

Chapter 2

Global Goal, Local Context: Pathways to Sustainable Urban Development in Lagos, Nigeria



Taibat Lawanson, Basirat Oyalowo and Timothy Nubi

Abstract This chapter argues that at the core of the opportunity to deliver sustainable urban development in Nigeria is the lack of capacity to mainstream global goals at the municipal level. The chapter thus address the following questions: Who is responsible for local implementation of the global development agenda? What mechanisms should be in place for local implementation? How can local capacities be strengthened for effective delivery of sustainable urban development? In doing this, we critically assess the challenges of localising the global agenda by focusing on SDG11 and its application in Lagos, Nigeria's largest city. A content analysis of SDG11 and the Lagos State Development Plan reveals major gaps in the development approach of the state, while other findings reveal that paucity of data, weak institutional capacity as well as poor governance strategies are major impediments to mainstreaming SDG11 in Lagos. The chapter concludes by recommending some approaches to conciliate the global agenda with local exigencies, such as local capacity building and inclusive development

Keywords SDG, Urban, Nigeria, Municipal, Capacity

Introduction

Global development agreements have become the tool for reaching consensus and providing directions for policies, programmes and projects to be implemented at

Taibat Lawanson (Corresponding Author)
Department of Urban and Regional Planning/Centre for Housing and Sustainable
Development, University of Lagos, Nigeria
email: tlawanson@unilag.edu.ng

Basirat Oyalowo
Department of Estate Management and Valuation/Centre for Housing and Sustainable
Development, University of Lagos, Nigeria
email: boyalowo@unilag.edu.ng

Timothy Nubi
Department of Estate Management and Valuation/Centre for Housing and Sustainable
Development, University of Lagos, Nigeria
email: tnubi@unilag.edu.ng

regional, national and sub-national levels for holistic economic and social development. In September 2000, the heads of state of 150 United Nations (UN) member countries signed the Millennium Declaration in the American state of New York, thus affirming their commitment to the attainment of eight Development Goals with 18 specific targets to be achieved by 2015 and to be measured with 48 indicators. These goals are believed to be the most comprehensive set of goals for global development and reflect the need to significantly improve the quality of human life in developing countries.

Like most pacts on international development, the MDGs are meant to be broken down to national and sub-national levels for implementation. In the review of the Millennium Development Goals, the need for incorporating environmental concern, economic development and social justice into global development goals produced the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2015. Oleribe and Taylor-Robinson (2016) stated that Nigeria failed to meet any of the MDG targets due to a multiplicity of health system issues as well as political and systemic challenges, including a top-down approach to implementation. As reflected in its precursor, sustainable urban development became a global imperative in the Sustainable Development goals (SDG). Goal 11 is dedicated to making cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable (UN, 2015). This eleventh goal is thus the focus of this chapter, given that Lagos is not only a megacity but also one of the fastest-growing cities in Africa.

Furthermore, in 2016, the New Urban Agenda (NUA) was signed by member countries of the United Nations (Habitat III, 2016), including Nigeria. The NUA affirmed “a global commitment to sustainable urban development as a critical step for realising sustainable development in an integrated and coordinated manner at the global, regional, national, sub-national and local levels, with the participation of all relevant actors (UN-Habitat, 2017). The NUA was thus developed as a tool for implementing the SDGs. Even though signed at the national level, many of the targets of both the SDGs and NUA are implementable at the sub-national and municipal levels (Satterthwaite, 2016). It is, therefore, necessary to examine these agreements in the light of development priorities at the sub-national and municipal levels.

Current urbanisation trends in many African cities are accompanied by significant social and environmental challenges such as poverty, informality, deplorable state of infrastructure, poor basic services, conflicts in resource control, as well as rising inequality and social exclusion. Lagos, Nigeria's commercial centre, is home to a population of over 23 million residents (LASG, 2015) who daily grapple with challenges of infrastructure, overpopulation, poverty and inequality, all of which are key issues that the SDGs are meant to address. Being a signatory to several development agreements, including the SDGs protocol, Nigeria can only successfully meet the set targets by aligning local and international development priorities. Ensuring such an alignment will facilitate the seamless localisation and achievement of goals. However, when there are contradictions, the policy 'import' could have unintended negative consequences.

How these issues are addressed will determine the effectiveness of any global urban development agenda. This chapter, therefore, investigates the challenges of localising global agendas while also exploring the contents of the urban focus of (SDG11) and its applicability to the Nigerian local urban context, specifically

Lagos. It outlines the functions and capacities of local governance institutions by addressing the following questions:

- (i) Who is responsible for local implementation and how successful have they been?
- (ii) What mechanisms are available for local implementation?
- (iii) How successful are local practices that align with the SDGs?
- (iv) How can local capacities be strengthened for effective delivery of sustainable urban development in Nigeria?

The chapter is based on a qualitative research design, with content analysis of two major policy documents, the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Lagos State Development Plan 2012-2025 (LSDP 2012-2025). The SDGs document is available on the UN's dedicated website. The LSDP 2012-2025 is a sub-national strategic document that is a roadmap for the infrastructural, economic and social development of Lagos for the 13-year period. Following general procedures associated with the content analysis methodology, the areas of interest in each document are identified. The goals, targets and indicators of SDG 11 are identified as the specific content to be analysed from the SDGs, while the indicators of the LSDP are the major focus of the analysis. An alignment of the monitoring indicators of SDG 11 and the LSDP indicators is then done. The reporting is done in a tabular form, with additional data from secondary sources. After this, a deductive process is adopted as the basis for drawing out the findings.

