using a fact-finding analytical method. For instance, Lawalson & Agunbiade (2018) analyse the socio-economic and environmental problems of customary landholding in line with community agitations (The knowledge of land governance expatiated in their studies is very significant to our study because it gives an insight to the socio-politically complex process of land acquisition for PPP projects and the intricacies - the main crux of the problem as land remains the main stake of the communities in the project. In the light of the foregoing, therefore, empirical study that analyses community participation in the implementation framework of PPP in the context of Nigeria is desirable. This study chooses to address the gap in the previous studies using the theoretical lenses of collaborative governance and ladder of citizenship participation for an ex-post analysis. This study is set to advance the knowledge of community stakeholding in PPP projects, looking at how the institutionalized framework and governance arrangement accommodate the host communities. The study adopts a multi-theoretical, community-based participatory research. Data were gathered and analysed through mixed-method research.

## **2.2 Theoretical framework: a multi-theoretical approach**

This study draws substantially from theories of collaborative governance and Arnstein's ladder of participation. Collaborative governance theory represents a conceptual map which incorporates components of governance systems including policy or program based inter-governmental co-operation. The model is applied in the context of the place or community in which the collaboration is taking place to accommodate various stakeholders in the collaborations (Kim, 2016;). This study employs a collaborative model put forward by Ansell and Gash (2008) to explore the involvement of communities in the implementation of infrastructural governance through a PPP policy framework in Lagos State. Ansell and Gash's emphasis on collaborative process focusing on dialogue, trust-building, commitment to the process and shared understanding is especially useful to the study as it allows the authors to think through the need to make the communities active stakeholders through effective participatory mechanisms as presented in the

collaborative governance framework. Collaborative model was used as an integrative model of analysis which harmonizes varying constructs relating to collaborative project governance.

Arnstein's age-long model which was developed in 1969 has current significant in major studies relating to public, community or citizenship participation (Jo & Nabatch, 2018; Mapfumo & Mutereko, 2020; Norton & Hughes, 2018). The model posits that participation is based on levels with a lot of inconsistencies and window dressing public participatory gradings. She describes levels of citizenship participation using ladder scale with eight steps refer to as "rungs" (Arnstein, 2015; 282). The conceptualisation of 'partnership' based on ladder spectrum is generative for grasping the contexts in which citizenship involvement as a partner is highly desirable over consultation. While the authors concede that "citizens control" remains elusive especially when viewed in the context of PPP framework, the partnership can work most effectively where there is organized power-base in the community by which the community representatives can be effectively involved in the collaborative efforts as major stakeholder.

### **3. DATA AND METHODS**

This section highlights and explains the various methods and methodologies used for data gathering and analysis.

**3.1 Study site and population of study:** This study was conducted in three out of the five administrative divisions of Lagos State. The divisions were selected on purpose because they are the divisions with the most community-based PPP infrastructural projects. The projects that constitute our case study are The Deep Sea Port (Badagry, The Lekki Free Trade Zone (Epe) and Terminal Project (Ikorodu). Overall, leaders of the 31 sub-communities affected by the projects (The *Baales*) and the paramount rulers in each division constituted the population of study at the community level. Others included top management staff in the Lagos State Office of Public-Private Partnership and members of different community groups in the Local Council jurisdiction (forums and community group's members) who participated in the survey.

### **3.2. Data collection instruments and sampling technique**

Data were collected using a blend of qualitative and quantitative instruments (mixed method). The processes involved in the two methods are explained as follows:

**Qualitative data:** For ease of representation and coordination, the population was grouped into two target groups. Group 1 involved participant from a public

agency, LOPPP (1 group interview) while group II represented participants from the community level. At the community, levels were representatives of the affected communities who were invited and participated in the focus group discussions (FGD) after which interviews were held with the divisional paramount rulers for further information and clarifications on issues that emanated from the FGDs (in all, 3 interviews were held across the divisions). To elicit a wider discussion on the subject, 10 discussants were purposely drawn from across the communities to participate in FGD in each division. The researcher conducted FGD firstly to address critical variables from the constructs of collaborative governance model while emerging themes from the discussions were addressed during the interview sessions with the paramount ruler in each division.

