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Abstract
Following the enactment of the Infrastructural Concessions Regulatory Commission (ICRC) Act in Nigeria, Abia state government keyed into the framework of the PPP in 2007. This was in a bid to bridge the infrastructural gap in the state and to actualize the objectives of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), especially as it affects the development of a global partnership for poverty reduction through provision of basic infrastructures. Despite policy efforts made towards this direction, decadence in the state’s health system, education, road network, electric power generation and distribution, housing, industries, among others, has been on increase. In the light of this, the study interrogated poor governance, insecurity and public sector reforms in Nigeria, using public-private partnership policy and infrastructural development in Abia state as a reference point. In doing this, the study relied substantially on the core assumptions of Systems theory, documentary method of data collection and content analysis. The study problematized poor governance regime as implicated on non-compliance to the legal framework of risk sharing in project design, execution and funding by the Abia State government, as well as internal security threats as casus belly to docile role of the policy objectives of the Public Private Partnership (PPP) Policy in infrastructural development in the state. The need for the Abia state government to improve in its governance system, which currently emphasizes on criminalization of politics and state dominance in the development process, is seen in the study as quite imperative.
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Introduction
Public sector reforms in Nigeria have come of age, not so because of its transition to efficiency and effectiveness in the conduct of public business and service delivery, but primarily because of concerns the wear and tear associated with the reforms have provoked in the academic and professional discourse. Between 1960 and 2014, the emergent Nigeria’s leaders implemented different fads nay a superfluity of challenging policy initiatives for overcoming the challenges associated with public service delivery in the country, especially on the area of infrastructural provision. Public-Private Partnership (PPP) is yet another such policy initiatives. PPP policy was implemented in Nigeria in 2005 to serve as a flagship for infrastructural development and provision and to ensure value for money in service delivery in the country. The rationale for PPP hinges on the fact that it provides for more efficient procurement that focuses on consumer satisfaction and life cycle maintenance, and new sources of investment in particular through a joint agreement of both parties. It has its major plank on leveraging from the technical expertise and investment potentials of the private sector and donor agencies, as well as in diminishing the entrenched government monopolies in infrastructural provision (Health and education facilities, housing, electricity, good road network, pipe borne water, railways etc) (Sotola & Ayodele, 2009).

In view of the relevance of PPP in infrastructural development and provision, the Infrastructural Concessions Regulatory Commission (ICRC) in Nigeria sets out the various frameworks for effective implementation of PPP, which include the review of the legal and regulatory framework created under the following existing legislations:
- the Privatization and Commercialization Act of 1999;
- the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2007; and
the Public Procurement Act of 2007 (Salami, 2012).

Central to PPP initiative is the identification of risk associated with each component of the project and the allocation of the risk factor to the public sector, the private sector or perhaps a sharing by both. Thus, the desire to ensure best value for money is based on allocation of risk factors to the participants who are at best able to manage those risks and thus minimize costs while improving performance (Sotola & Ayodele, 2009). Despite its many sidedness such as Built-Operate-Transfer (BOT), Build Own-Operate and Transfer (BOOT), among others, “Concession” has been identified as the most popular in Nigeria. According to Ayodele (2012:9-10):

Concession is a collaborative arrangement between a government and private developers aimed at designing and developing facilities through combination of participants, which include the financiers and the contractors and or consultants. The developer may not necessarily be the financiers of the project.

Whatever the case, good governance and security are the driving forces of PPP. This is because no meaningful development can take place in poor governed and unsecured environment.

Admittedly, when Abia State was carved out from Imo State on 27th August, 1991, there was a mass movement of people from Imo State to Abia State. This brought with it tremendous pressure on the existing infrastructures in the state with attendant challenges for governance and sustainable development, more so, in an environment of lean financial resources. Thus, a baseline survey by the Federal Office of Statistics in 2000 indicated a total collapse of infrastructure and social amenities (roads, health, educational institutions, water supply and other social services), environmental degradation, massive unemployment, threats to lives and property, inadequate housing provision, and thus, contributing to 52.6% poverty ratio of the population of the state. Unarguably, this situation can only be reversed if the right environment is created through a re-orientation towards entrenching good governance for improved delivery of public goods and services to the masses. In this regard, the Orji Úzor Kalu led administration adopted an integrated, multi-sectoral grassroots development approach and economic empowerment of the people represented, among others, by the Abia State Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (ABSEEDS) in 2000. The overriding policy thrusts of ABSEEDS were poverty alleviation and sustainable economic growth through the redefinition of the role of government, promotion of a private sector-led economy and sustenance of good governance through inclusive governance, public sector reform, transparency and accountability (ABSEEDS, 2005). Though modest efforts were made by the administration towards these directions, unfortunately, the policy thrust of ABSEED could not equate reality, and thus, creating a monumental infrastructural chasm and the need for paradigm shift in the development discourse in Abia State.