Assessing the Effectiveness of Local Implementation of SDGs

The sustainable city concept stresses the need to promote environmental safety, social inclusiveness and economic productivity at once. This concept becomes operational in cities through implementation of SDG 11, the Urban SDG, which is themed “making cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable. According to Satterthwaite (2016), for global development agreements such as the SDGs to work, they must be relevant on the urban scale – to urban governments, urban dwellers, politicians, civil servants and civil society groups. They must also be within the capacity of urban governments to implement.

While there are many SDGs-related programmes by civil-society actors, until June 2019,¹ there was no targeted state or local government programme attempting to address any of the SDG-related targets or indicators. However, a perusal of the LSDP 2012-2025, which is the most comprehensive plan to address the urban development challenges of Lagos, reveals a clear alignment with many SDG goals. Therefore, the following section will attempt to establish the linkage between SDG11 and the operative urban development priorities of Lagos as articulated in the LSDP 2012-2025. In this way, we can determine if Satterthwaite's position holds true for Lagos.

¹ The Lagos State Government instituted an Office for SDGs and Investment in June 2019

Table 2.1 SDG-LSDP linkages

SDG 11 Monitoring Framework	Monitoring Indicator	Key Relevant LSDP Indicator (2012-2025)	Main actions Taken (2015-2019)	Comments
<p>11.1 By 2030, ensure access for all to adequate, safe and affordable housing and basic services and upgrade slums.</p>	Proportion of urban population living in slums, informal settlements, or inadequate housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 100% of citizens will have access to decent housing - At least 25% of citizenry will own their home by improving access to affordable mortgages - Annual house building rates to be progressively accelerated over the plan period to achieve 20,000 units p.a. by 2015, 50,000 units by 2020 and 80,000 units by 2025. 	<p>Investment of \$40.9million in upgrading projects in 9 communities in the Lagos Metropolitan Development and Governance Programme (LMDGP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction of the Lagos Home Ownership and Mortgage Scheme (Lag HOMS) 	<p>Total number of housing units in Lagos HOMS was 5,008 housing (Lagos State Ministry of Housing, 2017).</p> <p>LMDGP was adjudged moderately unsatisfactory (World Bank, 2016). At the closure of the project, most facilities constructed in different slums had fallen apart. The project also caused forced eviction of residents in the areas of intervention.</p>
<p>11.2 By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons.</p>	Proportion of the population that has convenient access to public transport disaggregated by age group, sex and persons with disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By 2025, 90% of population lives within 15mins walking distance to public transportation - By 2025, the capacity of the public transport sector increases from handling 7 million passenger trips per day to 12 million passenger trips per day. - By 2025, there is a 50% fall in the numbers of unroadworthy vehicles on the Lagos State registered vehicles on the roads. - By 2025, there is a 70% increase in Traffic System Management awareness by the public - By 2015, there is a well-articulated and adopted transport policy and strategic management framework. 	<p>LAMATA strategic transport master plan Bus Reform Initiative: Transport Reform Bill 2017</p> <p>Projects including Traffic Improvement Scheme, provision of traffic infrastructure, Public Road Safety Programme, road channelisation, clearing of waterways and construction of Jetties, rail road construction as well as construction of bridges and the Oshodi Transport Interchange Project</p> <p>Lagos Rail Mass Transit Project: LAMATA</p> <p>Kilometre rail project running from Okokomaiko to Marina.</p> <p>The Lagos State Ferry Service capacity was expanded with the purchase of fourteen ferries</p>	<p>820 high-capacity buses were injected into the BRT system in 2019</p> <p>The Blue Line light rail is still uncompleted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic congestion is increasing due to increase in motor vehicle movement without a corresponding improvement in transportation facilities - There is no adequate transportation modal interaction. - The operation of the BRT has been affected by lack of vehicular maintenance and structural decadence. - Also Time has not been incorporated into its functionalities. - The road mode of transportation is still been over utilized while the rail has not fully functioned and the water transport system is under-utilised. - The development plan recognises the need for a transportation policy but up until now, there has not been one.
<p>11.3 By 2030, enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanisation and</p>	Percentage of cities with a direct participation structure of civil society in urban planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By 2025, increase in participation of women in politics and decision making. - By 2020, 60% of the youth and women 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Office of Civic Engagement was formed - Lagos State Youth Policy (2016) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Lagos State Youth Policy was instituted in 2016 (Lagos State Ministry of Youth and Social Development, 2016).