The instrument used for primary data collection included a pre-designed interview and FGD guides. These instruments were designed not as a strict rule but to assist the interviewer and FGD moderator against disjointedness and deviations. An audio recording device was used in strict compliance with research ethics. While secondary data were gathered through various documents including journals, PPP Manual for Lagos State, MoU between Lagos State Government, Local Council, private partner(s) and the communities affected by the project.

**3.3. Quantitative Method:** The participants from whom quantitative information was gathered were drawn at the Local Authority Development Office for the entire communities. The entire population across the three divisions was 841 (LBS, 2016). The authors employed an adjusted Yamane formula at 95% precision level to determine the sample size since the population is known (Smith, 2013). In all, 205 questionnaires were distributed across the divisions based on the proportion of each division to the entire population in the following order: Badagry (79), Ikorodu (66) and Epe (60). Of the 205 questionnaires distributed 146 questionnaires were correctly filled, returned and usable representing 71.2% rate of return. The questionnaires returned from active community group members in each of the division were as follows: Badagry (N= 47), Ikorodu (N= 50), and Epe (N = 49) giving a total sample of 146.

A survey questionnaire was designed using the various themes which were derived from literature to describe the constructs that make up institutional elements of the policy framework. The questionnaire was divided into two broad sections (A and B). Section A asked questions relating to the bio-data of the participant. This was considered necessary because the information assisted the researchers to analyse respondents' characteristics vis-à-vis their responses.

Section B captured the questions which this study sought to find answers to. The questions were 'Likert-styled'. Participants were asked to indicate their choice of responses from a 5-point continuum in order of magnitude from strongly which was rated 5 to Strongly Disagree which was rated 1.

**3.3. Data Analysis:** For qualitative data, interviews and FGD were transcribed and the information was interpreted and analysed using hermeneutics and thematic content analysis. Since ordinal data cannot be subjected to real quantifiable metrics, using descriptive statistics to present data features and Chi-square to ascertain whether a significant association exists in community members' responses to the study's research question. Location was used as a determinant variable using a non-parametric test, an alpha level of 0.05 to determine the level of the association after a chi-square test. Qualitative data were collected first after which the quantitative data were sourced from cluster II involving community groups (forum leaders, opinion leaders and civil societies). The instrument used was a structured questionnaire. Concurrently, those involving communities' heads and chiefs, public and private institutions (Cluster I and II). The outcome of the analysis from the two clusters was treated independently, analysed and interpreted and thereafter synthesized using a triangulated mixed-method analysis.

**3.4. Ethical Consideration:** The authors recognized the place of ethics in this study. The intents of the study together with information in respect of the study were made discussed and made available to all participants. Informed consents were sought at various stages through the design protocols and where digital audio recording (ADR) system was used. For anonymity and confidentiality, respondents were identified using alpha-numeric codes based on location and number on the attendance list e.g. first Badagry interviewee (BADINT01), No. 3 FGD participant from Ikorodu Division (IKDFGD03)

## **4. FINDINGS**

### **4.1 Institutionalizing community roles within the PPP policy implementation framework**

A major research question that the current study tried to address was to find out if there was any role that the host communities played within the PPP implementation framework as a stakeholder. Although, the policy statement that established PPP recognises the host community as stakeholders, community members largely expressed their non-inclusion in PPP project governance. Below



are few extracts of responses from the interviews and FGD held with community leaders which suggest that the host communities to the projects would wish to be part of the collaboration but they felt alienated:

*-We asked them questions concerning our stake, their plans and our benefits now and in the future. (BADINT01)*

*-We are not involved in the decision-making process? (EPEFGD03)*

*-Government lacks the framework or blueprint to follow-up the operations of the private investors in the communities (IKDFGD01).*

From community members’ responses above, it is evident that the communities seem not to know of any framework upon which the relationship was established.

To elicit further information, questionnaires were distributed amongst community groups. Table 1 illustrates the data obtained from across the divisions when a question was asked on whether they agreed that the existing institutional framework is redesigned to create specific roles for the community in the project implementation framework. Table 1 shows the descriptive and crosstab analysis of quantitative responses.

