
Building Trust and Support for Partnership Agendas through the Requisites of Early Community Involvement

Oladimeji Ashade

University of KwaZulu-Natal
ashadeji82@gmail.com

Sybert Mutereko

University of KwaZulu-Natal
muterekos@ukzn.ac.za

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51415/ajims.v3i1.874>

Abstract

One of the aims of the sustainable development goals (SDGs) is infrastructural development. In pursuance of this goal, partnerships and collaborations remain key responses. Thus, Goal 17, which is the climax of the SDGs, revolves around partnering with private investors to generate the required capital for the attainment of said developmental goals. Using some public-private partnership (PPP) projects as case study, this paper aims to analyse how early involvement or non-involvement influences the project communities to trust the project handlers and give support towards sustainable infrastructural development. The researcher applied qualitative method data gathering techniques and analysis. Findings show that communities that seemed to have been well engaged at the initial stages only experienced 'therapeutic' and 'manipulative' involvement because firstly there was a flagrant disregard for initial agreed-upon principles and tenets of inclusive governance and secondly the promoters of the collaborations did not do enough to have an all-inclusive advocacy with community groups. The study recommends that the law governing the implementation of PPP in Lagos State be modified to allow community representatives feature prominently on the committee for infrastructural projects right from the initial stage through the entire process.

Keywords: *Public-private partnership; collaborations; policy; community participation; sustainable development*

Introduction

The infrastructural deficit across sub-Saharan Africa is not only limiting the continent's growth and development; it is also impeding the attainment of sustainable development goals (SDG) for developing nations (Shen et al., 2016), including Nigeria. Therefore, governments of sub-Saharan African countries are opting for policy reforms to address this problem (Rana and Izuwa, 2018). Consequently, public-private partnership (PPP) evolved. PPP is generally described as a policy instrument for any government whose public finance financial cannot meet its infrastructural development goals. Partnering with private investors creates the opportunity for financiers, mostly private firms, outside the purview of government circle to invest in infrastructural development due to the huge capital outlay required in that sector (Zen, 2019). The involvement of the private sector in infrastructural development has changed the role of government across the globe. This development has bestowed a level of pluralism on a contemporary modern state where multiple actors partner to deliver public infrastructure. Hence, policy systems have also been significantly impacted (Desai and Rudra, 2019; Zen, 2019). A pluralised policy environment that transcends the narrow focus of state regulation emerged (Euchner and Preidel, 2018). The complexity of the contemporary governance arrangement also demands that those who were hitherto the subject of laws and policies have become partners and co-owners of the policy (Smith and Larimer, 2018). If

the goal of the PPP policy is to achieve sustainable development in a peaceful environment, the policy should consider its host communities in its plan for community-based infrastructural development and break unnecessary barriers arising from community exclusions.

Prior consultation and the right to informed consent on issues affecting the local inhabitants in any development in their area or domain, was enshrined in the UN Declaration on Right of Indigenous People (RIP) in 2007. Considering this, the implementation of any infrastructural development project or programme is more effective when free, prior information and consultation commences with the host communities in the early phase of the project cycle (The World Bank Group, 2019; Leifsen et al., 2017). PPP involves serial processes and phases of implementation. For instance, the procurement phase of PPP is a stage when the business case for the project is developed. This is a stage for climate setting for the environmental assessment, which includes advocacy. The Association of Accredited Public Policy Advocates to the European Union (AALEP) sees advocacy as the first step that any organisation, especially the government MDAs, can take to translate policy goals (either business-oriented or end-result oriented) into goals that make sense to those affected by these goals (AALEP, 2020). Advocacy is seen by Cullerton, Donnet and Gallegos (2018: 3) as the “process of undertaking active interventions with the explicit goal of influencing government policy”. The author summarised this into the statement that no policy should deliver results on its own without taking cognisance of the processes involved. The more coordinated the processes and strategies involved in a dynamic policy process are, the more effective the policy advocacy will be as a first step towards collaborative governance climate setting.

