

**Necessity or Opportunity for Africa's Management Development?  
Public Private Partnerships for Enhancing Organisational  
Capabilities in Nigeria**

Osikhuemhe O. Okwilagwe and Christos Apostolakis

Authors Note

Osikhuemhe Okwilagwe\*, Faculty of Management, Bournemouth University

Dr Christos Apostolakis, Faculty of Management, Bournemouth University

\* Corresponding author

Contact:

Faculty of Management, Bournemouth University,

Executive Business Centre,

89 Holdenhurst Road,

Bournemouth,

BH8 8EB

United Kingdom

E-mail address: [ookwilagwe@bournemouth.ac.uk](mailto:ookwilagwe@bournemouth.ac.uk)

## **Abstract**

Policy transfer has been widespread in developing African countries aiming to implement initiatives that have been adopted in the past in another country (primarily a western one) when faced with a socio-economic crisis. Local regeneration partnerships being one of such policy initiatives are aimed at improving the quality of life of local communities where they are being implemented. They have been assorted endeavours of establishing partnership operation in a number of sub-Saharan countries in recent years. These partnership arrangements are embedded in local regeneration reform initiatives directed at achieving specific goals. They are expected to be designed to involve integrated responsibilities, obligations and requirements over a long-term agreement and are therefore subject to various uncertainties. It becomes imperative to investigate how certain collaboration elements facilitate partnerships working within certain contexts to achieve their intended goals. In this view, explicit attention is given to the collaboration elements; mutual interdependence, trust and transparency and how they facilitate the collaborative process of partnership arrangements in the context of a developing sub-Saharan African country, Nigeria. This investigation is carried out using data collected from semi-structured interviews carried out between March and April 2014 from key officials involved in local regeneration partnership arrangements. Findings indicate that transparency in the tendering process had a direct implication in boosting financiers' confidence. Trust among the partners was subject to the negotiated contract as it ensured that the partners adhered to their obligations and the effective management of all stakeholders groups was significant in ensuring the partnership's success.

Keywords: Mutual interdependence, Trust, Transparency, Collaborative Advantage, Public Private Partnerships, sub-Saharan Africa - Nigeria

## 1. Introduction

Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) have become increasingly predominant as an effective way of delivering policy interventions than government-led approaches. As governments growingly experience huge infrastructure investment requirements, budgetary constraints, economic and technological changes, partnerships are looked upon as alternative ways to finance and deliver certain government services (de Bettignies and Ross 2009; Drumwright, Cunningham, and Berger 2004). It has been argued that the changing governmental role of coordinating and offering public services has created a systematic shift from bureaucratic hierarchy to the market and furthermore to networks. In this respect, partnerships are regarded as a new form of governance (Clarke and Glendinning, 2002).

Ferrer, Kee, Newcomer and Boyer (2010, p.476), define partnerships as “long-term agreements between the government and private sector organisations in which the private organisation participates in the decision-making and delivery of a public good or service that has traditionally been provided by the public sector and in which the private sector shares in the risk of that agreement”. Local regeneration partnerships are thus argued to be an expression of the desire for and utility of such collaborations for the physical, economic and social renewal of areas which have been subject to decline (de Bettignies and Ross, 2009; Davis, 2002).

This trend began initially among industrialised countries, such as the UK in 1992, after the UK government announced its ‘Private Finance Initiative’ in the use of regeneration programs in cities like Manchester, Leeds and parts of London (Broadbent and Laughlin, 1999; Tsenkova, 2002). From this period onwards, the interest in partnerships grew rapidly to other developed countries, including Australia, United States, Canada, Germany, Japan and the Netherlands. Emerging economies, like the BRIC countries; Brazil, Russian Federation, India and China have also adopted partnerships as a better approach for keeping up with the growing need for sufficient and effective public services and have been used extensively in road infrastructure and urban transport. An example of this is the São Paulo Metro Line 4, in Brazil (Willoughby, 2013; Kateja 2012). Despite the decline of a sluggish world economy, the economic conditions in sub-Saharan Africa have remained generally robust and growth was projected at 5.25 percent a year in 2012-13. In order to address these developmental challenges, the governments in sub-Saharan Africa are now recognising that public private partnership work is probably the most effective way for them to go forward (Sanni and

Hashim, 2014). In these countries, PPPs have been used across various programs such as water, housing, transport and road infrastructure.

In 2013, the World Economic Forum estimated that greater investment of about \$1 trillion per annum was needed for regeneration programs such as infrastructure development. A funding gap that is advocated can be filled up by bringing together capital investments, as well as know-how from both the public and private sector (WEF, 2010). Furthermore, while the huge capital investment may be a reason for such partnerships (Andrews and Entwistle, 2010; de Bettignies and Ross, 2009), on the other hand, they also enable different organisations to support each other by ensuring more efficient mobilisation of resources; leveraging and capitalising on their complementary strengths and capabilities and addressing the nexus of local regeneration problems using more comprehensive approaches (Tsenkova, 2002).

In Nigeria, PPPs are beginning to play a key role in keeping up with the growing need for sufficient and effective public services. They are envisaged to play a significant in fulfilling the objectives of the National Integrated Infrastructure Master Plan (NIIMP) approved by the Federal Executive council in 2014. The Master Plan is a 30-year plan and is to be implemented using 10-year operational plans and 5-year medium-term plans (Leke, Fiorini, Dobbs, Thompson, Suleiman and Wright, 2014; World Bank, 2014). It has thus been suggested that the desire and need for local regeneration is one of reasons for the government of Nigeria to look at the practices of PPPs, as an estimated \$350 billion is needed by the country to meet infrastructure needs (AfDB, 2013a; World Bank, 2014).

The collaborative endeavours of partners in the partnership arrangement can help to shape and steer these local regeneration issues and also improve the chances of addressing them successfully (Lasker, Weiss and Miller, 2001). In other words, local regeneration partnerships have come to be symbolised by a wide range of projects which enhance the capacity of economic activities in Nigeria. Additionally, Huxham (1996) and Huxham and Vangen (2005), confirm that the aspiration of partnerships is to gain some form of collaborative advantage from their arrangements. As this distinguishing feature and overarching goal of partnerships is the key mechanism through which these partnerships gain an advantage over individual organisations in addressing local regeneration issues.

Macdonald and Chrisp (2005) and Lasker, Weiss and Miller (2001) state that the ability of a partnership to achieve some form of collaborative advantage is likely to be influenced by internal factors in the partnership such as the opportunistic behaviours exhibited by the partners, delays caused by renegotiations or cost overruns. They also argued that partnership working can also be influenced by factors in the external environment that are beyond the ability of any partnership to control, such as a change in the political climate where the partnership operates. Some authors have also argued that certain collaboration elements such as mutual interdependence, trust and transparency between partners appear significant for collaborative arrangements to progress (Willems and Van Doreen, 2012; Bovens, 2010; Brunetto and Farr-Wharton, 2007; Vangen and Huxham, 2003).

Nevertheless, the difficulties in reporting the potential benefits of any form of collaboration in a developing country have been raised from various research (Ramiah and Reich, 2006; Selsky and Parker, 2005; Miraftab, 2004; Otiso, 2003). According to Selsky and Parker (2005) and Otiso (2003), this maybe because the many partnerships that operate at sub-national levels do so quite often outside the attention of researchers and most of these activities are usually funded and published by donor agencies as promotional material. Miraftab (2004) suggested that political, social, economic and cultural environment greatly influenced partnerships in developing countries in ways that lead them to deliver outcomes opposite to those they claim. Mitchell-Weaver and Manning (1991, p.16), also argue that “partnerships need to be defined and categorised as to their role in development planning and decision making under different development strategies and at different scales of action”. Further to the these arguments, Selsky and Parker (2005) in their research on cross-sector partnerships to address social issues suggested that it was imperative to investigate how partners overcome or exploit sector differences to learn about their social issue, learn from each other, and/or encourage partners learning to reach intended outcomes.

To contribute to this limited literature, the links between the collaboration elements; mutual interdependence, trust and transparency in facilitating collaborative processes in local regeneration partnerships arrangements are investigated in this chapter from the context of a developing African country. This is in contrast with most studies that have focused on these regeneration partnerships in developed countries and are consequently better reported than in developing ones (Couch, Oliver and Borstinghaus, 2010; Ramiah and Reich, 2006; Selsky and Parker, 2005). This chapter will explore the capacity of partnership organisations to

benefit from the full potential of their collaboration and the effectiveness of their partnership arrangement to achieve their intended goals using the context of a developing African country, Nigeria. This investigation is carried out using data collected from semi-structured interviews carried out between March and April 2014 from key officials involved in local regeneration partnership arrangements.