**Table 1: Participants’ responses that the government need not institutionalize role for the host communities in the implementation framework**

LOCATION OF STUDY		SD	D	SWA	A	SA	TOTAL
	Count	0	0	6	19	22	47
Badagry	% within location	0.00%	0.00%	12.80%	40.40%	46.8%	100%
Epe	Count	0	1	2	4	43	50
	% within location	0.00%	2.00%	4.00%	8.00%	86.0%	100%
Ikorodu	Count	2	2	9	16	20	49
	% within location	4.10%	4.10%	18.40%	32.70%	40.8%	100%
Total	Count	2	3	17	39	85	146
	% within location	1.40%	2.10%	11.60%	26.70%	58.2%	100%
NOTE: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagreed, SWA = Somewhat Agreed, A = Agreed, SA = Strongly Agreed							

Source: Field Survey Data, 2019

Table 1 shows responses based on locations. The table illustrates that the majority of the respondents across study sites concurred that there was the need for the government to clarify community role in the policy institutional framework. Results from Badagry show that 46.8% of the community members strongly agreed that the government needs to design a framework that will specify the role

of the host community. 40.4% agreed while 12% somewhat agreed. A similar trend in response was experienced in all the divisions as shown in the table above. None of the respondents in Badagry and Ikorodu division disagreed with this view. Furthermore, in Ikorodu, 86.0% strongly agreed while the remaining respondents of 14% agree to a varying extent with the statement. The overall response to the question was very positive. Of the 149 respondents who completed the questionnaire, 124 respondents (over 80%) agreed in varying degrees that there was a need to redesign the existing institutional framework to create a role for the host communities. A minority of less than 4% expressed disagreement in varying degrees. Other respondents to the question include the 12% who somewhat agreed with the statement. However, the value of the Chi-squared test statistic is given as ( $\chi^2 = 31.106$ ,  $df = 8$ ,  $p\text{-value} = 0.01$ ), Since the  $p$ -value is less than 0.05; it, therefore, indicates a shred of clear evidence that there is a statistically significant association between the location of respondents and the extent to which they agreed with the statement that the institutional framework for the implementation of PPP project should be redesigned to carve a clarified role for the host communities as stakeholders across various research locations.

Both qualitative and quantitative data correlates on the need to re-design the existing PPP implementation framework to carve an institutionalized role that will enhance collaboration and involvement with the host communities as stakeholders.

#### **4.2 Established communication link between stakeholders as a prerequisite for real community involvement**

The information generated during interview at the Office of PPP (LOPPP) established that apart from the statutory duty of LOPPP, the office was meant to provide information and get feedback from members of the public. In his response, the officer pointed that information dissemination and maintenance of good interaction with the public and among stakeholders was “one of the reasons why our office was created and the LOPPP was open to the people” (*OPPINT001*). However, the common view expressed at various communities during interviews and FGD was that there was “no established communication link as such” (*EPEINT001*). It was plainly pointed out by a community leader at a study site that:

*-Government lacks the framework or blueprint to follow-up the operations of the private investors in the communities (IKDFGD01).*

The above response points to the fact that the views expressed by the community leaders contradicted that of the officer at the LOPPP. Questionnaires were also distributed to members of the community groups to elicit wider responses in respect of communication framework. As illustrated in Table 2, the participants responded to the question of whether there was an established communication system between them (as community active groups) and either the government or the PH.

**TABLE 2: Participants responses that there was an established communication link between the communities and key stakeholders**

LOCATION OF STUDY		SD	D	SWA	A	SA	TOTAL
	Count	1	6	22	13	5	47
Badagry	% within location	2.10%	12.8%	46.8%	27.7%	10.6%	100%
Epe	Count	7	8	29	5	1	50
	% within location	14.0%	16.0%	58.0%	10.0%	2.0%	100%
Ikorodu	Count	11	18	16	2	2	49
	% within location	22.4%	36.7%	32.7%	4.1%	4.1%	100%
Total	Count	19	32	67	20	8	146
	% within location	13.0%	21.9%	45.9%	13.7%	5.5%	100%