This is because the project handlers (PHs), implementing ministries, or department as well as administrators need to negotiate and agree on certain starting conditions. These conditions revolve around the imbalance in the power relations between the collaborators, incentives, and disincentives for participation and the initial level of trust. As mentioned in the previous section, the government sets the institutional framework for the implementation of PPP through appropriate MDAs for the infrastructural projects. However, there is theoretical evidence that show that most of these MDAs lack the full range of knowledge or experience needed, especially during the initial stages of project implementation (The World Bank Group, 2014). Hence, extensive stakeholders’ early engagement plays a crucial role in the identification and implementation of PPP projects because distrust and suspicion usually characterise PPP implementation in the initial stages, as Oluwasanmi and Ogidi (2014) observed. Therefore, collaboration, negotiation, and consultation are required, especially at the initial stages.

To further design a collaborative governance model, Kim (2016) developed an integrated framework of collaborative community governance. Kim’s framework added that government’s mandate and institutional support facilitates collaborative initiation in the localities. In line with this thought by Kim, research has proposed that increased community participation in the decision about intervention components at the “early trial of the project reduces later conflict and improved implementation” (Roussos and Fawcett, 2000: 5). Osborne and Murray, in a study of PPP in respect of voluntary and non-profit organisations in Columbia, reported that the “initial level of trust established during earlier contact” makes the subsequent collaborative process easy and beneficial to all concerned stakeholders (Osborne and Murray, 2000). Rowe and Frewer (2004) identify early involvement as one of the nine criteria for the evaluation processes and outcomes in any local participation. The submission is that the conditions presented in the earlier stages of collaborative governance can either make or break the collaborative process (Wiewora Keast and Brown, 2016; De Schepper et al., 2014; Ansell and Gash, 2008).

These studies made notable remarks on the need for early involvement of communities in governmental decisions or projects as a factor that distinguishes a collaborative governance

framework and other community participatory systems (Nederhand and Kiljn, 2016). A considerable level of consensus was also observed that conditions present in the earlier stages of collaborative governance can either make or mar the collaborative process (Wiewora, et al., 2016; De Schepper et al., 2014). For instance, the initial level of trust established during earlier contact, alongside the creation of the right incentives for participation, makes the subsequent processes easy and beneficial to all concerned stakeholders (Kim, 2016; Ansell and Gash, 2008). Drawing up a conclusion on the theme of the initial stage involvement shows that it is important that leaders should pay adequate attention to and “invest considerable time and energy in the initial process”, especially to the bringing together of the right stakeholders from the community to the table (Luke, 1998: 81).

Several items in literature on community involvement in project planning and development show that there are several procedural problems, and that window-dressing and politically motivated involvement usually exist. Preliminary investigation reveals that most models of participation logically show that the degree of involvement in issues of public concern is directly proportional to the effort invested by the planning agencies (Swapan, 2016). Such involvement, however, fails to give legitimacy as well as necessary coordination, for effective community involvement in preliminary decisions regarding the project (Dean, 2018; Leifsen et al., 2017). The knowledge demonstrated by these scholars yields a partial view which is not adequate for an empirical, evidence-based position. However, the researcher was able to draw inferences based on existing works to address the research question which aims to find out how the involvement or non-involvement of the communities at the outset of the implementation impacts on the trust and community support for the national policy on PPP (NP4) in the Lagos State.

In the light of the foregoing, this study found the need to analyse the commitment of the Nigerian government, particularly the Lagos State Government (LSG) to its policy statement of shared governance and participatory planning principles (LSG, 2020) in its PPP drive for infrastructural development. Currently, there seemed to be no systematic studies that has addressed the involvement of the community solely at the early stage of the PPP policy implementation process in Nigeria. This study holistically analysed how the Lagos State Office of Public-Private Partnership has secured the trust and confidence of the community at the early stages of the projects through advocacy, information-sharing, and inclusive governance in line with the National Policy on Public Private Partnership (NP4).

This current study hopes to determine the real situation regarding the extent to which the support institution, LOPPP, has promoted shared jurisdiction and democratic ideals in the development of the infrastructural project from the initial stages across various communities in the Lagos State and the extent to which this has impacted the process. The study shall analyse the policy framework in the context of a developing nation like Nigeria, as the focus in the literature has concentrated on the developed nations where PPPs are firmly rooted, although the challenge is not peculiar to the third world (Delmon, 2017; Mehraz, 2016). The focus of this study shall be on analysing holistically, theoretically, and empirically how the agencies have secured the trust and confidence of the community during the early stages of the projects and on the impact that this has had on the projects.