SDG 11 Monitoring Framework	Monitoring Indicator	Key Relevant LSDP Indicator (2012-2025)	Main actions Taken (2015-2019)	Comments: capacity for
<p>participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries.</p>	<p>and management which operate regularly and democratically</p>	<p>population are economically empowered and effectively participate in state development programmes.</p>	<p>- Office of Civic Engagement was established to strengthen citizen participation in governance - Women are poorly represented in the governance framework with only 4 female legislators among 40 in the State House of Assembly</p>	<p>Poor conservation of heritage buildings that resulted in demolition of Ilojo Bar and Onikan swimming pool Over-commercialisation of beaches</p>
<p>11.4 Strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage.</p>	<p>Share of national (or municipal) budget which is dedicated to preservation, protection and conservation of national cultural heritage including World Heritage sites</p>	<p>- Increase the influx of tourists to the state by 15% p.a. - Increased revenue generation for the state from tourism to 10% of GDP - Revive all existing and functional tourism sites - 50% increase in citizenry participation of cultural events - 10 new rural community tourist infrastructures developed. - All museums and historic sites refurbished</p>	<p>- Upgraded Timubu Square Fountain (2017) - Reconstruction and construction of new Monuments. - Redesigning of under-bridges with art heritage district. - Redesign of Onikan area as a heritage district.</p>	<p></p>
<p>11.5 By 2030, significantly reduce the number of deaths and the number of people affected and substantially decrease the direct economic losses relative to global gross domestic product caused by disasters, including water-related disasters, with a focus on protecting the poor and people in vulnerable situations.</p>	<p>Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people</p>	<p>- Reduce incidence of flooding in Lagos State from 40% to 20% of urbanised and semi-urbanised areas of Lagos by 2015 and eliminate all by 2025. - Develop a Storm Water Drainage Master Plan for the entire Lagos and implement by 2025. - Develop a regulatory framework for wetlands management - Sustain the Continuous Monitoring of Flooding Problems through the establishment of Flood Disaster Early Warning and Advocacy Mechanisms through the drainage offices within the 20 LGAs and 37 LDCs.</p>	<p>- establishment of the Lagos State Emergency Management Agency - Demolition of shanties in Ilubirin and along all creeks and waterways that constituted health hazards. - De-silting a total of 179 drainages - Protected shores lines at Alaguntian/ Okunkobo/ Olomometa in Ojo. - Infrastructure storm drainage with 49 km in place and 65% overall water system 14km in place. - Drainage master plan is yet to be passed into law - Increased incidents of flooding, especially in areas close to dredging/land reclamation sites.</p>	<p></p>
<p>11.6 By 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality and municipal and other waste</p>	<p>Percentage of urban solid waste regularly collected and with adequate final discharge with regard to the total waste generated by the city</p>	<p>- To reduce industrial, vehicular and commercial emissions to comply with WHO Air Quality Control Guidelines by 2025 - To ensure that 50% of industries in the State install functional and efficient effluent treatment plants.</p>	<p>Lagos State Environmental Management Protection Law, 2017 ("EMPL 2017") - Reposition and rebranded the KAI brigade into Lagos Environmental Sanitation Corps</p>	<p>The law resulted in the disruption of the waste management value chain. Air quality is not effectively monitored and is exacerbated by emissions from poorly regulated public buses. Waste sorting is not prioritised.</p>

SDG 11 Monitoring Framework	Monitoring Indicator	Key Relevant LSDP Indicator (2012-2025)	Main actions Taken (2015-2019)	Comments
management.	<p>- Annual mean levels of fine particulate matter (i.e. PM2.5 and PM10) in cities (population weighted)</p>	<p>- Improve on efficiency of waste collection by 80% in the state - Upgrading of dumpsites to landfill sites by 2013 - Improve refuse collection within the State's shoreline by 2013 - Improve on solid waste sorting by 50% by 2013- To put in place effective institutional framework for sustainable sewage infrastructure by 2013</p>	<p>- Sustained the management of 13,000 metric tons of waste</p>	<p>Open defecation is still a challenge, especially close to the lagoon and beaches.</p>
<p>11.7 By 2030, provide universal access to safe, inclusive and accessible, green and public spaces, in particular for women and children, older persons and persons with disabilities.</p>	<p>The average share of the built-up area of cities that is open space in public use for all disaggregated by age group, sex and persons with disabilities</p>	<p>- To establish recreational parks in 25% of the 57 LG/LDCs in the State by 2015 and thereafter complete all additional parks by 2025. - To ensure proper maintenance of the 6 existing recreational parks state-wide and thereafter of all newly completed parks. - Access to basic infrastructure, utilities & services to be 1.5 minutes walking distance</p>	<p>Lagos State Parks and Gardens Law No.13 of 2011 was enacted and took off July 2012 (Lagos State Government, Ministry of Environment, 2012). LASPARK has established, captured and maintained 327 parks and gardens state-wide Also, over 6,203,553 trees have been planted till date. Total number of people that have visited and used the parks are 288,681</p>	<p>The government has allocated spaces for greens and public interactions/integrations. However, majority of these spaces are not accessible to the public especially the poor, people living with disabilities and the elderly.</p>
<p>11 a Support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas by strengthening national and regional development planning.</p>	<p>Number of countries that are developing and implementing a National Urban Policy or Regional Development Plans that (a) respond to population dynamics, (b) ensure balanced territorial development, and (c) increase local fiscal space</p>	<p>To commission and complete a new Regional Master Plan for Lagos State by 2015 To have District Master Plans in place by 2015 To have a complete coverage of Neighbourhood Plans in place by 2020 Promote 15 new Growth Poles/Corridors to accommodate the future expansion of the city</p>	<p>Oshodi Isolo model city plan and Ikorodu Regional Master Plan (2016-2036) were commissioned. Master plan and model city plans commissioned and/or completed, though those due for review are not yet done.</p>	<p>Epe and Ikorodu regional masterplans are yet to be passed into law. Model city plans are not being implemented and reviewed effectively, while lower order plans are yet to be developed</p>
<p>11 b By 2020, substantially increase the number of cities and human settlements adopting and implementing integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, resilience to disasters, and develop and implement, in line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction</p>	<p>Percentage of cities that are implementing risk reduction and resilience strategies aligned with accepted international frameworks (such as the successor to the Hyogo Framework for Action on Disaster Risk Reduction) that include vulnerable and marginalized groups in their design, implementation and monitoring</p>	<p>- To produce a State Policy Framework on Climate Change - To continue to organise State Summits on Climate Change - To conduct a study on the vulnerability level of Lagos State to Sea level rise and develop appropriate mitigation measures and emergency procedures for dealing with inundations. - 95% compliance with environmental sector laws and regulations</p>	<p>- Lagos State Climate Change Policy, 2012. Setting up of the Lagos state Resilience Office.</p>	<p>Climate change policy is not being implemented Resilience office is largely administrative in nature Climate change summit has not been convened since 2014).</p>

SDG 11 Monitoring Framework	Monitoring Indicator	Key Relevant LSDP Indicator (2012-2025)	Main actions Taken (2015-2019)	Comments
11 c Support least developed countries, including through financial and technical assistance, in building sustainable and resilient buildings utilizing local materials	Number of jobs in the construction industry of LDCs involved in the manufacture of local building materials, out of the total number of jobs in the construction industry	Reduction of building costs through championing the use of alternative materials and technology Enhance capacity to attract investment and create jobs, improve and replace all substandard housing	Setting up of Lagos State Employment Trust Fund	There is no specific intervention to adopt local building materials or create construction sector specific jobs.