The chapter provides the theoretical basis for the research by developing a theoretical framework that integrates the literature on collaborative advantage in partnership arrangements. The following section presents the methodological approach and describes the context of the empirical research and the case study. Following from this, the discussion of the findings are presented. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the contribution of the research, managerial implications, the research limitations and suggestions for further research.

## **2. Public Private Partnerships: A Necessity or an Opportunity?**

### **2.1. Local Regeneration Public Private Partnerships**

The process of local regeneration through infrastructure development (both economic and social infrastructure) by the public sector could be slow and inefficient. This quandary of inefficient public infrastructure delivery is worsened in developing African countries by government coffers not being able to finance and deliver on infrastructure development so as to meet population growth and ease the pressure on existing infrastructure (Willoughby, 2013). In such contexts, PPPs can be a viable way forward to overcome the limitations of the traditional delivery models; by accelerating major rehabilitation and renewal projects; particularly the ones with large capital expenditure involved and are also best suited to Greenfield infrastructure projects with their greatest potential positioned in emerging and developing African countries (WEF, 2013). Like any other delivery model, PPP arrangements can be stalled with difficulties preventing them from getting off the ground or be prone to opportunistic activities, hence, they need to be properly structured to ensure they run a successful lifecycle (Farlam, 2005).

## **2.2. Collaborative Advantage: the notion**

It is evident from literature that the collaboration process from the formation stage through to the evaluation stage of a PPP lifecycle can be a difficult journey for public and private sector partners. Although, these forms of collaboration are usually taken to be a good thing, Asthana, Richardson and Halliday (2002) argue that it is significant to determine the conditions or factors that increase the probability of successful collaborations emerging. Himmelman (1996, p.28), defines collaboration as “exchanging information, altering activities, sharing resources and enhancing the capacity of another for mutual benefit and to achieve a common purpose”.

In the context of PPPs, Gray (1996) offered a framework conceptualised along two dimensions in which she classified different inter-organisational collaborations; the factors that motivate partners to collaborate and the type of outcomes expected. According to this framework, collaborations involving collective strategies on how partners can implement a shared vision can be labelled as partnerships, whereby through their collaborative capacity, the partners gain appreciation of their interdependence.

Furthermore, the value of collaboration could be identified within the capacity of partners from different organisations to combine their resources and expertise in order to create and sustain successful partnership working; this notion has been termed collaborative advantage (Kanter, 1994; Huxham 1996). Giving the high investment in resources involved in partnerships, it will often be difficult to justify collaborating except when real advantage can be gained from it. According to Huxham (1996, p.14), “Collaborative advantage will be achieved when something unusually creative is produced- perhaps an objective is met – that no organisation could have produced on its own and when each organisation, through the collaboration, is able to achieve its own objectives better than it could alone”. The emphasis of this definition is that it focuses on the need for each individual organisation to achieve its own objectives better than it could alone and from the recognition that it is a necessary requirement for successful outcomes of the collaboration.

Apostolakis (2004) and Kanter (1994) further argued that collaborative advantage defines a high value and ambitious form of collaboration and it is vital to the growing practice of partnerships. Consequently, when partners are encountering challenges in operationalising their strategies, according to Huxham and Vangen (2004), the main values of

the concept of collaborative advantage can raise the profile of collaboration and legitimise it as an activity worthy of resource investment. Partners therefore need to engage in a continuous process of encouraging the collaborative processes within the partnership working. Considering that collaborative advantage can maximise the value gained when collaborating, the theoretical framework which guides this chapter is the theory of collaborative advantage. The theory of collaborative advantage is to support partners who seek to understand and capture the complexity of collaborative advantage in practice and convey it in a way that will seem real to those who experience it in their partnership process (Huxham and Vangen, 2005). This helps reinforces the rationale for translating the methodologies of the theory into a different geographical context.

### **2.3. Collaboration Elements in a Public Private Partnership Working Context**

Looking inwards into region-based economic and social issues many PPPs experience local context factors that are likely to make achievement of collaborative advantage challenging. These context specific factors are influential for the applicability of new policy approaches in any geographical context; therefore it is useful to conceptualize the collaboration elements in a partnership working as close as possible to the geographical contexts the PPPs operate in (Faehnle and Tyrvaenen, 2013; Slater, Frederickson, Thomas, Wiold, & Potter 2007). Furthermore, according to Hudson and Hardy (2002), partnership working can be laden by excessive bureaucracy and cumbersome working arrangements. In such instances, bureaucracy can reveal an individual partner organisation's true intentions.

Defining the relevant collaboration elements in partnership working within its context can assist in exploring the concepts of collaboration and collaborative advantage further. Therefore, taking this into consideration, collaboration elements in partnership working in the context of this chapter are defined as (a) the "*mutual interdependence*" of the partners in the partnership arrangement; (b) "*trust*" between partners in the partnership working and (c) "*transparency*" in the decision making processes.

Lachapelle and Mccool (2011), Lookwood (2010), Forrer *et al.* (2010) and Slater *et al.* (2007) argue that trust and transparency of partners is increasingly considered to be significant proponents of a successful partnership working. In other words, any activity that is seen to be non-opportunistic and to increase the partnership working experience, alongside



the expectation to achieve the partnership goals increases collaborative advantage between the partners. These collaboration elements would now be defined and discussed in relation to the collaborative advantage theory.

### **2.3.1. Mutual interdependence, trust and transparency as enablers of collaborative partnership working**

Furthermore, within the context of the debates above, researchers have also argued that collaborative advantage is the proximal outcome of partnership working that gives them their unique advantage (Kanter, 1994; Huxham, 1996). This debate has benefited from the support of various researches conducted in developed countries; Wilson (2014) explored key factors in the dynamics of the collaborative process and identified both congruence and discord in the perspectives of academics and employers in Northern Ireland. Yet, it is a testable theory that can be investigated based on the underlying assumptions of collaborative advantage and in a reasonably clear way of asking the members of these partnerships in another empirical context if their experiences conform to these underlying assumptions of the theory of collaborative advantage.

It is imperative to note that there is the danger that PPPs are mistaken as models that could be implemented without restriction in every geographical context. Within the context of developing countries, such as sub-Saharan African countries Mirafteb (2004) suggested that political, social, economic and cultural environment greatly influenced partnerships in a way that led them to deliver outcomes opposite to those they claim. According to Rein and Stott (2009) it is often difficult to assess whether the good intentions behind partnerships are translated into real benefits for both partners and the intended beneficiaries. In their study on six cross-sector partnerships in Southern Africa, they found out that proper monitoring and evaluation processes were usually absent in these partnerships. They concluded that the potential value of partnerships therefore lies in their ability to deliver tangible developments in social and economic infrastructure and the opportunities they can give to relatively declining areas of a community.

This chapter contributes to this debate by reporting research that investigated mutual interdependence, trust and transparency from a collaborative advantage theory perspective against the experiences of key officials involved in local regeneration PPPs in Nigeria, as it has been established in the literature theoretically and empirically as a paramount theory tool

under which PPP arrangements can be examined, based on the value they add to the partnership working (Vangen and Huxham, 2003; Huxham, 1996). Rein and Stott (2009, p.86) emphasise that there is a “there is a real danger when replicating partnership models and projects as certain factors may not be taken into account, for what has being proven successful in one context can be valuable both as a learning resource and as an inspiration, but cannot necessarily be transferred directly, in the same form, to a new context, without a thorough and locally informed analysis of the new environment”. Considering the political, cultural, social and economic diversity of African countries, collaborative advantage theory provides the tool to investigate how partners benefit from the full potential of their collaboration and influence the capacity of their partnership to achieve their intended goals.

### **2.3.1.1. Mutual interdependence of the partners in the partnership arrangement**

From the discussion in the previous sections, the chapter conceptualizes mutual interdependence in arrangements as involving the collaborative processes that contributes to and strengthens the partnership working, for instance, commitment and ownership, resource and information sharing, collaborative decision making, community involvement, collaborative communication and governing of partner organisations (Huxham and Vangen, 2005; Apostolakis, 2004; Hudson and Hardy, 2002). Mutual interdependence thus acts as an incentive to enter into partnership arrangements and motivates partners to pursue collective goals. The application of partnership work in sub-Saharan Africa has been based upon the argument by all sector participants that it can flourish only if stable communication channels are established. Partnerships have been operating, although lack of capacity and policy direction, mistrust among government and other implementing agencies, policy bias against PPP, high participation costs, low technology, socio-cultural and macro-economic issues, delay in negotiation, and poor performance are among the challenges that one can identify affecting the smooth management and implementation of the PPP projects in sub-Saharan Africa (Sanni and Hashim, 2014).