Material and Methods

The study adopted a sampling technique which was based on subjective judgement. This is called a non-probabilistic sampling technique. The non-probabilistic technique was purposively used. This implies that the participants were selected on purpose based on certain criteria that made them holders of information required for the study. For instance, in Badagry, 12 communities played host to the Badagry Deep Seaport project. All 12 community leaders represented the sample for FGD. Similarly, in Epe, the project spread across ten communities. The ten community leaders represented

the sample of the study at the community level. Lastly, at Ikorodu, nine communities were affected by the Egbin Thermal Project. The nine community leaders constituted the sample for the FGD. The sample for the interview sessions included the paramount ruler in each division. There were three divisions; the three paramount rulers represented the total sample with whom interviews were held in each division. The interview was held with the Executive Secretary, LOPPP, and a dissenting community head due to emerging issues.

The study applied purposive sampling which implies that the participants were selected on purpose based on criteria that make them holders of information required for the study. A total sampling technique is a type of purposive sampling in which the researcher involves only the population of interest due to their possession of specific characteristics the researcher is looking for (Glem, 2018; Etikan, 2016). The technique was considered most appropriate for a study in which the total population is of manageable scope with a sub-group which was regarded as the custodian of the information required (Glen, 2018; Taherdoost 2016). The common characteristics that involved the adoption of the total sampling technique included similar community challenges, similar socio-demographics, a similar cultural environment, and a similar community leadership style. The sample was thus framed on community leadership.

The researchers, during the study, reiterated the voluntariness, privacy, anonymity, and confidentiality principles guiding the study to participants. Therefore, every participant in FGD across the divisions was allotted codes based on the division and their time of arrival at the venue. The participants were coded BADFGD1 to BADFGD9 in line with how they arrived and registered for the discussion at the venue. In a similar way, IKDFGD01 to IKDFGD07; and EPEFGD01 to EPEFGD08 represents participants' codes in Ikorodu and Epe Divisions respectively.

For qualitative data analysis, the researchers generated a matrix for lucid visual and logical presentation as shown in Matrix 1 below. Data was analysed based on the themes relating to early-stage community involvement in the project. It is evident from the values to various themes varying based on the approaches adopted in project locations as obtained through the interview as well as the FGD. While there seemed to be some similarities in responses in the two approaches (FGD and Interviews), variations were sometimes observed. For instance, the responses of the participants to issues that emanate from advocacies carried out, reveal that more advocacy was done in Badagry than in other sites, as confirmed by the FGD and the interview held across study locations. Nevertheless, data gathered in Lekki communities reveals that advocacy was partially done at the initial stages contradicting what was gathered during the interview.

The varied responses between the interviewees and those of the discussants, suggest that the community's traditional rulers, with whom most interviews were held and some of the community leaders that were involved in the discussions, responded to issues based on their level of involvement and information at their disposal. However, the thoughts were articulated, summarised, and synthesised to reduce the volume of data based on categorical themes and sub-themes to generate the matrix. The matrices illustrate the aggregates from the wider spectrum of responses from the community. The responses were articulated and reflected on the matrices as follows:

Matrix 1: Analysis of qualitative data on early involvement using categorised themes

Themes/ Subthemes	Early-State Involvement	Relevant Quotes/Field Sources
Involving communities at the outset	The view of LOPPP and the involvement of the communities	We involved them from the beginning (OPPINT01). Our communities were well engaged at the initial stages (BADINT01; BADFGD04).