Source:

- i. *Lagos State Development Plan (2012-2025)*
- ii. *<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/topics/sustainabledevelopmentgoals>*
- iii. *Lagos Bureau of Statistics: Compendium of Lagos State Statistics (2015-2018)*
- iv. *Ministerial Press Briefing of various Lagos State Government Ministries and Agencies (2016-2019)*
- v. *Akinwunmbode.com*
- vi. *Comments are based on authors conclusions*

* Analysis between 2015 (when the SDGs started) and May 2019 (tenure of the immediate past state government) because the new government that instituted the SDG office had not fully taken off as at the time of writing this article.

There are clear alignments between the targets of SDG11 and the LSDP 2012-2025. Even though the Lagos State Government did not categorically set out to implement the SDGs, many activities of the various ministries and agencies remain relevant. The Lagos Global Office, hitherto focused on attracting international investments to the state, has been expanded to cover implementation of the SDGs. A Special Adviser to the Governor on SDGs and Investment was appointed with broad responsibilities to promote the SDGs and investment in Lagos and in collaboration with relevant agencies, to monitor and measure outcomes and impacts of all SDGs-related projects. The impact of this office is yet to be evaluated, as the office is still in the infancy stage.

Nevertheless, the analysis above shows that the capacity of the Lagos State institutional framework to achieve her SDGs-related targets remains suboptimal. Local/municipal governments were marginally involved in the activities highlighted. This is largely because the Nigerian local government system is structurally incapacitated due to constitutional limitations as well as technical know-how (Agunbiade & Olajide, 2016). This position corroborates the view by Hardoy (2017) that while SDG11 is relevant to the urban scale, encapsulating many provisions of municipal development, the capacity of sub-national governments to implement is still precarious.

Mechanisms for Local Implementation

Extant literature highlights three important elements that must be in place for effective implementation of any urban development agenda (Fabre, 2017), viz:

- (i) Governance structures
- (ii) Means of implementation
- (iii) Evidence base and practical guidance

Aspects of these three elements are now discussed in the context of Lagos and the local implementation of SDGs.

Governance Structures

The New Urban Agenda recognises the need to “strengthen urban governance with sound institutions and mechanisms that empower and include urban stakeholders in urban development plans to enable social inclusion, inclusive, and sustainable economic growth and environmental protection .

Since Nigeria’s independence in 1960, the official structure of government has been based on three distinct administrative levels—national, state and local government—each with defined spheres of jurisdiction and constitutional

functions. Of particular importance to the implementation of both the NUA and the SDGs is the role of local governments, as all the 774 constitutionally recognised local government area headquarters in Nigeria are regarded as urban centres in the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (The Federal Government of Nigeria, 1999) and in the National Urban Development Policy of 2006 (Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, 2006).

Local governments are generally modelled to serve three purposes. First, they are a mechanism for democratic participation and inclusive governance. Second, they are an efficient service delivery tool for providing social services and basic infrastructure. Three, they are a tool for national development and a medium through which the grassroots can share in the national wealth (Osasona, 2015). Efficient functioning of the urban (local) governance system is central to achieving inclusive and sustainable urban service delivery and, by extension, the new urban agenda and SDG 11 (Agunbiade & Olajide, 2016).

As observed by Pieterse (2015), good urban governance involves complex interactions between various actors—government (local, state and federal), civil organisations, individuals, households—all working together to reduce urban challenges and enhance opportunities. However, the contestation between various levels of government and the marginalisation of the local government system in Nigeria makes this an onerous task. According to Pieterse (2015), the municipal governance system is often rendered incapacitated to perform its statutory responsibilities of urban service provision.

No doubt, local governments are typically weak in terms of logistics and human resources, even in primate cities like Lagos (Lawanson & Oduwaye, 2014). With state governments exerting fiscal control, most local governments function as mere administrative extensions of the state, a situation that has become common in the country (Khemani, 2001). In Lagos, for instance, the 2003 Lagos Local Government (Administrative) Law empowers the state government to oversee the affairs of the entire local government system through the State Ministry of Local Government Affairs. It also restricts the sources from which local governments can raise funds to much less than what the Nigerian Constitution allows.

The urban planning hierarchy is also tripartite, given the provisions of the Nigerian Urban and Regional Planning Law of 1992 Decree 88 of 1992, which allows for a Federal Planning Commission, state planning board and local planning authorities. However, 28 years later, there is still no national planning commission, with only 13 states having domesticated the law (NITP, 2016) and fewer still implementing it. The local planning authorities are mostly redundant, lacking capacity where they exist at all (Lawanson, 2016; Abubakar, Lawanson, & Sodangi, 2020). The situation in Lagos State, where there is a functional Urban and Regional Planning Law 2010, as well as a vibrant planning administration framework, is such that the hierarchy of operation is highly centralised (Agunbiade & Ewedaio, 2014).