According to Lasker, Weiss and Miller (2001), the collaborative advantage that partnerships achieve is reflected in the way partners think about the partnership’s goals, strategies, the type of activities the partnership carries out, the partnership delivery and the relationship the partnership develops with the local community. The innovative interventions and holistic functioning of partnerships are likely to be revealed in the development of

strategic plans and partnership delivery which have a considerable potential for success; the achievement of the partnership goals are likely to be reflected in the scope of the partnership efficiency and management effectiveness as part of their collaborative advantage.

Furthermore, the capacity of PPP arrangements to identify and concentrate on the issues that matter to the community, to communicate how its activities will deal with these issues, to evaluate its activities and to obtain wide spread community participation can strengthen the sustainability of the partnership, thus allowing it adequate time for its activities to have a meaningful influence on the delivery of local regeneration initiatives and consequently have long-term effect on outcomes (Cropper, 1996).

### **2.3.1.2. Trust between partners in the partnership working**

Partnerships are characterised by mutually beneficial interactions of partners and the expectation that these partners would act in favour of the partnership arrangement (Forrer *et al.*, 2010). In other words, positive actions of the partners to decrease opportunistic activities will increase their trust in the partnership. According to Hudson and Hardy (2002, p.57) “development and maintenance of trust is the basis for the closest, most enduring and most successful partnerships”.

According to Krishnan, Martin and Noorderhaven (2006), trust is suggested to bring about good faith in the intent, reliability, and fairness of partner behaviour. In this chapter, trust is defined as the expectation that a partner organisation can be relied upon to fulfil its obligation and will behave in a predictable manner, and will act fairly when the possibility for opportunism is present (Zaheer, McEvily and Perrone, 1998). It plays a key role in the development and sustainability of long-term collaborations which allows for practical interpretation of partner intentions, facilitates more open communication and it reduces the potential for conflict, resource sharing, strategic flexibility and predictability (Seppänen, Blomqvist & Sundqvist, 2007).

Trust is also suggested to have different effects on partnership arrangements depending on the environmental and internal factors within which partners it interacts (Lachapelle and McCool, 2011). Therefore, it is useful to conceptualize trust as close as possible to the geographical contexts the partnerships operate in (Faehnle and Tyrvaenen, 2013; Slater *et al.*, 2007). As argued by Zaheer and Zaheer (2006), Ng, Lau and Nyaw (2007)

and Dyer and Chu, (2000), how trust is perceived, the institutional and cultural support for trust can vary considerably across national contexts and may also have an effect on the partners opinions and awareness of trust. Moreover, as trust is a context specific concept, partnerships are likely to experience local context factors that make it more difficult for them to achieve collaborative advantage (Appuhami, Perera and Perera, 2011). To establish and sustain trust, throughout a partnership is not an easy process; this has been attributed to the complexity that is attached to the formation of the partnership arrangements and to uncertainty within its environment (Lachapelle and McCool, 2011). From the partnership work produced in these sub-Saharan countries, it seems that building trust is a complex endeavour, heavily loaded with ethical, social, and cultural issues. These challenges affect significantly the policy and production areas with scepticism and concerns regarding private-sector involvement, and thus affects partnership operation (Ezezika *et al.*, 2013).

### **2.3.1.3. Transparency in the decision making processes**

Transparency is defined as the visibility of a decision-making process and it is a requirement, which is grounded in governance ethics, of each partner organisation's right to know about matters and decisions that affect the partnership arrangement (Lookwood, 2010). Decision support systems such as detailed information indicating the reason and procedures behind each decision reached and the clarity and justification of every particular course of action is vital (Willems and Van Doreen, 2012).

Akkermans, Bogerd and van Doremalen (2004) argue that transparency in partnerships is as a result of reinforcing dynamic interactions between partners. They also state that the more partners work closely together, the more they will trust each other and the more mutual their collaborative working. This in addition will improve their performance level when working together, while further improving trust in the collaborative process. Performance reporting is also an important aspect of transparency; it is essential that these partnerships regularly disclose their progress through various mechanisms such as annual reports, reports of achievements as against intended goals and management effectiveness evaluations (Forrer *et al.*, 2010, Lockwood, 2010).

## **2.4. Addressing Nigeria's Infrastructure Funding Gap through Local Regeneration**

### **Partnerships**

Nigeria is viewed as an emerging market, a middle income economy with fast developing financial, service, telecommunication, and entertainment sectors. To better measure the size of its economy, the country re-based its GDP in April 2014 from \$454 billion in 2012 and \$510 to 2013 by changing its base year from 1990 to 2010; this brought the country's GDP ahead of South Africa's GDP of \$354 billion, making Nigeria the 26th largest economy in the world from the previous 30th position (Leke *et al.*, 2014). These new figures can be attributed to the attraction of international investors since 2009 to the country's strong growth indices, enhanced macroeconomic stability, increase in population and unsaturated markets (Masetti, 2014, AfDB, 2013a). Furthermore, the on-going economic reforms in Nigeria have also aided the country as the largest economy in Africa. These economic reforms have influenced the country's institutional environment through the process of decentralization, leading to a raise in privatisation and commercialisation (Olaseni and Alade, 2012).

Another feature of the economic reform process has been the introduction of PPPs targeted at the local regeneration of communities through infrastructure development. With the rapid growth of the country's population which currently stands at about 174 million, and the increase in rural to urban migration, there is the need to mitigate the pressure this growth puts on housing, energy and to consider other social concerns; such as poverty and the deterioration of the local environment (AfDB 2013a). However, with the responsibilities for addressing local regeneration issues passed on from federal to state levels, the State Governments are expected to do more with the available financial funding in maintaining local infrastructure and service provision (Babatunde, Opawole and Akinsiku, 2012).

The desire and need for infrastructure development could indicate why PPPs as a policy approach has extended to various states in the country (Olaseni and Alade, 2012). The collaborative endeavours of partners in the partnership arrangement can help to shape and steer these local regeneration issues and also improve the chances of addressing them successfully (Lasker, Weiss and Miller, 2001). In other words, local regeneration partnerships have come to be symbolized by a wide range of projects which enhance the capacity of economic activities in Nigeria. According to Couch *et al.* (2010), when policy makers in a

country are faced with a new crisis, there is usually the trend to use or adopt solutions that have been implemented in the past or implemented in another country.

Though Nigeria has become Africa's largest economy, it still lags behind South Africa in terms level of economic development, needless say the cumulative experiences of PPPs that South Africa has. Thus, Nigeria still has a long way off in bridging the gap in infrastructure development (Babatunde, Opawole and Akinsiku, 2012). The on-going reforms in the public sector can only affirm the need for the adoption of PPPs in the country. Oluwasanmi and Ogidi (2014) state that the government is moving progressively towards a private sector driven economy and one of the major objectives is to facilitate the effective implementation of necessary policies such as enabling laws to regulate the PPP arrangements.

Furthermore, in order to promote the implementation of PPPs in the country, the ICRC Act was enacted into law in 2005 by the government to ensure adherence to best practices (ICRC, 2009). The Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission (ICRC) was also established as a Federal Government Agency tasked with the responsibility of monitoring PPPs by an Act of Parliament the same year. The ICRC has the mandate to regulate the PPP environment; develop the relevant legislation, guidelines and specific procedures for PPPs and to monitor compliance of PPP contract (ICRC, 2009).

There has been some degree of success in the implementation of PPPs since 2001; an example of this is in the revitalising of the power sector in 2014 leading to an improved power supply per day. Also in the transportation sector as seen in the modernization of the Abuja-Kaduna railway line is at 46% completion and the Lagos-Kano and Lagos-Ibadan lines have been rehabilitated, where access to local communities have been increased as well as reduction in travel time to these communities (AfDB, 2013b). This is amid a few past failures in the quest to fully implement PPP arrangements; the rehabilitation of the Lagos-Ibadan Expressway into five lanes which was a concession agreement with Bicourtney Nigeria Ltd failed because a financier could not be got for the concession, this was inevitably reverted to the traditional procurement method of contracting (Oluwasanmi and Ogidi (2014). Another failure was recorded in the PPP arrangement between the Federal government and the State Governments of Kogi and Nasarawa for the construction of the Guto-Bagana bridge over the River Benue. According to Oluwasanmi and Ogidi (2014), the failure of this arrangement was due to one or more of the partners not being able to meet up with the terms of the contractual agreement.