	at the initial stages.	At the initial stages, they came with the juicy offer, and they expressed willingness to cooperate with us to do a lot of things, but the reverse is the case now (EPEINT01).
Initial Stakeholder Meetings	Was there any form of an initial meeting involving every stakeholder?	A town-hall meeting was held involving all stakeholders (BADINT01; BADFGD04). They held a series of meeting with us at the planning stage of the project (EPEINT01). They had gone far with the project before we were involved (IKDFGD05). They relate more with the traditional rulers and neglect the community (EPPFGD03).
Conduct of EIA	How were the environmental impact assessment (EIA) and social impact assessment (SIA) conducted? What role did the community play?	Some professionals were contracted to do the EIA with local interest (OPPINT001). The EIA did not involve us. We were only briefed that it was okay without any adverse environmental impact (IKDFGD05; EPEDFGD2). Our youths were engaged for enumeration, evaluation, and EIA assessment.
Advocacy at the initial stage	How was the advocacy done? What impact does it make? Did the advocacy build trust and support of the communities for the project?	The way the PPP projects are structured, the community only needs to be involved in the area of advocacy. They need to know the relevance of the project (OPPINT001). There has not been a serious problem even at the initial stages due to what I earlier referred to as advocacy (OPPINT001). Any area where there are agitation and conflicts, it may be that the advocacy was not properly done at the initial states (OPPINT001). The project promoters failed to mobilise community support at the initial stages rather than relating to the community they were relating with traditional rulers to speak on their behalf (EPEFGD01). PPP is just about creating an opportunity for the few privileged ... the heritage of the community involved was stylishly privatized through supposed PPP ideology. Most things done were not part of the arrangement with the people, but they cannot complain because the government was directly or indirectly involved. (IKDFGD03).
Early involvement debate	Is there a need for the community to be involved in the early stages of policy implementation?	We may not involve them at the initial stage when we do the preliminary works...They only need to be involved at the commencement of the project (OPPINT001). Community do not necessarily need to be involved in the planning phase (BADINT01; BADFGD02). Government only needs to take initiative and put the interests of the community in mind" (EPEFGD05).
Early sensitisation, education, and enlightenment	How much information and education were carried out to sensitise the local people?	Meetings are held to inform and educate them about the project and to solicit their cooperation (OPPINT01). There were advocacy visits to the paramount ruler and all the white cap chiefs by ATM terminals (the handlers of the project). We held a town hall meeting together. They even distributed questionnaires (BADINT01)

		<p>They discuss local community involvement in terms of employment and financial dividends. All the communities were glad to be part of the project except one or two (BADINT01)</p> <p>Initially, we thought the project was purely government project (IKDFGD02).</p>
--	--	---

The study determined the role that early involvement played in building trust and community support for the project at the initial stage. The data gathered during interviews and the FGD reveals that community members do not have adequate knowledge about the PPP projects, except those that are actively involved whose knowledge was also seen to be limited. The perception of PPP is not clear to most of the community members especially at Ikorodu and Epe, who were not engaged at the prior stage. Although some of the participants were conscious of the fact that the project involved private investors, they were also aware that an implementation was undertaken with government support or some form of involvement. Interviewees at Epe (Lekki Port/LFTZ) and Badagry exhibited a significant level of awareness about the project. They appreciated the importance of the partnership. The knowledge expressed was based on their interactions and consultation at the initial stages.

During the FGD, the larger percentage of the discussants appeared to have limited information and had received limited updates regarding the projects. Rather than asking questions, they were rather docile and full of complaints and internal conflicts with the investors and their promoters i.e., the government. The data obtained from across the community groups showed that the respondents in all the divisions somewhat agreed on most items relating to the initial stage involvement of the communities in the PPP infrastructural projects. The extent to which the people agreed with the notion that the project was positively received in all the communities due to advocacies and initial stage involvement is relatively high with a low mean response, but the communities did somewhat agree. All the communities largely disagreed with the opinion that the government did not need to involve the community at the initial stages. This received a high response rate across the division. The response reflected that the respondents considered community participation at the commencement of the project as somehow good and acceptable.

In this section, an attempt was made to analyse the data obtained from interview with community leaders. Findings were synthesised and various results of data show a degree of association in the results from different locations. Results that were found in the sub-sections will be discussed and aligned with literature under discussion of findings.

Discussion of Findings

Building trust and community support through early involvement

The study found out that some communities got involved earlier than others. The findings suggest that the PHs of the Badagry Deep Seaport Project attracted more support because they involved the communities in all its activities right from the onset of the project. Further investigation revealed that the rate of resentment, suspicion, and conflict were higher in other communities that were not actively involved in the initial stages. Community leaders for instance, demonstrated that they knew nothing until the project had commenced before they were called for a meeting. Overall, the evidence from this study demonstrates that the communities that expressed trust and confidence in the project were the communities that experienced a good initial involvement by the PHs at the beginning of the project. The findings of this current study are consistent with those prior studies that have noted the importance of early involvement (Ashade and Mutereko, 2020; Norton and Hughes, 2017; Stafford, 2014).

