EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-In-Chief

Prof. E. C. Iloputaife
Faculty of Education, Enugu State University of Science & Technology, Enugu.

EDITORS

Dr. Jones E. Ibeagha  (Managing Editor)
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

Dr. P. J. Kpolovie
University of Port-Harcourt, Port-Harcourt

Dr. P. S. P. Eze
Enugu State University of Science & Technology, Enugu

Dr. G. Anaso
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Dr. A. E. Eze
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.

Dr. E. Imanhalami
Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma.

_Academic Scholarship Journal_ is published biannually. It is published in April and December of every year. Contributors may submit their manuscript to Assoc. Prof. B. U. Maduewesi, the Executive Secretary, 66 Old Market Road, Box 9952, Onitsha or Dr. Jones E. Ibeagha of Faculty of Education, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka with the payment of the vetting fee of two thousand naira (₦2,000 =) Only. The paper should be typed using 14 font size on A4 paper with double line spacing. The abstract should not be more than 150 words on a separate sheet. The manuscript should not be more than 14 pages including references. Use the latest APA Reference style. The title page should contain the topic, name of the writer, address, phone number and e-mail address.
# Contents

Education: A Veritable Instrument For Effective Achievement of the Millennium Development Goals In Nigeria ...........................Dr. B. K. Oyewole 1

The Challenges of Nomadic Education in Nigeria - Implication for Counselling......G. I. Osa-Edoh (Ph.D) & Ijeoma Henrietta Alika (Ph.D) 11

Reinvention and Management of Public Enterprises in Nigeria Through Public Private Partnership...O.L. Kuye (Ph.D); A. A. Sulaimon (Ph.D) & O. Dakare 20

The Role of Women in Formal and Informal Labour Market......................................................... Anuli Regina Ogbuagu 32

The Effect of Watershed Urbanization on Stream Hydrology and Riparian Vegetation of Orogodo River, Agbor Nigeria.............J. O. A. Mogboruko 42

On Pragmatics and Negation.................................................. Dr. Georgina O. Maduagwu 50

Revamping Nigeria's Economy: Implications for A Sustainable Educational System..........................Dr. Muhammad Garba Mahuta 57

The Problems, Prospects, Challenges and Expectations of Surveying and Geoinformatics Discipline In National Development.........K. U. Orisakwe 63

The Relationship Between Telecommunications Development and Economic Development, Using Data From Nigeria...........Joseph Mamman Ihiih 72

Optimizing Individualized Learning Towards Minimizing the Adverse Effects of Large Classes on the Learning of English Language in Secondary Schools.................................................................Clifford Irikefe Gbeyonron 82

Mechanisms for Manpower Production in Agricultural Sector of Nigeria........................................Ishaya I. Bature and Saratu O.Audu 90

Effect of Speed on the Response Pattern of Examinees During Achievement Examinations - Implication For 21st Century Education System In Nigeria .........................................................Godwin Sam Akpan and Dr. Umoinyang E. Umoinyang 95
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselling Strategies for Eradicating Street Begging</td>
<td>Margaret Osarugue Omozuwa</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints to Increased Yam Production Among Farmers in Ayetoro-Gbede ADP Zone A In Kogi State</td>
<td>Sunday Moses Oluyomi</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Issues For The Enhancing of Clothing Construction in Delta State Secondary Schools In Delta State</td>
<td>F. Emelue and Tessy Apaokueze</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Generation and Wealth Creation Through E-Banking Practice</td>
<td>Prof. C.A. Obi and Y. B Oliver</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Cultural Influence on Human Resources Management in Nigeria</td>
<td>Samuel Olushola Ajagun</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues and Challenges in the Application of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in Science Teaching in Nigerian Education System</td>
<td>T.E. Agboghoroma, (Ph.D)</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring and Controlling Fluid Paints on Canvas, As A Reference Point For Students of Fine Arts, in Tertiary Institutions</td>
<td>Mu'azu Mohammed Sani and Zakaria Adamu</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Farmers' Choice of Communication Media for Extension Services in Livestock Rearing In Delta State</td>
<td>Dr. J. F. O. Akpomedaye</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Analysis of the Quality of Well Water and Rainwater Harvested in Ughelli, Delta State</td>
<td>Ushurhe, Ochuko</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of Boiling on the Proximate Composition And Nutrient Profile of the Leaves of Myrianthus Arboreus</td>
<td>I.A. Amata and O. Itebu</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed Germination of Tetrapleura Tetraptera (TAUB) as Influenced by Various Nursery Techniques</td>
<td>K. Okunomo</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REINVENTION AND MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC ENTERPRISES IN NIGERIA THROUGH PUBLIC – PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP

O.L. Kyey (Ph.D)
Department of Business Administration,
University of Lagos, Nigeria

A.A. Sulaimon (Ph.D)
Department of Business Administration
University of Lagos, Nigeria

And

O. Dakare
Department of Business Administration,
University of Lagos, Nigeria

Abstract
This article is intended to help promote the use of Public-Private Partnership (PPP) strategy as a way to reinvent the Nigerian public enterprises and their management, which over the years have been faced with the problems of high public budget deficits and weak economic growth. This paper draws out the key findings of existing literature relating to the potential advantages of PPP, the pitfalls and risks involved in its implementation and how these can be minimized in order to help ensure that the PPP strategies successfully meet its objectives. Among other things, the paper recommends that the Nigerian government should put in place an enabling environment for private sector participation in the provision and development of infrastructure to occur.

Introduction
Developed and developing nations operating either capitalism or socialism have begun to look for new ways of providing public services and infrastructure. The myriad reasons for this include not only the provision of greater efficient delivery of essential services to their citizens but also to resolve the problems of high public budget deficits and weak economic growth which in turn can truncate the provision of these essential services and infrastructure.

One of the best new ways of providing public services and infrastructure is the Public Private Partnership (PPP or P3). The proponents of PPP argued that through the use of Public Private Partnerships governments work in partnership with private companies that get involved through the provision of their capital, expertise or both, depending on the arrangements of the country (Rusland, 2007). According to the PPP proponents, the strategy will not only help to correct the market/budget deficits and
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capital short-falls, but will also promote economic development, reduce mass
unemployment and improve efficiency and profitability (Khan, 2005).

Empirical evidence shows that since the 1990s, the concept (PPP) which dates
back to the 17th century (Morasch and Toth, 2008) became popularized into governance
processes of most States owned – enterprises, and has yielded more remarkable financial
returns as well as social benefits. The countries that recorded great success in this
regard include Spain, Italy, Ireland, France, Greece, Germany, Belgium, Netherlands,
Poland, Austria, Finland, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Portugal, UK, USA (Hall, 2008). Developing
countries are not also excluded; they include South Africa, Vietnam, Malawi, Ukraine, Bosnia and Herzegovina (Sagagi, 2007).

Despite the great success recorded by the adoption of PPP as policy instrument
to strengthen and improve the economy of the above-mentioned countries, the Nigerian
State seems to pay inadequate attention to promoting her economic growth; she has
demonstrated a non-challant disposition towards creating a favourable, transparent legal
framework and a well-organized business environment that will attract private investors
who can contribute to the economic development of the country.

While Nigeria is still mostly dependent on public provision and only beginning
to pursue the path of private provision, Indonesia and Thailand have been on sustained
gravitation towards full private provision of public infrastructure services much earlier.
Nigeria, on its part has been rather slow in promoting private provision and management
(Oluba, 2008). According to Oluba, the resultant consequences have been that
businesses are considerably compensating the deficiencies in publicly provided
infrastructure services via enormous expenditures in providing them by themselves.

The Nigerian Government, especially in this period of global economic down
turn and recession, needs to understand that reinvent the public enterprises and their
management positively is important for economic development. The way to do this is
through the “Public Private Partnership”. That is, the principle of doing what the
government does best and delegating the rest to other experts is a pre-condition in the
transformation of governance for the betterment of a country and its people (Rusland,
2007).