**NOTE:** SD=Strongly Disagree, D= Disagreed, SWA= Somewhat Agreed, A= Agreed, SA= Strongly Agreed

Source: Field Survey, 2019

Overall, the majority of respondents in Table 2 somewhat agreed to a very low extent that there existed a communication link between other stakeholders and the communities in the provision of public infrastructure. In Badagry, members of the community somewhat agreed. Their agreement, in essence, indicates that established communication link made a high impact on the community groups as stakeholders. Moreover, community groups at Ikorodu agreed, to a very low extent. Conversely, members of the community groups at Epe Division disagreed with the statement. This implies that Epe community groups largely disagreed that an established communication link exists between their communities and other parties to the project i.e. the government and the investors. However, the value of the Chi-squared test statistic ( $\chi^2$ ) is given as 32.707, the degree of freedom (df) equals eight and the corresponding p-value was 0.00. Since the p-value was less than 0.05; the result, therefore, indicates a statistically significant association between the location of the respondents and the extent to which they agreed with the statement that an established communication link exists between the handlers of the project, government, and the community. The data from Badagry community groups significantly reveal that location influenced the responses.

Our analysis of the MoU signed by key stakeholders and representatives of the communities reveals that free and effective access to information from the project handlers to the community's form part of the agreement reached. Article 4 (1b) of the MoU reads in part that:

“Government shall ensure that members of the affected villages/communities have free and effective access to information relevant to their understanding and participation in the LFTZ”

The extent to which the government is fulfilling this obligation remains a subject of much debate in all the divisions. Several issues emanated during the further analysis of qualitative and quantitative data. Firstly, there seems to be a strong correlation in the quantitative and qualitative data obtained across all the divisions. However, there was a deviation from the data obtained in Badagry and the data obtained from the other divisions. Further investigation revealed that the Badagry Sea Port was at the stage of procurement. Also, the project witnessed strong opposition from certain groups in the affected communities. There was an indicator that the strong opposition may have influenced the need for the PH to develop communication and persuasive strategy to win the trust and support of the opposing community. This observation remains a proposition which our study did not attempt to establish.

## **5. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS**

Having presented the data obtained from the field and analysed the same in the previous section. This section integrates findings and broadly discusses issues that emerged from the analysis earlier presented in line with the objective of this paper. This paper aims to examine how the PPP implementation framework in Lagos State policy on PPP accommodates the host communities in the project governance. From the results of qualitative and quantitative analysis, we deduced that the communities, beyond compensation, would wish to have specific roles entrenched for them in the policy framework of PPP. This is in line with the submission made by King et al. 1998 in a study that investigates the essence of authentic participation. The authors demonstrate that community members desire to play roles at every stage of the project and they wish to be involved in decision-making processes. One unanticipated finding was that the LOPPP was discrete about the substance of the institutional framework that should ordinarily accommodate the host communities in the PPP project implementation. The bureaucrats at the Office of PPP did not see the need to create specific roles and responsibilities for the host communities. The thought expressed by the senior public servant at LOPPP, though somewhat unexpected, it is consistent with

earlier findings by scholars in this brain area (Mapfuno & Mutereko 2020; Carpentier 2017). The result, therefore, provides further support for the hypothesis that public administrators/managers are usually not favourably disposed to sharing roles and responsibility in the implementation of government policy.

Another important finding which is somewhat connected to the above is the misconception expressed by public managers and administrators that advocacy and community involvement are the same concepts. They ended their interaction with the active members of the communities after the initial advocacy visits that launch the projects. Ironically, the obligations of facilitating the policy re-design rest on the administrators. They, however, did not see the need to take further action that will facilitate effective community participation. The communities were left to the dictates of the PH and private investors. This invariably remains an inhibiting factor that places limitations on the communities as stakeholders in the implementation of the policy. Theoretically, Arnstein illustrates this on her ladder of participation spectrum that mere consultation is not participation. She describes this as mere tokenism; it is barely a rung away from non-participation. Language and communication experts in the field of social participation buttress this dichotomy (Carpentier, 2011). King et al. (1998) in his expository finding confirms that it is not impossible for administrators and public managers to “keep doing the ‘wrong’ thing all along”. It is, therefore, necessary for administrators to be acquainted with the policy. They also need to undergo training and re-training in collaborative governance management to effectively involve communities in decision making as far as possible. Collaborative involvement should foster a mutually beneficial relationship rather than just informing or consulting. Therefore, beyond a brief formalised bureaucratic theatrics; community engagement in policy implementation is a long-term process that requires both formal and informal knowledge and skills.

