

**Public- Private Partnerships in Electricity Distribution: Lessons from IBEDC's
Operations in Oyo State (South-West)**

Damilola Olaoti MUSTAPHA LCU/PG/005853

**Being a MPA Thesis Submitted to the Department of Politics & International
Relations, Faculty of Management & Social Sciences, Lead City University, Ibadan,
Oyo State, Nigeria**

**In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Award of Master of Public
Administration Degree (MPA)**

2024
Certification

This is to certify that this thesis “**Public- Private Partnerships in Electricity Distribution: Lessons from IBEDC’s Operations in Oyo State (South-West)**” was carried out by **Damilola Olaoti MUSTAPHA** with Matriculation number **LCU/PG/005853**, in the Department of Politics and International Relations under my thorough supervision in the Faculty of Management and Social Sciences, Lead City University, Ibadan, Nigeria and that this work had not been previously submitted.

Dr. Remilekun Sarumi
Supervisor

Date

Dr. Adebola Alade
Head of Department

Date

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to Almighty God.

Lead City University Ibadan DO NOT COPY

Acknowledgement

My profound gratitude goes to Almighty God for guiding me throughout this journey. I am particularly grateful to Lead City University, Ibadan for the opportunity to undergo this degree.

I am thankful to my supervisor, Dr Remilekun Sarumi for her unwavering support and insightful guidance during my research. I would also like to express my appreciation to my lecturers Prof Akeem Amodu, Dr Modupe Albert, Dr Adebola Alade, Dr Oluwabunmi Akande who have impacted so much knowledge.

I extend my heartfelt thanks to my family and friends for their constant support and understanding.

Having acknowledged the above - mentioned institution and individuals who have assisted in this research work, I am nevertheless, responsible for any errors found in this work, If any.

Abstract

In recent time Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) have emerged as a prominent strategy to enhance efficiency, innovation, and resource mobilization and also to improve effective service delivery in Nigeria. The aim of the study is to comprehensively access the role of Public Private Partnership in improving public service delivery in Oyo State, Nigeria, focusing on the case of Ibadan Electricity Distribution Company (IBEDC) from 2019 to 2024. To achieve this study it adopted the mixed method that is both qualitative and quantitative method. For further understanding theory like the stakeholder theory was adopted. The findings revealed general agreement on the importance of service delivery improvement, financial investment, and leveraging private sector expertise in adopting PPPs in the power sector. Based on the findings the study concluded that PPPs play a critical role in enhancing public service delivery in Oyo State. And it further recommends that the key factors such as transparent governance, innovative financing mechanisms, and effective community engagement are essential for the success of PPP initiatives.

Keywords: Public- Private Partnerships, Electricity Distribution, IBEDC's, Oyo State

Word Count: 166

Table of Contents

Content	Page
Title Page	i
Certification	ii
Dedication	iii
Acknowledgement	iv
Abstract	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	vii
Chapter One: Introduction	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.1 Background to the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	4
1.3 Aim and Objectives of the Study	5
1.4 Research Questions	5
1.5 Significance of the Study	6
1.6 Scope of the Study	6
1.7 Limitation of the Study	7
1.8 Operational Definition of Terms	9
Endnotes	10
Chapter Two: Literature Review	
2.1 Conceptual Review	10
2.1.1 Concept of Public Private Partnership (PPP)	11
2.1.2 Concept of Public Service Delivery	17
2.1.3 Overview of NEPA	21

2.1.4	Relevance of PPPs in Public Service Delivery	26
2.1.5	Factors Affecting Public Service Delivery	32
2.1.6	Roles of NEPA in Public Service Delivery in Oyo State	34
2.2	Theoretical Framework	37
2.2.1	Principal-Agent Theory	37
2.2.2	Stakeholder Theory	37
2.2.3	New Public Management Theory (NPM)	41
2.2.4	Public Choice Theory	43
2.3	Review of Empirical Studies	44
2.4	Summary of Gap in Literature Reviewed	47
	Endnotes	48
Chapter Three: Methodology		
3.1	Research Design	58
3.2	Population of the Study	58
3.3	Sample and Sampling Techniques	58
3.4	Description of the Research Instrument	59
3.5	Validity of Research Instrument	59
3.6	Reliability of Research Instrument	59
3.7	Administration of Research Instrument and Method of Data Collection	60
3.8	Method of Data Analysis	60
	Endnotes	61
Chapter Four: Results and Discussion of Findings		
4.1	Analysis of Demographic of Respondents	62
4.2	Analysis of Research Questions	63
4.3	Discussion of Findings	78

Endnotes	80
Chapter Five: Conclusion	
5.1 Summary of Findings	81
5.2 Conclusion	81
5.3 Recommendations	82
5.4 Contribution to Knowledge	82
5.5 Suggestion for Further Studies	83
Bibliography	84
Appendix I: Questionnaire	97
Bio-data	102
The University Compliance Certification	103

List of Tables

Table	Title	Page
4.1	Age of Respondents	62
4.2	Key Motivations behind the Adoption of Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) in the Power Sector of Oyo State, Nigeria	63
4.3	Impact of PPP Arrangements on the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Public Service Delivery in the IBEDC (2019-2024)	65
4.4	Perceived Benefits and Drawbacks of PPPs in Improving Electricity Access, Reliability, and Affordability for Consumers	68
4.5	Institutional and Regulatory Frameworks Governing PPPs in Oyo State	71
4.6	Major Challenges and Constraints in Implementing PPPs in the Power Sector of Oyo State	73
4.7	Lessons from the IBEDC Case Study and Other PPP Initiatives in Oyo State (2019 – 2024)	76

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

In the evolving landscape of public service delivery, Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) have emerged as a prominent strategy to enhance efficiency, innovation, and resource mobilization. This study focuses on exploring the dynamics of PPPs and their impact on public service delivery in Oyo State, located in the South West region of Nigeria. Specifically, it investigates the case of the Ibadan Electricity Distribution Company (IBEDC) from 2013 to 2023, analyzing the effectiveness of PPP arrangements in the power sector within the state.

PPPs have gained traction globally as governments seek alternative mechanisms to address infrastructure deficits and improve service provision while leveraging private sector expertise and investment¹. In Nigeria, where inadequate infrastructure and service delivery gaps persist, PPPs have been increasingly adopted across various sectors, including energy, transportation, and healthcare². Oyo State, as a pivotal economic and administrative hub in the South West region, presents a compelling context to examine the dynamics of PPPs and their implications for public service delivery.

Cooperation between private actors, corporations and governments has existed since the inception of sovereign states, notably for the purpose of tax collection and colonization. Contemporary "public-private partnerships" came into being around the end of the 20th century. They were aimed at increasing the private sector's involvement in public administration. They were seen by governments around the world as a method of financing new or refurbished public sector assets outside their balance sheet. While PPP financing comes from the private sector, these projects are always paid for either through taxes or by

users of the service, or a mix of both. PPPs are structurally more expensive than publicly financed projects because the private sector's higher cost of borrowing, resulting in users or taxpayers footing the bill for disproportionately high interest costs. PPPs also have high transaction costs⁶.

PPPs are controversial as funding tools, largely over concerns that public return on investment is lower than returns for the private funder. PPPs are closely related to concepts such as privatization and the contracting out of government services. The secrecy surrounding their financial details complexifies the process of evaluating whether PPPs have been successful. PPP advocates highlight the sharing of risk and the development of innovation, while critics decry their higher costs and issues of accountability. Evidence of PPP performance in terms of value for money and efficiency, for example, is mixed and often unavailable⁹.

Electricity generation in Nigeria began in Lagos in 1886 with the use of generators to provide 60 kW. In 1923, tin miners installed a 2 MW plant on the Kwali River; six years later, the Nigerian Electricity Supply Company, a private firm, was established near Jos to manage a hydroelectric plant at Kura to power the mining industry. Then, another private enterprise was established in Sapele by United Africa Company to power the activities of the African Timber and Plywood Company. Between 1886 and 1945, electric power generation was relatively low, with power provided primarily to Lagos and other commercial centers such as mining industries in Jos and Enugu. The colonial government created an electricity department within the Public Works Department, which then installed generating sets in many cities to serve government reservation areas and commercial centers³. In 1950, the Legislative Council of Nigeria began moves to integrate the electricity industry when it enacted a law to establish the Electricity Corporation of Nigeria (ECN) with the duties of developing and supplying

electricity. ECN took over the electricity sector activities within PWD and the generating sets of Native Authorities. In 1951, the firm managed 46 MW of electricity. Between 1952 and 1960, the firm established coal-powered turbines at Oji and Ijora, Lagos. It began making preliminary plans for a transmission network to link the power-generating sites with other commercial centers. In 1961, ECN completed a 132 kV transmission line linking Lagos to Ibadan via Shagamu; in 1965, this line was extended to Oshogbo, Benin, and Ughelli to form the Western System.

In 1962, a statutory organization, the Niger Dams Authority (NDA), was formed to build and maintain dams along River Niger and Kaduna River, NDA went on to commission a 320 MW hydropower plant at Kainji in 1969, with the power generated sold to ECN². In 1972 NDA and ECN merged to form the National Electric Power Authority (NEPA). NEPA was the major electricity firm in Nigeria until power sector reforms resulted in the creation of the Power Holding Company of Nigeria (PHCN) and later the privatization of electricity generation and distribution.

IBEDC, the primary electricity provider in Nigeria, underwent significant transformation with the introduction of PPPs aimed at enhancing service reliability, reducing losses, and expanding access to electricity³. Against this backdrop, analyzing the IBEDC case study from 2018 to

2023 provides valuable insights into the outcomes and challenges of PPP initiatives in Oyo State's power sector. This timeframe encompasses critical developments and policy changes, offering a comprehensive perspective on the evolution of PPPs and their impact on public service delivery within the state.

By delving into the IBEDC case study, this research seeks to address several key questions.

Firstly, it examines the motivations behind the adoption of PPPs in the power sector of Oyo

State and assesses the objectives set forth by the government and private partners involved in these arrangements. Secondly, it evaluates the performance of PPPs in improving electricity access, reliability, and affordability for consumers in Oyo State, considering factors such as service quality, outage frequency, and tariff structures⁴.

Furthermore, the study investigates the institutional and regulatory frameworks governing PPPs in Oyo State, analyzing their effectiveness in promoting accountability, transparency, and stakeholder participation in the decision-making process. Additionally, it explores the challenges and constraints encountered in implementing PPPs in the power sector, including issues related to contract management, regulatory compliance, and community engagement⁵.

By synthesizing empirical data, policy analysis, and stakeholder perspectives, this research aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of the dynamics of PPPs and their implications for public service delivery in Oyo State. The findings are expected to inform policymakers, practitioners, and scholars about the opportunities, constraints, and best practices associated with leveraging PPPs to enhance service delivery and promote sustainable development in the region.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The statement of the problem regarding public-private partnerships and public service delivery in Oyo State, South West Nigeria, focusing on a case study of NEPA from 2019-2024, can be addressed by examining the challenges and benefits of such partnerships. Research indicates that public-private partnerships play a significant role in restructuring education, providing facilities in housing delivery, and acquiring equipment in hospitals. Challenges identified include poor definition of PPP scopes, staffing issues, and jurisdictional conflicts. Benefits encompass improved service delivery, residency training, and access to

resources. To specifically address the case study of NEPA, it would be essential to evaluate the operational status, outcomes, and impact of the partnership during the specified period, considering factors like service quality, infrastructure development, and conflict resolution mechanisms. By analyzing the existing data on PPPs in Nigeria, insights can be gained to enhance the effectiveness of such collaborations for better public service delivery.

1.3 Aims and objectives of the study

The aim of the study is to comprehensively assess the role of Public Private Partnership in improving public service delivery in Oyo State, Nigeria, focusing on the case of Ibadan Electricity Distribution Company (IBEDC) from 2019 to 2024.

Specific objectives of the study include:

1. To analyze the key motivations behind the adoption of PPPs in the power sector of Oyo State, Nigeria.
2. To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of PPP arrangements in improving public service delivery, particularly in the provision of electricity, within Oyo State.
3. To evaluate the perceived benefits and challenges associated with PPPs in enhancing electricity access, reliability, and affordability for consumers in Oyo State.
4. To examine the institutional and regulatory frameworks governing PPPs in Oyo State and their role in promoting accountability, transparency, and stakeholder engagement.

1.4 Research Questions

1. What are the key motivations behind the adoption of Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) in the power sector of Oyo State, Nigeria?

2. How have PPP arrangements impacted the efficiency and effectiveness of public service delivery, particularly in the case of the Ibadan Electricity Distribution Company (IBEDC), from 2019 to 2024 in Oyo State?
3. What are the perceived benefits and drawbacks of PPPs in improving electricity access, reliability, and affordability for consumers in Oyo State?
4. What institutional and regulatory frameworks govern PPPs in Oyo State, and how effective are they in promoting accountability, transparency, and stakeholder participation in the decision-making process?

1.5 Significance of the Study

The significance of studying public-private partnerships and public service delivery in Oyo State, particularly focusing on Ibadan Electricity Distribution Company (IBEDC) from 2019 to 2024, lies in understanding the impact of such partnerships on service delivery, infrastructure development, and investment climate in the state. The study can provide insights into the effectiveness of public-private partnerships in enhancing public infrastructure and assets through coordinated policies and programs. It can also help identify the challenges and opportunities associated with such partnerships and inform policy decisions related to investment promotion and public-private partnerships in Oyo State. Additionally, the study can contribute to the existing literature on public-private partnerships and service delivery systems in Nigeria, particularly in the Southwest region

1.6 Scope of the Study

The scope of the study focus on Public- Private Partnerships in Electricity Distribution using the lessons from IBEDC's Operations in Oyo State (South-West) as case study. The time frame covers 2019-2024. The reason behind the usage of this timeframe was because IBEDC

Was established in 2013 after its privatization in order to replace NEPA/PHCN and has been very active in Oyo State south west area.

1.7 Limitation of the Study

Methodological Limitations

1. Data Accessibility: Limited access to sensitive financial and operational data from IBEDC and regulatory bodies.
2. Sample Size: Restricted geographical scope (Oyo State) and sample size (single distribution company).
3. Research Design: Difficulty in establishing causality between PPPs and electricity distribution outcomes.

Theoretical Limitations

1. Conceptual Frameworks: Limited theoretical frameworks specifically addressing PPPs in electricity distribution.
2. Contextual Understanding: Complexity of Nigeria's electricity sector and regulatory environment.

Practical Limitations

1. Regulatory Constraints: Regulatory uncertainties and changes affecting IBEDC's operations.
2. Stakeholder Cooperation: Difficulty in obtaining cooperation from key stakeholders.
3. Financial Constraints: Limited resources for extensive field research.

Generalizability Limitations

1. Geographical: Findings may not be generalizable to other regions or countries.
2. Sector-Specific: Results may not apply to other infrastructure sectors.

Time-Related Limitations

1. Temporal Scope: Study's timeframe may not capture long-term impacts.
2. Policy Changes: Evolving regulatory landscape affects study validity.

Mitigating Strategies

1. Triangulation: Combine multiple research methods.
2. Stakeholder Engagement: Foster collaboration with IBEDC, regulators and customers.
3. Literature Review: Integrate existing research.
4. Pilot Studies: Conduct preliminary research.
5. Adaptive Research Design: Adjust methodology as needed.

Recognizing these limitations enhances the study's credibility and provides a foundation for future research.

1.8 Operational Definition of Terms

Public Private Partnership: A public-private partnership (PPP) is a long-term contractual agreement between a government agency and a private-sector company to build, operate, and/or finance a project, such as public transportation networks, parks, and convention centers

Service Delivery: Service delivery in business refers to providing services to customers, ensuring they receive the amenities they pay for and are satisfied with the service quality.

Southwest: The southwest part of Nigeria comprises six states: Ekiti, Lagos, Ogun, Ondo, Osun, and Oyo. This region is predominantly Yoruba-speaking and forms part of Yorubaland in Nigeria. Major cities in the Southwest include Lagos, Ibadan, Abeokuta, Akure, Osogbo, and Ado Ekiti. The region has a population of about 47 million people, contributing significantly to the Nigerian economy through urban areas like Lagos and Ibadan. The weather in the Southwest varies between the rainy season (March - November) and the dry season

(November - February), with the dry season bringing Harmattan dust from the northern desert.

IBEDC: It's the largest Electricity Distribution Company in Nigeria serving Millions of Customers across Oyo, Osun, Oyo, Kwara and Part of Ekiti State.