The purpose of this paper is intended to help promote the use of PPP in the
Nigerian Public Sector, specifically the Nigerian public enterprises and their
management by drawing on the key findings of existing literature on PPP to highlight its
potential benefits, the pitfalls and risks involved in its implementation and the pre-
conditions for successful achievement of its goals. An overview of PPP practices in
Nigeria will also be done. This will be followed by the conclusion and policy
recommendations.

Public-Private Partnership (PPP) is a kind of collaboration in which public and
private sectors assume ownership and co-responsibility in alternative to fully public or
private organizations (Sagagi, 2007). ILO (2008) defines PPP as voluntary and
collaborative relationships among various actors in both public and private sectors, in
which all participants agree to accomplish a common goal or undertake specific tasks. It
is an economic driving tool that is presumed to be full of potential that will not only
improve the administrative processes of the state-owned enterprises but is also a catalyst
and products required by their citizens. The possibility of this is that the private sector is involved, bringing their skills and core competencies, funds and other resources and best practices to assist government in delivering high standard of services, products and other public goods.

Technically and conceptually, Public-Private Partnerships have been defined as collaborations with corporations, small businesses, non-government organizations and civil society organizations to provide socially beneficial goods and services (Rondinelli, 2005). PPP also refers to the supply by the private sector of works, goods or services as defined by the public authority. The Canadian Council for Public Private Partnership defines PPP as “a cooperative venture between the public and private sectors, built on the expertise of each partner that best meets clearly defined public needs through the appropriate allocation of resources, risks and rewards”.

Roth (1987), however, argues that some countries see PPP as an intermediate phase in privatizing state-owned enterprises or an alternative to privatization. To reinforce these meanings attached to the concept of “PPP”, Sagagi (2007) concluded that PPP introduces Private Sector efficiencies into public service by means of medium or long term contractual agreements. There are similarities in the reasons why countries whether developing or developed implement the PPP strategy. The rationale is that state ownership is economically inefficient and leads to budget deficit, and studies by the World Bank (2007) provided evidence for such viewpoints. According to Hall (2008), there are the four claims made by the supporters of PPP to justify its use by nations:

1. There is no alternative to PPP.
2. PPP allows public money to be spent on other things.
3. Governments are relieved of risks, which are transferred to private companies
4. The private sector is intrinsically superior at delivering goods and services.

While the United Kingdom launched the idea of PPP after the macroeconomic dislocation during the 1970’s and 1980’s which resulted in high government debts, the United States of America initiated PPP in the Eisenhower/Benson era when US production was outstripping domestic consumption resulting in the search for external markets to absorb the overproduction (Rusland, 2007).

Public enterprises and the private sector through the scheme of PPP provide services and infrastructure through a variety of device. The most common devices as highlighted by Sagagi (2007) are as follows:

1. Service contract: Private sector provides services but with active public involvement in operations and maintenance.
2. Management contract: To manage services on behalf of the government.
3. Public lease contract: Lease of public assets over a long time period.
4. Concessions: On the use of public assets but with clear government regulations.
5. Built Operation Transfer (BOT): To build joint assets that would otherwise be a heavy burden on either side.
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For Bennett, Grohmann and Gentry (1999), the final choice among the varieties or forms of PPP should be dependent on four main factors. The factors are identified as follow:

1. The degree of control desired by the government.
2. The ability of the government and their private partners to provide the desired services.
3. The legal framework for private investment and regulatory oversight.
4. The availability of financial resources from the public and the private sector.

In order to reinforce the above factors in determining the appropriate form of PPP a government will adopt, Rusland (2007), suggests that risk is another factor that should be taken into consideration on whether to adopt PPP and how to allocate responsibilities between the public and private sector. Rusland (2007) further categorizes the risk as material risk, commercial risk and political risk. While the material and commercial risks are expected to be carried mainly by the private sector, the political risks are carried by the government. An important principle of allocating risk in PPP is to take account of which party is best suitable to deal with situations where specific expertise is needed. In this way, costs can be lowered and unnecessary losses avoided because of the specific experience and expertise of the participating partners (Rusland, 2007).