From the discussion above, it can be argued that although considerable changes in reforms across various sectors are taking place in Nigeria, this is evident with the establishment of institutions with the relevant authority to promote PPPs, it might be too soon to praise the commitment of the Federal and State Governments towards considering the adoption and implementing PPPs, the willingness of interest groups to adopt the policy or to depict that there is a favourable PPP policy climate. Consequently, Nigeria provides a novel context for investigating mutual interdependence, trust and transparency from a collaborative advantage theory perspective against the experiences of key officials involved in local regeneration PPPs in the country.

### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1. Research Strategy**

To understand this notion of collaborative advantage between public and private sector partners, a qualitative case study approach is used. A case study research is extensively used to explore the opinions and behaviour of individuals and groups within organizations (Gibbert, Ruigrok and Wicki, 2008). Case studies rely on multiple sources of evidence, with the data converging through triangulation, and, as a result, they benefit from the development of the theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis. This helps to generate rich and contextual interpretations of the data collected (Yin, 2009). Case study research is a beneficial approach where there is little previous empirical research and also in situations where there are complex and multiple processes, thus necessitating the use of a qualitative, explorative approach (Yin, 2009). Eisenhardt (1989, p. 534) defines a case study as "a research strategy which focuses on understanding the dynamic present within its natural settings". Case studies are advocated as methodological tools for providing descriptions and to test theories. They are the preferred strategy for asking "how" and "why" questions, the researcher has very little control over the events and the entire focus lies on an existing phenomenon within a real life context (Yin, 2009). The developing African country context provides an opportunity to study PPPs outside of the developed world and to test whether the theories developed in the developed world makes sense in this context.

Though a single case is used in this research, the participants were from the public and the private sectors to provide a rich research context. More specifically, interviews were carried out with participants from government organisation, regulatory and advisory bodies, funding organisations, financial and investment organisations, consulting and infrastructure development firms.

### **3.2. Research design, case selection and case description**

The poor condition of roads throughout the country is quite evident due to low quality of construction and maintenance (ADF, 2010). Road networks are vital to the country's economic growth because about 80% of Nigerian traffic (including people and goods) are conducted by road. However, it is estimated that about 42% of federal roads, 70% of state roads and 90% of local government roads are in poor and unmaintained condition (AfDB, 2013b). The case selected involved the building and designing of a toll road to link various communities within Lagos, a Western State in Nigeria. According to (OPPP, 2011), one million motor vehicles are estimated to be stationed within Lagos State, and a daily traffic flow of about 500,000 motor vehicles to and fro from the commercial business centre of the state to other environs (LCC, 2015).

The toll road partnership was signed in 2006 and it was a partnership among a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) and the State Government. The partnership was formed based on the Design, Finance, Build, Operate and Transfer (DFBOT) partnership model to construct and maintain a toll road for a 30-year concession agreement (Ekanem, 2010). The Financial close was achieved in 2008. The agreement was scheduled for two phases: the first phase was the expansion and upgrade of 49.4 km of road and the construction of a ramp. The 50billion naira (US\$ 333 million) estimated project cost financed by the SPV was to be recovered through charging tolls, advert fees, duct leases and so on (Ekanem, 2010). The second phase was the construction of 20km of coastal road. The State Government was able to provide 5billion naira of Mezzanine Finance and the Federal Government provided a sovereign support for the financing. Lagos State established the "Roads Law" in 2004 as an enabling framework for such PPP arrangements (LCC, 2015).

Though, the partnership was selected because it was the pioneering local regeneration partnership arrangement at a State level using the PPP model. The Lagos State Government in 2014 re-acquired the concession rights from the private partners 6 years into the



concession agreement. The decision to buy back the concession rights have been linked to the costs of construction resulting from the increase in interest rate and the request of the SPV company to raise toll collection on the first toll plaza by 20% and also to commence toll collection at the second toll plaza which is 10km from the first at the new rate. This was to enable the SPV raise the needed funds for further construction (Vanguard, 2013).

### 3.3. Data collection and analysis

The primary method for data collection was through semi-structured interviews. Fourteen interviews were conducted with participants drawn from seven organisations; the participants were from the public and private sectors; from different business units and from different managerial levels to ensure that diverse perspectives on the partnership had been captured. It was an opportunity to discover the roles and interactions that existed between the partners in the partnership arrangement. The selected participants were either currently or recently involved in the decision making process of the contract negotiation and in the operations and coordination of the activities of the partnership arrangement (summarised in table 1, p.16). The interviews followed a loose thematic guide. This was to allow the participants the freedom to express their views and raise new issues which they felt were important (Yin, 2009). The interviews were conducted on the premises of each organisation and they varied between 42 and 125 minutes.

Sector	Organisation	No. Interviews	Position of Participants
Public Sector	Government Institution	n = 4	Team leaders for core infrastructure, social infrastructure, contract administration and contract management and an infrastructure engineer
Public Sector	Economic Reform Agency	n = 1	Director
Public Sector	Regulatory Agency	n = 1	Director
Private Sector	Infrastructure Development Institution	n = 1	Director
Private Sector	External Consultant	n = 1	PPP Expert and Consultant
Private Sector	Financial and Investment Adviser	n = 1	Director
Private Sector	International Funding Body	n = 5	Transport Specialist, Economist, Disbursement Officer, Procurement Officer, Private Sector Specialist

Table 1: Overview of the demographics of the participating organisations and participants as it came up from the research findings

The participants were asked to discuss their reasons for participating in the local regeneration partnership, their opinions related to the local regeneration partnership and their experiences of such collaborations, especially their experiences relating to the partnership collaborative processes and partnership working. Additional data was collected from some of the participants by way of documents such as policy frameworks and reports on the partnership activities. This is to enable triangulation of findings in order to elicit a better understanding of the phenomenon been investigated and to improve the validity of the findings (Gibbert, Ruigrok and Wicki, 2008).

Data analysis was conducted in line with the process of engaging inductive theory with the use of case studies. The data analysis began by initially transcribing the interviews and thereafter the interview transcripts and documents collected were reviewed to identify significant issues and highlight patterns in the data. A thematic analysis approach was used to analyse the primary data collected with the assistance of the NVivo software. Analysing with NVivo consisted of logging of data movements, coding patterns, and mapping of conceptual categories alongside the thought progression of the researcher. This made all stages of the analytical process traceable and transparent, thus facilitating the production of a better detailed and comprehensive audit trail than a manual mapping of the process can allow.

According to Braun and Clark (2006), thematic analysis strategy offers the means by which to access and analyse the articulated perspectives of the participants so that they may be integrated into a model that looks to explain the social processes under investigation. This analytical strategy involved categorizing the data in terms of themes that related to the partners, the resources and their operations which are the building blocks of collaborative advantage partnership arrangements.

#### **4. Findings and Interpretations**

The analysis of the empirical data illustrated how three key collaboration elements identified in the context of Nigeria “*mutual interdependence*” of the partners in the partnership arrangement; “*trust*” between partners in the partnership working and “*transparency*” in the decision making processes are pertinent in facilitating the collaborative processes in partnerships and how the collaborative processes in turn influences the local regeneration partnership performance and outcomes of the partnership working.

Analysis of the empirical data involved carefully reviewing and coding the 14 interview transcripts. This also involved re-reading the transcripts while making constant comparison and coding important themes into categories as guided by the research question, however, the researcher was also open to unexpected findings. As this process progressed, categories were expanded and refined, and data were re-coded to fit the latest theme identified. Compilations of transcript-quotes representing the different themes were then reviewed for coherence, and these themes are used in selecting quotations for discussing the findings.

In the discussion of the findings, the themes identified from the data analysis are put in italics and are used in organising the results below (summarised in tables 2, p. 24). The participants from the different organisation are denoted by both alphabetical and numerical codes; the four participants from the public sector government institution are denoted by PG1, PG2, PG3 and PG4; the two participants from the public sector regulatory institution are denoted by PR1 and PR2; the participant from the private sector infrastructure development institution is denoted by PD1; the participant from the private sector consulting organisation is denoted by PC1; the participant from the private sector financial and investment advisory organisation is denoted by PA1 and five participants from the private sector international funding body are denoted by PF1, PF2, PF3, PF4 and PF5.

#### **4.1. Local regeneration partnerships as a necessity for Nigeria's infrastructure development**

Findings indicate that economic and social infrastructure development in Nigeria have in the past received little attention from the government and this could be attributed to the budgetary restraints experienced at both the federal and state levels of government, coupled with the growing population in the country which currently stands at about 174 million. The resultant effect of this has been the decline of existing infrastructure and services in certain communities within different states of the country. Participants within the research voiced the need for rapid infrastructure expansion through huge investments. In such an effort to meet up with the demands of infrastructure and service provision, the Federal Government have had to implement policy initiatives aimed at improving the quality of life of the local residents living in these communities. Local regeneration partnerships being one of such initiatives serve as alternative sources of capital investment.