In a bid to bridge the infrastructural gap in the state, the civilian administration of Governor T.A. Orji keyed into the framework of the PPP in 2007 (Abia State Investment Brochure, 2014). In synergy with the World Bank, UNIDO, UNDP and other local and international partners, Common Facility Centre (CFC), Community Driven Development (CDD) initiative, among others were put in place to facilitate the provision of basic infrastructures in the state. Like its predecessor, Abia State under Governor T.A. Orji could hardly boast of, or break even, in terms of development and provision of basic infrastructures. Consequently, poor infrastructural scenario in Abia State as seen in the health system, education, road network, electric power generation and distribution, industries, among others, worsened by 30% between 2004 and 2014 (United Nations Wider Report, 2014). This precarious state of infrastructures in Abia State and its consequent toll on socio-economic activities and overall development and security of the state has indeed, raised serious concern among Abians, as well as other national and international observers. It is therefore in the light of this concern that this paper is focused on the investigation of poor governance, insecurity and public sector reforms in Nigeria, using Abia State Public-Private Partnership policy and infrastructural development as a reference point.

Conceptual clarifications on: Poor Governance, Insecurity and Public Sector Reforms

Poor governance is the opposite of good governance. Governance itself consists of the traditions and institutions by which authority is exercised. It includes the capacity of the government to formulate and implement sound policies, manage scarce resources, and deliver, or ensure the delivery of services to its citizens. The components of governance: citizenry, the institution and public/private providers are enhanced through three fundamental elements – accountability, responsiveness and capability (World Bank, 2010). Good governance entails efficiency and effectiveness in the management of the available human and material resources, initiation and implementation of potent policies and programmes,
accountability, transparency, unrestricted access to information, all aimed at optimum realization of stated goals and objectives. In contrast, poor governance refers to inefficiency in the formulation and implementation of policies that are necessary to meet the developmental needs of society. It is associated with some basic elements of which one of these elements is weakness in public-sector management. This involves laxity in changing the organizational structure of a sector agency to reflect new objectives, making budgets work better, sharpening civil-service objectives and placing public and private enterprises’ managers under performance contract. Poor governance entails lack of openness and transparency in the conduct of public business and discharge of service (World Bank, 2010).

Insecurity on the other hand, presupposes the absence of the tenets of security. Security has a multifaceted and multidimensional meaning. Security in its objective and primary sense entails:

...a cherished value associated with the physical safety of individuals, groups or nation-states, together with a similar safety of their other most cherished values. It denotes freedom from threats, anxiety or danger. Therefore, security in an objective sense can be measured by the absence of threat, anxiety of danger (Nnoli, 2006:16).

Security is the antithesis of insecurity. Insecurity connotes different meanings and usually seen as lack of confidence on physical safety and existence of danger and anxiety. It is a state of fear or anxiety due to absence or lack of protection (Beland, 2005). Achumba, Ighomereho and Akpan-Robaro, (2013) define insecurity from two perspectives. Firstly, insecurity is the state of being open or subject to danger or threat of danger, where danger is the condition of being susceptible to harm or injury. Secondly, insecurity is the state of being exposed to risk or anxiety, where anxiety is a vague unpleasant emotion that is experienced in anticipation of some misfortune.

Obviously, the logic of insecurity and its cataclysmic effect on socio-economic development as obtainable from most societies, especially in Nigeria and Abia State in particular, derives substantially from the decline of the state as the guarantor of protection and human security and political exclusion, marginalization and social exclusion orchestrated by the pursuit of parochial interest by the few political gladiators. As Nnoli (2006:9) contends:

Political exclusion, economic marginalization and social discrimination threaten the security of citizens to such an extent that they regard the state as the primary threat to their survival. In desperation, the victimized citizens take laws into their own hands as a means of safeguarding their fundamental values from the threat of unacceptable government policies. People who believe that the government no longer represents their best interests seek by all means to overthrow it or otherwise establish an alternative state. The decline of the state as the guarantor of protection and human security is serious; but its role as the creator of insecurity is more serious.

Nnoli’s contentions explain in a clear terms, the logic of the insecurity that engulfed Abia State, which in essence, served as albatross to the realization of the policy objectives of PPP and infrastructural development in the state between 2007 and 2014.