According to Pflug (2002), the categorization of PPP can be based on the contributed investments and risk of each partner as follow:

1. Concession type arrangements where the private sector is responsible for 100 percent of the construction and commercial risk, and the public sector partner only bears the political risk.
2. Joint-Venture arrangements where both the private and public sector jointly share the risks and benefits usually proportionately based on their relative share of investment in the project.
3. Hybrid arrangements where a project is split into several components controlled by the government, and relative risks might differ between the components.

The PPP arrangement can offer several benefits if the processes are well integrated by the parties. The Nigeria Infrastructure Advisory Facility (NIAF) in 2008 identified some of such benefits as:

1. Integrating the different phases of the project such as design, construction and operation into a single contract which combines each element to give a single unitary price for the service to be delivered.
2. Providing a structure which encourages the whole life costs of providing the service to be minimized and for maintenance costs to be factored into the design and financing requirement.
3. Allocating risks to the party best able to manage them and thus minimizing their expected cost.
4. Linking payment to the quality of service delivered and thus providing a strong incentive for the efficient management of the services to meet the requirements set out in the contract.

5. Encouraging innovation by specifying outputs, not inputs, and ensuring that the policy and regulatory functions of the public authority are not compromised by direct involvement in service delivery.

6. Providing greater transparency in terms of cost and risk within these projects and involving third party investors who ensure that the project finances are robust and management achieves the expected outcomes."

“If PPPs are not well designed and supervised, their service can become more expensive than those provided by the government. Poorly designed and inadequately analyzed projects have failed in both rich and poor countries” (Rondinelli, 2005).

Research Evidence on PPP in Developed and Developing Countries

The PPP arrangements have contributed immensely to economic development in both developed and developing countries in many important ways. As a strategic tool for economic development, the PPP arrangements in the developed countries like UK added nearly £60 billion (£75 billion) value to the economy of UK by the end of 2007. According to Hall (2008), the value of all PPP in the rest of Europe has risen to a total of £31.6 billion by the end of 2006 in European countries as a whole, transport infrastructure accounts for 82 percent by value of all completed, current and projected PPP projects. In the United Kingdom (UK) over half of all the PPP projects are in health, education and local government. Tables 1 and 2 below show the growth of PPP in Europe and UK.

Table 1: PPP in Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of Signed contracts, £m</th>
<th>Number deals</th>
<th>Projects being produced Jan 2007 £m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain 1000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy 890</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland 720</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France 1788</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece 0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany 440</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium 1300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands 1302</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland 1520</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria 49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal 278</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries 488</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (exc, UK) 7987</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK 21849</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IFS! (2008)
The developing countries have also adopted PPP not only as an economic strategy for economic development but also as a cost-effective way of delivering essential services to their citizens. As noted by Pessoa (2006), PPP has been used for a range of purposes within developing countries, from “the construction of physical infrastructure, the provision of health and social services, to public administration”. Also, a report produced under the NEPAD/OECD Investment Initiative (2005) asserted that PPP was adopted by virtually all developing countries in the 1990s. Again, the World Bank Group cited in Hansen (2004) reveals that, between 1990 and 2000, there were a total of 2,300 PPP projects in infrastructure alone in 130 developing countries, and that total investment in these projects was US $690 billion.

The research survey conducted on PPP projects in infrastructure in developing countries by Pessoa (2006) cited in Rusland (2007) also revealed that between 1990 and 2003, most of the cumulative investment was in Latin America, while Brazil, Argentina and Mexico alone accounted for more than a third of total PPP investment in the developing world. The telecommunications sector accounted for the highest proportion of overall cumulative investment (46.1 percent) between 1990 and 2003 followed by the energy sector (33.1 percent). However, the majority of the PPP projects in Latin America took the form of concessions and divestitures, while Greenfield investments were more common in other regions such as Asia (Pessoa, 2006 cited in Rusland, 2007).