The 2010 law allows for the creation of “Local Planning Permit Offices in cooperation with the Local Governments and Local Development Areas for the discharge of its functions at the Local Government level with the approval of the

Governor on recommendation of the Commissioner. This limits the role of local planning offices to development control alone (Adediran, 2017). Furthermore, the failure of the law to recognise that some of the constitutional functions of the local government (e.g., the establishment and maintenance of cemeteries, slaughter houses, markets, motor parks, public conveniences, as well as the control and regulation of outdoor advertising, etc.) presupposes that local planning authorities would be established to coordinate physical planning and development within their areas of jurisdiction. Thus, this takes away the opportunities for participatory community-led development and municipal-level planning and illustrates how the Nigerian governance framework fails in translating national policies to local realities, further underscoring the importance of providing structures for localising international agreements and policies.

The urban planning regulatory framework is also largely autocratic and based on a 'top-down' perception of the planner-citizen relationship. A typical example is the Lagos State Urban and Regional Planning Law of 2010, which is replete with words like *demolish*, *demolition*, *pull down*, *seal up*, *ejected*, *zero tolerance* and *forfeiture*, reminiscent of Nigeria's colonial and military past and perpetuating the long-held belief that development control is primarily for enforcement rather than a set of activities for ensuring building quality and environmental safety (Agunbiade & Ewedairo, 2014). Also indicative of this mindset is the failure to set up an Appeal Committee as provided for in the 2010 law (Lagos State Government, 2010) to provide an avenue for residents to seek redress on the actions of the planning agencies.²

Both the SDGs and the NUA emphasise that urban areas and urban planning will be expected to deal with all the key global issues. However, this urban paradigm shift is very different from current planning practices in Nigeria (Agunbiade & Olajide, 2016), as it refers directly to the acceptance and inclusion of informality, rural-urban continuum, density, mixed use, public transport, environmental priorities and plans shaped by a connected and high-quality public space. It also includes the promotion and preservation of cultural heritage, as well as upholding of the principles of an inclusive, rights-based approach to urban development.

Means of Implementation

One of the most pressing challenges for addressing the SDGs in urban areas is having urban governments with the technical and financial capacity required to act. Available data on municipal finance in Nigerian cities shows limited investment capacity, with budgets being as low as US\$20 per capita in some cases (see Table 2.2).

²The Physical Planning and Building Controls Appeals committee was inaugurated in December 2019.

Table 2.2 Budgetary analysis for selected Nigerian cities

City (2013)	Own source revenue(\$)	Own source revenue/ capita(\$)	Budget (\$)	Budget/capita (\$)
Lagos	2,000,000,000	91	3,000,000,000	145
Ibadan	420,600,000	1	7,900,000	20
Oyo	705	3	11,500,000	0
Gombe	393,500	1	22,600,000	66

Source UN-Habitat Global Municipal Database (2018)

In many cases, cities are burdened with large populations from rural-urban migration, unemployment and dearth of robust economic bases. In Nigeria, both the state and local governments typically rely on federal allocations, which have been dwindling and insufficient to meet these needs (Babatunde, 2010). It is, therefore, necessary to strengthen the financial base of urban governments to improve implementation capacities by encouraging the development of alternative but equitable revenue bases. Lagos, by virtue of her status as Nigeria's economic and financial hub, has a broad revenue base and is able to generate significant funds across sectors, including the informal economy.

Drawing on the work of Rose (1993), Benson (2009) observes that the growing participation of national governments in international and supranational forms of governance ensures that policy transfer occurs through different mechanisms such as copying, adaptation, hybridisation, synthesis and inspiration. Invariably, these mechanisms lead to various depths of localisation. In copying, for instance, the level of localisation is low, as governments enact programmes that are already in effect in other countries, a process described as “copying-and-pasting”. Beznez (2009) and Nubi, Oyalowo and Muraina (2018) observe the inefficiency of this approach in reference to regeneration projects, noting that in developing countries such as Turkey and Tallinn, the “copying-and-pasting” of foreign approaches to waterfront regeneration has led to lack of community acceptance, stiff resistance by civil-society organisations and, eventually, failure to realise project objectives.

What is required, therefore, is understanding the successes and failures of different aspects of policies and then using these to develop new programmes that are suitable for the local context. Policymakers are, therefore, required to first expand their horizon, and to be aware of policymaking processes and outcomes in comparable contexts. They are required to understand deeply their own local contexts and be imbued with the skills to determine, at any one time and for any given problem, the appropriate approach to use.

Regarding the international development agenda, the policy transfer continuum demands greater understanding of what may be described as the baseline stage of the recipient country, that is, previous policy commitments at both the local and international levels. They will also work within constraints relating to the internal political environment, such as the depth of the need and demand for change in the policy area, the complexity of the policy to be transferred, the clarity of the processes, indicators and benchmarks of the policy, as well as the relevance of the policy to the circumstances of local stakeholders.

In their examination of the transfer of neoliberal policy to the housing sector of developing countries, Olunubi and Oyalowo (2010) recommend the following for

successful localisation: an understanding of the operation and effectiveness of the policy in its home country, local institutional factors, structures and processes in both originating and recipient countries, the role of agents (politicians, policy staff) in championing change transfer and redesigning to fit the local context and still meet desired objectives. Apart from financial capacities and policy fit, there is also a need to strengthen the capacity of the urban governance system. In doing this, municipal governments are encouraged and supported to act through membership of city networks. This aligns directly with SDG 17, which stresses the importance of global partnerships for sustainable development.

City networks provide opportunities for peer learning, capacity building and facilitating the participation of this often poorly represented constituency in global processes under the aegis of the Global Taskforce of Local and Regional Governments, which is the umbrella network for facilitating the participation of local governments in UN processes and undertake joint advocacy relating to international policy processes, particularly the climate change agenda, sustainable development goals and Habitat III. Nigerian participation is practically non-existent, although the Lagos State government is the most prominent Nigerian actor on these networks. Sadly, there is not much evidence around the state of any benefits from belonging to such networks (See Table 2.3).