Endnotes

1. A. Johnson, Fatima "Assessing the Effectiveness of Public-Private Partnerships in Infrastructure Development: A Comparative Study." ***International Journal of Public Administration***, vol. 25, no. 3, 2020, pp. 345-362
2. World Bank Group. "Public-Private Partnerships in Nigeria: A Brief Overview." Available: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2016/08/29/public-private-partnerships-in-nigeria-a-brief-overview>
3. Nigerian Electricity Regulatory Commission. "About Us." Available: <https://www.nerc.gov.ng/about-us/>
4. O. Adeyemi, Temitope et al. "Assessing the Impact of Public-Private Partnerships on Electricity Access in Nigeria: A Case Study of Oyo State." ***Journal of Infrastructure Development***, vol. 12, no. 2, 2021, pp. 67-82.
5. Federal Ministry of Finance, Nigeria. "Guidelines for Public-Private Partnership in Nigeria." Available: <https://www.fmf.gov.ng/guidelines-for-public-private-partnerships-in-nigeria/>

Chapter Two

Literature Review

2.1 Conceptual review

2.1.1 Concept of Public Private Partnership (PPP)

Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) have gained prominence in recent years as a mechanism for delivering public infrastructure and services efficiently and effectively. The concept of PPPs involves collaboration between the public and private sectors, with each party contributing resources, expertise, and capabilities to achieve shared objectives ¹. Through PPPs, governments can leverage private sector innovation and investment while retaining oversight and accountability for public assets and services ².

Traditionally, the public sector has tended to engage the private sector merely to construct facilities or supply equipment. The public agencies will then own and operate the facilities or equipment or engage separate maintenance and operations companies to operate the facilities and equipment to deliver the services to the public³. PPP is born based on the fact that government provision of goods and services should not only lay emphasis on finance but on the quality of goods and services. “Managerially, modernization emphasizes a shift from a focus on inputs to a concern with outcomes – providing services is no longer a sufficient justification for state intervention, it must create added public value ³.

There is a more open-minded approach to service procurement, and no presumption that inhouse provision is always the best option ⁴. Public Private Partnership is a contractual arrangement which is formed between public and private sector partners which involve the private sector in the development, financing, ownership, and or operation of a public facility or service. In such a partnership, public and private resources are pooled and responsibilities divided so that the partners’ efforts are complementary. Public-Private partnerships relate to perceptions and practices affecting public private sector relationships in ensuring global health, development and well-being of the society, and the conceptual aspects of such relationships, including the role of the key players in collaborating to make these partnerships successful or otherwise ⁵.

The acceptance of public private partnerships should be based on mutual benefits and not intended to benefit the investors at the expense of the local citizens. This explains why countries like Hong Kong are very skeptical on PPP. Although most forms of PPP involve a contractual relationship between the public and private parties, the long-term nature of these contracts creates a strong long-term mutuality of interest. ⁶ PPPs are not just a step in the procurement process; given their long-term nature, they differ from traditional procurement contracts, which often are associated with a short-term “claims culture.” Early evidence of operational contracts in more mature PPP programs shows that in many cases the parties can recognize this mutuality of interest without adversely affecting the mechanisms in the formal contract that determine performance ⁷.

The main purpose of PPP in infrastructure provision is that financial, technical and management risks should be allocated to the party that is best placed to manage it at the least cost, acceptable quality and reasonable time. In United Kingdom, Ireland, United States of America and India, PPP has been successfully used in the provision of infrastructures. Nigeria infrastructure gap is very wide because of the irresponsibility of past and present leaders in the provision of infrastructures ⁸.

PPPs encompass a range of contractual arrangements tailored to specific projects and contexts. These include Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT), concessions, management contracts, and hybrid models, each with its own set of rights, responsibilities, and risks³. For example, under a BOT arrangement, the private sector designs, finances, builds, operates, and maintains the infrastructure or service for a specified period before transferring it back to the public sector ⁴.

The rationale for PPPs is grounded in economic theories such as transaction cost theory and agency theory. Transaction cost theory highlights the role of market failures and transaction

costs in determining the most efficient allocation of resources, advocating for contractual arrangements that minimize these costs ⁵. Agency theory, on the other hand, focuses on the challenges of aligning the interests of the principal (government) with those of the agent (private sector partner) and proposes mechanisms to mitigate agency problems ⁶.

PPPs have been widely applied across sectors such as transportation, energy, water and sanitation, healthcare, and education, reflecting their versatility and adaptability ⁷. In the transportation sector, for instance, PPPs have facilitated the development of roads, bridges, ports, and airports, leveraging private sector expertise in project financing, construction, and operations ⁸. Similarly, in the healthcare sector, PPPs have enabled the construction and management of hospitals, clinics, and medical facilities, expanding access to quality healthcare services ⁹.

The success of PPPs depends on several factors, including clear objectives, robust legal and regulatory frameworks, effective risk management strategies, and transparent governance structures ¹⁰. Moreover, stakeholder engagement, transparency, and accountability are critical for building trust and legitimacy in PPP projects¹¹. Additionally, capacity building and knowledge sharing play a vital role in enhancing the skills and capabilities of public and private sector actors involved in PPPs ¹².

While PPPs offer numerous benefits, they also pose challenges and risks that must be carefully managed. These include financing constraints, cost overruns, delays, performance failures, contract disputes, regulatory changes, and political instability¹³. Therefore, robust project preparation, due diligence, and risk assessment are essential for identifying and mitigating potential pitfalls in PPP projects ¹⁴. Furthermore, monitoring, evaluation, and accountability mechanisms are crucial for ensuring transparency, efficiency, and value for money in PPP implementation ¹⁵.

2.1.1.2 Types of Public-Private Partnerships

Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT): In a Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) arrangement, the private sector is responsible for designing, financing, building, and operating a facility for a specified period. During this concession period, the private entity recoups its investment through user fees or government payments. Once the concession period ends, ownership of the facility is transferred to the public sector. This model allows the public sector to leverage private sector expertise and financing, reducing the immediate financial burden on the government. It ensures that the facility is maintained at high standards during the operation phase. Examples are infrastructure projects such as highways, bridges, and power plants often use the BOT model.

Build-Own-Operate (BOO): In a Build-Own-Operate (BOO) arrangement, the private sector finances, builds, owns, and operates a facility. Unlike BOT, the private entity retains ownership indefinitely and is responsible for the operation and maintenance of the facility throughout its life. The BOO model incentivizes the private sector to maintain high-quality standards since they retain ownership and responsibility. It can also attract significant private investment due to the potential for long-term revenue. Energy generation facilities and waste management plants commonly utilize the BOO model.

Design-Build-Finance-Operate (DBFO): The Design-Build-Finance-Operate (DBFO) model involves the private sector undertaking the design, construction, financing, and operation of a project. The public sector retains ownership of the facility, ensuring that the public interest is protected. This model allows for an integrated approach where the private sector handles all aspects of project delivery, potentially leading to cost savings and efficiency gains. The public sector benefits from the private investment while retaining

control over the asset. DBFO is frequently used for transportation infrastructure, such as toll roads and rail systems.

Lease-Develop-Operate (LDO): In a Lease-Develop-Operate (LDO) arrangement, the public sector leases an existing facility to a private entity. The private sector is responsible for investing in the development and modernization of the facility and operating it for a specified period. This model allows the public sector to utilize private sector capital and expertise to upgrade existing facilities. It can lead to improved service delivery and efficiency without the need for public sector investment in development. Airports, ports, and water treatment plants often use the LDO model.

Concession: A concession arrangement grants the private sector the right to operate and maintain a public service or infrastructure, often with the responsibility of investing in its improvement. The concessionaire typically earns revenue through user fees or government payments. Concessions can attract private investment and improve service quality through the introduction of private-sector efficiencies. They can also reduce the financial and operational burdens on the public sector. Toll roads, public transport systems, and utilities like water and electricity services frequently operate under concession agreements.

Benefits of PPP

Access to Private Capital: PPPs enable governments to leverage private sector funding, reducing the need for public borrowing and spreading the financial burden.

Efficiency and Cost Savings: Private companies often bring higher efficiency and innovation, leading to cost savings and improved service delivery.

Accelerated Project Delivery: PPPs can expedite the implementation of projects by combining public oversight with private sector speed and agility.

Enhanced Service Quality: Performance-based contracts incentivize private partners to maintain high standards, resulting in better quality services and infrastructure.

Risk Mitigation: By transferring specific risks to private partners, PPPs can mitigate the financial and operational risks faced by the public sector.

2.1.1.3 Challenges of Public-Private Partnership

Public-private partnership (PPP) agreements are inherently complex, demanding extensive negotiation and legal expertise to structure effectively. This complexity arises from the need to delineate the roles, responsibilities, and risks borne by both the public and private partners over the lifecycle of a project, which can span decades⁷.

Firstly, the intricacies of PPP contracts stem from their multi-faceted nature. These agreements must address various elements, including project financing, design, construction, operation, maintenance, and eventual transfer or ownership. Each phase involves specific terms and conditions that need to be meticulously defined to avoid ambiguities and potential disputes. For instance, the design and construction phase must outline detailed specifications, timelines, and quality standards, while the operation phase must set performance benchmarks and maintenance protocols.

Secondly, risk allocation is a critical component that adds to the contractual complexity. PPP contracts must identify all potential risks—such as construction delays, cost overruns, regulatory changes, and market demand fluctuations—and assign these risks to the party best equipped to manage them. This requires thorough risk assessment and negotiation to ensure that both parties are adequately protected and incentivized.

Moreover, the financial arrangements in PPPs are particularly sophisticated. They often involve multiple sources of funding, including public funds, private investments, and loans

from financial institutions. Structuring the financial model requires careful consideration of interest rates, repayment schedules, revenue projections, and profit-sharing mechanisms. Legal and financial advisors play a crucial role in crafting these terms to balance financial viability with the project's objectives.

The long-term nature of PPPs also necessitates provisions for monitoring and governance throughout the contract period. This includes establishing mechanisms for performance monitoring, dispute resolution, and contract renegotiation. The governance framework must be robust enough to adapt to changing circumstances without compromising the project's integrity or public interest⁷.

Furthermore, PPP contracts must comply with a wide array of legal and regulatory requirements. These can vary significantly across jurisdictions and can encompass land acquisition laws, environmental regulations, labor laws, and public procurement rules. Legal experts are essential in navigating these regulatory landscapes to ensure that the contract is legally sound and enforceable.

The risk of project failure in Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) is a significant concern, as inadequate management can result in severe financial losses and unmet public needs. PPP projects inherently involve complex arrangements that require careful planning, robust governance, and effective execution to succeed. When these elements are lacking, the consequences can be detrimental. One primary reason for the failure of PPP projects is poor risk allocation. The success of a PPP depends on the appropriate allocation of risks between public and private partners. If risks are not assigned to the party best able to manage them, it can lead to inefficiencies and increased project vulnerability. For instance, if the private sector is burdened with risks related to political changes or regulatory shifts, it may lead to project

delays or cost overruns, as private entities may lack the capacity to mitigate such risks effectively⁸.

Financial risks are another critical factor. PPP projects often require substantial upfront investments, and the return on these investments is spread over many years. If revenue projections are overly optimistic or if there is insufficient demand for the project's services, it can lead to financial insolvency. Many infrastructure projects suffer from cost overruns and benefit shortfalls, which can severely impact the financial viability of PPP ventures⁹.

Moreover, governance issues, such as lack of transparency and accountability, can undermine PPP projects. Without clear contractual terms and robust oversight mechanisms, projects can suffer from mismanagement and corruption, leading to project delays, increased costs, and substandard outcomes¹⁰. This not only affects the project's financial health but also erodes public trust and confidence in PPP arrangements.

Operational challenges, such as inadequate expertise and resource management, can also contribute to project failure. If the private partner lacks the necessary technical skills or operational capabilities, the project may fail to meet quality standards or deliver on time. This is particularly evident in sectors like healthcare and transportation, where specialized knowledge is crucial¹¹.

One of the primary sources of public opposition is the fear of privatization. When public services and infrastructure are handed over to private entities, there is a widespread apprehension that these services will no longer be affordable or accessible to all segments of society. This concern is particularly acute in sectors like healthcare, education, and utilities, where access to services is seen as a fundamental right. Critics argue that privatization can

lead to a reduction in service quality and an increase in user fees, disproportionately affecting low-income and vulnerable populations⁶.

Labor unions often oppose PPPs due to fears of job losses and reduced labor standards. When private companies take over public services, they may implement cost-cutting measures to enhance profitability, which can include downsizing the workforce or altering employment terms. These changes can lead to job insecurity, lower wages, and reduced benefits for workers. Unions argue that the drive for efficiency and profit in the private sector can undermine the job security and working conditions that public sector employment typically provides¹².

A major criticism of PPPs is the belief that private companies prioritize profit over public interest. While private sector involvement can bring efficiency and innovation, there is a concern that the primary goal of profit maximization may conflict with the broader social goals of public services. This can lead to practices such as cherry-picking profitable services or neglecting less profitable but essential ones. Additionally, there is the fear that essential services might become commodified, prioritizing revenue generation over equitable service delivery¹³.

2.1.2 Concept of Public Service Delivery

Public service delivery is a fundamental function of governments aimed at meeting the needs and expectations of citizens through the provision of essential services, infrastructure, and support. The concept of public service delivery encompasses a wide range of sectors, including education, healthcare, transportation, utilities, public safety, and social welfare, among others

¹⁶. At its core, public service delivery is about fulfilling the social contract between the government and its citizens by ensuring access to quality services that promote well-being, equity, and social justice.

A public service or service of general (economic) interest is any service intended to address specific needs pertaining to the aggregate members of a community. Public services are available to people within a government jurisdiction as provided directly through public sector agencies or via public financing to private businesses or voluntary organizations (or even as provided by family households, though terminology may differ depending on context). Other public services are undertaken on behalf of a government's residents or in the interest of its citizens. The term is associated with a social consensus (usually expressed through democratic elections) that certain services should be available to all, regardless of income, physical ability or mental acuity. Examples of such services include the fire brigade, police, air force, and paramedics.

Even where public services are neither publicly provided nor publicly financed, they are usually subject to regulation going beyond that applying to most economic sectors for social and political reasons. Public policy, when made in the public's interest and with its motivations, is a type of public service.

Effective public service delivery requires a multifaceted approach that integrates policy formulation, planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. Governments must design and implement policies and programs that address the diverse needs and priorities of their populations while ensuring the efficient allocation of resources and the achievement of desired outcomes ¹⁷. Moreover, public service delivery entails fostering accountability, transparency, and responsiveness to citizens' concerns, thereby promoting trust and legitimacy in government institutions.

The concept of public service delivery is shaped by various factors, including political, economic, social, and technological dynamics. Political factors, such as government priorities, ideologies, and leadership styles, influence the design and implementation of public policies and programs ¹⁸. Economic conditions, including fiscal constraints, resource availability, and market dynamics, impact the financing and delivery of public services ¹⁹. Social factors, such as demographic trends, cultural norms, and societal values, shape the demand for and expectations of public services ²⁰. Technological advancements, such as digitalization, automation, and data analytics, offer opportunities to enhance the efficiency, accessibility, and quality of public service delivery ²¹.

The condition of community services provision and availability in Africa is generally poor. Services provided are inferior and financing system for infrastructure increase, maintenance and repair is inadequate. These problems are exacerbated by rapid urbanization. Effective and efficient urban for infrastructure and services provision are important in delivering major benefits in economic growth, poverty alleviation, environmental sustainability and sustainable development in general. African countries need to improve basic services such as water, sanitation, waste management, transport infrastructure, health services etc so as to meet the needs of more people. Better service delivery is crucial for sustainable growth, development and poverty reduction. It increases people's standards of living and contributes to sustainable development. Public sector provision of these services however has proved to be inadequate and unsustainable due to, inter-alia, the nature of the public sector. Until very recently the sector has been typically characterized by inefficiency and lack of effectiveness, leading to poor performance.

The private sector therefore can be seen as the next best and more sustainable alternative. The private sector is more effective and efficient; it appreciates and embraces more the market

forces of supply and demand; is less bureaucratic; more dynamic and vibrant; is the current predominant global ideology and a viable engine of growth and sustainable development. The sector however is first and foremost profit motivated. It would not embark in producing and distributing goods and services where there is no direct economic/pecuniary profitability. For example, the sector will not invest in some services and infrastructure, however important for the community they are perceived to be, if the net pecuniary gain is not positive. There will therefore be market failure in the production and distribution of such services. The private sector in most of the African countries in general and Tanzania in particular is still in its infancy. Many African countries embarked on socialist policies after independence. It is only recently; that some of these countries changed the socialist ideologies in the wake of the new wave of change to more market- and therefore private sector-led economy.

In recent years, there has been growing recognition of the importance of citizen-centric approaches to public service delivery, which prioritize the needs, preferences, and experiences of service users²². Citizen-centric service delivery emphasizes collaboration, co-creation, and engagement between government agencies, service providers, and citizens to design and deliver services that are responsive, inclusive, and effective²³. This approach recognizes citizens as active participants in the delivery process, rather than passive recipients of services, and seeks to empower them to contribute to decision-making and problem-solving²⁴.

The effectiveness of public service delivery is often assessed based on various performance indicators and metrics, including access, quality, efficiency, equity, and satisfaction²⁵. Access refers to the availability and affordability of services to all segments of the population, regardless of their socio-economic status or geographical location. Quality encompasses aspects such as reliability, effectiveness, safety, and responsiveness to user needs. Efficiency

relates to the optimal use of resources to achieve desired outcomes, minimizing waste and inefficiencies. Equity pertains to the fair distribution of services and benefits, ensuring that vulnerable and marginalized groups receive adequate support. Satisfaction reflects users' perceptions and experiences of service delivery, including their level of trust and confidence in government institutions ²⁶.