In the words of participant PG2:

“Public funds are drying out, the treasury is inundated, government is also coming down with very huge overheads, so what is left for development keeps diminishing I guess that is why the PPP option is very useful”.

Similarly, participant PO1 was of the opinion that;

“Most importantly finances are limited and many governments in Nigeria have all come to realise that services cannot wait, the users of government services cannot wait, road project development cannot wait. Meanwhile, their resources are finite and they need these things, so they have come to realise that PPPs are a way out for them to achieve them, hence they can eat their cake and have it”.

Findings also indicate that the Nigerian government consideration for implementing PPPs in not only stems from the financial benefits as an alternative source of funds, but also in the believe that they are advocated as an established global model that serve to improve the delivery of economic and social infrastructure across the country.

This was reflected by some of the participants in the research:

PD1: “Ultimately, we believe it is a model that would help to serve our purposes, as well as the nation’s purposes of course there is another very important thing as well, it is not just about doing projects to optimise share-holders value”.

PG1: “With the deficit in infrastructure, any government knows the reality that there is no way your development, renewal, regeneration of infrastructure can happen without external funds, PPP is becoming a fashionable, tested model”.

#### **4.2. Local regeneration partnerships as an opportunity to attract the capability needed for Nigeria’s infrastructure development**

It is a common consensus among the public sector participants, that projects which involve the private sector have a greater potential to succeed. They believe that the private sector partners tend to be more efficient in fulfilling the term of a contract and in managing such projects over their life cycle than when the public sector partners are in charge of

managing similar projects and in such cases it would only be reasonable for the public sector to leverage on the expertise of the private sector practise.

PR2: “So you have people managing the partnership who do not have a full understanding of the arrangements and when it comes to making informed decisions, they cannot make informed decisions and they cannot even advise their management to make appropriate decisions, so some of these processes have been taken up by the private sector”.

Though having the right skills and capabilities might enable a partnership to take advantage of the strengths of both the private and public sectors and thus reap the collaborative rewards of the partnership. It also entails that the partners be more efficient in the mobilisation of resources and in leveraging and capitalising on their complementary strengths and capabilities (Huxham and Vangen, 2004).

In the toll road partnership, while it was important to the partners that the partnership arrangement had the needed capacity to deliver the intended goals, certain issues were not fully addressed at the contract negotiation stage. These issues pertained to questions about the risks each of the partners were ready to take on? How were the risks going to be mitigated to ensure that the partners delivered on the terms of the contract? Did they have partners who had knowledge of partnership arrangements? It becomes imperative to ensure the negotiation of a robust contractual agreement and a clearly defined project framework before the commencement of projects. Participant reported that the expertise and past work records of potential partners need to be taken into consideration during the bidding and tendering stage.

PR1: “The thing is who is going to deliver it; we have to look at who the counterparties are. What the government would deliver on its own end, can the private investor deliver on its own end? Do we have the right contractors for example, not everything is done by the private investor, also some of these things are outsourced as well, and do we have the right input?”

PF1: “I think the critical thing is that the partners have a track record, see what they’ve done and importantly see what they’ve done in similar environments. Doing business in Nigeria is not the same as doing business in London or doing business in

some states of the United States. It is not the same thing, there are some issues that are unique to Nigeria and there are some difficulties too”.

The interest and commitment of stakeholder groups to participate in the partnership leads to a greater potential to fulfil the terms of the contract and for the success of a partnership in its achieving its intended goals. As argued by Coote, Forrest and Tam (2003), the long-term orientation of these partnerships, where the partners focus on long-term goals and believe the collaboration will achieve the desired outcomes creates commitment among the partners.

One participant warns that interest and commitment does not come only from the internal stakeholder groups but other external stakeholders:

PF3: “The way you can ensure that it works is to manage the entire chain. The end user must be happy to pay for it, have the ability to pay for it, pay for it consistently and of course you have to provide the level of support and service that goes with that, otherwise people won’t want to pay and that is what flows up the chain and to the very end of the delivery chain”.

Furthermore, Doz (1996) suggests that commitment is an important goal for the partnership working, as it counters opportunism and determines trustworthiness, as well as the willingness to collaborate because the partners can then put their efforts towards desired outcomes. Participants in the research reported that though there were challenges associated with fulfilling the terms of the partnership agreement, there was a commitment to achieve the set goals of the partnership.

PC1: “By and large it delivered a road, a good world class road, I think it initially underrated the problem, the community issues, the stakeholder issues, but in the end it’s being a success”.

PD1: “As seen with the construction of the toll road, the massive development it has catalysed that therefore as a multiplying effect on industries and they create new jobs, and other industries are built further down the axis. What we find in all of this, is that a critical infrastructure was put in place”.

### **4.3. Contextual Elements Associated with Partnerships Working in Nigeria**

This section aims to identify the contextual elements that are likely to affect the building of credible pipelines of investable opportunities and to enable institutional investors who can manage and adequately implement PPP projects in Nigeria. The findings of the research indicate some of these contextual elements and these are presented below.

#### **4.3.1. Mutual interdependence of the partners in the partnership arrangement**

Goodman and Dion (2001) pointed out that confidence in a partner is the perceived level of certainty that its partner organisation will pursue mutually compatible interests in the alliance, rather than act opportunistically. Some of the participants indicated that perhaps the project risks were not probably assigned to the best partner to mitigate them.

PC1: “The bottom line in the partnership, there is risk on both sides, either that the private sector would overwhelm the government, structure a transaction that would unduly favours the private side, there are some who believed that the transaction was unduly favourable to the private investor and there are others who would argue to the contrary”.

Following from the collaborative advantage theory, the extent of the collaboration between partners has been identified as important to its ultimate success and the quality of collaboration between partner organisations has obvious implications for outcomes (Wilson, 2014). The participant further suggested that:

“That has to be openness, fairness in negotiation, that confidence, trust on both sides to negotiate and to put appropriate structures in place for both interests”.

Collaborative decision making is considered to be a mechanism for ensuring mutual interdependence and trust in the partnership. The key success however, as suggested by Thompson and Perry (2006) lies in the willingness of partners to monitor the partnership and each other’s adherence to the agreed-upon rules and to impose credible sanctions on non-compliant partners. Within the partnership, the fulfilment of the terms of contract is seen in the visibility of the decision making processes.

PF5: “The other one thing that must be offered to the investor is the certainty that the government must keep its side of the bargain. The political risk involved, especially if government changes”.

However, in spite of the on-going regulatory reforms in the state which has set an enabling environment for PPP policy. Some of the participants from the private sector are of the view that the government still needs to revisit and redefine the institutional structures in place to enhance the rapid implementation of the PPP within the state.

This was reflected by some of the participants in the research:

PF2: “One of the reasons investors ask for guarantee is not because of the fear of defaulting, but the fear of exploitation (forcefully taking an organisation’s possession for the enjoyment of the government). Foreigners are always weary of exploitation”.

PF1: “The regulations need to be able to protect the public interest, because many of the facilities they have monopoly characteristics where you have, a single provider and you don’t want a situation where they are going to extort money from the consumer, so things like tariff have to be regulated, you have technical standards, the roads have to be of certain quality, so that kind of regulation needs to be in place”.

#### **4.3.2. Ensuring transparency in the decision making processes**

The need for clearer and transparent competitive tendering procedures and guidelines was inferred from the concerns of the participants in the research, that transparency in the tendering process has a direct implication for obtaining adequate funding for the partnership’s project. One of the participants raised a concern stating that:

PD1: “If there isn’t competitive tendering banks get nervous because they think there isn’t proper competitive tendering, because they think if a new government comes in they would come and revoke it’.

As further explained that by participant PF5, that they have to ensure that the project is bankable and that the formulation of the project and the running of the tender, they have to ensure that the way the project is conceived is likely to attract bidders and be able to raise the funds. So also the confidence that partners would ensure efficient project delivery is



attributed to the clarity in terms of negotiation at the formation stage and ensuring greater credibility among partners going forward into the partnership arrangement.

From the literature, while partners from these different sectors may bring distinctive advantages to the partnership arrangement, Lasker, Weiss, and Miller (2001) reinforces, that the private sector partners most possess the ability to maximise value for money and thus deliver outcomes at lower costs; while the public sector have to be accountable and ensure the protection of public goods and to ensure more justifiable interest of the local communities where the partnership would operate this can also enhance the delivery of the outcomes. While participant PD1, was of the opinion that a sense of satisfaction could be felt from collaborating with the government in achieving its objectives by opening up the area for people and to catalyse growth, participant PR2 was of the opinion that it was important for them to ensure that the private sector had a high level of confidence going into the partnership agreement.