Public sector reform in itself is an integral part of the changing role of government in service delivery, as well as a response to challenges arising from malfeasance in public service. Thus, according to White Paper on Public Sector Reform in Barbados, “public sector reform is a deliberate policy and action to alter organizational structures, processes and behavior in order to improve administrative capacity for efficient and effective performance”. Thus, it is a paradigm shift from the traditional bureaucratic procedures and practices to inducing changes that focused on improving outcomes or outputs that are consistent with the policy intentions of government. Public sector reform is an important part of a solution which governments have embarked upon to achieve improvements in public sector management. Obviously, the rapid changes in global socio-economic, political and technological environments dictate that the public sector must be transformed into a more active and responsive agency if it is to assist government in its quests for sustained economic growth and development. In the light of this, Public Private Partnership in public service delivery in Nigeria is at the best an outcome of the public sector reforms embarked upon by Obasanjo civilian administration in 2000.
Theoretical Framework

This paper derives its philosophical foundation and argument from Systems theory. We consider the theory most appropriate among other means because of its utility and analytical strength in explaining the interactive effects of elements and their consequences on other elements within the same system. The aptness of the Systems theory for this paper is clearly captured by Koontz and O’Donnell (1980: 23):

The advantage of approaching any area of inquiry or any problem as a system is that it enables us to see the critical variables and constraints and their interaction with one another. It forces scholars and practitioners in the field (of management) to be constantly aware that one single element, phenomenon or problem should not be treated without regard to its interacting consequences with other elements.

The classical proponent, David Easton (1965) perceives politics as a whole and not as a collection of different problems to be solved. His systems model was driven by an organic view of politics, as if it were a living object. Easton’s theory is a statement of what makes political systems as a set of human interactions. He identifies five concepts under which his model can be explained, thus, political system is seen essentially as a system for converting inputs into authoritative decisions. To arrive at authoritative decisions, the system takes inputs from the environment. However, two types of inputs exist according to Easton thus, demand and support. Demands are claims on how values are to be allocated. Support on the other hand, exist when the environment backs up the system or is favorably disposed to it. Output emerges from the system in the form of authoritative decisions. The environment reacts to these decisions or outputs and there is a process of feedback. Feedback is a process through which the system adapts itself to the environment by modifying its behavior and changing its interest structure. All these interactions culminate in the system maintaining itself in equilibrium. Figure 1 below depicts a model of systems approach.

Figure 1: A Model of System Approach.

![Figure 1: A Model of System Approach.](image)

In view of this, the following assumptions of Systems theory have been put forward by Easton (1965):

- Political system as a unit or living being that is made up of difference parts that functions in an ordered manner for maintenance of system equilibrium.
- That changes in the social or physical environment surrounding political system produce ‘demand’ and ‘support’ towards the political system, through political behaviors.
- These demands and supporting groups stimulate competition in a political system, leading to decisions or ‘outputs’ directed at some aspect of the surrounding social or physical environment.

- After a decision or output is made it interacts with its environment, these are ‘outcomes’.
- When a policy interacts with its environment, outcomes may generate new demands or support and groups in support or against the policy (feed back) or a new policy in some related matter.
- Feedback leads to (iii) above and it is never ending.

Expatiating further, Igwe (2007:436) asserts that:

System theory draws significantly from the conclusions of structural-functional analysis for enquiring into any integrity, especially the examination of the nature of its internal organization. The interrelationship between the components, between them and their collective environments, and the consequences of these processes upon the survival of the system and attainment of its purpose. In other words, for an object to be considered a system according to him, it must posse a level of integrity with a knowable structure or logically
arranged parts, such parts or elements must interrelate in a certain, law governed manner to fulfill a purpose or produce an ordered outcome. In the process of its life, a situation may arise in which more become imposed upon a system than it is structurally designed to hand. This may create strains and instability, raising the need for a return to normally.

To Von Bertallanfy (1975), in order to understand an organized whole, we must know both the parts, as well as the relations between them. He defines a system as a set of elements standing in interaction. It is any collection of elements that interact in some way with one another such as ‘a galaxy, a football team, a legislature, a political party’ (Dahl, 1991). In other words, a system is a whole, which is compounded of many parts – an ensemble of attributes. In the light of this, Ake (1979) contends that the performance of a system depends on the extent to which it possesses certain characteristics or capabilities namely: regulative capacity (i.e. law making), distributive capacity (ability to distribute goods and services), responsive capacity (ability to respond to demand), and extractive capacity (ability to generate resources, both materials and human, for use in meeting set goals.

In view of the foregoing, system theory can rightly be applied to explain the vicissitudes linked to poor governance, insecurity and public sector reforms in Nigeria with reference to implementation of Public-Private Partnership policy and infrastructural development in Abia state from 2007 to 2014. To this end, Public-Private Partnership (PPP) is seen as independent variable and authoritative decision, which was implemented by the Abia state government in 2007 as policy output arising from the demand for provision of basic infrastructures in the state. As stated earlier, though the policy attracted the synergy of local and international partners, however, the interactive effects of such underpinned systemic variables or indeed elements in Nigeria as political system and Abia state in particular such as poor governance, high profile insecurity, crimes and weak compliance to the legal frameworks of risk allocation in project design, execution and monitoring by the executive under T.A. Orji were identified in the study as having negative consequences on the dependent variable, which is infrastructural development in the state within the period under study. In fact, the increased percentage of infrastructural decadence in Abia state as noted by the United Nations Wider Report (2014) coupled with the character of the chief executive and his inability to adapt the government to the political environment by modifying his behavior and interest structure through feedback process mechanism further led to disenchantment and frustration among Abians and demand for change in party structure and political leadership.