According to Norton and Hughes (2017), early engagement facilitates efficient and effective planning for all parties within an implementation framework. Qualitative pre-application discussion "enables better coordination between public and private resources and improved outcomes for the community" (Norton and Hughes, 2018: 29-30). Using the "controversy Local Benefits Matrix" as a tool, Stafford argued that early engagement of the communities to identify local benefits reduces the cost of implementing infrastructural projects quite significantly. The key thing is to earn their trust by demonstrating commitments to their views no matter how insignificant they seemed to be. On the contrary, the authors found that the policy document for the implementation of PPP recognised the relevance of the civil society groups when it states, "the government will ensure that representative of civil societies, investors and contracting organisations contribute to the effectiveness of the government investment strategy and institutional framework" (Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission (ICRC), 2013: 15).

However, the extent to which this had to be pursued by the administrators was not defined in the policy framework. Therefore, the implementation was left to the discretion of the bureaucrats. Therefore, the inclination of the bureaucrats in the office that oversaw PPP project implementation, i.e., LOPPP determined the level of community involvement. Although, findings from previous studies established that the attitude of bureaucrats towards community participation rather than being symbiotic, has remained lopsided (Mapfumo and Mutereko, 2020; King et al., 1999). Policy analysts have consistently maintained that it is important for citizens, for who a policy is meant to take care, to be well informed of all aspects of the policy. Hence, Kweit and Kweit (1984) wrote that, in an ideal democratic setting the people determine where they want to go and the bureaucrats must get them there. The argument of Kweit and Kweit (1984) was that it would be irrational to detach the citizens from any policy that affects them, irrespective of their low level of technical knowledge. Therefore, even if the community lacks technical expertise; they should be 'emotionally involved' right from the planning phase if the policymakers required their support during implementation (Kweit and Kweit, 1984: 22). This was further supported by Dean (2018: 186) while making case for the incapacitated groups against domination that "planning should have an inbuilt bias towards those with least choices".

Advocacy to the communities at the initial stages: Any impact?

Scholars have made notable remarks on the need for early involvement of communities in governmental decisions or projects as a factor that distinguishes collaborative governance and other community participatory systems (Ashade and Mutereko, 2020; Nederhand and Kiljn, 2019). One major finding was that the initial advocacy carried out by the project handlers (PHs) created the forum for a mutually beneficial discussion at the outset of project implementation between the host communities and the PHs. An attempt was made by the researcher to ascertain the level of advocacy carried out by the PHs across the communities to know whether the advocacy conducted was able to have a positive impact on the trust and sense of support from the community members or not. Findings from this study showed that the PHs conducted some sort of advocacy in all the divisions. However, there were disparities in the way the advocacies were conducted. Our findings revealed that, while advocacies started earlier in the Badagry and Epe divisions, the same cannot be said by the community members at Ikorodu. During the field study, an apparent display of docility and apathy was observed in participants at Ikorodu communities unlike the other communities in the other two divisions. It was deduced that the lack of basic knowledge about the project at the initial stages made the community a bit more docile and apathetic.

During the review of literature, no study was found to have treated advocacy in isolation, however, Mapfumo and Mutereko (2020), in a similar study, reported that advocacy at the early stage facilitates stakeholder's participation and trust in the management of the informal sector in Harare,

Zimbabwe. Nevertheless, it is argued by the agonist that advocacy does not connote involvement going by the counter-governance paradigm (Dean, 2018). The agonists had advocated that certain groups be accorded recognition in the policy environment and that they should be awarded recognition. The recognition requires that participatory strategies be institutionalised in the policy design to promote collective solidarities to reduce conflict and to integrate residents into the implementation process (Dean, 2018; Lowndes and Paxton, 2018). For instance, Dean (2018) concluded in a study that institutionalising specific actions and roles for dissenting groups in a pluralist policy environment, will broaden inclusion, promote policy robustness, and reduce resistance.

Further investigation showed that there is no uniform system of operation at the initial stages in the three locations surveyed. Some communities had good interactions with the PHs at the initial stages while some did not. This was further illustrated in the Matrix 1.

Awareness through early participatory consultations

Access to information is crucial for PPP effective governance. There are shreds of evidence that suggest that most community members do not have adequate knowledge about the projects except those that are actively involved, whose knowledge was seen to be limited. The perception of PPP was not clear to most of the community members across the board. Interviewees at Lekki and Badagry exhibited an appreciable level of awareness about the project. They appreciated the importance of the partnership. The findings suggest that the knowledge expressed was based on their interactions and consultations with the PHs. However, during the FGD, a larger percentage of the discussants appeared to have limited information and had received limited updates regarding the projects. The observation was made during the FGD with leaders that were drawn from the various communities.