Another participant shared a similar view:

PA1: “I think that one thing we can say this project illustrates is the need for transparency around the terms of concession”.

#### **4.3.3. Building trust among stakeholders in the partnership working**

Participants in the research expressed their concerns and views about the inability of either side of the partnership to actively engage with the local community where the partnership project was located. They were of the opinion that more could have been done to encourage public opinions and to avoid the challenges and public disruption by way of demonstrations which came about as a result the partnership’s oversight to do so. Some participants expressed the need for greater engagement by both sectors with all stakeholders.

Zaheer, McEvily and Perrone (1998) state that trust is the expectation that a partner organisation can be relied upon to fulfil its obligation, behave in a predictable manner, and will act fairly when the possibility for opportunism is present. In that context, trust is used to reduce the complexity of events and to gain positive expectations which are in line with the partnership’s goals.

PF4: “There are many ways of doing this and you need to encourage the community and this can take many forms. You can have meetings where you can speak with people, you can have small focus groups where you can get into people’s minds and you can pass messages.

PG: “It is considered from the very beginning of the project, from the beginning we get their consent, we tell them this is what we want to do. We speak with their leaders, and the community. Otherwise they can sabotage your operations”.

Furthermore, by genuinely engaging the local community creates an atmosphere of trust and transparency in the decisions which have implications on the local residents. Some interviews indicated that engaging with the leaders who are the influences in the communities could encourage them to have a positive attitude towards the project.

PG2: “It pays the government to do so, because when we get the buy in of the people they can advise us of some peculiarities in that area, they can help facilitate the operations”.

Another participant was of the opinion that people fear change because they think they would be disenfranchised and sometimes be in the interest of all involved to reach a compromise.

PG3: “The process starts early, you get them involved early, sometimes they would tell you what they want before the operations can go forward, compromise and understanding and it is a continuous one”.

Findings also indicated the need for effective management of the various stakeholder groups throughout the life cycle of the partnership. Participants indicated that being proactive in getting across relevant information involved through multiple communication channels plays a key role in avoiding conflicts. The importance attached to opening up and ensuring wider channels of communication can affect how decisions are made and how the partnership’s working is taken forward (Andrews and Entwistle, 2010) This is because conflict resolutions are deemed as tedious processes and if taken through Nigerian courts tended to be time consuming with an adverse effect on the delivery timeline of the project. Although this was not the case in the partnership, participants however made mention of it based on their experiences from past PPP projects.

PG4: “The contract has dispute resolution clauses, we usually start with meetings, depending on the contract and the partners involved, there could be 30 days in which to remedy the dispute, then 7 extra days which is the final notice, or we go to mediation or arbitration, or even a dispute process court”.

#### **4.3.4. Evaluating the partnership’s overall performance**

In evaluating the effectiveness of the partnership working, the allocation and acceptance of the responsibility for decisions and actions of the partnership members can be linked to the partnership’s performance management and problem solving. The availability of relevant information about the partnership performance and clarity of the decision making process are also deemed important. Participants suggests that it is also imperative that some form of joint monitoring and management mechanisms involving stakeholder groups are included into the partnership agreement. According to Kelly (2012) evaluation of PPP arrangements can serve many different purposes and the approach taken will depend on the environment, participatory mechanisms and in addition the objectives which lie behind the drive to evaluate. In other words, evaluation assists in determining the merit or the worth of the PPP arrangements and partnership working.

PF2: “They sign an agreement, supervision and reprimand for any breach of those clauses; they do the monitoring through the supervision missions they do, which is done 2 to 3 times a year”.

PR1: “At the end of the day, if you deal with somebody who cannot deliver, it is a waste of time. You need to be satisfied, especially when you sign the bottom lines that it is a good prospect that you would be able to see your budget through to the end in its entirety, the delivery mechanisms in terms of the physical deliverables, the service levels people would be willing to pay for”.

It is the opinion of some participants that although the entire toll road is not completed and the concession rights of the SPV had to be bought back by the Lagos State government, the idea of the toll road infrastructure would not have conceived if the private sector had not stepped in.

PF1: “Infrastructure helps to promote economic development and growth, infrastructure especially social infrastructure, roads, water and others, help to improve the quality of life. We have seen with the construction of the toll road, the massive development it has catalysed that therefore as a multiplying effect on industries and they create new jobs, and other industries are built”

<b>PPP policy implementation and collaboration elements in a partnership working in the context of Nigerian local regeneration</b>	<b>The influence of the collaboration elements on the collaborative processes</b>
Antecedents to partnership arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• budgetary restraints experienced by the government</li> <li>• seeking alternative sources of capital investment</li> <li>• the need for rapid infrastructure expansion through huge investments</li> <li>• advocated as a well-established global model to improve the delivery of services</li> <li>• the need to revisit and redefine the institutional structures for PPP projects</li> <li>• a need for the stability of legal frameworks and regulatory guidelines</li> <li>• the willingness of interest groups to participate in the implementation of PPP initiatives</li> <li>• a greater potential for economic growth through increased infrastructure development in Nigeria</li> </ul>
Mutual interdependence of the partners in the partnership arrangement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• respect for the commitment made at the formation stage</li> <li>• understanding the skill gaps needed for the partnership working</li> <li>• the need to focus on the right capabilities needed for the partnership progress</li> <li>• the need for clearer and transparent competitive tendering procedures and guidelines</li> <li>• monitoring of the operations of the partnership</li> </ul>
Building trust among stakeholders in the partnership working	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• making a long-term commitment to the PPP life cycle and contractual arrangement</li> <li>• the inclusion of guarantees into the contracts as a risk sharing mechanism</li> <li>• the negotiation of a robust contractual agreement and clearly defined framework</li> <li>• enlisting partners with the needed capabilities, the need for the partners to act with integrity and commitment</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to focus on the priorities and intended outcomes</li> <li>• the availability of relevant information about the partnership performance</li> <li>• clarity of the decision making process</li> </ul>
Ensuring transparency in the decision making processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the clarity in terms of negotiation at the formation stage</li> <li>• the visibility of the decision making processes</li> <li>• ensuring greater credibility among partners going forward into the partnership arrangement</li> <li>• the building of credible pipelines of investable opportunities and enabling institutional investors</li> <li>• transparency was an important collaborative element in facilitating the partnership working</li> <li>• the effective management of the various interest groups is deemed equally important throughout the life cycle of the partnership</li> </ul>
Evaluating the partnership's overall performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the allocation and acceptance of the responsibility for decisions and actions of the partnership members</li> <li>• introduction of delivery units which anticipate and manage threats, opportunities and associated risks of a project</li> <li>• the ability of the partners to fulfil the terms of the contract negotiated</li> </ul>

Table 2: Summary of the findings that indicate the implication of collaboration elements on the collaboration processes in the Public Private Partnership working in Nigeria

## 5. Discussion, Managerial Implication and Limitations

The purpose of this chapter is to investigate the links between the collaboration elements; mutual interdependence, trust and transparency in facilitating collaborative processes in local regeneration partnerships from the context of a developing African country, Nigeria. The country's sizable and growing population continues to put pressure on the already evident infrastructure deficit. Local regeneration partnerships from the findings thus represent both a necessity and an opportunity for diversifying income and economic growth, as a result of a certain degree of political willingness of the government to advocate for improvements in the infrastructure sector. Though PPP implementation in Nigeria is in its

early years, the country is however keen to adopt PPP models that suit the country's own business and cultural contexts.

### **5.1. Discussion and main contributions**

Despite the difficulty encountered from setbacks and delays in the construction of this toll road in Lagos State, PPPs are considered models with great potentials. This is the case in most developing African countries as the policy portrays a positive contribution to the infrastructure development. An essential element in the success of the investigated partnership arrangement was seen in the collaborative efforts of the partners through coordinated activities right from the formation stage. From the case study, it was evident that the government and decision makers alike took into consideration the long-term nature of the partner arrangement by ensuring that the right partners with the appropriate expertise and knowledge were selected, as well as ensuring that right from the inception of the partnership a robust and well-structured contract was negotiated. Though, this contract had to be renegotiated at a later stage of the lifecycle of the arrangement, nonetheless the overall results was positive as the intended goals of linking various communities together and reducing the traffic congestion on the road was achieved.