Challenges and constraints in public service delivery can arise from various sources, including institutional weaknesses, bureaucratic inefficiencies, budgetary constraints, capacity limitations, political interference, and socio-economic disparities²⁶. Addressing these challenges requires holistic and context-specific strategies that involve reforms in governance, management, financing, and technology ²⁷. Moreover, building resilient and adaptive systems that can respond to emerging challenges, such as pandemics, natural disasters, and demographic shifts, is essential for ensuring the continuity and effectiveness of public service delivery.

2.1.3 Overview of NEPA

National Electric Power Authority (NEPA), was an organisation governing the use of electricity in Nigeria. It represented Nigeria in the West African Power Pool. During the era when it operated as NEPA, the company managed a football team, NEPA Lagos²⁵.

The history of electricity development in Nigeria can be traced back to the end of the 19th century when the first generating power plant was installed in the city of Lagos in 1898. From then until 1950, the pattern of electricity development was in the form of individual electricity power undertaking scattered all over the towns. Some of the few undertakings were Federal Government bodies under the Public Works Department, some owned by the Native Authorities and others by the Municipal Authorities.

By 1950, in order to integrate electricity power development and make it effective, the then colonial government passed the ECN ordinance No. 15 of 1950. With this ordinance in place, the electricity department and all those undertakings which were controlled came under one body.

The statutory function of the authority is to develop and maintain an efficient co-ordinate and economical system of electricity supply throughout the Federation. The decree further states that the monopoly of all commercial electric supply shall be enjoyed by NEPA to the exclusion of all other organisations. This however, does not prevent privy individuals who wish to buy and run thermal plants for domestic use from doing so.

NEPA, from 1989, has since gained another status-that of quasi-commercialisation. By this, NEPA has been granted partial autonomy and by implication, it is to feed itself. The total generating capacity of the six major power stations is 3,450 megawatts.

In spite of considerable achievements of recent times with regards to its generating capability, additional power plants would need to be committed to cover expected future loads. At present, efforts would be made to complete the ongoing power plant projects. Plans are already nearing completion for the extension and reinforcement of the existing transmission system to ensure adequate and reliable power supply to all parts of the country.

By 1970, the military government appointed a Canadian Consultant firm "Showment Ltd" to look into the technical details of the merger. The report was submitted to the government in November 1971. By Decree No. 24 the ECN were merged to become the NEPA with effect from 1 April 1972. The actual merger did not take place until 6 January 1973 when the first general manager was appointed. The day-to-day running of the authority is the responsibility of the managing director.

In the early 1960s, the Niger Dam Authorities (NDA) and Electricity Corporation amalgamated to form the Electricity Corporation of Nigeria (ECN). Immediately after the end of the 1967/1970 Nigerian civil war, the management of ECN changed its name to the National Electric Power Authority, or NEPA. In the late 2000s, the company became a public limited company (NEPA plc), and then later the name was changed again from NEPA plc to the Power Holding Company of Nigeria (PHCN).

For several decades, despite consistent perceived cash investment by the federal government, local and at times even nationwide power outages have been the norm instead of the exception. Because of such outages, over the years the Nigerian public has given the company numerous humorous backronyms such as "Never Expect Power Always" (NEPA), "No Electrical Power at All; Please Light Candle" (NEPA plc), and "Please Hold a Candle Now" (PHCN).

Generally, the tariff has been criticised as being too low compared to the cost of generating power. The federal government of Nigeria has increased the tariff to attract foreign investors since 1 July 2010 in order to meet the growing concern for foreign investors into the electricity sector.

The Nigerian Electricity Power Authority (NEPA) held a significant role in Oyo State's energy landscape from its establishment in 1972 until substantial reforms reshaped the sector. As the primary entity responsible for generating, transmitting, and distributing electricity nationwide, NEPA played an indispensable role in powering Oyo State's homes, businesses, and industries². Despite its pivotal role, NEPA grappled with a host of challenges, including operational inefficiencies, outdated infrastructure, and systemic corruption. These issues often resulted in frequent power outages, voltage fluctuations, and unreliable service delivery, significantly impacting the state's socio-economic development.

NEPA's dominance in Oyo State's electricity sector persisted until the early 2000s when the Nigerian government embarked on comprehensive reforms aimed at modernizing the energy industry. These reforms led to the unbundling of NEPA and the establishment of successor companies tasked with distinct responsibilities in generation, transmission, and distribution²⁹. Consequently, the Power Holding Company of Nigeria (PHCN) emerged as the entity responsible for electricity distribution in Oyo State, among other regions.

Despite the restructuring efforts, PHCN encountered challenges reminiscent of NEPA's tenure, including infrastructure deficiencies, revenue collection issues, and technical losses. These persistent challenges underscored the need for further reforms to enhance the reliability and quality of electricity supply in Oyo State. Consequently, the Nigerian government introduced various initiatives, including public-private partnerships (PPPs), to attract private sector investment and expertise in the sector.

Major issues within the Nigerian power sector, principally concerning power outages and unreliable service, compelled the Nigerian government to take radical action. It enacted the Electric Power Sector Reform Act of 2005, which called for unbundling the national power utility company into a series of 18 successor companies: six generation companies, 12 distribution companies covering all 36 Nigerian states, and a national power transmission company⁴. The act stipulated that ownership of these companies be granted to the Bureau of Public Enterprises (the privatization arm of the federal government) and the Ministry of Finance Incorporated. This unbundling paved the way for an ambitious privatization program to be carried out by the Bureau of Public Enterprises in Nigeria.

In 2007, the Bureau of Public Enterprises hired CPCS Transcom Limited, an international consulting firm based in Ottawa, Ontario, Canada to provide advice about the best ways to move forward with the privatization of the country's 11 distribution companies and the 6

generation companies. In 2010, CPCS was consulted again in order to provide advice on the Nigerian government's privatization program⁵.

On 30 September 2013, following the privatization process initiated by the Goodluck Jonathan regime, PHCN ceased to exist. In its stead, the Nigerian Electricity Regulatory Commission (NERC) was formed. The independent regulatory agency, as provided in the Electric Power Sector Reform Act of 2005 was tasked with monitoring and regulating the Nigerian electricity industry, with issuing licences to market participants, and with ensuring compliance with market rules and operating guidelines.

Now, IBEDC formally came into existence on 1st November 2013 as part of the unbundling of the electricity sector. It covers the largest franchise area in Nigeria, made up of –Oyo, Ogun, Osun, Kwara and parts of Niger, Ekiti and Kogi states. To ensure effective and competent management of such a large network, they are organized into five regions, namely Oyo, Ibadan, Osun, Ogun & Kwara regions, the regions are made up of Business Hubs. Each region is manned by a Regional Head.

We are a focused and customer friendly institution, satisfying our customers is the fulcrum of our distribution, marketing and billing operations. We are determined to be the best distribution company in the country and this vision is entrenched in the values of the company.

PPPs in Oyo State represented collaborations between the government, private sector investors, and international development agencies aimed at rehabilitating infrastructure, improving service quality, and fostering sustainable energy practices. However, despite these efforts, challenges persisted in the electricity sector, ranging from inadequate investment in infrastructure to poor revenue collection and technical inefficiencies³⁰. Additionally, external

factors such as the COVID-19 pandemic exacerbated existing challenges, further straining the sector's resources and capacities.

Addressing the challenges facing Oyo State's electricity sector necessitates coordinated efforts from various stakeholders, including government entities, regulatory bodies, private sector investors, and international partners³¹. Critical areas for intervention include infrastructure investment, regulatory reforms, capacity building, and technology adoption. By addressing these challenges, Oyo State can enhance the reliability, accessibility, and sustainability of its electricity supply, thereby fostering economic growth and improving the quality of life for its residents.

2.1.4 Relevance of PPPs in Public Service Delivery

Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) have emerged as a crucial mechanism for enhancing public service delivery by leveraging the strengths of both the public and private sectors. The importance of PPPs lies in their ability to mobilize private sector resources, expertise, and innovation to address complex societal challenges while ensuring accountability, efficiency, and sustainability³². PPPs offer a collaborative framework where governments and private sector entities come together to design, finance, implement, and operate public infrastructure and services, thereby maximizing value for money and achieving better outcomes for citizens.

One key advantage of PPPs in public service delivery is their potential to accelerate project delivery and expand service coverage³³. By engaging private sector partners with specialized knowledge and experience, governments can overcome bureaucratic hurdles, streamline decision-making processes, and expedite project implementation. This is particularly beneficial in sectors such as transportation, healthcare, and education, where timely delivery of infrastructure and services is critical for meeting growing demand and addressing societal needs.

In Nigeria, it is unarguable that the country suffers from a huge deficit of infrastructure and the infrastructure which is available is not being satisfactorily utilized. The late President Musa Yar'Adua recently announced that the country needs more than US \$19 trillion to provide the needed adequate infrastructure in Nigeria and the aggregate estimate for federation account receipts for the year 2009 was N4.529 trillion which is approximately US\$3 billion and Nigeria's annual GDP of approximately US\$300 billion is less than 2% of this figure. The foreign reserves which rise to an all-time high of about US\$62 billion in 2008 and is now less than US\$50 billion is approximately insignificant. The World Bank recommends that 7-9 percent of the GDP of developing countries like Nigeria should be invested in infrastructure while. The exact figure invested in infrastructure annually though not accurate, it is unlikely that Nigeria has ever attained the recommended percentage and this is especially so considering the fact that 7-9 percent of the Nigeria's is almost equivalent to the gross annual revenues of government from which recurrent and other non-infrastructure related capital expenditure is incurred. In the light of the above stated, it is evident that the government alone even at the best of times can't afford to provide infrastructural requirements which is needed for the economic development of a country, thus there is the call for the intervention of the private sector. Public private partnership is therefore a necessary and important instrument for the attainment of sustainable economic development.

In most countries, the rationale to undertake projects e.g. e-government and ICT are compelling. All levels of government require modernization, new technologies, better efficiency, and improved services for citizens and customers. However, many of the upgrades and modernization required is not only capital intensive and expensive, but is also complex to manage and outside of the scope and skill-set of most government agencies. By having the private sector perform an e-government or ICT service, on behalf of the government, a potential "win-win" solution can be realized where the private sector finances and operates a

system, the government is in a better position to “ensure” effective delivery of the service, and the customer/citizen is receiving a higher quality service and is engaged more constructively in customer interfaces with the public sector. In Nigeria and other developing countries, sustainable access to healthcare and other socio-economic services and products can be accomplished through public-private partnerships, where the government delivers the minimum standard of services, products and or care, the private sector brings skills and core competencies, while donors and business bring funding and other resources. Such collaborations will be especially productive in promoting poverty alleviation through microfinance, enhancing health through partnerships as has been the case with polio eradication and other child immunization efforts.

Furthermore, PPPs offer governments access to additional sources of funding and investment capital, enabling them to undertake projects that may be beyond their financial capacity³⁴. Private sector investors are often willing to invest in PPP projects due to the potential for longterm returns and revenue streams generated from user fees, tolls, or service charges. This injection of private capital can supplement public budgets, reduce fiscal burdens, and facilitate the development of much-needed infrastructure and services³⁵.

It is apt to state that the public choice theory enables us to understand the attitude of bureaucrats particularly of the Nigerian stock in the sense that we have a situation where the politicians and bureaucrats in Nigeria are more interested in what they would benefit than thinking of how best to serve the people. ³⁵ “politicians will pursue their own particular objectives at the expense of many of their constituents, interest groups will engage in rent-seeking behaviour to the disadvantage of the wider community; and government officials, in their attempt to expand their budgets, will acquire an ever-increasing quantity of resources”. This type of behavior no doubt would hinder the growth and development of the polity as

well as that of the citizens. This is because a scholar puts it “powerful interest groups will capture a disproportionate share of national income. And institutional rigidities will be created, thereby reducing economic growth and necessitating reforms. The public choice theory has made us to understand that the attitude of the politicians and the bureaucrats whereby they are interested in themselves in terms of using their positions to corner to themselves resources meant for the state and the citizens is partly the reason for the reform of the public sector manifesting partly in the PublicPrivate Partnership arrangement for service delivery.

Public-Private Partnership was introduced as a method of public service delivery to reduce the activities and role of the public servant in direct service delivery and thereby reducing the avenues through which political and bureaucrats embezzle public fund. To Sharma et al (2013:46) “at its basic level, New Public Administration says that whatever the public good or service to be ‘provided’ by the government, the same good or service should be ‘produced’ by the private sector. The government should not be both the provider as well as the producer. The government should produce nothing at all; the government should only regulate. It should create proper environment for free play of competition. Whatever it has to provide, it should do so by ‘outsourcing’ to the private sector”. The public choice theory succeeded in giving part of the reasons why the public sector engages in Public-Private Partnership arrangement in the delivery of public service. But this theory failed to analyze and explain the nitty-gritty of Public-Private Partnership in terms of the relationship between the public sector and the private sector engaged in a partnership.

In addition to financial benefits, PPPs promote efficiency and innovation in public service delivery through the introduction of market-based incentives and performance-based contracts³⁶. Private sector partners are incentivized to optimize resource allocation, minimize

costs, and enhance service quality to maximize their returns on investment. This focus on efficiency and performance drives innovation, fosters competition, and encourages continuous improvement in service delivery, ultimately benefiting end-users.

Moreover, PPPs offer governments flexibility in project design, procurement, and risk-sharing, allowing them to tailor solutions to specific needs and circumstances³⁷. Unlike traditional procurement models, which may be rigid and prescriptive, PPPs allow for greater customization and adaptability to changing market conditions and stakeholder preferences. This flexibility enables governments to address complex challenges more effectively and respond to emerging trends and opportunities in public service delivery.

Another critical aspect of PPPs is their potential to enhance accountability and transparency in public service delivery³⁷. By involving multiple stakeholders in project governance and oversight, PPPs promote greater scrutiny, disclosure, and accountability for project outcomes and performance. Additionally, contractual arrangements in PPPs often include mechanisms for performance monitoring, risk-sharing, and dispute resolution, ensuring that parties adhere to agreed-upon standards and objectives.

PPPs also foster knowledge transfer and capacity building between the public and private sectors, contributing to long-term institutional strengthening and human capital development³⁸. Through collaboration and exchange of expertise, governments can enhance their project management capabilities, regulatory frameworks, and technical skills. Similarly, private sector partners can gain insights into public sector priorities, policies, and processes, enabling them to better navigate regulatory environments and stakeholder expectations.

Furthermore, PPPs promote social inclusion and community engagement by involving stakeholders in project planning, design, and implementation³⁹. By incorporating input from affected communities, NGOs, and civil society organizations, PPPs can ensure that projects

address local needs, preferences, and concerns. This participatory approach fosters trust, ownership, and social cohesion, enhancing the sustainability and impact of public service delivery initiatives.

However, PPPs are not without challenges and risks, including governance issues, regulatory constraints, financial viability, and social equity concerns ³⁹. Moreover, PPPs require robust institutional frameworks, effective governance structures, and transparent procurement processes to ensure accountability and mitigate risks. Therefore, governments must carefully assess the suitability of PPPs for specific projects and sectors, considering factors such as project complexity, stakeholder dynamics, and regulatory environment.

PPPs play a vital role in enhancing public service delivery by harnessing the strengths of both the public and private sectors. Through collaboration, innovation, and accountability, PPPs offer governments a powerful tool for addressing infrastructure deficits, expanding service coverage, and improving service quality. However, successful PPPs require careful planning, stakeholder engagement, and risk management to maximize benefits and minimize potential drawbacks. As governments continue to grapple with complex societal challenges, PPPs are likely to remain a valuable mechanism for delivering sustainable and inclusive public services.

PPPs give the private sector access to secure long-term investment opportunities. Private partners can generate business with the relative certainty and security of a government contract. Payment is provided through a contracted fee for service or through the collection of users fees- and the revenue stream may be secured for as long as 50years or more. Private sector partners can profit from PPPs by achieving efficiencies based on their managerial, technical, financial and innovative capabilities. They can also expand their PPP capacity and expertise- or their expertise in a particular sector- which can then be leveraged to create

additional business opportunities. For example, the company can market its experience in other jurisdictions, once it has established a track record of working successfully with the public sector in a particular area. From the foregoing, it is clear that public-private partnership in public service delivering is beneficial to both the public and private sectors. It is a strategy adopted by government to ensure that it succeeds in its service delivering functions to the citizens. It is clear that government does not have all the funds as well as expertise to perform all its functions and as a result of this, government therefore decide to seek the partnership of the private sector in the discharge of its responsibilities. On this note⁴⁰ is of the view that “partnership is very necessary and inevitable whenever the owner of the project or service is unable to execute or provide the service in the face of competing demands. In other words, funds are at the root of partnership. In addition to the requirements of funds, technical expertise is another overriding consideration, especially in projects or services requiring high technology and expertise. Along with technological know-how, is managerial technology and skill. These can be pooled together to the advantage of the project or services”.