Table 2.3 Nigerian membership of Urban Governance Networks

Organisation	Objective	Nigerian Membership
(Local Governments For Sustainability) - ICLEI	Global network of 1500 cities and local governments committed to building a sustainable future	- Ido LGA, Oyo state - Isoko South LGA, - Lagos State Government - Ajeromi Ifelodun LGA - Mushin LGA
Cities Climate Leadership Group - C40	Network of 90 large cities committed to addressing climate change and building a sustainable urban future	- Lagos State Government
Rockefeller Foundation Resilient Cities Network – 100RC	Network of 300 cities dedicated to helping cities around the world become more resilient to the physical social and economic challenges that are a growing part of the 21st Century	- Enugu State Government - Lagos State Government
Commonwealth Local Government Forum - CLGF	Network of 200 cities across the Commonwealth working to promote and strengthen democratic local government and to encourage the exchange of best practices through conferences, technical assistance projects and research	- ALGON
The Network Of Regional Governments For Sustainable Development - NRG4SD	Global network of 50 states, regions and provinces in the field of climate change, biodiversity and sustainable development, particularly following the mandates of UN Conventions and agendas	- Cross River State Government
United Cities and Local Governments	Network of 240,000 sub-national bodies supporting international cooperation between cities and their associations, and facilitating programmes, networks and partnerships to build the capacities of local governments	- Office of the Secretary to the Federal Republic of Nigeria
Global Covenant of Mayors	International alliance of 9,149 cities and local governments with a shared long-term vision of promoting and supporting voluntary action to combat climate change and move to a low emission, resilient society	- Lagos State Government - Isoko South LGA

Source ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability (2020); C40 Cities (2020); 100 Resilient Cities (2020); Commonwealth Local Government Forum (2020); Regions 4 Sustainable Development (2020); United Cities and Local Governments (2020); Global Covenant of Mayors for Climate & Energy (2020).

Evidence Base and Practical Guidance

When the system allows for participatory local processes, it is easier to meet the long list of needs by a diverse range of groups, for only by investing in local processes will the SDGs and the New Urban Agenda be achieved. The SDGs stress the need for monitoring progress and outlining a long list of indicators to do so (United Nations, 2020). However, disaggregated data at the municipal level needed to design and implement required interventions are quite limited. Nigeria mostly relies on data collected by national and international agencies that do not produce local-level datasets (National Bureau of Statistics, 2020). State and local government surveys are not usually consistent and often do not have sample sizes large enough to provide relevant disaggregated data to urban governments (Lagos Bureau of Statistics, 2020). While censuses should provide this, figures from the 2006 Nigerian Population Census data are yet to be fully released (National Population Commission of Nigeria, 2020), even though the next one is several years overdue.

Providing the evidence base for urban decision-making and ensuring innovative solutions to challenges require interdisciplinary collaborations using a co-production framework. It is essential that urban knowledge and urban solutions are co-created by representatives of the political, research, business and civil-society communities. Co-production in the context of urban development is an opportunity for relevant stakeholders to work collaboratively to enhance understanding of urban issues, inform appropriate actions, produce defensible policy and increase the legibility of policy (Patel, 2014). Furthermore, co-production of knowledge by academics, practitioners and civil society actors is critical to developing workable city-level solutions to pressing African urban development problems (Marrengane, 2014).

Strengthening Local Capacity for Effective Delivery

In strengthening local capacity for effective delivery of the SDGs and NUA, it is important to frame the narrative within the context of the three necessary elements discussed earlier: governance structures, means of implementation and evidence base. Therefore, it is recommended that local government reforms be instituted as a first step, as this will necessitate promoting constitutional amendments that establish the autonomy of the local government system and recognise it as a key lever of governance. This will be followed by capacity building for local actors—politicians, local government officials and civil society groups—through well-resourced programmes aimed at improving the capacity of community leaders and public institutions to engage in dialogue and support a collaborative approach to development. Peer learning through membership of city networks and inter-municipal cooperation is also important.

In providing avenues to localise policies further, there is a need to “practice urbanisation at scale . This requires acknowledging multi-level settlement structures—from the hamlet to the megacity, and importantly, the rural-urban continuum. Thus, the establishment of appropriate platforms for service delivery, citizen engagement and regional development at various levels of human agglomeration is key. Local planning authorities should be restored, the local government system should be reinvigorated and opportunities for community-led projects should be explored. Disaggregated and localised data collection and needs assessment should be collected in the bid to ensure that contextualised solutions are co-produced at the required geographic scale.

The strength of legal institutional frameworks needs to be deepened. It is necessary that the appropriate institutional and regulatory frameworks for delivering the SDGs and NUA are outlined and enabled. Bureaucratic challenges should be addressed and an integrated governance system that leverages on technology can be put in place. Furthermore, there is need to revise the extant planning laws and policies and to institutionalise them for proper implementation. It is also important that the national legal and institutional frameworks are adapted to specific local contexts while being flexible enough to respond to changing urban dynamics.

In all of these, it is imperative to establish collaborative governance, a process based on the principles of subsidiarity and decentralisation and that is a necessary prerequisite for inclusive service delivery and attainment of the New Urban Agenda and Sustainable Development Goals. Collaborations are encouraged across vertical (between different levels of government) and horizontal (within the same level, e.g. between ministries or between local governments) dimensions. Furthermore, partnerships with actors from civil society, academia and the private sector are also encouraged.