Despite this success, there has been the slow implementation of the PPP model across various sectors and states in the country and even at the federal level, however, the few on-going ones are mostly in their formation stages. Findings show that foreign investors, as well as indigenous financiers are weary about the existing regulatory framework as there is a limit to which it is enforceable. Mutual interdependence, trust and transparency in this chapter have been investigated from the collaborative advantage theory perspective. This theory also perceives organisations as social systems that constantly need collaborative working through mutual agreements and interdependence of partners in order to achieve intended goals (Vangen and Huxham, 2005).

From the findings, these three collaboration elements are seen to be influenced by the contextual factors in the case investigated. The findings indicate that they act as enablers of the collaborative processes of the partnership working without which the partnership would have been plunged into very troubled waters. It can be inferred from the opinions of the participants that transparency in the tendering process had a direct implication for obtaining adequate funding, as the visibility of the process boosted financiers confidence in financing

the toll road project. Trust among the partners was subject to the negotiated contract that bonded the partnership working and ensured that the partners adhered to their obligations and carried out the actions needed to achieve the mutually set goals. The resultant effect of this was that it enabled mutual rules for the collaboration to be established and this assisted the partners in the re-negotiation of part of the contract when issues arose during the construction of the road. Evidently, trust is necessary for creating and maintaining a long term relationship between the partner organisations.

Mutual interdependence and trust from the case study is also seen to be evident in the selection of partners with the right skills and capabilities. Getting this process right enabled the partnership to take advantage of the strengths of both the private and public sectors partners and to reap the collaborative rewards of the partnership. The ability of the partners to fulfil the terms of the contract negotiated then emanated from this process.

The collaborative rewards of the partnership can only be fully reaped when such collaborative efforts help promote economic growth and infrastructure development, as well as improve the quality of life of the local residents in the communities where the partnerships are implemented. Consequently, from the case investigated, there is the need for appropriate risk allocation to partners; partners' acceptance of the responsibility for decisions and actions in the partnership process and for an effective management procedure to be put in place. The issues which arose from the community residents' unwillingness to pay the tolls could be resolved by better proactive communication strategies. There is also the opportunity to use delivery units which can help anticipate and manage threats, opportunities and associated risks of the partnership process.

## **5.2. Managerial implications**

This chapter demonstrates that a partnership's collaborative advantage is influenced by certain contextual collaboration elements that may hinder the implementation of PPP arrangements in local regeneration in Nigeria. Diffusion of the findings from local regeneration partnerships such as the one investigated in this chapter could contribute to the quality of decisions that need to be made with deciding on the appropriate PPP models to be implemented in funding local regeneration projects in other similar developing countries, for instance, sub-Saharan Africa. Such decisions can be influenced by having relevant knowledge about the selection of the most appropriate partners at the formation stage with the needed expertise, core capabilities and competences. Decisions that contribute to the

collaborative advantage potential of the partnership such as risk allocation and resource complementarity are also dependent on the compatibility of the partner organisations. The chapter also suggests that the partnership design and functioning can facilitate collaborative advantage through the entire partnership processes, for example, partnership evaluation and management that influences partnership working could lead to intended outcomes. The institutionalisation of partnerships can be a great asset as it strengthens the partnership inter-relationships such that the partners are able to share the same vision leading to the delivery of innovative solutions and services. Finally, the ability to match the objectives of the partnership to the different resources and collaboration activities enables value for money processes.

### **5.3. Limitations and suggestions for further research**

This chapter is based on the analysis of a single case, hence contextual factors that could limit generalising it should be carefully considered. Despite it being a single case, there is the possibility for analytic generalisation; whereby the purpose is to reach an interpretation of the studied phenomenon that could be transferable to other similar empirical contexts (Yin, 2009). A varied range of participants were considered from both the public and private sector to increase the relevance of the findings to other contexts and to enhance the validity of the conclusions. The selection of the local regeneration partnership also gave a varied nature of actors, activities and resources needed to reveal a much broader picture of the phenomenon studied. Furthermore, the findings of this research could be further checked by conducting comparative case studies across a number of PPPs.

The longitudinal study of the empirical case could be conducted so has to improve the quality of findings. Another limitation has to do with the theoretical perspective and scope of the research. The research was based on the perception of the key officials who were asked to discuss their reasons for participating in the local regeneration partnership; hence, their opinions related to the partnership arrangement and partnership collaboration processes. There is the opportunity to include the local community in the framework as they are the end users of the partnership activity and the ones that can ultimately benefit from the partnerships activities and resources.



## References

- African Development Bank (AfDB). (2013a). An infrastructure action plan for Nigeria - Closing the Infrastructure Gap and Accelerating Economic Transformation. *African Development Bank*. August 2013.  
<http://www.afdb.org/en/documents/document/an-infrastructure-action-plan-for-nigeria-closing-the-infrastructure-gap-and-accelerating-economic-transformation-33031/>
- African Development Bank (AfDB). (2013b). Federal Republic of Nigeria country strategy paper (2013-2017). *African Development Bank and African Development Fund: Regional Department West*, January 2013.  
<http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Project-and-Operations/Nigeria%20-%202013-2017%20-%20Country%20Strategy%20Paper.pdf>
- African Development Fund (ADF). (2010). Capacity building for PPP infrastructure (C84PPPi) in Nigeria. *African Development Fund Project Appraisal Report*, August 2010.  
[http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Project-and-Operations/NIGERIA\\_-\\_PAR\\_-\\_CB4PPPi\\_.pdf](http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Project-and-Operations/NIGERIA_-_PAR_-_CB4PPPi_.pdf)
- Akkermans, H., Bogerd, P., & Van Doremalen, J. (2004). Travail, transparency and trust: a case study of computer-supported collaborative supply chain planning in high-tech electronics. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 153(2), 445-456.
- Andrews, R., & Entwistle, T. (2010). Does cross-sectoral partnership deliver? An empirical exploration of public service effectiveness, efficiency, and equity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 20(3), 679–701.
- Apostolakis, C. (2004). Citywide and local strategic partnership in urban regeneration: can collaboration take things forward? *Politic*, 24(12), 103-112.
- Appuhami, R., Perera, S., & Perera, H. (2011). Coercive policy diffusion in a developing country: the case of public-private partnerships. *Sri Lanka Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 41(3), 431–451.
- Asthana, S., Richardson, S., & Halliday, J. (2002). Partnership working in public policy provision: a framework for evaluation. *Social Policy and Administrative*, 36(7), 780-795.
- Babatunde, S. O., Opawole, A., & Akinsiku, O. E. (2012). Critical success factors in public-private partnership (PPP) on infrastructure delivery in Nigeria. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 10(3), 212-225.

- Bovens, M. (2010). Two concepts of accountability: Accountability as a virtue and as a mechanism. *West European Politic*, 33(5), 946-967.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Broadbent, J., & Laughlin, R. (1999). The Private Finance Initiative: clarification of a future research agenda. *Financial Accountability and Management*, 15(2), 95-114.
- Brunetto, Y., & Farr-Wharton, R. (2007). The moderating role of trust in SME owner/managers' decision-making about collaboration. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 45(3), 362-387.
- Clarke, J., & Glendinning, C. (2002). Partnership and the remaking of welfare governance, in C Glendinning, M Powell and K Rummery, eds. *Partnerships, New Labour and the Governance of Welfare* Bristol: the Policy Press.
- Coote, L. V., Forrest, E. J., & Tam, T. W. (2003). An investigation into commitment in non-Western industrial marketing relationships. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 32(7), 595-604.
- Couch, C., Olivier, S., & Borstinghaus, W. (2010). Thirty years of urban regeneration in Britain, Germany and France: The importance of context and path dependency. *Progress in Planning*, 75, 1-52.
- Cropper, S. (1996). Collaborative working and the issue of sustainability. Huxham, C., ed. *Creating collaborative advantage*, 80-100. London: Sage.
- Davis, J. S. (2002). The governance of urban regeneration: A critique of the governing without government thesis. *Public Administration*, 80(2), 301-322.
- De Bettignies, J. E., & Ross, T.W. (2009). Public- private partnerships and the privatization of financing: an incomplete contracts approach. *International Journal of industrial Organisation*, 27(3), 358-368.
- Doz, Y. L. (1996). The evolution of cooperation in strategic alliances: Initial conditions or learning processes? *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(Summer Special Issue), 55-83.
- Drumwright, M. E., Cunningham, P. H., & Berger, I. E. (2004). Social alliances: Company/nonprofit collaboration. *California management review*, 47(1), 58-90.
- Dyer, J. H., & Chu, W. (2000). The determinants of trust in supplier-automaker relationships in the US, Japan, and Korea. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 31(2), 259-285.