**Brief overview of the institutional and legal frameworks for PPP in infrastructural development in Nigeria and Abia State.**

The development of any nation’s infrastructure is a sine qua non for nation building. Without it, there can be no development regardless of what progress there may seem to be. Most developed and developing states in the world such as United States of America and India jumpstarted their economies by accelerating their infrastructures and building on them. All the great civilizations attained greatness only through the entrenchment of adequate and sustainable infrastructure. Furthermore, the World Bank estimates that every 1% of government funds spent on infrastructure leads to an equivalent 1% increase in Gross Domestic Product (GDP), which invariably means that there is a correlation between any meaningful inputs in infrastructure development and economic growth indices (Ebozuwa, 2012).

In order to maximize the gains accruable from PPP and as part of liberalization and privatization program embarked upon by the Federal Government of Nigeria in 2000, the Federal Government inaugurated the Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission (ICRC) in late 2008 to drive the program in Nigeria. As a first step towards establishing the proper legal and regulatory environment to attract private sector investors, the Federal Executive Council (FEC) approved the National Policy on Public Private Partnership (NPPP). The policy sets forth the ways in which private investment could be leveraged in tackling the menace of poor infrastructure stocks and boosting delivery of services to the public in a manner that is sustainable. This is pursuant to sections 33 and 34 of the Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission Act (ICRCA), which empowers the Commission to take directives from the President regarding matters of policy and power to make regulations, respectively. Figure 2 below provides a clear insight on institutional framework for PPP in Nigeria.
Critical to the entrenchment of the PPP models in Nigeria is an enabling legal framework. This is rightly underscored in the United Nations Legislative Guide on Privately Financed Infrastructure Projects (2001), which states that the existence of an appropriate legal framework is a prerequisite to creating an environment that fosters private investment in infrastructure and where it is in place, it is important to ensure that the law is sufficiently flexible and responsive to keep pace with the developments in various infrastructure sectors in the economy. Generally, the legislative framework provides the platform by which the governments regulate and ensure the provision of public services to the public and offers protection of rights for public service providers and the customers (United Nations Legislative Guide on Privately Financed Infrastructure Projects, 2001). Pursuant to the signing into law of the Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission Act (ICRCA), the Federal Government of Nigeria inaugurated the Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission (ICRC) on the 27th November 2008, to provide the requisite regulatory framework within which all Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) of the Federal Government and constituent states can effectively enter into partnership with the private sector in the financing, construction, operation and maintenance of infrastructure projects as provided for in the ICRCA (ICRC National Policy on PPP, 2009). The Act provides for the participation of the private sector in financing the construction, development, operation, or maintenance of infrastructure or development projects of the Federal Government through concession or contractual arrangements. The Act has two distinct points of focus set out in Part I and Part II. Part I provides that Federal Government entities can enter into agreements with the private sector for the provision of infrastructure. Part II establishes the Commission and provides that its functions are to: Take custody of every concession agreement made under the ICRCA and monitor compliance with the terms and conditions of such agreement; ensure efficient execution of any concession agreement or contract entered into by the government; ensure compliance with the ICRCA; and perform such other duties as may be directed by the President (sections 1, 14, 19, 20 of the ICRC Act, 2005).

As a state in Nigerian federation, Abia State keyed into the foregoing institutional and legal frameworks for PPP in Nigeria by enacting Law (2) of 2008, which, *inter alia*, aimed at:

- support communities, private bodies, donor agencies and local government authorities on achieving a sustainable increase in services and making services available to communities;

- empowering communities and private bodies to plan/implement projects that have a direct effect on the people to improve community life;

- community and private partnership with human development;

- promote community participation in governance;

- promoting transparency through private and community participation in implementation, monitoring and evaluation to improve sustainability of the project and to mitigate the effects of inadequate use of funds in development (*Abia State Investment Brochure*, 2014).
Poor Governance, Public-Private Partnership and Infrastructural Provision in Abia State.