The above research review on PPP arrangements in both the developed and developing nations to demonstrates that the PPP strategy or concept is a must for any economy in the globe that wishes to re-invent her public enterprises and its management for efficiency, productivity, transparency and economic development.

### Table 2 PPP in UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed Projects £m</th>
<th>Cumulative £m</th>
<th>% Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>1987-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>457</td>
<td>(%) 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence</td>
<td>992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecom and IT</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste mgt and water</td>
<td>718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Projects</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IFSL (2008)
another dimension, PPP can offer the possibility of significant benefits to all parties. There are also a number of potential pitfalls and risks to the success of such an arrangement, as well as obstacles to its implementation (Rusland, 2007). The critics of PPP argue that even in the face of the expected benefits of PPP such as improved efficiency and financial performance of the State, the PPP has a negative effect on the employment conditions of the workers and their collective organization in Unions. These negative effects, according to Hall (2008), are caused by firstly, the employees being transferred to a separated private employer, and secondly, by the dominant role of the PPP contract itself, which force public authorities to prioritize payments to the PPP Company over all other expenditure. The effects of these actions are further categorized under five broad headings according to Hall (2008):

1. Security of employment is reduced because it is related to the contract itself and/or the private company rather than the public authority.

2. Workers normally lose their status as public employees. Possible future returns to public sector employment becomes complex. Workers may lose the benefit of public sector pension schemes.

3. It is more difficult to protect and improve pay and working conditions. This depends on the enforceability of indirect mechanisms such as fair wage clauses or legal rules on sectoral pay agreements.

4. Other public service workers may also be affected as a result of the existence of the contract. If the income of a public authority is reduced, or if the PPP itself becomes more expensive than expected, the cuts are concentrated on the remaining direct employees, because the PPP contract cannot be broken.

Other pitfalls and risks that are likely to be faced by PPP, if not well incorporated into the governance process of any State are: lack of previous experience of such arrangements especially in developing countries, lack of shared goals or a lack of understanding of the needs or abilities of partners. Politically, PPP can be controversial, and governments may come up against considerable political criticism or resistance to its adoption. For instance, conservative governments believe that PPP arrangement may result in a major loss of jobs and in reduced wages and benefits for employees in order to maximize profits (Rusland, 2007).

With all these potent agitations against PPP arrangements, there is the need for the government or authorities in charge of the policy to acknowledge and address how best to partner the public enterprises in order to help maximize the chances of success of
PPP arrangements when the need arises. In this regard, USAID (2006) highlights the essential ingredients that can help the partners involved in PPP arrangements to achieve good success as follow:

1. Having common objectives set by all relevant stakeholders who are all key players in the related industry.
2. The inclusion of a thorough problem identification phase including intensive research and goal oriented information exchange.
3. The use of know-how and expertise from relevant organizations like multilateral organizations, the private sector, government and NGOs, along with adequate financial support.

The IMF (2004) in its Public Partnership report identifies several crucial aspects for implementing a high quality PPP to include not only a workable legal framework, but also political commitment and good governance are prerequisites for success, and that both partners must be confident that the whole party is committed to the PPP principle and to the project goals (Rusland, 2007).

On the same issue of how well to partner the public enterprises, The Department of Finance of the Republic of South Africa suggests, in its article “A Strategic Framework for Developing Public Services through Public Private Partnerships (2002) states four important elements of a strategic framework:

1. Establishing a clear policy framework to ensure that PPPs are a coherent option for departments.
2. Refining legislation through a targeted programme to remove unnecessary obstacles to cost-effective PPP arrangements.
3. Enhancing the capacity of departments to use PPP in sound and effective projects.
4. Providing a simple yet effective institutional framework to ensure that PPP achieves value for money and facilitates capacity enhancement activities.