- Eisenhardt, K., M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532–550.
- Ekanem, N., G. (2010). Nigeria: The most dynamic market in Africa? SADC PPP Forum and Network Launch Midrand. South Africa, February 2010.
- Ezezika, OC, Deadman, J, Murray, J, Mabeya, J and Daar, AS 2013. To Trust or Not to Trust: A Model for Effectively Governing Public- Private Partnerships *AgBioForum* 16(1) 27-36
- Faehnle, M., & Tyrväinen, L. (2013). A framework for evaluating and designing collaborative planning. *Land Use Policy*, 34, 332– 341.
- Farlam, P. (2005). Working together: Assessing Public-Private Partnerships in Africa. *The South African Institute of International Affairs. NEPAD Policy Focus Report No 2.*
- Forrer, J., Kee, J. E., Newcomer, K. E., & Boyer, E. (2010). Public–private partnerships and the public accountability question. *Public Administration Review*, 70(3), 475-484.
- Gibbert, M., Ruigrok, W., & Wicki, B. (2008). What passes as a rigorous case study? *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(13), 1465-1474.
- Goodman, L. E., & Dion, P. A. (2001). The determinants of commitment in the distributor–manufacturer relationship. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 30(3), 287–300.
- Gray, B. (1996). *Cross-sectoral partners: Collaborative alliances among business, government and communities*. In: Huxham, C., ed. 1996. *Creating collaborative advantage*, 57-79. London: Sage Publications.
- Himmelman, A.T. (1996). *On the theory and practice of transformational collaboration: from social service to social justice*. In: Huxham, C., ed. 1996. *Creating collaborative advantage*, 19-43. London: Sage Publications.
- Hudson, B., & Hardy, B. (2002). *What is ‘successful’ partnership and how can it be measured?* In: Glendinning C, Powell M, and Rummery K. eds. *Partnerships, new labour and the governance of welfare*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Huxham, C. (1996). *Collaboration and collaborative advantage*. In: Huxham, C., ed. 1996. *Creating collaborative advantage*. London: Sage Publications, 1-18.
- Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2004). Doing things collaboratively: Realizing the advantage or succumbing to inertia? *Organizational Dynamics*, 33(2), 190–201.

Huxham, C., & Vangen, S. (2005). *Managing to collaborate: The theory and practice of collaborative advantage*. Routledge: London and New York.

Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission. (2009). *The National policy on Public Private Partnership*.

Kanter, R. M. (1994). Collaborative advantage: the art of alliances. *Harvard Business Review*, (July-August), 72(4), 96-108.

Kateja, A. (2012). Building infrastructure: Private participation in emerging economies. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 37, 368-378.

Kelly, C., 2012. Measuring the performance of partnerships: why, what, how, when? *Geography Compass*, 6(3), 149-162.

Krishnan, R., Martin, X., & Noorderhaven, N. (2006). When does trust matter to alliance performance? *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(5), 894–917.

Lachapelle, P. R., & McCool, S. F. (2012). The role of trust in community wildland fire protection planning. *Society & Natural Resources*, 25(4), 321-335.

Lasker, R.D., Weiss, E.S., & Miller, R. (2001). Partnership synergy: A practical framework for studying and strengthening the collaborative advantage. *The Milbank Quarterly*, 79(2), 179-205.

Leke, A., Fiorini, R., Dobbs, R., Thompson, F., Suleiman, A., & Wright, D. (2014). Nigeria's renewal: Delivering inclusive growth in Africa's largest economy. *McKinsey Global Institute*. July 2014.

Lekki Concession Company (LCC). (2015). Project information.  
<http://www.lcc.com.ng/tolls.asp>

Lookwood, M. (2010). Good governance for terrestrial protected area: A framework, principles and performance outcomes. *Journal of Environment Management*. 9(3), 754-766.

Macdonald, S., & Chrisp, T. (2005). Acknowledging the purpose of partnership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 59(4), 307-317.

Masetti, O. (2014). Nigeria- the number one African Economy. *Briefing on emerging markets. Deutsche Bank Research*.

Miraftab, F. (2004). Public-Private Partnerships: the Trojan Horse of Neoliberal Development? *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 24(1), 89-101.

Mitchell-Weaver, C., & Manning, B. (1991). Public-private partnerships in third world development: A conceptual overview. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 26(4), 45- 67.

Ng, P. W. K., Lau, C. M., & Nyaw, M. K. (2007). The effect of trust on international joint venture performance in China. *Journal of International Management*, 13(4), 430-448.

Office of Public-Private Partnership. (2011). Building the Lagos of our dream. *Office of Public-Private Partnerships, Lagos State, 2011*.

Olaseni, M., & Alade, W. (2012). Vision 20:2020 and the challenges of infrastructural development in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 5(2), 63-76.

Oluwasanmi, O., & Ogidi, O. (2013). Public Private Partnership and Nigerian economic growth: problems and prospects. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(11), 132-139.

Otiso, K. M. (2003). State, voluntary and private sector partnerships for slum upgrading and basic service delivery in Nairobi City, Kenya. *Cities*, 20(4), 221–229.

Ramiah, I., & Reich, M. R. (2006). Building effective public–private partnerships: Experiences and lessons from the African Comprehensive HIV/AIDS Partnerships (ACHAP). *Social Science & Medicine*, 63(2), 397–408.

Rein, M., & Stott, L. (2009). Working together: Critical perspectives on six cross-sector partnerships in Southern Africa. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 90, 79–89.

Sanni, A. O., & Hashim, M. (2014). Building Infrastructure through Public Private Partnerships in sub-Saharan Africa: Lessons from South Africa. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 143, 133-138.

Selsky, J. W. and Parker, B., 2005. Cross-Sector Partnerships to Address Social Issues: Challenges to Theory and Practice. *Journal of Management*, 31, 849–73.

Seppänen, R., Blomqvist, K., & Sundqvist, S. (2007). Measuring inter-organizational trust—a critical review of the empirical research in 1990–2003. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 36(2), 249-265.

Slater, R., Frederickson, J., Thomas, C., Wield, D., & Potter, S. (2007). A critical evaluation of partnerships in municipal waste management in England. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 51(3), 643-664.

Thompson, A. M. and Perry, J. L., 2006. Collaboration processes: inside the black box. *Public Administration Review*, December 2006, Special Issue.

Tsenkova, S. (2002). *Partnership in urban regeneration: From 'top down' to 'bottom up' approach*. In: Tsenkova, S. (ed.) *Urban Regeneration: Learning from the British Experience*. Calgary. University of Calgary: Faculty of Environmental Design, 73-84.

Vangen, S., & Huxham, V. (2003). Nurturing collaborative relations: Building trust in inter-organizational collaboration, *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 39(1), 5-31.

Vanguard Newspaper. (2013). Lekki-Epe Expressway concession buy-back: Begging posers <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2013/11/lekki-epe-expressway-concession-buy-back-begging-posers/>

Willems, T., & Van Doreen, W. (2012). Coming to terms with accountability: combining multiple forums and function, *Public Management Review*, 14(7), 1011-1036.

Willoughby, C. (2013). How much can public private partnership really do for urban transport in developing countries? *Research in Transportation Economics*, 40(1), 34-55.

Wilson, G. (2014). Building partnerships in social work education: Towards achieving collaborative advantage for employers and universities. *Journal of Social Work*, 14(1), 3-22.

World Bank. (2014). *Nigeria - Country partnership strategy for the period FY2014-FY2017*. Washington, DC; World Bank Group.  
<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2014/03/19341853/nigeria-country-partnership-strategy-period-fy2014-fy2017>

World Economic Forum (WEF). (2010). *Positive infrastructure a framework for revitalizing the global economy*. Switzerland: World Economic Forum.  
[http://www.idfc.com/pdf/publications/wef\\_positive\\_infrastructure\\_report.pdf](http://www.idfc.com/pdf/publications/wef_positive_infrastructure_report.pdf)

World Economic Forum (WEF). (2013). "Strategic infrastructure: Steps to prepare and accelerate Public-Private Partnerships. May 2013. Switzerland: World Economic Forum.  
[http://www3.weforum.org/docs/AF13/WEF\\_AF13\\_Strategic\\_Infrastructure\\_Initiative.pdf](http://www3.weforum.org/docs/AF13/WEF_AF13_Strategic_Infrastructure_Initiative.pdf)

Yin, R.K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. 4th ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Zaheer, A., McEvily, B., & Perrone, V. (1998). Does trust matter? Exploring the effects of interorganisational and interpersonal trust on performance. *Organisation Science*, 9(2), 141-159.

Zaheer, S., & Zaheer, A. (2006). Trust across borders. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(1), 21-29.