Every newly created state requires basic infrastructures such as good road networks, airport or port facilities, railway, health and education facilities, electricity, and above all, buildings from which the processes of legislation and general government and administration could be conducted. Obviously, for a state to achieve this fit, good governance is required. Good governance, both in the ancient, medieval and, indeed, in contemporary times, has always remained synonymous with sustained efforts and commitments by those who are at various levels of decision-making, either in a corporate organization or state, towards efficient and effective realization of the set targets and goals. This is usually attained by means of formulation and implementation of relevant policies and programmes that have bearing on the aspirations of the masses. (Obi and Igwe, 2013). In contrast, and as stated earlier, poor governance, the world over, is associated with some basic elements of which one of these elements has remained weakness in public-sector management. This involves laxity in changing the organizational structure of a sector agency to reflect new objectives, making budgets work better, sharpening civil-service objectives and placing public and private enterprises’ managers under performance contract. Poor governance entails lack of openness and transparency in the conduct of public business and discharge of service.

Incidentally, between 1999 and 2014, Abia State was totally immersed in aura of poor governance regime, especially on the area of public sector management, accountability and overall administration and service delivery. This fostered poor governance regime and its consequent recrimination on poor infrastructural and insecurity scenario in Abia State derived from the contemporaneous systemic grotesque in Nigeria, which is largely defined by flawed electoral process and criminalization of politics and governance. The point being made is that elections in the country have been reduced as a legitimate means of enthroning the dominance of the few vantage political elite and exercise in futility; as votes do not count in the emergence of political leaders in all levels. Indeed, elections have more or less become an organized crime in various parts of Nigeria, including Abia State. In this criminal enterprise called election, politicians go into electioneering contests with a fixation not on service but on capturing state power and access to public resources meant for overall development of the people for personal gains (Innocent, 2012). The cataclysmic effect of this disaster in the Nigeria’s electoral process and emergence of political leaders is the reduction of the institutions of the state and governance to a personal or group fief and enterprises with egregious security implications. This is the case with Abia State. Notably, Abia state, which was once reputed as the most advanced traditional features of democracy, accountable and transparent governance system exemplified in its amala community governance system under the defunct Eastern Region has since the return of democratic governance in Nigeria become a bastion of criminal autocracy, opaque and imperial governance style (Innocent, 2012).

By 1991 when Abia State was created, hopes were high, but challenges were multiple; one of which was lack of basic infrastructures. After short span of military governance in the state, the Orji Uzor Kalu civilian administration that benefited from the subverted and stolen popular wills of Abians in 1999 general elections claimed it was in the mission of prioritizing economic growth in the state. This development paradigm was encapsulated in the Abia State Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (ASEEDS). The vision and mission stipulated in ASEEDS was, inter alia:

…the vision of the state is to transform it into a prosperous and self-sustaining economy, characterized by high standards of living among the people. In this regard, it is the mission of the state to fight poverty, hunger, penury and ignorance as well as enthrone good governance marked by openness and accountability at all levels for the good of its citizens (Abia State Government 2005:8).

The key policy frameworks for attaining this vision and mission were stated as follows:

- economic empowerment of the people automatically creates employment and reduces poverty. The employment generation and poverty reduction strategies of government shall be sustained;
- aggressive infrastructural development through massive roads rehabilitation and reconstruction;
- rural electrification and provision of urban and rural water;
- promoting enabling environment for the growth of small and medium enterprises and privatization of government industries and ailing enterprises;
• sustaining a healthy citizenry through the government free health scheme;

• maintaining an uncompromising assault on school drop-out syndrome and encouraging qualitative and quantitative education at all levels;

• public sector reforms (PSR) to promote efficiency, transparency and accountability and mounting a frontal attack on corruption; and

• ensuring private public partnership for a sustainable development (Abia State Government, 2005:26).

Although the Administration (1999-2007) made serious effort towards the above directions, especially in the area of improving the state of infrastructures in Abia State during the first tenure, the overall attainment of the ASEEDS policy and security objectives in Abia State was highly distorted by its long-running battle with President Olusegun Obasanjo owing to the Administration’s intense search for political relevance, independence and personal/group innuendos. In the long run, the Administration became highly domineering in all spheres of public life, repressive, unaccountable and short-sighted to the plights and aspirations of the common populace. The immediate outcome of this imperial governance style in Abia State between 1999 and 2007 was public sector dominance in the provision of infrastructures and basic services and diminished awareness of the role of the private sector in the socio-economic development of the state; a state where the people were, and still, very entrepreneurial, productive and market oriented. Given that the state government was a key player in service and infrastructural provision, the majority of Igbo entrepreneurs and other interested investors were obliged to relocate to other regions of the country where investment environment was more favorable (The Citizen, October 12, 2012). Thus, in the face of the growing socio-economic and infrastructural decadence in Abia State, crimes and social vices became highly elevated as norms and acceptable means of livelihood and survival of the masses. The security and investment climate in the state were further threatened and compounded, especially in Aba, the investment and commercial hub of Abia State. In fact, the security situation in Aba town degenerated to the extent that it developed from a state into a federal or, even unfortunately international such as World Bank or IMF problem by 2007 (Igwe, 2014).