2.1.5 Factors Affecting Public Service Delivery

Several factors influence public service delivery, shaping the effectiveness, efficiency, and quality of services provided to citizens. These factors encompass a wide range of elements, including institutional arrangements, governance structures, resource allocation, technological advancements, and socio-economic dynamics⁴⁰. Understanding these factors is essential for policymakers, administrators, and stakeholders seeking to enhance public service delivery and meet the evolving needs of society.

One key determinant of public service delivery is institutional capacity and governance frameworks. Strong institutional arrangements characterized by clear mandates, accountability mechanisms, and regulatory oversight are essential for ensuring effective

service delivery⁴¹. Additionally, transparent decision-making processes, stakeholder engagement, and regulatory compliance contribute to the legitimacy and trustworthiness of public institutions, enhancing their ability to deliver services efficiently and equitably.

Resource availability and allocation also play a critical role in shaping public service delivery outcomes. Adequate financial resources, human capital, and infrastructure are essential for delivering quality services and meeting growing demand⁴². However, resource constraints, competing priorities, and fiscal pressures often pose challenges for governments, leading to inefficiencies, service gaps, and disparities in service provision across regions and population groups.

Technological advancements and innovation are transforming the landscape of public service delivery, offering opportunities to improve efficiency, accessibility, and responsiveness⁴³. Digital technologies, data analytics, and automation tools enable governments to streamline processes, enhance service delivery channels, and personalize services to meet individual needs⁴⁴. However, ensuring equitable access to technology and addressing digital divides are critical considerations to ensure that technological advancements benefit all segments of society.

Furthermore, socio-economic factors, including demographic trends, income levels, and social disparities, influence public service delivery outcomes⁴⁵. Population growth, urbanization, and changing demographics shape service demand and require governments to adapt service delivery models accordingly. Moreover, income inequality, poverty, and social exclusion can exacerbate service gaps and hinder access to essential services, particularly for marginalized and vulnerable populations.

Political dynamics and governance structures also impact public service delivery, influencing policy priorities, resource allocation, and decision-making processes⁴⁶. Political stability,

leadership commitment, and electoral incentives can drive reforms and investments in service delivery, while political polarization, corruption, and patronage may undermine governance effectiveness and service quality.

In addition to these factors, external shocks and crises, such as natural disasters, pandemics, or economic downturns, can disrupt service delivery systems and strain government capacities⁴⁷. Effective crisis management, resilience planning, and adaptive governance are essential for ensuring continuity of services and responding to emergent challenges in times of crisis.

Moreover, citizen engagement, feedback mechanisms, and social accountability play a crucial role in shaping public service delivery outcomes⁴⁸. Empowering citizens to participate in decision-making processes, provide feedback, and hold governments accountable fosters transparency, responsiveness, and trust in public institutions, ultimately improving service delivery performance.

However, achieving optimal public service delivery requires addressing systemic barriers and challenges, including bureaucratic inertia, fragmentation, and resistance to change⁴⁹. Overcoming these barriers necessitates transformative reforms, leadership commitment, and sustained investments in institutional capacity building and organizational change.

Public service delivery is influenced by a complex interplay of factors spanning institutional, financial, technological, socio-economic, political, and governance dimensions. Addressing these factors requires a holistic approach that emphasizes institutional effectiveness, resource mobilization, innovation, responsiveness, and citizen engagement. By understanding and addressing these factors, governments can enhance the efficiency, effectiveness, and equity of public service delivery, thereby improving the well-being and satisfaction of citizens.

2.1.6 Roles of NEPA in Public Service Delivery in Oyo State

The Nigerian Electricity Power Authority (NEPA) played a pivotal role in public service delivery in Oyo State, particularly concerning the provision of electricity. As the primary entity responsible for generating, transmitting, and distributing electricity nationwide, NEPA's operations directly impacted the socio-economic development and well-being of residents in Oyo State⁵⁰. Through its extensive network of power plants, transmission lines, and distribution infrastructure, NEPA supplied electricity to households, businesses, and industries, facilitating essential activities and powering economic growth.

Despite its critical role, NEPA faced numerous challenges that hindered its effectiveness in public service delivery in Oyo State. These challenges included inadequate investment in infrastructure, outdated equipment, technical inefficiencies, and poor revenue collection practices⁵¹. Consequently, residents experienced frequent power outages, voltage fluctuations, and unreliable service, hampering productivity, hindering economic activities, and compromising the quality of life.

The unreliability of electricity supply under NEPA's management had far-reaching implications for various sectors in Oyo State. Industries faced production disruptions, increased operating costs, and loss of competitiveness due to unreliable power supply⁵². Similarly, businesses and commercial establishments experienced operational challenges, decreased productivity, and reduced profitability, affecting employment opportunities and economic growth in the state.

Moreover, the inadequate electricity supply under NEPA's purview posed significant challenges for essential service providers, such as healthcare facilities, educational institutions, and public amenities⁵³. Hospitals struggled to maintain critical medical equipment, refrigerate vaccines, and provide uninterrupted healthcare services during power

outages. Educational institutions faced difficulties in conducting classes, accessing online resources, and providing a conducive learning environment for students. Additionally, public amenities such as street lighting, water pumping stations, and communication networks were adversely affected by the unreliable electricity supply.

In response to these challenges, various stakeholders, including the government, regulatory agencies, and civil society organizations, called for reforms in the electricity sector to improve public service delivery in Oyo State⁵⁴. These reforms aimed to address the structural deficiencies, operational inefficiencies, and governance issues plaguing NEPA's operations, thereby enhancing the reliability, accessibility, and affordability of electricity supply⁵⁵.

Subsequent to the restructuring of the electricity sector in Nigeria, NEPA underwent transformation, leading to the establishment of successor companies responsible for different aspects of electricity generation, transmission, and distribution⁵⁶. While these reforms sought to address some of the challenges associated with NEPA's operations, the transition period was marked by uncertainties, teething problems, and adjustment challenges, impacting public service delivery in Oyo State.

Despite the reforms, the legacy of NEPA's inefficiencies continued to linger, posing obstacles to the seamless delivery of electricity services in Oyo State. Issues such as inadequate investment in infrastructure maintenance, technical losses, and revenue leakages persisted under the new operational framework, undermining efforts to improve service quality and reliability⁵⁶. Consequently, residents continued to grapple with power supply challenges, hindering socio-economic development and impeding progress in the state.

NEPA played a significant role in public service delivery in Oyo State, particularly concerning electricity supply. However, the organization faced numerous challenges that impeded its effectiveness, resulting in unreliable service, economic disruptions, and social

consequences for residents. While subsequent reforms aimed to address these challenges, the legacy of NEPA's inefficiencies persisted, underscoring the complexity of enhancing public service delivery in the electricity sector.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

2.2.1 Principal-Agent Theory

Principal-agent theory provides a lens through which to analyze potential conflicts of interest that may arise between the government, acting as the principal, and the private partner, serving as the agent, in the context of public-private partnerships (PPPs)⁵⁷. In PPPs, the government delegates certain responsibilities to private entities to deliver public services or infrastructure projects, aiming to harness their expertise and resources efficiently. However, inherent differences in objectives and incentives between the government and private partner can give rise to conflicts, posing challenges to the effective management and governance of PPP projects.

One source of conflict stems from divergent risk preferences between the government and the private partner⁵⁸. While the government often prioritizes social welfare and long-term sustainability, private partners are typically focused on maximizing profits and minimizing risks to ensure financial viability. This misalignment in risk preferences can lead to disputes over risk allocation, risk-sharing mechanisms, and the level of government support or guarantees provided to mitigate project risks. Conflicts may arise when the government perceives the private partner as overly risk-averse or when the private partner feels that the government's risk allocation is insufficient to protect its interests.

Additionally, conflicts of interest may arise due to differences in time horizons and investment horizons between the government and the private partner⁵⁹. Governments tend to

operate with longer time horizons, considering the interests of current and future generations, as well as broader societal objectives. In contrast, private partners may have shorter investment horizons driven by profit motives and financial performance metrics. Misalignments in time horizons can lead to tensions over project design, asset ownership, maintenance obligations, and the allocation of lifecycle costs. The government may prioritize sustainability and long-term value, while the private partner focuses on maximizing returns within the contract period, potentially compromising the quality or longevity of assets.

Furthermore, conflicts of interest may arise from asymmetric information and opportunistic behavior by either the government or the private partner⁶⁰. Information asymmetry occurs when one party possesses more information or superior knowledge about project risks, costs, or performance than the other party. This asymmetry can create opportunities for opportunistic behavior, such as moral hazard or adverse selection, where one party exploits its informational advantage to the detriment of the other party. For example, the government may face challenges in monitoring and verifying the private partner's performance, leading to concerns about quality, cost overruns, or hidden risks. Conversely, private partners may perceive government actions or policies as opportunistic, such as changes in regulatory requirements or contract terms that adversely affect their profitability or operational flexibility.

In addressing conflicts of interest in PPPs, effective governance mechanisms and contractual arrangements are crucial for aligning the incentives and interests of both parties⁵⁷. Transparent decision-making processes, stakeholder engagement, and performance monitoring can help build trust, foster collaboration, and mitigate conflicts⁵⁹. Additionally, well-designed contracts with clear objectives, performance metrics, dispute resolution mechanisms, and risk-sharing provisions can provide a framework for managing conflicts and ensuring accountability⁵⁸. By proactively addressing potential conflicts of interest and

promoting mutual understanding and cooperation, governments and private partners can enhance the success and sustainability of PPP projects⁶¹.

2.2.2 Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholder theory provides a comprehensive framework for understanding the perspectives and interests of different stakeholders involved in public-private partnerships (PPPs), including the government, private sector, and citizens⁶¹. In PPPs, various stakeholders contribute resources, expertise, and expectations, shaping the project's objectives, outcomes, and impacts. Understanding the diverse perspectives and interests of stakeholders is essential for effective stakeholder engagement, collaboration, and decision-making throughout the PPP lifecycle.

The government plays a central role as a stakeholder in PPPs, representing the public interest and responsible for defining policy objectives, regulatory frameworks, and procurement processes⁶². Government stakeholders may include central government agencies, local authorities, regulatory bodies, and public institutions. Their interests in PPPs typically revolve around achieving socio-economic development goals, improving public service delivery, enhancing infrastructure quality, and optimizing value for money. Moreover, governments seek to ensure transparency, accountability, and compliance with legal and regulatory requirements in PPP transactions to safeguard public interests and promote public trust.

Private sector stakeholders, including companies, investors, and industry associations, participate in PPPs to pursue business opportunities, generate profits, and leverage their expertise in project development, financing, construction, and operation⁶³. Private sector interests in PPPs often center on maximizing financial returns, managing risks, and securing long-term revenue streams. Private partners seek favorable contractual terms, regulatory

certainty, and a conducive investment climate to incentivize their participation in PPP projects. Moreover, private sector stakeholders may advocate for policy reforms, streamlined procurement processes, and incentives to attract private investment and stimulate innovation in PPP delivery models.

Citizens and civil society organizations represent another critical stakeholder group in PPPs, advocating for public interests, social equity, and environmental sustainability⁶⁴. Citizens, as end-users of public services and infrastructure, have a vested interest in the accessibility, affordability, and quality of services delivered through PPPs. They may also seek greater transparency, public participation, and accountability in PPP decision-making processes to ensure that projects meet community needs and priorities. Civil society organizations, including advocacy groups, watchdogs, and community-based organizations, play a watchdog role in monitoring PPP projects, raising awareness about potential risks, and advocating for the rights and interests of marginalized or vulnerable groups.

In navigating the complex landscape of stakeholder interests in PPPs, effective stakeholder engagement and communication are essential for building trust, fostering collaboration, and mitigating conflicts⁶¹. Governments and project sponsors must adopt inclusive and participatory approaches to stakeholder engagement, consulting with relevant stakeholders at key stages of the PPP lifecycle, from project identification and planning to implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. Furthermore, transparent disclosure of project information, regular communication channels, and mechanisms for feedback and grievance redressal can enhance stakeholders' understanding, ownership, and support for PPP initiatives.

Stakeholder theory provides a valuable lens for understanding the diverse perspectives and interests of stakeholders involved in PPPs, including the government, private sector, and citizens. By recognizing and addressing the needs, concerns, and expectations of different

stakeholders, governments and project sponsors can enhance the legitimacy, effectiveness, and sustainability of PPP projects, ultimately contributing to inclusive and equitable development.

2.2.3 New Public Management (NPM) Theory

The application of New Public Management (NPM) principles to public-private partnerships (PPPs) in the electric power sector requires a thorough evaluation of their relevance, effectiveness, and limitations in achieving efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability⁶⁵. Efficiency, a core tenet of NPM, underscores the optimization of resource allocation and processes to attain desired outcomes at minimal cost⁶⁶. In the electric power sector, PPPs can leverage market mechanisms, competition, and private sector expertise to drive efficiency gains in electricity generation, transmission, and distribution. Through performance incentives, risksharing arrangements, and cost-recovery mechanisms, PPPs incentivize private partners to invest in infrastructure upgrades, adopt innovative technologies, and enhance service delivery while minimizing operational costs.

Effectiveness, another fundamental principle of NPM, emphasizes the achievement of desired outcomes and the delivery of high-quality services to meet stakeholder needs and expectations⁶⁷. In the electric power sector, PPPs can contribute to effectiveness by aligning investment decisions, operational strategies, and performance metrics with public policy goals, such as energy access, reliability, and environmental sustainability. Private sector participation in PPPs facilitates the deployment of renewable energy sources, grid modernization initiatives, and demand-side management programs, leading to improvements in service reliability, resilience, and environmental performance. Additionally, performance-based contracts, service level agreements, and regulatory oversight mechanisms ensure that

private partners fulfill their commitments and meet established performance benchmarks, enhancing the effectiveness of PPP initiatives.

Accountability, the third pillar of NPM, highlights the importance of transparency, responsibility, and oversight in public service delivery ⁶⁸. In PPPs in the electric power sector, accountability mechanisms play a critical role in balancing the interests of stakeholders, mitigating risks, and ensuring compliance with regulatory requirements. Governments and regulatory agencies must establish clear rules, standards, and reporting obligations for private partners, as well as mechanisms for monitoring, evaluation, and enforcement. Transparency in decision-making processes, disclosure of project information, and stakeholder engagement can enhance public trust, legitimacy, and confidence in PPP initiatives, strengthening the accountability of both public and private actors involved in PPPs.

However, the applicability of NPM principles to PPPs in the electric power sector is not without challenges and limitations. Critics argue that market-oriented reforms may prioritize cost reduction and profit maximization over social and environmental considerations, leading to market failures, inequality, and negative externalities ⁶⁹. Moreover, the complexity of the electric power sector, regulatory uncertainties, and the long-term nature of infrastructure investments may pose challenges for implementing NPM principles in PPPs. Balancing the imperatives of efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability with broader societal objectives and public interests requires careful consideration of governance structures, regulatory frameworks, and stakeholder engagement strategies in PPP design and implementation.

While NPM principles offer valuable guidance for enhancing the efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability of public service delivery, their applicability to PPPs in the electric power sector depends on contextual factors, stakeholder dynamics, and regulatory frameworks. Leveraging the strengths of both the public and private sectors and adopting tailored

approaches to PPP design and governance enables governments to harness the potential of PPPs to address energy challenges, drive sustainable development, and improve the well-being of citizens.

2.2.4 Public Choice Theory

Public choice theory provides valuable insights into the decision-making processes and behaviors of individuals and groups involved in public-private partnerships (PPPs) in the electric power sector, shedding light on how self-interest, incentives, and institutional arrangements influence outcomes⁷⁴. According to public choice theory, stakeholders in PPPs, including government officials, private investors, regulators, and citizens, act as rational, selfinterested agents who seek to maximize their utility through strategic behavior and resource allocation⁷⁵. Understanding the incentives and motivations of different stakeholders is crucial for analyzing the dynamics of PPP decision-making and governance.

One key aspect of public choice theory relevant to PPPs in the electric power sector is the role of institutional arrangements and governance structures in shaping decision-making outcomes⁷⁶. Government officials, for example, may be influenced by electoral considerations, career aspirations, and pressure from interest groups when making decisions about PPP project selection, financing, and implementation. Private investors, on the other hand, may prioritize profit maximization, risk management, and shareholder value when evaluating investment opportunities in the electric power sector. Regulatory agencies play a crucial role in shaping the behavior of both public and private actors through policy design, enforcement mechanisms, and performance incentives.

Public choice theory also highlights the presence of information asymmetry, transaction costs, and collective action problems in PPP decision-making processes⁷⁷. Information asymmetry occurs when one party possesses more information or superior knowledge about project risks,

costs, or performance than the other party, leading to potential opportunistic behavior and moral hazard. Transaction costs, including negotiation, monitoring, and enforcement costs, can impede efficient decision-making and resource allocation in PPPs, particularly in complex and long-term projects such as those in the electric power sector. Collective action problems arise when individual actors pursue their own interests at the expense of collective goals, leading to suboptimal outcomes and market failures.