Results showed that some communities in Ikorodu and Epe were denied access to valid information on the projects. Particularly on issues that have direct impact on the people like the EIA. Aside Badagry, the results from other divisions did not show that information was being withheld from the people and was made open at the LOPPP. Possible explanation for the incident was found in earlier works of scholars that showed that bureaucrats sometimes relate less with community members when they have the premonition that the community members lack the required technical abilities to make a positive contribution to a particular course of action (Ismail et al., 2019; Gualini, 2018). Also, the findings corroborate earlier studies that have established a relatively good correlation between PPP and non-disclosure of information (Ismail et al., 2019; Musawa et al., 2017). However, these findings would have to be interpreted with caution because the results could not be extrapolated to all the divisions.

This study showed that early involvement builds trust and project support. It was established that communities, where there was a level of public mistrust, were with low levels of non-involvement at the initial stages. Generally, a lack of transparency and inappropriate advocacy recorded at the initial stage breeds docility and apathy in most communities owing to lack of basic knowledge about the projects. Moreover, communities that seemed to have been well engaged at the initial stages only experienced 'therapeutic' and 'manipulative' involvement because firstly, there was a flagrant disregard for initial agreed upon principles and tenets of participatory planning at a later stage and secondly, the promoters did not do enough to have all-inclusive advocacy with community groups. The exclusion of community groups in planning and initial advocacy accounted for the resistance recorded in most communities.

From the findings of the study, there are some critical recommendations for practitioners and policymakers. We enunciate these recommendations below. For practitioners/bureaucrats:

- Engagement of Community Relations Officer: As a matter of urgency, the ICRC and LOPPP should create an office that will facilitate inter-communal relations and employ a community relations officer, a graduate with significant experience in community relations, whose role would be to coordinate, facilitate, and maintain a harmonious relationship between key stakeholders and host communities.
- Need for re-orientation and training of front-line personnel: The field officers of the LOPPP and ICRC need to be offered specialised training for the astute implementation of the policy. The field officers should be inducted and well informed about how to conduct community engagement practices and about the role they play in facilitating harmonious relationships amongst the key stakeholders and host communities. There is also the need to re-orientate the administrators that are glued to the bureaucratic orientation. Most of the resentments witnessed from the community were avoidable if the administrators had played their role well during the advocacy stage with the community leaders on behalf of the government. LOPPP should collaborate with similar agencies in other countries to emulate the successful practices of PPP in the context of stakeholders' involvement.
- Ensure compliance of every stakeholder with the agreed terms in the memorandum of Understanding (MoU): The findings reveal an utter disregard for agreed terms of the MoU by the project managers, which has always resulted in conflict between the PHs and their host communities. It is the responsibility of the public managers to ensure that PHs respect and act on the agreements of the signed MoU.

There is also the need for policymakers to develop a comprehensive participatory planning system in collaboration with LOPPP for PPP implementation in Lagos State. The system should take cognisance of the need to evaluate the grievances of the community regarding non-involvement in preliminary processes of environmental impact assessments and social impact assessments and should devise a strategy to make up for the flaws, especially in the Ikorodu and Epe communities. The device to address the system should not be based on single measures; multiple measures should be put in place to promote the satisfaction of stakeholders at the inception. Below are few suggestions in this regard:

- Policy makers should initiate bills that will make it mandatory for community representatives to be part of the board for the project as soon as location for the project has been determined. This bill, when passed, should supersede the MoU which, from the researcher's findings, has not been respected by the key parties to the partnership.
- The evidence from this study suggests that the environmental impact assessment (EIA) was contracted-out by the LOPPP in most of the communities. Findings further expressed the possibility that the communities neither participated nor accessed the report. Evidently, the assessment was done without considering local interests. This invariably violates international conventions. This study strongly condemns this and recommends that policymakers should include the community representatives as a signatory to the EIA and Social Impact Assessment (SIA) report before it becomes authenticated.
- Policymakers should ensure that the PPP policy is given a human face right from the earliest phase of conception for procurement and development. The policy design should have a level of flexibility that will not prompt the administrators to take some initiatives that are sensitive to community concerns, and which would cause forestall resentments. As it stands, the policy purpose behind the projects is good but the initial stage processes regarding community stake-holding seemed disorientated, perhaps due to the promoters' insensitivity to other stakeholders.