Our survey on information dissemination and interactions across the divisions shows that different interactive approaches were adopted by the PHs across the divisions. However, occasional meetings remain the major channel through which the project handlers communicate with the community leaders. Synthesis of both qualitative and quantitative reveals a wide communication gap between the PH and interest groups across the communities. This indicates the inadequacies and ineffectiveness of the existing information system. Given these findings, there are empirical studies that have revealed that PPP policies are notable for lack of information disclosure to other stakeholders (Ismail et al., 2019; Hodge & Greve,

2016). The finding, therefore, accords with Ismail et al. who reveal in their studies that the “reporting framework for PPP is inadequate and not capable of addressing the transparency and multifaceted accountability paradigm of the policy” (Ismail et al., 2019:5). A possible explanation for this inadequate communication system may be attributed to the submission made by Hudon (2011) that community members often lack the intellectual, social and political skills required to be directly engaged in technical public issues like PPP. He, therefore, suggests an indirect form of engagement where only representatives are recognized. In contrast, Stafford (2014) argued that it is sometimes more important to share technical details when undertaking a public project and programs with all the community members. It is important to note that the theoretical explanations given by the authors as to why communities are not engaged in a meaningful dialogic relationship would have to be interpreted with caution since there is no empirical evidence to establish these findings yet. Notwithstanding, the domestication of the Freedom of Information (FOI) Act effective in Lagos State in 2014 confers certain inalienable rights to any community member or group to acquire any information from the LOPPP because democratic governance is primarily about the right to be involved in governance choices and processes. A significant conclusion drawn from this finding is that the policy model that best describes the existing communication between the government and private investor on the one hand, and the host communities, on the other hand, is “top-down”. Although this policy model has been criticised for its mechanistic (Cloete & Wissnick, 2000) and paternalistic tendencies (Im, 2014). In contradiction, a study demonstrates that policy model has no significant impact on policy implementation, especially where the ideals of collaborative governance infuse the policy implementation process (Koontz & Newig, 2014).

## **6. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS**

While the theoretical and pragmatic arguments for PPPs are defensible, their implementation, particularly in emerging economies, has not been hitch-free. The paper established the need for PPP implementers (the bureaucrats) and the community active members to be re-orientated regarding the processes and dictates of infrastructural governance. Subsequently, a process that includes the host communities in project execution ought to be institutionalized in the policy implementation framework. The authors are not unaware of the legislative and administrative bottlenecks involved in policy redesign; therefore, it is recommended that where MoUs (which specifies the role of every stakeholder) are signed; parties to the agreement should abide by it. To sum up, this study

identifies some inadequacies in the existing PPP implementation framework in Lagos State and concludes that the host communities were poorly recognized and barely accommodated in the PPP infrastructural governance. The authors' inferences were drawn based on the findings made at the implementation agency as well as interactions with the host communities to the selected projects. The findings of this study may be further stretched by interested researchers who may wish to investigate those factors that are encumbrances for the PHs to meaningfully engage the host community in their operations. Moreover, this study also creates the opportunity for scholars who may wish to replicate this study in other states or at the national level of PPP policy implementation. Finally, the scope of this study centred on Lagos State PPP project governance, however, the findings from the study have profound global implications for practitioners as well as scholars in the field of policy analysis, public governance and development studies.

#### **REFERENCES:**

- Amsler, L. B. (2016). Collaborative Governance: Integrating Management, Politics and Law. *Public Administration Review*, 76(5), 700-711.
- Arnstein, S. R. (2015). A ladder of citizen participation. In L. G. T. RICHARD & F. STOUT (Eds.), *The City Reader* (6th ed., pp. 279). London: Routledge.
- Bamidele, A., Adenusi, R. & Osunsanmi, T. 2016. State of Infrastructure Procurement in Lagos State, Nigeria: The PPP Approach. *Global Journal of Management And Business Research* [Online]. <https://journalofbusiness.org/index.php/GJMBR/article/view/2439> [Accessed 03/12/2018].
- Bekele, M. L., (2019). Community Participation in Urban Infrastructure Development: Case study at Bishoftu Town, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Research in Business Studies and Management*. Vol. 6 (1),44-51 [online] <https://www.ijrbmsm.org/papers/v6-i1/4.pdf> Accessed 24/3/2020
- CESD (2019) Susty Events: Stakeholders' Roundtable On Public-Private Partnership In Lagos State. Center for Ethics & Sustainable Development Retrieved from <https://sustyvibes.com/susty-events-stakeholders-roundtable-public-private-partnership-lagos-state/> Accessed 9/2/2020
- Carpentier, N. (2017). The concept of participation. If they have access and Interact, do they really participate? In L. Iannelli & P. Musaro (Eds.), *Performative Citizenship. Public Art, Urban Design and Political Participation* (pp. 25-49). Prague: Mimesis.
- Cloete, F., Wissink, H. and De Coning, C. eds., 2006. *Improving public policy: From theory to practice*. Van Schaik Publishers.