In order to rescue Abia State from the debacle of poor governance, security challenges and infrastructural and industrial degradations, Theodore Orji, on assumption of office in 2007, outlined his priority vision and mission in the state as follows:

…To embark on the creation of a more secured and sustainable environment for the economic growth, investment, and promotion of the ingenious entrepreneurship of the people, and where the protection of our citizens’ lives and property is dominant. In doing this, we will create synergy with the Military Barrack in Ohafia and the Naval Base in Owerrinta, to provide logistic support to enable these Forces to back the preservation of security and combat crime in our state. This is because we believe that development can only thrive in the atmosphere of peace and tranquility (http://www.abiastate.gov.ng/a-speech-presented-by-his-excellency).

Prominent among the means the Administration adopted for attaining her development agenda and objectives in Abia State was the PPP (Abia State Investment Brochure, 2014). To this end, and in synergy with the World Bank, United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and other local and international partners, Common Facility Centre (CFC) and Community Driven Development (CDD) initiative, among others, were put in place by the state to facilitate the provision of basic infrastructures. The State also partnered with a private firm, MECURE, in order to put in place health facilities and other infrastructures on Build, Operate and Transfer basis. Like its predecessor, as noble as PPP framework and infrastructural projects conceived under it in Abia State from 2007 to 2014 seemed to be, ideas could not approximate reality, the attainment of the PPP objectives in infrastructural provision in the state remained a shifting sand. Table 1 below depicts a few selected projects under PPP in Abia State from 2007 to 2014.
Table 1: A few selected projects under PPP in Abia State, 2007-2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>PPP Projects and sites</th>
<th>Partnership organization/date</th>
<th>Completion Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Skills and Entrepreneurial Development Academy (SEDA) in 3 Senatorial zones of the state</td>
<td>New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD)/2007</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Common Facility Centre (CFC) in Aba</td>
<td>UNIDO/2010</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>General Hospital in 17 L.G.As</td>
<td>MECURE/ 2009</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Specialist and Diagnostic Centres in Umuahia and Aba</td>
<td>MECURE/ 2010</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>New Regional Water Schemes in various communities in Abia</td>
<td>UNDP/2010</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Umuahia Modern Market in Ubani-Ibeke</td>
<td>Build, Operate and Transfer with SACHAS consortium/2011</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Obuaku City Housing Project on the Aba-Port-Harcourt Expressway</td>
<td>Build, Operate and Transfer with SACHAS consortium/2010</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Modular Refinery Project at Owazza in Ukwa-East Local Government</td>
<td>Hermes Juno Consortium/2009</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Road Construction Projects in 17 L.G.As</td>
<td>HITECH Nig. Ltd/2008</td>
<td>Uncompleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NEPAD Progress Report in Abia State PPP Projects, 2014

Due to highly entrenched and contradictions of opaque and imperial governance style in Abia State mostly implicated in public sector dominance in the development process and service provision, private and donor agency participation in the provision of services and development of infrastructures as depicted by table 1 became stalled. The Administration under T.A. Orji demonstrated less-commitments in sharing the risk involved in the form of payment of counterpart funds necessary for successful execution of the projects. Consequently, most of the targets set for the projects were not realized. The targets, among others, included the following set for the Skills and Entrepreneurial Development Academy (SEDA):

- withdrawing a vast number of Abia youths roaming the streets helplessly and redirect their lives through career guide and to engage them in productive venture;
- riding the society of street urchins, thugs and area boys with a view to assist them with a better and modest means of income;
- assisting the students awaiting results and those on holiday to eke out a living through skills and craft acquired in the academy;
- enabling graduates to be gainfully employed and also become employers of labor from knowledge acquired from the academy, thereby reducing the number of white collar job seekers;
- serving as a reorientation agent to the youths against peer pressure and social vices;
- engaging the indolent and devastated widows and widowers including certain category of the indigent society;
- serving as indirect agent of mass illiteracy/poverty eradication; and

Consequently, NEPAD’s comprehensive sociological review (2014) on poverty, employment and human capacity development in Abia state revealed that the vast majority of youths (graduates, undergraduate, high
school leavers, drop outs, widows and other categories of the indigents in the society) roam the street idly and hopelessly too. Furthermore, official statistics from the annual abstract of the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) (2013) showed that 82.48 per cent of the Abia populace lack access to basic infrastructures, and thus, lived below the poverty line, while mere 17.54 per cent was classified as non poor. In a bid to eke out a means of livelihood by the citizens, all sorts of criminality and terrorist networks were ostensibly entrenched and established in the state. In fact, armed bandits and kidnapping literary turned the state into a Hobbesian state of nature where life was short, nasty and brutish, which further repulsed visitors and prospective private investors and donor agencies (Ukiwo, Henry-Ukoha and Emole, 2012).