Conclusion and Implications of the Study

Having established the significance of private partnerships to the realisation of sustainable development goals, particularly in infrastructural development, the implementations, of public-private partnerships in emerging economies are characterised by a series of hitches revolving around stakeholders' involvement. The study established how the host communities were poorly accommodated in infrastructural governance of PPP projects in the Lagos State, Nigeria. In this regard, the Lagos State House of Assembly needs to revisit the Lagos State PPP law enacted in the year 2011 with a view to ensuring that the law governing the implementation of PPP provides that community representatives should constitute members of the committee on infrastructural projects from the initial stage. The affected communities should be allowed to make contributions to early planning decisions. The host communities' awareness and involvement should be at the centre of the discourse on participatory planning. Issues such as land-use decisions, first-line labour engagements, and community advocacy should be the focus of the national or state PPP policy review.

The literature that addressed the issue of initial stage involvement and did not advance insight beyond normative understanding. The study has highlighted the practical implications of how the building of trust at the earlier stage determines the extent to which the host communities give support to the project. As it stands, the community that made the greatest demands on the PHs were those communities that lacked coordinated processes through effective policy advocacy in the early stages. If the Lagos State and, Nigeria, wants to ensure appropriate systems in its collaborative infrastructural governance system, services, and support for initial involvement of the host communities in PPP implementation, they should be given a policy priority by the policymakers.

The problem-solving approach adopted for this investigation has gone some way to enhance our knowledge base and to make positive contributions to our understanding in the following key areas:

- Advocacy impacted trust and earned community support for the PPP programmes in the communities; and
- Most communities did not participate in the conduct of EIA and SIA.

Moreover, this study has made a significant contribution to the discourse on early involvement of host communities in project governance. Further, the study employed a community-based pragmatic approach to advance the scholarship on policy implementation by establishing that successful implementation of community-based projects was an end-product of collaborative involvement of the host community. This result establishes an excellent step towards collaborative project implementation or project's inclusive governance, which suggests that policy makers and project planners should involve every stakeholder right from the outset of the policy implementation process.

References

- AALEP. 2013. Understanding advocacy: context and uses. Available: <http://www.aalep.eu/understanding-advocacy-context-and-use> (Accessed 20 March 2021).
- Ansell, C. and Gash, A. 2008. Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18: 543-571.
- Ashade, O. A. and Mutereko, S. 2020. Infrastructural governance in Lagos State: Analysing community engagement in the PPP implementation policy framework. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Studies*, 12(2): 561-577.
- De Schepper, S., Dooms, M. and Haezendonck, E. 2014. Stakeholder dynamics and responsibilities in Public-Private Partnerships: A mixed experience. *International Journal of Project Management*, 32(7): 1210-1222.

- Cullerton, K., Donnet, T., Lee, A. and Gallegos, D. 2018. Effective advocacy strategies for influencing government nutrition policy: a conceptual model. *International Journal of Behavioural Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 15: 1-11.
- Dean, R. J. 2018. Counter-governance: Citizen participation beyond collaboration. *Journal of Politics and Governance*, 6: 180-188.
- Delmon, J. 2017. Public-private partnership projects in infrastructure: an essential guide for policy makers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Desai, R. M. and Rudra, N. 2019. Trade, poverty, and social protection in developing countries. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 60: 1-11.
- Etikan, L., Musa, S. A. and Alkassim, R. S. 2016. Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1): 1-4.
- Euchner, E. and Preidel, C. 2018. When morality policies meet governance: Private governance as response to value-driven conflicts. *Journal of Public Policy*, 38(1): 57-81.
- Glen, S. 2018. Total population sampling. Available: <https://www.statisticshowto.com/total-population-sampling/> (Accessed 11 September 2020).
- Gualini, E. 2018. *Planning and the intelligence of institutions: Interactive approaches to territorial policymaking between institutional design and institution-building*. Oxfordshire: Routledge.
- Ismail, S., Musawa, M. S. and Ahmad, H. 2019. Transparency of public private partnership (PPP): the extent of mandatory information disclosure. *Built Environment Project and Asset Management*, 9(5): 655-668.
- Nederhand, J. and Klijn, E. 2019. Shareholder involvement in public-private partnerships: Its influence on the innovative character of projects and on project performance. *Administration and Society*, 51(8): 1200-1226.
- Kim, S. 2016. The workings of collaborative governance: Evaluating collaborative community-building initiatives in Korea. *Urban Studies*, 53(16): 3547-3565.
- King, C. S., Feltey, K. M. and Susel, B. O. N. 1998. The question of participation: Toward authentic public participation in public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 58(4): 317-326.
- Kweit, M. G. and Kweit, R. W. 1984. The politics of policy analysis: The role of citizen participation in analytic decision making. *Review of Policy Research*, 3: 234-245.
- Leifsen, E., Gustafsson, M. T., Guzmán-Gallegos, M. A. and Schilling-Vacaflor, A. 2017. New mechanisms of participation in extractive governance: between technologies of governance and resistance work. *Third World Quarterly*, 38(5): 1043-1057.
- Luke, J. S. 1998. *Catalytic leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lowndes, V. and Paxton, M. 2018. Can agonism be institutionalised? Can institutions be agonised? Prospects for democratic design. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 20: 693-710.
- LSG. 2020. About Lagos, Location/Extent. Available: <https://lagosstate.gov.ng/about-lagos/> (Accessed 02 February 2020).