- Di Maddaloni, F., & Davis, K. (2018). Project managers' perception of the local communities' stakeholders in megaproject: an empirical investigation in the UK. *International Journal of Project Management*, 36 (2018), 542-565.
- Gaventa, J., & Barrett, G. (2012). Mapping the Outcomes of Citizen Engagement. *World Development*, 40(12), 2399 - 2410.
- Hodge, G. & Greve, C. (2016). On Public-Private Partnership Performance. *Public Works Management & Policy*, (Vol. 22), 1-24.
- Hudon, P. A. (2011). A Critique of Public-Private Partnerships in Quebec. *Public Integrity*, 13, 257-274.
- ICRC (2013). National Policy on Public-Private Partnership PPP. Abuja: Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission.
- Ismail, S., Musawa Mubarak, S., & Ahmad, H. (2019). Transparency of public-private partnership (PPP): [online] <https://doi.org/10.1108/BEPAM-01-2018-0020> Accessed 23/4/2020
- Im, T. (2014). Bureaucracy in three different worlds: The assumptions of failed public sector reforms in Korea. *Public Organization Review*, 14, 577-596.
- Jordhus-Lier, D. (2015). Community resistance to megaprojects: The case of the N2 Gateway project in Joe Slovo informal settlement, Cape Town. *Habitat International*. (45) 169-176. [online] <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2014.02.006> Accessed 23/2/2020
- King, C., Feltey, K. & Susel, B. (1998). The question of participation: Toward authentic public participation in public administration. *Public administration review*, 317-326.
- Koontz, T. M., & Newig, J. (2014). From Planning to Implementation: Top-Down and Bottom-Up Approaches for Collaborative Watershed Management. 42(3), 416-442. [online] <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/psj.12067> Accessed 27/12/2019
- LBS (2016). Abstracts of Local Government Statistics. Lagos Bureau of Statistics, Lagos Ministry of Statistics, Budget and Economic Planning, Alausa, Ikeja
- LSG 2019. Lagos State Government Policy Focus <http://governor.lagosstate.gov.ng/>
- Lawanson, T. & Agunbiade, M., 2018. Land governance and megacity projects in Lagos, Nigeria: the case of Lekki Free Trade Zone, *Area Development and Policy*, 3:1, 114- 131,
- Leigland, J. (2018). Public-Private Partnerships in Developing Countries: The Emerging Evidence-based Critique. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 33(1), 103-134. [online] <https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/lkx008> Accessed 4/3/2019



Mapfumo, L., & Mutereko, S. (2020). "Contextualising stakeholder participation in the governance of Harare's informal economy sector". [online] <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ijefs/issue/51660/670624> Accessed 4/4/2019

Moynihan, D. P., & Soss, J. (2014). Policy feedback and the politics of administration. *Public Administration Review*, 74 (3), 320-322.

Nederhand, J., & Klijn, E. (2019). Shareholder Involvement in Public-Private Partnerships: Its Influence on the Innovative Character of Projects and on Project Performance. *Administration and Society*. 51 (8), 1200-1226.

Stafford, J. (2014). Improving understanding of community engagement on infrastructure projects. from Association for Consultancy & Engineering [online] <http://www.infrastructure-intelligence.com/article/nov-2014/improving-understanding-community-engagement-infrastructure-projects> Accessed 15/2/2020

Smith, S. 2013. Determining Sample Size: How to Ensure You Get the Correct Sample Size. Florida Cooperative Extension Service Bulletin PE-1. Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences. University of Florida.