In nutshell, it can concluded that in order to attack “PPP failure” partners must after they set up, avoid “government failures” as well as consequent “managerial failure” in their operations.

The Current Public -Private Partnership Efforts in Nigeria

Nigeria as perceived, has a large number of public enterprises, most of which are known to be underperforming and failing to make positive contributions to the Nigerian economy.

No matter the quantum of financial resources at the disposal of Government, closing the funding gap for infrastructure is an enormous challenge that cannot be met by Government alone (Tafida, 2009). Consequently, the Nigerian government in many ways has introduced measures to strengthen these State-owned Enterprises by partnerships with the private sector. It has adopted the PPP model as a mean of raising the much-needed resources, to generate jobs and skills as well as ensure efficient service delivery (Tafida, 2009).
Statistical records indicate that between 1990 and 2005, the Nigerian Government, in conjunction with the private sector participated in 21 projects involving a total investment of US$8.7bn. As is typical with most Public-Private Partnership projects, most of these projects were Greenfield (Opula-Charles, 2008). Table 3 below shows the distribution of these projects:

### Table 3: Financing the Infrastructure Needs of Lagos State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Percentage Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Lease Contracts</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Renaissance Capital 2007*

Furthermore, 57 percent of the PPP projects and 80 percent of the investment value was in telecoms, 28 percent of the PPP projects and 15 percent of the investment value was in energy and 14 percent of the PPP projects and 5 percent of their investment value was in transportation (Opula-Charles, 2008).

In conclusion, the highlights of PPP on-going and operating projects in Nigeria include:

1. The Murtala Mohammed International Terminal II;
2. The Nnamdi Azikiwe International Airport Concession;
3. The Lekki-Epe Expressway; and
4. The Second Niger Bridge

### Conclusion and Policy Recommendations

In the this paper, the use of Public-Private Partnership (PPP) strategy has been proposed as strategic engine for reinventing Nigerian public enterprises and their management. In order to help the Nigerian State to improve and reform her public enterprises in the process of establishing an enable environment which is conducive for the implementation of PPP, this paper draws out the key findings of existing literature relating to the potential benefits of PPP, the pitfalls and risks involved in its implementation and how the pitfalls and risks can be minimized so to ensure that the PPP arrangements successfully meet their objectives.

In spite of the Nigerian government positive disposition toward reinventing and reforming the Nigerian Public Enterprises through the PPP strategy as observed in current PPP initiatives in Nigeria, this paper recommends that:

(i) There is need for all stakeholders i.e. the Federal, State, Local, private sector, transnational agencies, and civil society groups as well as other important community development associations to work together to ensure sustainable development and poverty reduction in the country. There is also the need for public enlightenment on the features and benefits of PPP. The public enlightenment programme should include definition of PPP including the fundamental issues with regard to forms, types, elements and working methods of PPP, conditions necessary to construct PPPs, the supporting
pillars of successful PPP, the potential advantages and pitfalls of
PPPs, the possible contributions of the public and the private sector to the
formation of PPP, and the planning and implementation process of PPP.

The Nigerian Government and authorities at all level of government should
be the lead force to stimulate the utilization and integration of structured
PPP programmes in Nigeria.

Government must put in place, laws, regulations and institutions or enhance
existing ones as well as improve the enabling environment for private sector
participation in the provision and development of infrastructure to occur
(Adirieje, 2009).

In achieving sustainable PPP strategy that will ensure result- oriented and
value creation which will in turn affect the state as a whole positively, there
will be the need to establish a single framework of action for clear
understanding of the purpose, direction and priorities of the policy process.

Nigeria should be willing to interact and communicate with other countries
and foreign organizations that have been successful in the implementation
of the PPP strategy in their environments.

For all the stakeholders to appreciate the need and importance of the PPP
arrangements, it is also suggested that the mass media should be used as a
means to depict the progress made during all phases of the process including
the preparation as well as the implementation phase of the PPP projects.
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