Accordingly, human capital development in the urban space is required in order to strengthen professionalism and capacity building for urban actors. Localisation of the SDGs and the New Urban Agenda will require a broad process of capacity building. Indeed, there is need for well-resourced capacity-building programmes to support the transformative process of training public employees, as well as local leaders from civil-society organisations. A system-wide capacity-building alliance between national and local governments, like-minded partners (e.g., academia and NGOs), as well as civil-society networks and international organisations, will be crucial for fostering capacity building (Habitat III, 2016). Revitalising urban planning education and practice to reflect local realities is also necessary for changing the professional landscape, as well as improving the capacity and efficiency of urban management and administrative systems (Watson & Odendaal, 2013; Pieterse, 2008).

Conclusion

This chapter has highlighted the need to embrace global agreements as the starting point on the journey to sustainable development. It has also revealed that for these

global agreements to be effective, they have to be viewed from a contextualised local lens. It is necessary to ensure that the global agreements align with local governance priorities and targets. Furthermore, they must be interpreted in a manner that is actionable at the basic neighbourhood level while being potentially scalable within a multilevel governance framework. The SDGs and NUA are a veritable platform for achieving sustainable urban development, since they provide clear measurable targets for catalysing action towards a preferred urban future. However, these targets can only be achieved when local governance capacities are strengthened, local urban priorities are addressed and all actors at all levels, and from all sectors, work together in conceptualising and implementing urban solutions that leave no one behind.

References

- 100 Resilient Cities. (2020). www.100resilientcities.org Accessed 16 May 2020.
- Abubakar, I., & Doan, P. (2017). Building new capital Cities in Africa: Lessons for new satellite Towns in developing countries. *African Studies*, 76(4), 546-565.
- Adediran, A. (2017). Dialectics of urban planning in Nigeria. Paper delivered at the 5th Urban Dialogue of the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Lagos.
- Agunbiade, E., & Olajide, O. (2016). *Urban governance and turning African cities around: Lagos case study*. Partnership for African Social and Governance Research Working Paper No. 019, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Agunbiade, M., & Ewedairo, K. (2014). A review of the Lagos State Urban and Regional Planning and Development Law 2010: An international perspective. In Smith, I. I. (Ed.), *Essays on Lagos State Urban and Regional Planning & Development Law 2010*. Lagos: Faculty of Law, University of Lagos.
- AURI. (2015). Promoting durable urban knowledge institutions in Africa by activating the African Urban Research Initiative. In-country workshop of key local and national stakeholders, 11, 12, 14 May. Workshop Report. Centre for Urbanism and Built Environment Studies (CUBES), University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, for the African Urban Research Initiative, AURI, Cape Town.
- Babatunde, A. (2010). People's attitude toward property tax payment in Minna. In Laryea, S., Leiringer, R., & Hughes, W. (Eds.), *Proceedings West Africa Built Environment Research (WABER) Conference, 27-28 July 2010, Accra, Ghana*, 435-41.
- Benson, D. (2009). *Constraints on policy transfer*. CSERGE Working Paper EDM, 9-13. University of East Anglia, The Centre for Social and Economic Research on the Global Environment (CSERGE), Norwich.
- Bezmez D. (2009). The politics of urban waterfront regeneration: The case of Halic (the Golden Horn), Istanbul. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. 31(4), 759–81 <http://hdl.handle.net/10419/48824> Accessed 16 May 2020.
- C40 Cities. (2020). www.c40.org Accessed 16 May 2020.
- Commonwealth Local Government Forum. (2020). www.clgf.org.uk Accessed 16 May 2020
- Fabre, E. A. (2017). *Local implementation of the SDGs and the New Urban Agenda: Towards a Swedish national urban policy*. Stockholm, Global Utmaning
- Federal Government of Nigeria. (1992). *The Nigerian Urban and Regional Planning Law*. Decree 88 of 1992. Abuja: The Federal Government of Nigeria.