Insecurity and PPP Environment in Abia State

A critical factor necessary for the realization of the objectives of PPP in infrastructural development is enabling environment. This is because no meaningful development can take place in an unsecured environment. Crime such as armed robbery, kidnapping, gangsterism, and other social vices such as religious bigotry creates atmosphere of apprehension and derives away potential domestic and foreign investors, as well as undermining any genuine effort towards overall national development. As stated earlier, due to deeply entrenched systemic problems of criminalization of politics and poor governance regime in Abia State, insecurity drivers such as poverty, unemployment and high rate of crime, which are themselves serious threats to Public Private Partnership and investment climate, were implicated in the state from 1999 to 2014. Tables 2 and 3 below depict selected states in Nigeria with high incidence of poverty and crime

Table 2: Selected states in Nigeria with high incidence of poverty, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Food Poor</th>
<th>Non Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Non Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Non Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Non Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South South</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perhaps more worrisome to the insecurity situation and investment environment in Abia state is the spate of kidnapping that was witnessed in the state between 2008 and 2012. Remarkably, kidnapping began in Nigeria as a form of organized protest in the Niger Delta region by the various groups that were agitating for infrastructural development of the region. At the time, the group thought that kidnapping presented them with a viable option for drawing the attention of government and other international organizations in their long drawn struggle for resource control and better living conditions in the region. In Abia state, kidnapping was mostly nurtured by the high and rising level of youth unemployment. The unemployment situation in the state rose from 11.4 per cent in 2007 to 15.7 per cent in 2008, 17.7 per cent in 2009 to 18.5 per cent in 2010 and a drop to 17.5 per cent in 2011 as depicted by table 4 below

### Table 3: Crime cases reported to the police by selected states, 2007-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abia</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adamawa</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akwa Ibom</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayelsa</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross River</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Perhaps more worrisome to the insecurity situation and investment environment in Abia state is the spate of kidnapping that was witnessed in the state between 2008 and 2012. Remarkably, kidnapping began in Nigeria as a form of organized protest in the Niger Delta region by the various groups that were agitating for infrastructural development of the region. At the time, the group thought that kidnapping presented them with a viable option for drawing the attention of government and other international organizations in their long drawn struggle for resource control and better living conditions in the region. In Abia state, kidnapping was mostly nurtured by the high and rising level of youth unemployment. The unemployment situation in the state rose from 11.4 per cent in 2007 to 15.7 per cent in 2008, 17.7 per cent in 2009 to 18.5 per cent in 2010 and a drop to 17.5 per cent in 2011 as depicted by table 4 below

### Table 4: National unemployment rates by selected states in Nigeria, 2007-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Nigeria</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abia</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauchi</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebonyi</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamfura</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The activities of the kidnappers in Abia state was equally facilitated by some criminally-minded politicians who saw in the restive youths the needed fodder to ferment trouble, intimidate political opponents, scuttle and manipulate the electoral process, and perpetrate other such criminal activities in the state. Between 2008 and 2012, the state was held to ransom by these bands of dare-devil kidnappers, armed robbers and hired assassins. Worse affected in the state was Aba, the hub of commercial activities in the southeast and south-south zones. The bustling commercial ‘Enyimba City’ was virtually deserted with business closing down and residents relocating in droves. Thus, according to Ukoha, Henri-Ukoha and Emole (2012:24):

For several months in 2008 and 2010, armed bandits literally turned Abia State into a Hobbesian state of nature where life was short, nasty and brutish. Aba, the once bustling commercial capital of the state that attracted merchants and buyers from across West Africa became a ghost of itself as its new image as den of kidnappers and robbers repulsed visitors and forced its rich residents to relocate to safer places. The anomie in Abia went largely unnoticed by most Nigerians apart from the hapless residents of the state and residents of neighboring south-south and south-east states who occasionally visited or travelled through the state.

Furthermore, Save Abia Now Group (SANG) equally observed the insecurity phenomenon and its effect on the business environment and overall development in the state when the group in its report noted that:

All the major players in the society have left town, houses are padlocked, offices closed, banking activities scaled down, hospitals closed. As we write no single new building is being developed in the entire city. All prominent doctors are gone, all major lawyers are gone, all prominent importers are gone, all prominent industrialists are gone, all major entrepreneurs are gone, and all foreign technical factory experts are gone. No sane person allows any of his or her family members to be posted to Aba any more. Non indigenes are leaving in droves. (http://www.elombah.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=4200:kidnapping-the-aba-timebomb&).