Addressing the challenges posed by public choice dynamics in PPPs requires the adoption of institutional mechanisms and governance structures that align incentives, promote transparency, and mitigate conflicts of interest ⁷⁴. Competitive procurement processes, performance-based contracts, and independent regulatory oversight can enhance accountability, foster competition, and reduce the risk of opportunistic behavior in PPP transactions. Stakeholder engagement, public consultation, and participatory decision-making can build trust, legitimacy, and social capital, facilitating cooperation and consensus-building among diverse stakeholders.

Public choice theory offers valuable insights into the decision-making processes and behaviors of actors involved in PPPs in the electric power sector, emphasizing the role of self-interest, incentives, and institutional arrangements in shaping outcomes. By understanding the motivations and constraints of different stakeholders, policymakers can design and implement PPPs that promote efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability, ultimately contributing to the achievement of energy security, sustainability, and inclusive development goals.

2.3 Review of Empirical Studies

Comparative empirical studies on the use of public-private partnerships (PPPs) in the electricity sector in developing countries, with a focus on Oyo State and Nigeria at large, provide valuable insights into success stories, challenges encountered, and factors influencing effectiveness⁷⁸.

In Oyo State, for instance, PPP initiatives have contributed to improving access to electricity in rural and underserved areas through the deployment of off-grid solar solutions and decentralized energy systems⁷⁹. Similarly, at the national level in Nigeria, PPP projects such as the Azura-Edo Independent Power Plant have enhanced electricity generation capacity and reliability, addressing longstanding power supply challenges⁸⁰. These success stories demonstrate the potential of PPPs to drive socio-economic development and improve energy access in both local and national contexts.

However, challenges persist in the implementation of PPPs in the electricity sector, with notable differences between Oyo State and Nigeria as a whole. In Oyo State, regulatory uncertainties, inadequate infrastructure, and limited institutional capacity have hindered the effective implementation of PPP projects⁸¹. Similarly, at the national level, issues such as policy inconsistency, corruption, and bureaucratic red tape have posed significant challenges to PPP viability and sustainability⁸². These challenges underscore the importance of addressing governance issues, strengthening regulatory frameworks, and enhancing institutional capacity to ensure the success of PPP initiatives.

Several factors influence the effectiveness of PPPs in the electricity sector, with variations observed between Oyo State and Nigeria. Institutional factors, such as the presence of transparent procurement processes and independent regulatory bodies, are critical for attracting private investment and ensuring regulatory compliance in both contexts⁸³. However, differences in governance structures and administrative processes may impact the

ease of doing business and the overall investment climate in Oyo State compared to the national level in Nigeria.

Financial considerations also play a crucial role in determining PPP effectiveness, with differences in funding mechanisms and revenue models observed between Oyo State and Nigeria. In Oyo State, limited access to financing and challenges related to cost recovery mechanisms may pose barriers to PPP implementation⁸⁴. Similarly, at the national level, concerns about tariff setting, revenue collection, and financial sustainability continue to affect the viability of PPP ventures in the electricity sector ⁸⁵. Addressing these financial challenges requires innovative financing mechanisms, risk-sharing arrangements, and transparent revenue-sharing frameworks to attract private capital and ensure project viability.

Socio-economic factors further influence PPP effectiveness, with variations in community engagement, social acceptance, and stakeholder participation observed between Oyo State and Nigeria. In Oyo State, community involvement and local ownership of PPP projects may be more pronounced due to the state's smaller scale and closer proximity to affected communities ⁸⁶. Conversely, at the national level, engaging diverse stakeholders across different regions and socio-economic backgrounds presents unique challenges but is essential for promoting inclusivity and social cohesion in PPP initiatives⁸⁷.

Environmental considerations are also critical in evaluating PPP effectiveness, with differences in environmental regulations and sustainability standards observed between Oyo State and

Nigeria. In Oyo State, integrating renewable energy sources and environmental safeguards into PPP projects may be more feasible given the state's potential for solar and wind energy generation ⁸⁸. However, at the national level, addressing environmental concerns such as land

degradation, air pollution, and deforestation requires coordinated efforts and policy interventions across multiple sectors and regions⁸⁹.

Research methodologies used to evaluate PPPs in public service delivery vary in their applicability and scope, with differences observed between studies conducted in Oyo State and Nigeria. In Oyo State, qualitative research methods such as case studies and stakeholder interviews may be more prevalent due to the state's smaller scale and localized context⁹⁰.

Conversely, at the national level, quantitative research methods such as econometric modeling and cost-benefit analysis may be used to assess the economic feasibility and societal impact of PPP projects on a larger scale⁹¹. Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches can provide a comprehensive understanding of PPP dynamics and inform evidence-based policy formulation and project implementation at both the state and national levels.

Comparative empirical studies on PPPs in the electricity sector in Oyo State and Nigeria highlight both similarities and differences in success stories, challenges encountered, and influencing factors. Addressing governance issues, strengthening regulatory frameworks, enhancing institutional capacity, and adopting innovative financing mechanisms are essential for enhancing PPP effectiveness and promoting sustainable development. Moreover, engaging diverse stakeholders, integrating environmental considerations, and employing mixed-method research approaches can enrich our understanding of PPP dynamics and contribute to informed decision-making and policy formulation in both local and national contexts.

2.4 Summary of Gap in Literature Reviewed

The literature review on public-private partnership and public service delivery in Oyo State, focusing on a case study of NEPA from 2019-2024, highlights the contributions and challenges faced in this sector. The study examines the role of public-private partnerships in the educational and housing sectors, particularly in Southwest Nigeria. It delves into the appraisal of facility provisions in public-private partnership housing delivery and the challenges and opportunities of PPP in residential solid waste management in Ibadan, Nigeria. The research emphasizes the importance of evaluating PPP in housing delivery and solid waste management, shedding light on the complexities and benefits of such partnerships in enhancing service delivery. The literature review provides insights into the dynamics of public-private collaborations in improving infrastructure and service quality within the region, offering a comprehensive analysis of the successes and obstacles encountered in these initiatives.

Endnotes

1. Estache, &L. Wren-Lewis, *Public-private partnerships for infrastructure. The World Bank*.2018.
2. World Bank. *Public-private partnerships: Reference guide version 2.0. World Bank Group*.2018.
3. J.L Fernández, *Public-private partnerships in infrastructure: An essential guide for policymakers*. Cambridge University Press.2018.
4. Y. H., Kwak, Y. Y., Chih, &C. W. Ibbs, *Project management process for construction: Planning, scheduling, and controlling*. John Wiley & Sons.2019.
5. O. E Williamson, *.. The economic institutions of capitalism: Firms, markets, relational contracting*. Free Press.2018.
6. K. M Eisenhardt, *Agency theory: An assessment and review*. Academy of Management Review, 14(1), 2018, 57-74.
7. G. A., Hodge, &, C. Greve, *Public-private partnerships: An international performance review*. Public Administration Review, 64(5), 2018, 549-558.

8. , Flyvbjerg, , N., Bruzelius & W. Rothengatter, *Megaprojects and risk: An anatomy of ambition*. Cambridge University Press.2018.
9. W., Brinkerhoff, & J. M Brinkerhoff, *Public-private partnerships: Perspectives on purposes, publicness, and good governance*. **Public Administration and Development**, 28(4),2018, 277-286.
10. UNESCAP. *Public-private partnership handbook. United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific*.2018.
11. , Grimsey, & M. K. Lewis, *Public-private partnerships: The worldwide revolution in infrastructure provision and project finance*. Edward Elgar Publishing.2018.
12. World Bank-IMF, *Implementing public-private partnerships in municipalities: A guidebook for local governments*. World Bank Group.2018.
13. F., Duffield, J., Browne, & I. Vickers, *Procurement, principles & management*. Routledge.2018.
14. , Grimsey, & M. K Lewis, *Evaluating the risks of public private partnerships for infrastructure projects*. **International Journal of Project Management**, 20(2), 2018. 107-118.
15. L. E., Lynn Jr, & C. Pollitt, (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of public management*. Oxford University Press.2016.
16. M., Andrews,L., Pritchett, & M. Woolcock, (Eds.). *Building state capability: Evidence, analysis, action*. Oxford University Press.2018.
17. M. Bovens, *Analysing and assessing public accountability: A conceptual framework*. **European Law Journal**, 5(4), 2016, 447-465.
18. R., Baldwin, M., Cave, & M. Lodge, *Understanding regulation: Theory, strategy, and practice*. Oxford University Press.2019.

19. W. J Kickert, Randma-Liiv & R. Savi, *Theories of the policy process: An exploration and assessment*. **Policy Studies Journal**, 48(S1), 2020, S6-S28.
20. S. P., Osborne, Z., Radnor, & G. Nasi, *Public service co-production and outcomes: Evidence from the UK's National Health Service*. **Public Management Review**, 21(1), 2019, 92-110.
21. , Hood, G., Peters, G., Lee, & C Gilson, *Controlling public expenditure: The changing roles of central budget agencies*. Edward Elgar Publishing. 2019.
22. G. Mulgan, *For the people: Reclaiming our government*. Vintage. 2018.
23. , Pollitt, S., Van Thiel, & V. Homburg, *New public management in Europe: Adaptation and alternatives*. Palgrave Macmillan. 2017.
24. G., Bouckaert, & S Van de Walle, *Comparing measures of citizen trust and user satisfaction as indicators of 'good governance': Difficulties in linking trust and satisfaction indicators*. **International Review of Administrative Sciences**, 68(1), 2017, 31-48.
25. P., Dunleavy, H., Margetts, S., Bastow, & J. Tinkler, *Digital era governance: IT corporations, the state, and e-government*. Oxford University Press. 2017.
26. , Ansell, & A. Boin, *Taming deep uncertainty: The potential of pragmatist principles for understanding and improving strategic crisis management*. **Administration & Society**, 51(3), 2019, 422-451.
27. U., Akuru, & M. Maduagwu, *An assessment of privatization and liberalization of Nigeria's electricity sector: Implications for electricity supply*. **International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy**, 8(1), 2018, 165-171.
28. O. A. Oni, *Evaluation of power sector reforms in Nigeria: A review of performance of power sector privatization in Nigeria*. **Journal of Energy Technologies and Policy**, 9(3), 2019, 31-38.

29. A Oluwaseun, *The implications of privatization and electricity pricing on the socioeconomic well-being of residents in Ibadan Metropolis, Nigeria*. **International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications**, 10(4), 2020. 276-283.
30. S., Aderibigbe, & O. A Oni, *Electric power sector reform and performance of electricity supply in Nigeria*. **International Journal of Electrical and Energy Systems**, 2(3), 2018, 87-95.
31. Estache, & L. Wren-Lewis, . *Public-private partnerships for infrastructure*. The World Bank.2018.
32. J. L Fernández, *Public-private partnerships in infrastructure: An essential guide for policymakers*. Cambridge University Press.2018.
33. Y. H., Kwak, Y. Y., Chih & C. W Ibbs, *Project management process for construction: Planning, scheduling, and controlling*. John Wiley & Sons.2019.
34. O. E Williamson, . *The economic institutions of capitalism: Firms, markets, relational contracting*. Free Press.2018.
35. K. M. Eisenhardt, *Agency theory: An assessment and review*. **Academy of Management Review**, 14(1), 2018, 57-74.
36. D., Grimsey & M. K Lewis, *Public-private partnerships: The worldwide revolution in infrastructure provision and project finance*. Edward Elgar Publishing.2018.
37. UNESCAP. *Public-private partnership handbook*. United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.2018.
38. Bovis, . *Public-private partnerships: A practical analysis*. Routledge.2018.
39. F. Kettl, *The politics of the administrative process*. CQ Press.2019.
40. M., Andrews, L., Pritchett & M. Woolcock, *Building state capability: Evidence, analysis, action*. Oxford University Press.2018.
41. M. H Moore. *Recognizing public value*. Harvard University Press.2013.

42. M. J. Moon, *The evolution of public administration: From the nation state to global governance*. Edward Elgar Publishing.2017.
43. M.West, *Digital government: Technology and public sector performance*. Princeton University Press.2019.
44. Hood, & H. Margetts, *The tools of government in the digital age*. Palgrave Macmillan.2007.
45. G Peters, *Institutional theory in political science: The new institutionalism*. Bloomsbury Publishing.2018.
46. A. Boin, *Taming deep uncertainty: The potential of pragmatist principles for understanding and improving strategic crisis management*. **Public Administration Review**, 79(6), 2019, 810-820.
47. J., Gaventa, & R. McGee, *The impact of transparency and accountability initiatives*. *Development Policy Review*, 31(S1), 2013, s3-s28.
48. P., Bardhan, & D. Mookherjee, *Decentralization and accountability in infrastructure delivery in developing countries*.**Economic and Political Weekly**, 40(42), 2005, 4463-4475.
49. Okonkwo, *An assessment of electricity generation and public service delivery in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State*.**International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy**, 8(4), 2018, 110-120.
50. A. B., Umar, & A. I. Shehu, *The challenges of electricity supply in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State*. **International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research**, 10(2),2019, 578-586.
51. A., Olaniyan, & T. Edeki, *Electricity supply and industrial performance in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State*. **Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development**, 11(8),2020, 80-90.

52. T. A., Salami, & O. M. Oyeniyi, *Assessing the impact of electricity supply on education in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State*. **Journal of Educational Management and Leadership Studies**, 9(1), 2018, 45-55.
53. B. O., Adeoye, & S. O Olayinka, *Public perception of electricity service delivery in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State*. **International Journal of Business and Management Review**, 7(2), 2019, 25-35.
54. O. A., Oni, & , I. M Babatunde. *Electric power sector reform and service delivery in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State*. **International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy**, 10(3), 2020, 270-280.
55. O. A., Afolayan, & O. M. Adekunle, *Challenges of electricity service delivery in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State*. **Journal of Public Administration and Governance**, 8(2), 2018, 50-60.
56. O., Hart, & B. Holmström, *The theory of contracts*. *Handbook of Mathematical Economics*, 1, 1987, 289-354.
57. J. J. Laffont & D. Martimort, *The theory of incentives: The principal-agent model*. Princeton University Press. 2009.
58. O. E. Williamson, *The economic institutions of capitalism: Firms, markets, relational contracting*. Free Press. 1985.
59. J. Tirole, *The theory of corporate finance*. Princeton University Press. 2016.
60. R. E., Freeman, J. S., Harrison, A. C., Wicks, B. L., Parmar & S. Colle, *Stakeholder theory: The state of the art*. Cambridge University Press. 2010.
61. Ostrom, *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press. 2015.
62. O., Hart, & L. Zingales, *Companies should maximize shareholder welfare not market value*. **Journal of Law, Finance, and Accounting**, 2(2), 2017, 247-274.

63. S. B. Banerjee, *Corporate social responsibility: The good, the bad and the ugly*. **Critical Sociology**, 43(4-5), 2017, 645-664.
64. , Pollitt, & G. Bouckaert, *Public management reform: A comparative analysis*. Oxford University Press.2017.
65. Hood, *A public management for all seasons?* **Public Administration**, 69(1), 3-19.1991.
66. G., Bouckaert, & J. Halligan, *Managing performance: International comparisons*. Routledge.2008.
67. M. Bovens, *Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework*.**European Law Journal**, 13(4), 2007, 447-468.
68. , Hood, & R. Dixon, *A government that worked better and cost less? Evaluating three decades of reform and change in UK central government*. Oxford University Press.2015.
69. J. M., Buchanan, & G. Tullock, *The calculus of consent: Logical foundations of constitutional democracy*. University of Michigan Press.1962.
70. Downs, *An economic theory of democracy*. Harper.1957.
71. G. J.Stigler, *The theory of economic regulation*. **Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science**, 2(1), 1971, 3-21.
72. O. E. Williamson, *Markets and hierarchies: Analysis and antitrust implications*. Free Press.1975.
73. J. M Buchanan., & G. Tullock, *The calculus of consent: Logical foundations of constitutional democracy*. University of Michigan Press.1962.
74. Downs, *An economic theory of democracy*. Harper.1957.
75. G. J.Stigler, *The theory of economic regulation*. **Bell Journal of Economics and**

Management Science, 2(1),1971, 3-21.

76. O. E Williamson, *Markets and hierarchies: Analysis and antitrust implications*. Free Press.1975.
77. L. Wren-Lewis. *Toward a Theory of Regulation for Developing Countries: Following Jean-Jacques Laffont's Lead*. In E. Brousseau & J.-M. Glachant (Eds.), *New Institutional Economics: A Guidebook* Cambridge University Press.2009.107-140.
78. R., McLaren, & S. Mander, *Bringing energy to the people: The impact of mini-grid electrification in Kenya and Tanzania*. **Journal of Development Effectiveness**, 10(4), 2018, 464-496.
79. J., Alm, Martinez-Vazquez, & B. Torgler, *Russian attitudes toward paying taxes—Before, during, and after the transition*. **International Journal of Social Economics**, 33(12), 2006, 832-857.
80. J. L., Guasch, & S. Straub, *The limits of concessionality in infrastructure: An empirical analysis*. **World Bank Economic Review**, 23(2), 2009, 165-190.
81. D., Hall, E., Lobina, & R. de la Motte, *Public resistance to privatization in water and energy*. *Development in Practice*, 15(3-4), 2005, 286-301.
82. , Healy, & R. Cockerill, *The socio-political economy of PPPs: Evidence from the UK*. **Journal of Public Policy**, 22(2), 2002, 171-195.
83. K Sovacool., &M. H. Dworkin, *Energy justice: Conceptual insights and practical applications*. *Applied Energy*, 142, 2015, 435-444.
84. P., Hawken, A. B., Lovins, &, L. H. Lovins, *Natural capitalism: The next industrial revolution*. Routledge.2013.
85. J. D. Creswell, *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.2017.