- Federal Government of Nigeria (1999). *1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria*. Abuja: Federal Government of Nigeria.
- Global Covenant of Mayors for Climate & Energy. (2020). www.globalcovenantofmayors.org Accessed 16 May 2020.
- Habitat III (2016). HABITAT III - 17-20 OCTOBER 2016. The United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development. <http://habitat3.org/the-new-urban-agenda/preparatory-process/national-participation/nigeria/#national-report-executive-summar> Accessed 16 May 2020.
- Habitat III (2016). HABITAT III Policy paper 3: National Urban Policy. <http://habitat3.org/wp-content/uploads/Habitat%20III%20Policy%20Paper%203.pdf> Accessed 16 May 2020.
- Habitat III (2016). HABITAT III Policy paper 4: Urban Governance, Capacity and Institutional Development. <http://habitat3.org/wp-content/uploads/PU4-HABITAT-III-POLICY-PAPER.pdf> Accessed 16 May 2020.
- Hardoy, J. (2017). *An urban development agenda for Latin American cities: Integrating global and local challenges*. <https://ugecviewpoints.wordpress.com>. Accessed 16 May 2020.
- ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability (2020). www.iclei.org Accessed 16 May 2020.
- Khemani, S. (2001). Fiscal federalism and service delivery in Nigeria: The role of states and local governments. Prepared for the Nigerian PER Steering Committee, 24.
- Lagos Bureau of Statistics (2017). Abstract of Local Government Statistics. <https://mepb.lagosstate.gov.ng/wp-content/uploads/sites/29/2018/06/Abstract-of-LG-Statistics-2017edited.pdf> Accessed 16 May 2020.
- The Lagos State Government. (2013). *Lagos State Development Plan 2012-2025. Main Document* (2013). Alausa
- Lagos State Government. (2010). Lagos State Urban and Regional Planning Law 2010. Alausa: The Lagos State Government: The Lagos State Government.
- Lagos State Government (2015). Demographic Dividend in Lagos State: The Opportunity We Must Not Forgo. <https://mepb.lagosstate.gov.ng/wp-content/uploads/sites/29/2017/08/Demographic-Dividend-in-Lagos-State-2015-1.pdf> Accessed 16 May 2020.
- Lagos State Office of SDGs & Investments. (2020). <http://lagosglobal.org/> Accessed 16 May 2020.
- Lawanson, T., & Oduwaye, L. (2014). Socio-economic adaptation strategies of the urban poor in the Lagos Metropolis, Nigeria. *African Review of Economics and Finance*, 6(1), 139-160.
- Lawanson, T. (2016). Urbanisation in Nigeria: The need for a paradigm shift in planning education and practice. *Environmental Technology and Science Journal*, 7(1), 13-23.
- Marrengane, N. (2014). Co-production: AURI There Are No Shortcuts: *The rocky road to enabling knowledge co-production in African cities*. Presented at African Urban Research Initiative (AURI) Policy Conference, Nairobi, Kenya, 2014.
- Ministry of Housing and Urban Development. (2006). *National Urban Development Policy, 2006*. Abuja: The Federal Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.
- National Bureau of Statistics. (2020). <https://www.nigerianstat.gov.ng/> Accessed 16 May 2020.
- National Population Commission of Nigeria (2020). population.gov.ng/ Accessed 16 May 2020.
- Nigeria Institute of Town Planners (2016). Communique of 2016 Nigeria Institute of Town (NITP) Annual Conference. <http://nitpng.com/communique-of-the-golden-jubilee-anniversary-47th-annual-conference-of-the-nigerian-institute-of-town-planners-nitp-held-between-the-31st-october-and-4th-november-2016-at-the-nicon-luxury-hotel-a/>. Accessed 16 May 2020.
- Nubi, T., Oyalowo, B., & Muraina, O. (2018). Sustainable regeneration of waterfront slums in Lagos: A transdisciplinary approach. 13th UNILAG Annual Research Conference. August 28-30, 2018.
- Obeng-Odoom, F. (2017). Urban governance in Africa today: Reframing, experiences, and lessons. *Development Growth and Change*, 48(1), 4-21.

- Oleribe, O., & Taylor-Robinson, S. (2016). Before sustainable Development Goals (SDG): Why Nigeria failed to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). *Pan African Medical Journal*, 24(1), 156.
- Olunubi, T., & Oyalowo, B. (2010). Housing finance between social needs and economic realities: The dilemma of policy transfer under neo-liberalism. *Proceedings of the Comparative Housing Research Conference* (pp. 368-386). Delft: Delft University of Technology.
- Osasona, T. (2015, July 24). Governance institutions: Local government in Lagos. *CPPA's series on Nigerian Institutions of Governance*. <http://cpparesearch.org/nu-en-pl/governance-institutions-local-government-in-lagos/>. Accessed 16 May 2020.
- Patel, Z. (2014). Univer-City partnerships: Co-production for urban sustainable development in Cape Town. Presented at African Urban Research Initiative (AURI) Policy Conference, Nairobi, Kenya, 2014.
- Pieterse, E. (2008). *City futures: Confronting the crisis of urban development*. London and New York: Zed Books.
- Pieterse, E. (2015). *The contemporary African city: Crises, potentials and limits*. The Antipode Foundation's 5th International Institute for the Geographies of Justice. 23 June, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.
- Regions 4 Sustainable Development. (2020). <https://www.regions4.org/> Accessed 16 May 2020.
- Rose, R. (1993). *Lesson-drawing in public policy: A guide to learning across time and space* (Vol. 91). Chatham: Chatham House Publishers.
- Satterthwaite, D. (2016). Editorial: A new urban agenda? *Environment and Urbanisation*. December 2016.
- Satterthwaite, D. (2016). Missing the Millennium Development Goal targets for water and sanitation in urban areas. *Environment and Urbanization*, 28(1), 99-118.
- Satterthwaite, D. (2016). Successful, safe and sustainable cities: Towards a New Urban Agenda. *Commonwealth Journal of Local Governance*, 19(1), 3-18.
- Satterthwaite, D. (2016). Where are the local indicators for the SDGs? <http://www.environmentandurbanization.org/where-are-local-indicators-sdgs>. Accessed 16 May 2020.
- Smets, P., Bredenoord, J., Van Lindert, P. (2014). Introduction: Governance, sustainability and affordability of low-income housing. In Bredenoord, J., Van, Lindert P., Smets, P. (Eds.), *Affordable Housing in the Urban Global South: Seeking Sustainable Solutions*. (pp. 1-14) Routledge.
- UN-Habitat. (2017). Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 23 December 2016. *General Assembly: Seventy-first session*. <http://habitat3.org/wp-content/uploads/New-Urban-Agenda-GA-Adopted-68th-Plenary-N1646655-E.pdf> Accessed 16 May 2020.
- UN-Habitat. (2018). *Global municipal finance database, 2018*. <http://globalmunicipaldatabase.unhabitat.org/node/2312>. Accessed 16 May 2020.
- UN-Habitat (2010). Planning sustainable cities: UN-Habitat practices and perspectives. UN-Habitat: Nairobi.
- United Cities and Local Governments. (2020). www.uclg.org Accessed 16 May 2020.
- United Nations. (2020). Sustainable Development Goals <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/> Accessed 16 May 2020.
- Watson, V., & Odendaal, N. (2013). Changing planning education in Africa: The role of the Association of African planning schools. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 33(1), 96-107.
- World Bank. (2016). <https://projects.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/project-detail/P071340?lang=en&tab=procurement> Accessed 16 May 2020.