Official statistics from the Nigerian Police in December 2009 showed that Abia state led the pack of kidnapping incidence with a total of 110 cases. The federal government was forced to intervene when it became clear to all Nigerians that the matter was beyond the capacity of the police. The insecurity in Abia was catapulted into a national security concern deserving the attention of the President and Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces when it was reported that kidnappers had taken hostage a bus load of school pupils and a contingent of Nigerian journalists travelling back to their Lagos base after attending a national executive council meeting of the Nigeria Union of Journalists (NUJ) at Uyo in neighboring Akwa Ibom State. The armed banditry was brought under control after the president ordered troops into the state (http://saharareporters.com/report/ untold-story-aba-firm-grip-kidnap-militia). Thus, in response to the fast decaying infrastructures and accompanying insecurity climate in Abia State and to avoid being tagged as ‘non-performing governor’, Governor T.A. Orji embarked on politically expedient cum problematic mission of patronage masqueraded as Youth Empowerment Scheme (YES) as alternative approach to PPP and infrastructural development in the state.

### Political Approach to PPP and Infrastructural Development in Abia State

The state of socio-economic derelict, festering insecurity and other malfeasance in Abia State, created an urgent need for quick fix in order to restore a conducive investment climate, as well as rescue the citizens from the obvious ache, poverty, frustration and disillusionment. Having this situation in mind, Governor T. A. Orji acted impulsively and embarked on politically expedient, monosyllabic and insidious Youth Empowerment Scheme (YES) project. The project had its plank on distribution of buses, cars and tricycles to Abia unemployed youths as a way of curtailing youth unemployment and crimes in the state. In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imo</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kebbi</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

contrast, and as evidence showed, the project remained one of the political intrigues meant for diversion of scarce public resources to servicing of political thugs, sycophants and patronage networks, as the real unemployed Abians hardly found their fit in the project. As Norman (2012) rightly observed:

The Governor acted impulsively as a result of pressure and shame of non-performance. There was an urgent need for quick fix because people were obviously becoming frustrated and disillusioned. So the distribution of the vehicles under the guise of youth empowerment then was the only handy option; but was blown out of proportion because of his love for media hypes and praises. The beneficiaries of these buses, cars and tricycles are mostly political thugs and sycophants who are not less than 45 to 60 years old, while the real youths are the drivers, conductors and the riders. Others who cannot condescend; mostly the graduates are roaming the streets as derelicts. Many are mentally ruined as a result of heavy indulgence in hard drugs (www.nairaland.info.com).

This, in essence, implied that the high opportunity cost of using the available funds in building infrastructures such as electricity, roads, health facilities, industries etc, that are capable of boosting the economic activities and reducing the poverty of the Abians across the seventeen local government areas was exchanged with the distribution of buses, which in effect, negatively impacted on the completion of the physical infrastructures conceived under the Public Private Partnership in the state as depicted by table 2 below.

Table 2: Abandoned projects under PPP in Abia State, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>PROJECT TYPES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pipe borne Water</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Classroom Blocks</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Health facilities</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Electric Power Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Civic Centre Hall</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Skills Acquisition Centres</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Market Stores</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>School Dormitories</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2 above shows that most physical infrastructures under PPP arrangement in Abia state within the period of under study were abandoned resulting from non-remittance of counterpart funds by the state government and corruption. As rightly observed and summed up by the LEEDS’ report on stakeholders’ validation workshop held at Umuahia between 29th and 28th July 2010 under the auspices of the UNDP and CEPD:

Unavailability of funds, corruption, inadequate capacity of the implementation committees, monitoring and evaluation process, gap between participatory method and finance, lack of political willingness, lack of coordination among the three tiers of government and their agencies, poor commitments by the implementers, untimely adherence and compliance to strategies and targets (Thisday, July 29, 2010:33).

Given the fact that the Abia state government failed to foster the development of infrastructures necessary for boosting the economy and poverty reduction in the state within the framework of Public Private Partnership, the accompanying dearth in the state infrastructures and the grim harsh conditions experienced by people have served as motivating factors for unemployed Abians to seek for extra-legal ways to come out of their deplorable state of survival (Warime-Jaja, 2010). This explains the logic of chronic and recalcitrant crime situation that had a systematic occurrence and characterized as dangerous in the state between 1999 and 2014.
Conclusion

This study has explored poor governance, insecurity and public sector reforms in Nigeria: using the Public-Private Partnership Policy and infrastructural development in Abia State as a reference point. Using the core assumptions of the Systems theory as basis of analysis and ex-post-facto research design, the study problematized poor governance regime as implicated on non compliance to the legal framework of risk sharing in project design, execution and funding by the Abia State government, as well as internal security threats as *casus bello* to docile role of the Public Private Partnership Policy in infrastructural development in the state. The need for the Abia state government to improve in its governance system, which currently emphasizes on criminalization of politics and state dominance in the development process, is seen in the study as quite imperative.
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