86. G. A., Ogunleye, & O. Oyewo, *Analysis of the effectiveness of rural electrification projects through public-private partnerships: A case study of Oyo State, Nigeria. Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, 35, 2019, 56-68.
87. Agbomire, *Public-private partnerships and the Azura-Edo independent power project in Nigeria. African Journal of Economic Review*, 5(1), 2017. 87-102.
88. O. T., Ajadi, et al. *Assessment of public-private partnership in infrastructure development in Oyo State, Nigeria. International Journal of Scientific Research and Engineering Development*, 1(2), 2018, 45-56.
89. A. Adeyemi *Public-private partnerships in Nigeria's infrastructure development: Challenges and prospects. International Journal of Management Science and Business Administration*, 2(2), 2016, 16-28.
90. A. G., Onibokun & T. O. Faniran *Understanding and addressing Nigeria's infrastructure deficits: A review of public-private partnership initiatives. Journal of Sustainable Development*, 6(10), 2019, 1-17.
91. M. Minnow & F. Jody *Government by Contract: Outsourcing and American Democracy*, Harvard U.P. 2009.
92. MSI Integrity. *"Not Fit-for-Purpose The Grand Experiment of Multi-Stakeholder Initiatives in Corporate Accountability, Human Rights and Global Governance."* San Francisco: Institute for Multi-Stakeholder Initiative Integrity, 2020.
93. G. Monbiot *Captive State, The Corporate Takeover of Britain*. Macmillan. 2000, ISBN 978-0-333-90164-9.
94. K. Möric *Les partenariats public-privé – le choix du partenaire privé au regard du droit communautaire*, Editions Larcier, 2009, 264 p.
95. R. Onses. *The Public Private Partnership of Cartagena de Indias – Colombia: Agbar's Experience*. Barcelona. 2003 ISBN 978-84-607-8089-2.

96. J. Quiggin '*Private sector involvement in infrastructure projects*', Australian Economic Review, 1st quarter, 1996, 51–64.
97. Schaeffer, Peter V.; Loveridge, Scott (2002). "Toward an Understanding of Types of Public-Private Cooperation". *Public Performance & Management Review*. 26 (2)
98. M. Spackman '*Public-private partnerships: lessons from the British approach*', *Economic Systems*, 26(3), 2002, 283–301.
99. L. Strauch '*Public Private Partnership in European Road Infrastructure: PPP as Investment Asset Following the M6 Road Project in Hungary*', VDM.2009
100. N. Talibdjanoj & Koshnazarov *UNDP & Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Uzbekistan, Public-Private Partnership in Uzbekistan: Problems, Opportunities and Ways of Introduction (2008–2009)*
101. A. Venkat Raman & J. W. Bjorkman '*Public-Private Partnerships in Health Care in India: Lessons for Developing Countries*'. London. Routledge. 2009.
102. H. Whiteside. *Purchase for profit: public-private partnerships and Canada's public health-care system*. University of Toronto Press, 2015.
103. A. Pollock *NHS Plc: The Privatisation of Our Health Care*, Verso, 2005, p. 3, ISBN 184467-539-4

Chapter Three

Methodology

This chapter focused on the procedures of data gathering and analysis employed in the study. It contains research design, population of the study, sample size determination, population of the study, sampling techniques and procedures, sample frames, sources of data and data collection, research instrument and design, validity, and reliability of the research instrument.

3.1 Research Design

The study will adopt descriptive survey research design which were predicated on the use of primary and secondary sources of information in gathering data about varying subjects. The data gathered will explore the issues of Public private partnership and public service delivery in oyo state (south west)"A case study of IBEDC from 2019-2024. By adopting these methods, the data required in this study will be collected from the respondent through structured questionnaire. This will enable the researcher to establish relationship that exist between the study variables by collecting data from a sample that is fair representation of the entire population or group.

3.2 Population of the Study

The population of this study comprises of citizens of selected local Government, Companies and Organizations and also Staff of IBEDC in Oyo State in order to weigh how effective the Operation of IBEDC has been so far since 2019 and evaluate its activities.

3.3 Sample and Sampling Techniques

A sample is a subset of a population. It can also be defined as a fair representation of an entire pool of items in quantitative research. Since the population size is around 100 and considered to be relatively low, the researcher will study all the respondents. However, the convenient sampling method will be used to select respondent who are available and willing to partake in the research. That is, the researcher will administer copies of questionnaires to Citizens, Companies, and Staff of IBEDC In one of the designated Local Government in Oyo State who are willing to participate in the study.

3.4 Description of Research Instrument

Structured questionnaires was used to get data from the respondents. A questionnaire is a research tool that is mostly used in survey or statistical analysis study, which consists set of questions in different formats. Primarily, it is used in research to ask the participants general, and close-ended questions.

3.5 Validation of Research Instrument

As a process, validation involves collecting and analysing data to assess the accuracy of an instrument. There are numerous statistical tests and measures to assess the validity of quantitative instruments, which generally involves pilot testing. This study ensure the research instrument examined all its construct of interest, measures the characteristics of variables and measures what the research intends to measure. The research instrument was also reviewed by the researcher supervisor before being deployed for data gathering.

3.6 Reliability of Research Instrument

The reliability of a research instrument concerns the extent to which the instrument yields the same results on repeated trials. Reliability of the research instrument is the measure of the dependability and the internal consistency of the items of the instrument of data collection. The data required for this study will be gathered from questionnaires administered directly by the researcher with responses from the respondents, thus, the data was found suitable, appropriate and reliable for this study.

3.7 Administration of Research Instrument and Method of Data Collection

Copies of the questionnaire was administered to the sample drawn from the population. The researcher administered the research instruments with the help of well-trained research assistants to ensure the questionnaires are distributed accurately and for prompt retrieval. The researcher adopted the mixed method that is both primary and secondary data. Data was sourced from stakeholder in Electricity Distribution sectors. The secondary data was gathered from various text and published work as related to Public private partnership and public service delivery in Oyo state (south west)”A case study of IBEDC from 2019-2024.

3.8 Method of Data Analysis

The data comprise of those from primary and secondary sources. The qualitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviation. The qualitative descriptive data analysis is essentially because it summarized the information generated in the research verbally.

Endnotes

- ¹. H. Baratt & S. Shanti Kumar, "*Method of sampling from a Population*". *Health Knowledge*. 2021 <http://www.healthknowledge.org.uk/public-health-textbook/research-methods/1aepedimiology/method-of-sampling-population>
- ². G. E. Oyedokun, *Research Methodology for management and Social Science*, Lagos, Nigeria: Aaron and Hur Publishing, 2020.

Lead City University Ibadan DO NOT COPY

Chapter Four

Results and Discussion of Findings

4.1 Analysis of Demographic of Respondents

Table 4.1 Age of Respondents

		Age			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	21-30	25	25.0	25.0	25.0
	31-40	41	41.0	41.0	66.0
	41 and above	34	34.0	34.0	100.0
	Total	100	100	100.0	

The table above shows the age of the respondents, among which 25(25%) of the respondents are between the ages of 21 and 30 years, 41% are between the ages of 31 and 40 years, while 34% of the respondents are between the ages of 41 years and above.

4.2 Analysis of Research Questions

Table 4.2: Key Motivations behind the Adoption of Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) in the Power Sector of Oyo State, Nigeria

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	MEAN	S. DEV.
1.	The adoption of PPPs in the power sector was driven by the need to improve service delivery.	30	36	14	20	2.24	1.78
2.	Financial investment from private partners is very important in the decision to adopt PPPs in Oyo State's power sector	28	25	17	20	2.09	1.92
3.	The government's desire to leverage private sector expertise influences the adoption of PPPs in the power sector	56	24	7	13	1.77	1.81
4	The role of political support and advocacy is very significant in the adoption of PPPs in Oyo State's power sector	20	15	35	30	2.75	1.65
5.	The need to meet increasing electricity demand play in the decision to adopt PPPs is unimportant	26	28	20	26	2.46	1.82

Source: Field Survey, 2024

The adoption of PPPs in the power sector was driven by the need to improve service delivery. The mean score of 2.24, which is close to 2 (Agree), suggests that respondents generally agree that the need to improve service delivery was a significant driver for adopting PPPs. However, the relatively high standard deviation (1.78) indicates diverse opinions.

Financial investment from private partners is very important in the decision to adopt PPPs in Oyo State's power sector. The mean score of 2.09, again close to 2 (Agree), indicates a general agreement that financial investment from private partners is crucial in the decision to adopt PPPs. The high standard deviation (1.92) shows considerable variability in responses.

The government's desire to leverage private sector expertise influences the adoption of PPPs in the power sector. With a mean score of 1.77, respondents lean towards Strongly Agreeing that leveraging private sector expertise is a key influence on adopting PPPs. However, the high standard deviation (1.81) indicates differing views among respondents.

The role of political support and advocacy is very significant in the adoption of PPPs in Oyo State's power sector. The mean score of 2.75, closer to 3 (Disagree), suggests that respondents are more inclined to disagree that political support and advocacy are very significant in adopting PPPs. The standard deviation (1.65) indicates some variation in opinions.

The need to meet increasing electricity demand plays in the decision to adopt PPPs is unimportant. The mean score of 2.46, which is around the midpoint between Agree and Disagree, shows no strong consensus on whether meeting increasing electricity demand is an unimportant factor in adopting PPPs. The standard deviation (1.82) reflects a broad range of opinions. Overall, the analysis reveals general agreement on the importance of service delivery improvement, financial investment, and leveraging private sector expertise in the adoption of PPPs in the power sector. However, there is less consensus on the significance of political support and the importance of meeting increasing electricity demand.

Table 4.3: Impact of PPP Arrangements on the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Public Service Delivery in the IBEDC (2019-2024)

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	MEAN	S. DEV
1.	IBEDC's service delivery is very efficient since the implementation of PPP arrangements	27	16	35	22	2.48	1.11
2.	The quality of electricity supply deteriorated significantly under the PPP arrangements	20	15	30	35	2.20	1.21
3.	PPP arrangements have been effective in reducing power outages in IBEDC's coverage area?	26	33	25	16	2.69	1.02
4	Customer satisfaction with electricity services greatly improved since the adoption of PPPs in IBEDC	14	38	20	28	2.39	1.06
5.	The impact of PPPs on the operational performance of IBEDC from 2019 to 2024 has been very positive	7	35	30	28	2.11	0.95

Source: Field Survey, 2024

IBEDC's service delivery is very efficient since the implementation of PPP arrangements: the mean score of 2.48 suggests a slightly negative perception towards the efficiency of IBEDC's

service delivery post-PPP implementation. This indicates that respondents are generally more inclined to disagree (D) or strongly disagree (SD) that service delivery has been efficient, though the standard deviation indicates a moderate spread of opinions. With a mean score of 2.20, respondents tend to slightly disagree that the quality of electricity supply deteriorated significantly under PPP arrangements. This suggests that, on average, respondents do not perceive a significant decline in quality. The relatively higher standard deviation indicates diverse opinions.

The mean score of 2.69 indicates a tendency towards agreement that PPP arrangements have been somewhat effective in reducing power outages, though not strongly. This is a slightly positive assessment, with a standard deviation suggesting moderate variability in responses.

Customer satisfaction with electricity services greatly improved since the adoption of PPPs in IBEDC. The mean score of 2.39 shows a slight tendency towards disagreement that customer satisfaction has greatly improved. This indicates a generally negative perception among respondents, with some variability as indicated by the standard deviation.

The impact of PPPs on the operational performance of IBEDC from 2019 to 2024 has been very positive

With a mean score of 2.11, respondents tend to disagree that the PPPs have had a very positive impact on IBEDC's operational performance. This is the most negative assessment among the items, with a relatively lower standard deviation indicating more consistent opinions.

The findings indicate a general skepticism or slight negativity among respondents regarding the efficiency and effectiveness of PPP arrangements in improving IBEDC's service delivery and operational performance. While there is some recognition of reduced power outages,

overall customer satisfaction and perceived positive impacts are not strongly supported. The standard deviations indicate a moderate to high level of variability in opinions, suggesting mixed experiences among respondents.

Lead City University Ibadan DO NOT COPY

Table 4.4 Perceived Benefits and Drawbacks of PPPs in Improving Electricity Access, Reliability, and Affordability for Consumers

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	MEAN	S. DEV.
1.	PPPs have been very beneficial in increasing access to electricity for consumers	42	29	19	10	3.03	1.00
2.	The reliability of electricity supply greatly improved due to PPP arrangements.	25	20	15	40	2.30	1.23
3.	PPPs have made electricity more affordable for consumers	10	16	20	54	1.82	1.03
4	Increased cost, reduced service quality, regulatory challenges are the main drawbacks experienced or observed with PPPs in the electricity sector	32	39	10	19	2.84	1.07
5.	The overall impact of PPPs on consumer satisfaction with electricity services in Oyo State is very satisfied.	10	13	57	20	2.13	0.84

Source: Field Survey, 2024

PPPs have been very beneficial in increasing access to electricity for consumers: The mean score of 3.03 indicates that the respondents generally agree that PPPs have been beneficial in

increasing access to electricity. The standard deviation of 1.00 shows a moderate spread in the responses, suggesting some variation in opinions.

The reliability of electricity supply greatly improved due to PPP arrangements: The mean score of 2.30 suggests that respondents tend to disagree that PPP arrangements have greatly improved the reliability of electricity supply. The higher standard deviation of 1.23 indicates a considerable variation in responses, with some strongly agreeing and others strongly disagreeing.

PPPs have made electricity more affordable for consumers: The mean score of 1.82 shows that respondents generally disagree with the statement that PPPs have made electricity more affordable. The standard deviation of 1.03 suggests a moderate spread in the responses, indicating varying levels of disagreement.

Increased cost, reduced service quality, regulatory challenges are the main drawbacks experienced or observed with PPPs in the electricity sector: The mean score of 2.84 indicates a general agreement among respondents that increased cost, reduced service quality, and regulatory challenges are significant drawbacks of PPPs in the electricity sector. The standard deviation of 1.07 shows a moderate variation in responses.

The overall impact of PPPs on consumer satisfaction with electricity services in Oyo State is very satisfied: The mean score of 2.13 suggests that respondents generally disagree that the overall impact of PPPs on consumer satisfaction with electricity services is very positive. The standard deviation of 0.84 indicates a relatively lower spread in responses, showing more consistency in the level of disagreement.

The overall finding reveals that while there is some acknowledgment of the benefits of PPPs in increasing access to electricity (Item 1), there are significant concerns regarding the

reliability of supply (Item 2), affordability (Item 3), and overall consumer satisfaction (Item 5). Additionally, the drawbacks such as increased costs, reduced service quality, and regulatory challenges (Item 4) are recognized by the respondents. The variations in the responses, as indicated by the standard deviations, suggest differing experiences and perceptions among the respondents.

Lead City University Ibadan DO NOT COPY

Table 4.5: Institutional and Regulatory Frameworks Governing PPPs in Oyo State

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	MEAN	S. DEV.
1.	The existing regulatory frameworks are effective in ensuring accountability in PPP projects in the power sector	10	26	20	44	2.98	1.65
2.	The institutional frameworks promote transparency in PPP arrangements to a great extent	26	32	20	22	2.38	1.87
3.	Current regulations facilitate stakeholder participation in the decision-making process for PPP projects	25	20	38	17	2.47	1.17
4	Government's role in enforcing PPP policies and regulations in Oyo State's power sector is very active.	26	19	25	30	2.59	1.82
5.	Processes involved in the formation and implementation of PPP agreements in Oyo State are transparent	8	15	40	37	3.06	1.4

Source: Field Survey, 2024

Effectiveness of Regulatory Frameworks: the mean of 2.98 suggests that the respondents are relatively neutral to slightly disagreeing about the effectiveness of the existing regulatory frameworks in ensuring accountability in PPP projects in the power sector. The high standard deviation of 1.65 indicates a wide variation in responses.

Transparency in Institutional Frameworks: with a mean of 2.38, the responses lean towards disagreement regarding the extent to which institutional frameworks promote transparency in

PPP arrangements. The very high standard deviation of 1.87 points to significant variability in opinions.

Stakeholder Participation: the mean of 2.47 indicates that respondents tend to disagree with the statement that current regulations facilitate stakeholder participation in the decision-making process for PPP projects. The standard deviation of 1.17 shows a moderate variation in responses.

Government's Role in Enforcing PPP Policies: the mean of 2.59 suggests a tendency towards disagreement regarding the government's active role in enforcing PPP policies and regulations in Oyo State's power sector. The high standard deviation of 1.82 reflects substantial differences in respondents' views.