- Mapfumo, L. and Mutereko, S. 2020. Contextualising stakeholder participation in the governance of Harare's informal economy sector. *Economics and Financial Studies*, 12(1): 103-118.
- Mehraz, K. K. 2016. Meaningful community engagement in public-private partnerships: a case study of Manhattan's downtown redevelopment project. Doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University.
- Musawa, M. S., Ismail, S. and Ahmad, H. 2017. Disclosure of public-private partnership (PPP) voluntary information. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, 9(5): 655-688.
- Norton, P. and Hughes, M. 2017. *Public consultation and community involvement in planning: A twenty-first century guide*. London: Routledge.
- Oluwasanmi, O. and Ogidi, O. 2014. Public private partnership and Nigerian economic growth: Problems and prospects. *International Journal of Business Social Science*, 5: 132-139.
- Osborne, S. P. and Murray, V. 2000. *Understanding the process of public-private partnerships. Public-Private Partnerships*. London: Routledge.
- Rana, F. and Izuwa, C. 2018. Infrastructure and Africa's development: The PPP imperative. Available: <https://blogs.worldbank.org/ppps/infrastructure-africa-s-development-ppp-imperative> (Accessed 23 November 2020).
- Roussos, S. T. and Fawcett, S. B. 2000. A review of collaborative partnerships as a strategy for improving community health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 21: 369-402.
- Rowe, G. and Frewer, L. J. 2004. Public participation methods: A framework for evaluation. *Science, Technology, and Human Values*, 25: 3-29.
- Shen, L., Tam, V., Gan, L., Ye, K. and Zhao, Z. 2016. Improving sustainability performance for public-private-partnership (PPP) projects. *Sustainability*, 8: 1-15.
- Smith, K. B. and Larimer C. W. 2018. *The public policy theory primer*. New York: Routledge.
- Stafford, J. 2014. Improving understanding of community engagement on infrastructure projects. Available: <http://www.infrastructure-intelligence.com/article/nov-2014/improving-understanding-community-engagement-infrastructure-projects> (Accessed 3 June 2019).
- Swapan, M. S. H. 2016. Who participates and who doesn't? Adapting community participation model for developing countries. *Cities*, 53: 70-77.
- Taherdoost, H. 2016. Validity and reliability of the research instrument: How to test the validation of a questionnaire/survey in research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 5(3): 28-36.
- The World Bank Group. 2019. A guide to community engagement for PPP. Available: <https://pppknowledgelab.org/guide/sections/39-stakeholder-communication-and-engagement> (Accessed 9 October 2020).
- Wiewiora, A. R., Keast, R. K. and Brown, K. 2016. Opportunities and challenges in engaging citizens in the co-production of infrastructure-based public services in Australia. *Public Management Review*, 18(4): 483-507.
- Zen, F. 2019. Public-private partnership development in Southeast Asia. In: Deep, A., Kim, J. and Lee, M. eds. *Realizing the Potential of Public-Private Partnerships to Advance Asia's Infrastructure Development*. Manila: Asian Development Bank, 255-285.