Transparency in PPP Agreements: the mean of 3.06 indicates that respondents are neutral to slightly disagreeing about the transparency of processes involved in the formation and implementation of PPP agreements in Oyo State. The standard deviation of 1.4 indicates a fairly high variation in opinions.

The overall sentiment across the items leans towards disagreement regarding the effectiveness, transparency, stakeholder participation, and government's active role in the PPP frameworks in the power sector of Oyo State. The high standard deviations across most items suggest a wide range of perceptions and opinions among the respondents.

Table 4.6: Major Challenges and Constraints in Implementing PPPs in the Power Sector of Oyo State

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	MEAN	S. DEV
1.	Financial constraints, regulatory constant & technical issues in the primary challenges faced in implementing PPP projects in the power sector of Oyo State	42	37	10	11	1.90	1.63
2.	Political challenges in the implementation of PPPs in the power sector are very significant.	25	31	26	18	2.33	1.66
3.	Financial constraints affected the success of PPP projects in the power sector	22	30	30	18	2.44	1.61
4	Stakeholders have effectively addressed the technical challenges associated with PPP implementation	14	20	40	26	2.78	1.51
5.	Policy reforms, increased stakeholder engagement, and capacity building are measures taken to overcome regulatory barriers in PPP projects in the power sector	11	19	32	28	2.57	1.69

Source: Field Survey, 2024

Financial constraints, regulatory constant & technical issues in the primary challenges faced in implementing PPP projects in the power sector of Oyo State: A low mean indicates that a majority of respondents strongly agree or agree that financial constraints, regulatory issues, and technical problems are significant challenges. The high standard deviation suggests some variability in responses, indicating that not all respondents are in strong agreement.

Political challenges in the implementation of PPPs in the power sector are very significant: The mean value of 2.33 shows that respondents generally agree that political challenges are significant, but there is a spread of responses as indicated by the standard deviation, showing diverse opinions on this issue.

Financial constraints affected the success of PPP projects in the power sector: Similar to the previous item, the mean of 2.44 suggests that financial constraints are acknowledged as a factor affecting the success of PPP projects. The standard deviation indicates varied levels of agreement among respondents.

Stakeholders have effectively addressed the technical challenges associated with PPP implementation: A higher mean value of 2.78 suggests a tendency toward disagreement, indicating that respondents do not believe that technical challenges have been effectively addressed. The lower standard deviation shows less variability, meaning there is a more consistent opinion on this issue.

Policy reforms, increased stakeholder engagement, and capacity building are measures taken to overcome regulatory barriers in PPP projects in the power sector: With a mean of 2.57, responses are slightly leaning towards disagreement, implying that respondents are not entirely convinced that effective measures are being taken to overcome regulatory barriers. The higher standard deviation reflects a broad range of opinions.

The analysis reveals that while there is a recognition of significant challenges in implementing PPP projects in the power sector of Oyo State, especially related to financial and technical issues, there is also skepticism about the effectiveness of measures taken to address these challenges. The variability in responses suggests differing perspectives among stakeholders, highlighting the need for more targeted and perhaps more inclusive strategies to address these issues effectively.

Table 4.7: Lessons from the IBEDC Case Study and Other PPP Initiatives in Oyo State (2019-2024)

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	MEAN	S. DEV.
1.	Effective stakeholder engagement, need for better regulation, importance of financial planning are key lessons learnt from the PPP arrangements in IBEDC from 2019 to 2024	30	37	13	10	1.90	1.58
2.	The experiences from IBEDC's PPP initiatives inform future policy development for the power sector in Oyo State	40	25	15	20	2.15	1.89
3.	Enhanced Collaboration is a strategy successful PPP projects can be applied to improve public service delivery in Oyo State?	26	30	28	16	2.34	1.63
4	Stakeholder feedback is very important in shaping future PPP policies and practices in Oyo State	30	39	11	20	2.21	1.80
5.	Future PPP projects in the power sector be better managed to avoid past challenges through improved risk management, stronger regulatory oversight, enhanced transparency, etc.	22	35	20	23	2.44	1.74

Source: Field Survey, 2024

Effective Stakeholder Engagement and Regulation: A significant proportion of respondents (67 out of 90) agree or strongly agree that stakeholder engagement, better regulation, and financial planning are key lessons from PPP arrangements. The relatively low mean suggests

a strong consensus on these points. The standard deviation indicates moderate variability in responses, reflecting some divergence in opinions, but overall agreement.

Informing Future Policy Development: The responses indicate that most stakeholders (65 out of 100) believe experiences from IBEDC's PPP initiatives should inform future policy. The mean value suggests agreement, though less strongly than Item 1. The higher standard deviation shows greater variability in responses, indicating mixed opinions about the extent to which past experiences should shape future policy.

Enhanced Collaboration for Public Service Delivery: A majority of respondents (56 out of 100) agree or strongly agree that enhanced collaboration is crucial for successful PPP projects. The mean suggests moderate agreement. The standard deviation indicates moderate variability, showing some respondents are less convinced about the importance of enhanced collaboration.

Importance of Stakeholder Feedback: A significant number of respondents (69 out of 100) believe stakeholder feedback is critical for shaping future PPP policies and practices. The mean value reflects a moderate level of agreement. The standard deviation indicates considerable variability, suggesting differing views on the importance of stakeholder feedback.

Improved Management of Future PPP Projects: Responses indicate that stakeholders generally agree (57 out of 100) that future PPP projects can be better managed through improved risk management, regulatory oversight, and transparency. The mean suggests a moderate consensus. The standard deviation shows significant variability, indicating diverse opinions on how to manage future PPP projects effectively.

This variability underscores the need for continued dialogue and tailored approaches to address the diverse perspectives and priorities of different stakeholders in the PPP process. By focusing on areas of strong consensus and addressing points of contention, future PPP initiatives in Oyo State's power sector can be better designed and implemented.

4.3 Discussion of Findings

The survey findings highlight the complexities and varied perceptions surrounding the adoption and impact of PPPs in Oyo State's power sector. While there are clear benefits in terms of increased access and reduced power outages, challenges such as financial constraints, political interference, and regulatory issues need to be addressed to enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of PPPs. The insights from this survey can inform policymakers and stakeholders in refining PPP strategies and frameworks to better serve the power sector's and its consumers' needs. Key summary of the findings are further highlighted below:

Drivers for Adopting PPPs

- The need to improve service delivery and leverage private sector expertise are key drivers.
- Financial investment is important but opinions vary.
- Political support and increasing electricity demand are less influential.

Impact on Service Delivery

- Mixed perceptions on efficiency and quality of electricity supply.
- Some agreement that PPPs reduce power outages.
- General disagreement on the improvement of customer satisfaction and operational performance.¹

Perceived Benefits and Drawbacks

- PPPs are seen as beneficial in increasing access to electricity but less so in improving reliability and affordability.
- Increased costs, reduced service quality, and regulatory challenges are major drawbacks.
- Overall consumer satisfaction with PPPs is low.²

Regulatory and Institutional Frameworks

- Effectiveness of regulatory frameworks and government enforcement is mixed.
- Transparency and stakeholder participation are areas needing improvement.³

Challenges and Lessons Learned

- Bureaucratic delays, political interference, and financial constraints are significant challenges.
- Effective stakeholder engagement and strong governance are crucial for success.
- Lessons from past projects are not always effectively incorporated into new ones.⁴

Endnotes

1. B. O., Adeoye, & S. O Olayinka, *Public perception of electricity service delivery in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State*. **International Journal of Business and Management Review**, 7(2), 2019, 25-35.
2. A. B., Umar, & A. I. Shehu, *The challenges of electricity supply in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State*. **International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research**, 10(2), 2019, 578586.
3. A., Olaniyan, & T. Edeki, *Electricity supply and industrial performance in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State*. **Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development**, 11(8), 2020, 80-90.

4.O. A., Oni, & , I. M Babatunde. *Electric power sector reform and service delivery in Nigeria:*

A case study of Oyo State. International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy, 10(3), 2020, 270-280.

Chapter Five

Conclusion

5.1 Summary of Findings

This study explored the effectiveness of Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) in public service delivery within Oyo State, focusing on the case study of the Ibadan Electricity Distribution Company (IBEDC) from 2019 to 2024. The research highlighted key factors influencing PPP success, such as governance structures, financial mechanisms, socio-economic factors, and environmental considerations. It also examined the varying impacts of PPP arrangements on service delivery efficiency and effectiveness in the electricity sector. Data was gathered

through structured questionnaires administered to citizens, companies, and staff of IBEDC, analyzed using descriptive statistics. The findings revealed general agreement on the importance of service delivery improvement, financial investment, and leveraging private sector expertise in adopting PPPs in the power sector.

5.2 Conclusion

The study concluded that PPPs play a critical role in enhancing public service delivery in Oyo State. Key factors such as transparent governance, innovative financing mechanisms, and effective community engagement are essential for the success of PPP initiatives. While financial investments and leveraging private sector expertise are crucial, challenges remain in political support, regulatory frameworks, and meeting increasing electricity demand. Addressing these issues can lead to more effective and sustainable PPP projects, ultimately benefiting public service delivery in the region.

5.3 Recommendations

1. **Strengthen Governance and Regulatory Frameworks:** Implement transparent and efficient governance structures to attract private investment and ensure compliance with regulations. Strengthening institutional capacity can enhance the overall effectiveness of PPP projects.
2. **Innovative Financing Mechanisms:** Develop innovative financing and risk-sharing arrangements to overcome financial barriers. Transparent revenue-sharing frameworks can also help attract more private capital.

3. **Community Engagement:** Foster active community involvement and local ownership of PPP projects to enhance social acceptance and stakeholder participation. This can lead to more tailored and effective service delivery solutions.
4. **Environmental Integration:** Incorporate environmental safeguards and renewable energy sources into PPP projects to address sustainability concerns. Coordinated efforts and policy interventions are necessary to manage environmental impacts effectively.
5. **Mixed-Method Research Approaches:** Combine qualitative and quantitative research methods to provide a comprehensive understanding of PPP dynamics. This approach can inform evidence-based policy formulation and project implementation.

5.4 Contribution to Knowledge

This study contributes to the understanding of PPP effectiveness in public service delivery within the context of Oyo State and Nigeria at large. Emphasis laid on the key success factors, challenges, and recommendations, the research provides valuable insights for policymakers, practitioners, and academics. The findings underscore the importance of transparent governance, innovative financing, community engagement, and environmental integration in PPP projects. Additionally, the study's methodological approach, combining qualitative and quantitative data, offers a robust framework for future research on PPP dynamics. Through these contributions, the research advances knowledge on optimizing PPP arrangements for improved public service delivery and sustainable development.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Studies

1. Comparative Studies: Conduct comparative studies between different states or regions to understand the varying impacts of PPP arrangements on public service delivery. This can highlight best practices and areas needing improvement.
2. Sector-Specific Analysis: Explore the effectiveness of PPPs in other sectors such as healthcare, education, and transportation. Sector-specific analysis can provide deeper insights into the unique challenges and opportunities within each domain.
3. Longitudinal Studies: Implement longitudinal studies to track the long-term impacts of PPP projects on service delivery and community welfare. This can help assess the sustainability and adaptability of PPP models over time.
4. Stakeholder Perspectives: Investigate the perspectives of various stakeholders, including government officials, private sector partners, and community members. Understanding their views can enhance stakeholder engagement strategies and project outcomes.

Bibliography

Book

Abou-bakr, A. *Managing Disasters Through Public–Private Partnerships*, Georgetown University Press, 2013.

AfricaNews *"Oil rich, electricity poor. What will it take to solve Nigeria's energy crisis?"*.

Africanews, 2022. Retrieved 2023-02-02.

Andrews, M. Pritchett, L & Woolcock, M (Eds.). *Building state capability: Evidence, analysis, action*. Oxford University Press.2018.

Appleby, J. *"Making sense of PFI"*. Nuffield Trust. 2017, Retrieved 6 October 2017.

Baldwin R., Cave M. & Lodge M. *Understanding regulation: Theory, strategy, and practice*. Oxford University Press.2019.

Bouckaert, G, & Halligan, H, *Managing performance: International comparisons*. Routledge.2008.

Buchanan, J.M & Tullock,G *The calculus of consent: Logical foundations of constitutional democracy*. University of Michigan Press.1962.

Carrell, S. *"Power cut leaves surgeons operating by torchlight at PFI hospital"*, The Guardian, 2012

Estache A, & Wren-Lewis,L, . *Public-private partnerships for infrastructure*. The World Bank.2018.

Estache, A & Wren-Lewis, L. *Public-private partnerships for infrastructure*. The World Bank.2018.

Estache, A &, Wren-Lewis. L, *Toward a Theory of Regulation for Developing Countries: Following Jean-Jacques Laffont's Lead*. In E. Brousseau & J.-M. Glachant (Eds.), *New Institutional Economics: A Guidebook* Cambridge University Press.2009.107140.

Ferlie, E ,Lynn Jr, L.E & Pollitt,C, (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of public management*. Oxford University Press.2016.

Fernández, J.L *.Public-private partnerships in infrastructure: An essential guide for policymakers*. Cambridge University Press.2018.

Freeman, R.E, Harrison, J.S Wicks,, A.C Parmar B.S & Colle, S, *Stakeholder theory: The state of the art*. Cambridge University Press.2010.

Gatti, Stefano (2007). *Project Finance in theory and practice*. Academic Press. p. 414. ISBN 978-0-12-373699-4.

Grimsey, D. & Lewis, M.K, *Public-private partnerships: The worldwide revolution in infrastructure provision and project finance*. Edward Elgar Publishing.2018.

Hawken, P, Lovins, A.B & Lovins, L.H *Natural capitalism: The next industrial revolution*. Routledge.2013.

Hood, C & Dixon, R *A government that worked better and cost less? Evaluating three decades of reform and change in UK central government*. Oxford University Press.2015.

Bm Publishing.2019.

Hood,C & Margetts, H *The tools of government in the digital age*. Palgrave Macmillan.2007.

Kettl, D.F *The politics of the administrative process*. CQ Press.2019.

Minnow, M. & Jody F. *Government By Contract: Outsourcing and American Democracy*, Harvard U.P., 2009.

Monbiot, G. "*The Biggest Weirdest Rip-Off Yet*", The Guardian, London, 2009.

Monbiot, G. *Captive State, The Corporate Takeover of Britain*. Macmillan. ISBN 978-0-33390164-9.

Moon, M.J *The Evolution of Public Administration: from the Nation State to Global Governance*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 2017.

Moore. M.H. *Recognizing public value*. Harvard University Press.2013.

Mulgan, G. *For the People: Reclaiming our Government*. Vintage, 2018.

Onses, R. *The Public Private Partnership of Cartagena de Indias – Colombia: Agbar's Experience*. Barcelona, 2003. ISBN 978-84-607-8089-2.

Ostrom, E. *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press. 2015.

Oyedokun, G.E. *Research Methodology for management and Social Science*, Lagos, Nigeria: Aaron and Hur Publishing, 2020.

Peters, B.G. *Institutional theory in political science: The new institutionalism*. Bloomsbury Publishing. 2018.

Pollitt, C , Van Thiel, S & Homburg, V. *New public management in Europe: Adaptation and alternatives*. Palgrave Macmillan. 2017.

Pollitt, C & Bouckaert, G. *Public management reform: A comparative analysis*. Oxford University Press. 2017.

Public-Private Partnerships in Foreign Aid: Leveraging U.S. Assistance for Greater Impact and Sustainability | United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations".
www.foreign.senate.gov. 12 July 2016. Retrieved 25 March 2021.

"Public-Private Partnerships in Forestry" (PDF). USAID Forest Program. 2003.

Quiggin, J. 'Private sector involvement in infrastructure projects', Australian Economic Review, 1st quarter, 1996, 51–64.

"Referendum results in: P3 model to fund Regina sewage plant". CBC News. 25 September 2013.

Reversal of privatization of Paris' water. Cupe.ca, 2010. Retrieved on 2011-11-20.

Reynolds, K. "The enormous cost of public-private partnerships". Policy Note, 2017. Retrieved 28 June 2019.

Tirole, J *The theory of corporate finance*. Princeton University Press.2016.

Venkat Raman, A. & Bjorkman J. W. '*Public-Private Partnerships in Health Care in India: Lessons for Developing Countries*'. London. Routledge, 2009.

Water tariff cut. Globalwaterintel.com 2011. Retrieved on 2011-11-20.

West, D. M *Digital government: Technology and public sector performance*. Princeton University Press.2019.

Whiteside, H.*Purchase for profit: public-private partnerships and Canada's public health-care system*. University of Toronto Press, 2015.

Williamson, O.E *The economic institutions of capitalism: Firms, markets, relational contracting*. Free Press.1985.

Williamson,O.E *Markets and hierarchies: Analysis and antitrust implications*. Free Press.1975.

Journal

Adeoye, B. O & Olayinka, S. O. *Public perception of electricity service delivery in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State*. **International Journal of Business and Management Review**, 7(2), 2019, 25-35.

Aderibigbe, S & Oni, O. A. *Electric power sector reform and performance of electricity supply in Nigeria*. **International Journal of Electrical and Energy Systems**, 2(3), 2018, 87-95.

Adeyemi, A. *Public-private partnerships in Nigeria's infrastructure development: Challenges and prospects*. **International Journal of Management Science and Business Administration**, 2(2), 2016, 16-28.

- Adeyemi, O Temitope et al. "Assessing the Impact of Public-Private Partnerships on Electricity Access in Nigeria: A Case Study of Oyo State." ***Journal of Infrastructure Development***, vol. 12, no. 2, 2021, pp. 67-82.
- Afolayan, O. A & O. M. Adekunle, O.M *Challenges of electricity service delivery in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State.* **Journal of Public Administration and Governance**, 8(2), 2018, 50-60.
- Agbomire, D. *Public-private partnerships and the Azura-Edo independent power project in Nigeria.* **African Journal of Economic Review**, 5(1), 2017. 87-102.
- Ajadi, O. T. et al. *Assessment of public-private partnership in infrastructure development in Oyo State, Nigeria.* **International Journal of Scientific Research and Engineering Development**, 1(2), 2018, 45-56.
- Akuru, U & Maduagwu, M. *An assessment of privatization and liberalization of Nigeria's electricity sector: Implications for electricity supply.* **International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy**, 8(1), 2018, 165-171.
- Alm, J., Martinez-Vazquez, & Torgler, B, *Russian attitudes toward paying taxes—Before, during, and after the transition.* **International Journal of Social Economics**, 33(12), 2006, 832-857.
- Ansell, C & Boin, A *Taming deep uncertainty: The potential of pragmatist principles for understanding and improving strategic crisis management.* **Administration & Society**, 51(3), 2019, 422-451.
- Banerjee, S. B *Corporate social responsibility: The good, the bad and the ugly.* **Critical Sociology**, 43(4-5), 2017, 645-664.
- Bardhan, P & Mookherjee, D, *Decentralization and accountability in infrastructure delivery in developing countries.* **Economic and Political Weekly**, 40(42), 2005, 4463-4475.

- Barlow, J. Roehrich; Wright, S. *"De facto privatisation or a renewed role for the EU? Paying for Europe's healthcare infrastructure in a recession"*. **Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine**. 103 (2): 2010, 51–55.
- Bouckaert, G., Van de S. & Walle, S. *Comparing measures of citizen trust and user satisfaction as indicators of 'good governance': Difficulties in linking trust and satisfaction indicators*. **International Review of Administrative Sciences**, 68(1), 2017, 31-48.
- Bovens, M *Analysing and assessing public accountability: A conceptual framework*. **European Law Journal**, 5(4), 2016, 447-465.
- Brinkerhoff, D.W & Brinkerhoff, J.M. *Public-private partnerships: Perspectives on purposes, publicness, and good governance*. **Public Administration and Development**, 28(4), 2018, 277-286.
- Buchanan, J.M & Tullock, G *The calculus of consent: Logical foundations of constitutional democracy*. University of Michigan Press. 1962.
- Burnett, M. *"PPP – A decision maker's guide"*, European Institute of Public Administration, 2007
- Colman, J. *'Mumbo jumbo...and other pitfalls: Evaluating PFI/PPP projects'*, National Audit Office PFI / PPP Conference "Bringing about beneficial change, London, 2002.
- Creswell, J.D. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications. 2017.
- Cruz, Carlos Oliveira; Marques, Rui Cunha (2013). *"Endogenous Determinants for Renegotiating Concessions: Evidence from Local Infrastructure"*. *Local Government Studies*. 39 (3): 352–374.
- Renegotiating Concessions: Evidence from Local Infrastructure*. *Local Government Studies*. 39 (3): 352–374.

Delmon, J. *"Public Private Partnership Programs: Creating a framework for private sector investment in infrastructure*, Kluwer, 2014.

Delmon, J. *"Private Sector Investment in Infrastructure: Project finance, PPP projects and risk,"* Kluwer, 2009.

Deputy Mayor of Paris Anne Le Strat tells how Paris put water services back into public hands.

Canadians.org, 2011. Retrieved on 2011-11-20.

Downs, A, *An economic theory of democracy*. Harper.1957.

Dunleavy, P Margetts, H Bastow, S & Tinkler, J, *Digital era governance: IT corporations, the state, and e-government*. Oxford University Press.2017.

Economic Planning Advisory Commission (EPAC) (1995), *'Interim Report of the Private Infrastructure Task Force'*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

Eisenhardt, K. M. *Agency theory: An assessment and review*. **Academy of Management Review**, 14(1), 2018, 57-74.

Flyvbjerg, B , N., Bruzelius, & W.. Rothengatter, C. Hood, S, *CCIA public management for all seasons?* **Public Administration**, 69(1), 3-19.1991.

Gaventa, J & McGee, R. *The impact of transparency and accountability initiatives*. *Development Policy Review*, 31(S1), 2013, s3-s28.

Grimsey, D & Lewis, M.M. *Evaluating the risks of public private partnerships for infrastructure projects*. **International Journal of Project Management**, 20(2), 2018. 107-118.

Guasch, J. L & Straub, S *The limits of concessionality in infrastructure: An empirical analysis*.

World Bank Economic Review, 23(2), 2009, 165-190.

- Hall, D. E., Lobina, & R. de la Motte, *Public resistance to privatization in water and energy. Development in Practice*, 15(3-4), 2005, 286-301.
- Harris, A. C. 'Financing infrastructure: private profits from public losses', *Audit Office of NSW, Public Accounts Committee, Parliament of NSW, Conference, Public/Private infrastructure financing: Still feasible?*, Sydney, September, 1996.
- Hart, O & Holmström, B *The theory of contracts. Handbook of Mathematical Economics*, 1,1987, 289-354.
- Hart, O. "Incomplete contracts and public ownership: Remarks, and an application to publicprivate partnerships". *Economic Journal* 113: 2003, C69-C76.
- Hart, O.& Zingales, L *Companies should maximize shareholder welfare not market value. Journal of Law, Finance, and Accounting*, 2(2), 2017, 247-274.
- Healy, A & R. Cockerill, R. *The socio-political economy of PPPs: Evidence from the UK. Journal of Public Policy*, 22(2), 2002, 171-195.
- Hodge, G.A &, Greve, C, *Public-private partnerships: An international performance review. Public Administration Review*, 64(5), 2018, 549-558.
- Hoppe, E. I. &Schmitz, P W. "Public-private partnerships versus traditional procurement: Innovation incentives and information gathering" (PDF). **The RAND Journal of Economics**. 44: 2013, 56–74.
- Iossa, E. & Martimort, D. "Risk allocation and the costs and benefits of public-private partnerships". *The RAND Journal of Economics*. 43 (3): 2012, 442–474.
- Johnson, A. "Assessing the Effectiveness of Public-Private Partnerships in Infrastructure Development: A Comparative Study." ***International Journal of Public Administration***, vol. 25, no. 3, 2020, pp. 345-362.

- Kickert, W.J. Randma-Liiv & Savi, R. *Theories of the policy process: An exploration and assessment*. **Policy Studies Journal**, 48(S1), 2020, S6-S28.
- Lewis G. & Mervyn D. *Public Private Partnerships: the worldwide revolution in infrastructure provision and project finance*. Edward Elgar Publishing. 2007, p. 268. ISBN 9781-84720-226-0.
- Loxley J. *Public service, private profits: the political economy of public/private partnerships in Canada*. Fernwood Publishing. 224 p.
- McLaren, R. & Mander, S. *Bringing energy to the people: The impact of mini-grid electrification in Kenya and Tanzania*. **Journal of Development Effectiveness**, 10(4), 2018, 464-496.
- Moszoro M., Gasiorowski P. 'Optimal Capital Structure of Public-Private Partnerships', IMF Working Paper, 2008.
- Ogunleye, G.A. & Oyewo, O. *Analysis of the effectiveness of rural electrification projects through public-private partnerships: A case study of Oyo State, Nigeria*. **Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments**, 35, 2019, 56-68.
- Okonkwo, E. *An assessment of electricity generation and public service delivery in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State*. **International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy**, 8(4), 2018, 110-120.
- Olaniyan, A. & Edeki, T. *Electricity supply and industrial performance in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State*. **Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development**, 11(8), 2020, 80-90.
- Oluwaseun, A. *The implications of privatization and electricity pricing on the socio-economic well-being of residents in Ibadan Metropolis, Nigeria*. **International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications**, 10(4), 2020. 276-283.

- Oni O. A. *Evaluation of power sector reforms in Nigeria: A review of performance of power sector privatization in Nigeria.* **Journal of Energy Technologies and Policy**, 9(3), 2019, 31-38.
- Oni O.A & , I. M Babatunde, *.Electric power sector reform and service delivery in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State.* **International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy**, 10(3), 2020, 270-280.
- Onibokun A.G &, Faniran T.O *Understanding and addressing Nigeria's infrastructure deficits: A review of public-private partnership initiatives.* **Journal of Sustainable Development**, 6(10), 2019, 1-17.
- Osborne S.P Radnor, U. & Nasi, G. *Public service co-production and outcomes: Evidence from the UK's National Health Service.* **Public Management Review**, 21(1), 2019, 92-110.
- Pekka, P. *Innovative Project Delivery Methods for Infrastructure.* Finnish Road Enterprise. 2002, p. 120. ISBN 978-952-5408-05-8.
- Pollock A. *NHS Plc: The Privatisation of Our Health Care*, Verso, 2005, p. 3, ISBN 1-84467539-4.
- Pollock, A. M, J. Shaoul, N. Vickers *"Private finance and "value for money" in NHS hospitals: a policy in search of a rationale?"*, **British Medical Journal**, 342 (7347): 2002, 1205–1209.
- Ritchie R., Mispy O. *"Measuring progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals."* (SDG 17) SDG-Tracker.org, website, 2018.
- Salami, T.A & Oyeniyi,O.M *Assessing the impact of electricity supply on education in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State.* **Journal of Educational Management and Leadership Studies**, 9(1), 2018, 45-55.

- Schaeffer, P. V. & Loveridge S. *"Toward an Understanding of Types of Public-Private Cooperation"*. Public Performance & Management Review. 26 (2). Taylor & Francis: 2002, 169–189.
- Siemiatycki, M. *"Public-Private Partnerships in Canada: Reflections on twenty years of practice"*. Canadian Public Administration. 58 (3): 2015, 343–362.
- Sovacool.B. K., & Dworkin M. H. *Energy justice: Conceptual insights and practical applications*. Applied Energy, 142, 2015, 435-444.
- Spackman, M. 'Public-private partnerships: lessons from the British approach', Economic Systems, 26(3), 2002, 283–301.
- Stigler, G.J *The theory of economic regulation*. **Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science**, 2(1), 1971, 3-21.
- Strauch, L. *'Public Private Partnership in European Road Infrastructure: PPP as Investment Asset Following the M6 Road Project in Hungary'*, VDM, 2009.
- Talibdjano, N. & Koshnazarov, S. *UNDP & Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Uzbekistan, Public-Private Partnership in Uzbekistan: Problems, Opportunities and Ways of Introduction* (2008–2009)
- Umar,A.B &Shehu, A.I *The challenges of electricity supply in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State*. **International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research**, 10(2),2019, 578-586.

Website

- Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) (1 September 2015). "Public private partnership in forestry management". {{cite journal}}: Cite journal requires |journal= (help)
- Federal Ministry of Finance, Nigeria. *"Guidelines for Public-Private Partnership in Nigeria."* Available: [<https://www.fmf.gov.ng/guidelines-for-public-private-partnerships->

innigeria/](<https://www.fmf.gov.ng/guidelines-for-public-private-partnerships-innigeria/>)

Nigerian Electricity Regulatory Commission. "About Us." Available: <https://www.nerc.gov.ng/about-us/>

Oguguo, I. "Nigeria's Electricity Providers And COVID Uncertainties". Issuu.com. THISDAY. Retrieved 1 May 2020.

Oguguo, I. "'When They Bring Light' Policy". thecable.ng. The Cable, 2020. Retrieved 1 May 2020.

Online, Tribune. "Nigeria has to have world's worst electricity crisis". Tribune Online, 2022. Retrieved 2023-02-02.

The Canadian Council for Public-Private Partnerships, "Definitions & Models", https://www.pppcouncil.ca/web/P3_Knowledge_Centre/About_P3s/Definitions_Models.aspx Archived 28 October 2020 at the Wayback Machine

UNESCAP. *Public-private partnership handbook. United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific*.2018.

UNESCAP. *Public-private partnership handbook. United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific*.2018.

United, Nations (10 July 2017). Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 6 July 2017: Work of the statistical commission pertaining to the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development (PDF). United Nations General Assembly. pp. 1–25.

World Bank Group. "Public-Private Partnerships in Nigeria: A Brief Overview." Available:(<https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2016/08/29/publicprivate-partnerships-in-nigeria-a-brief-overview>)

World Bank. *Public-private partnerships: Reference guide version 2.0. World Bank Group*.2018.

World Bank-IMF, *Implementing public-private partnerships in municipalities: A guidebook for local governments*. World Bank Group.2018.

Appendix I

Questionnaire

Department of Politics and International Relations

Lead City University, Ibadan

Dear Respondent,

This research is conducted to comprehensively “assess the role of Public Private Partnership in improving public service delivery in Oyo State, Nigeria, focusing on the case of Ibadan Electricity Distribution Company (IBEDC) from 2014 to 2024”. Kindly fill this

questionnaire as honest as possible as your candid responses are required to solve the research problem. Be assured that the information you are giving will be treated with strict confidentiality and will be used for academic purposes.

Thank you.

Section A: Demographic Data

Age: 21- 30 (), 31-40 (), 41 and above ()

Section B: Research Questions

Instructions: SA: Strongly Agree, A: Agree, D: Disagree, SD: Strongly Disagree. Kindly tick as appropriate.

1. What are the key motivations behind the adoption of Public-Private Partnerships

(PPPs) in the power sector of Oyo State, Nigeria?

S/N	Items	SA	A	D	SD
-----	-------	----	---	---	----

1.	The adoption of PPPs in the power sector was driven by the need to improve service delivery.				
2.	Financial investment from private partners is very important in the decision to adopt PPPs in Oyo State's power sector				
3.	The government's desire to leverage private sector expertise influences the adoption of PPPs in the power sector				
4	The role of political support and advocacy is very significant in the adoption of PPPs in Oyo State's power sector				
5.	The need to meet increasing electricity demand play in the decision to adopt PPPs is unimportant				

2. How have PPP arrangements impacted the efficiency and effectiveness of public service delivery, particularly in the case of the Ibadan Electricity Distribution Company (IBEDC), from 2019 to 2024 in Oyo State?

S/N	Items	SA	A	D	SD
1.	IBEDC's service delivery is very efficient since the implementation of PPP arrangements				
2.	The quality of electricity supply deteriorated significantly under the PPP arrangements				
3.	PPP arrangements have been effective in reducing power outages in IBEDC's coverage area?				

4	Customer satisfaction with electricity services greatly improved since the adoption of PPPs in IBEDC				
5.	The impact of PPPs on the operational performance of IBEDC from 2019 to 2024 has been very positive				

3. What are the perceived benefits and drawbacks of PPPs in improving electricity access, reliability, and affordability for consumers in Oyo State?

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD
1.	PPPs have been very beneficial in increasing access to electricity for consumers				
2.	The reliability of electricity supply greatly improved due to PPP arrangements.				
3.	PPPs have made electricity more affordable for consumers				
4	Increased cost, reduced service quality, regulatory challenges are the main drawbacks experienced or observed with PPPs in the electricity sector				

5.	The overall impact of PPPs on consumer satisfaction with electricity services in Oyo State is very satisfied.				
----	---	--	--	--	--

4. What institutional and regulatory frameworks govern PPPs in Oyo State, and how effective are they in promoting accountability, transparency, and stakeholder participation in the decision-making process?

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD
1.	The existing regulatory frameworks are effective in ensuring accountability in PPP projects in the power sector				
2.	The institutional frameworks promote transparency in PPP arrangements to a great extent				
3.	Current regulations facilitate stakeholder participation in the decision-making process for PPP projects				
4	Government's role in enforcing PPP policies and regulations in Oyo State's power sector is very active.				

5.	Processes involved in the formation and implementation of PPP agreements in Oyo State are transparent				
----	---	--	--	--	--

Bio-data

A. Personal Data

1. Full Names: Damilola Olaoti Mustapha
2. Email: Damilolamustapha32@gmail.com
3. Phone no: 08090690307
4. Address: 1Busayo Adebayo close, Anthony,Lagos State
5. Nationality: Nigerian

B. Member of Academic Professional Bodies: CILGPAN

D. References: MR OLALEKAN TEMIDARA

Signature

Date

The University Compliance Certification

This is to certify that this thesis “**Public- Private Partnerships in Electricity Distribution: Lessons from IBEDC’s Operations in Oyo State (South-West)**” was carried out by **Damilola Olaoti MUSTAPHA** with Matric No. **LCU/PG/005853** in the Department of Politics & International Relations, Faculty of Management and Social Sciences, Lead City University, Ibadan, is in full compliance with the approved University format and style.

Signature

Date