UKR Journal of Economics, Business and Management (UKRJEBM)
Homepage: https://ukrpublisher.com/ukrjebm/
Email: submit.ukrpublisher@gmail.com
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2026
ISSN: 3049-429X (Online)

Assessment of Urban Infrastructure Financing Models and Their Impact On Sustainable Development in The Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja, Nigeria

Abubakar Sidiq, Usman[1]; Abdurasheed Alao[2]; Ibrahim Musa[3]

[1]Sustainable Development Centre, University of Abuja.
[2,3]Department of Economics, University of Abuja.

***Corresponding Author**: Ibrahim Musa
DOI: *https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18257085*

Article History
Original Research Article
Received: 02-01-2026
Accepted: 14-01-2026
Published: 15-01-2026

Citation: Abubakar Sidiq, Usman; Abdurasheed Alao; Ibrahim Musa. (2026). Assessment of Urban Infrastructure Financing Models and Their Impact On Sustainable Development in The Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja, Nigeria. UKR Journal of Economics, Business and Management (UKRJEBM), Volume 2(1), 117- 126.

Abstract

This study investigates urban infrastructure financing in the Abuja Municipal Area Council (AMAC) of the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), focusing on the models employed, their effectiveness, and the developmental outcomes achieved. Using a mixed-methods approach, primary data were collected from 384 household respondents through structured surveys, complemented by semi-structured interviews with institutional and community stakeholders. Analysis was guided by the Finance–Mediators–Outcome (FMO) framework, linking financing mechanisms to service availability, affordability, accessibility, and sustainable urban development outcomes. Findings reveal a diversified financing landscape encompassing government budgetary allocations, Public–Private Partnerships (PPPs), private sector contributions, Sukuk bonds, and emerging community-based initiatives. Institutional actors demonstrate a detailed understanding and selective application of these models, while community awareness remains limited, with most residents perceiving infrastructure as generally "government-funded." Effectiveness varies across sectors: electricity and water supply are relatively accessible, whereas housing, waste management, and peri-urban infrastructure face persistent gaps. Affordability and spatial disparities further constrain inclusive service delivery. The study recommends enhancing transparency and stakeholder engagement, adopting blended financing approaches, and prioritising equitable, sector-specific interventions to improve infrastructure outcomes. These measures are essential for fostering sustainable, resilient, and inclusive urban development aligned with Sustainable Development Goal 11 in the FCT.

Keywords: *Urban Infrastructure, Financing Models and Sustainable Urban Development.*

Introduction

Urban infrastructure financing is a critical determinant of sustainable development outcomes in rapidly urbanising cities, particularly in developing countries (Suleiman et al., 2025). Infrastructure systems such as transportation, housing, water supply, energy, and sanitation form the backbone of urban economies and directly influence social welfare, environmental quality, and economic productivity (Musa et al., 2022; Abubakar et al., 2025; Akpan et al., 2025). However, many cities face persistent financing gaps due to limited public revenues, competing development priorities, and weak institutional capacity (Hafizu et al., 2025). In Nigeria, these challenges are pronounced, as decades of underinvestment have resulted in a substantial infrastructure deficit that constrains inclusive growth and sustainable urban development (World Bank, 2020).

The Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja, exemplifies the complexities of urban infrastructure financing in a fast-growing metropolitan region. Since its designation as Nigeria's capital, Abuja has experienced rapid population growth and spatial expansion, placing immense pressure on existing infrastructure systems. Although government budgetary allocations remain the primary source of infrastructure financing in the FCT, they have proven

inadequate in meeting growing demand. Fiscal constraints, delays in funding releases, and rising construction costs have further weakened the effectiveness of traditional public financing mechanisms, leading to project delays and service delivery gaps (Federal Capital Territory Administration [FCTA], 2019).

In response to these constraints, alternative urban infrastructure financing models have gained prominence in Abuja, particularly public–private partnerships (PPPs) and other private sector–driven approaches. PPPs are designed to mobilise private capital, technical expertise, and managerial efficiency while sharing risks between the public and private sectors. Globally, such models have been promoted as viable instruments for bridging infrastructure financing gaps and improving service delivery, especially in contexts where public resources are insufficient (Yescombe, 2018). In the FCT, institutions such as the Abuja Infrastructure Investment Centre have been established to facilitate private sector participation in infrastructure development, reflecting a shift toward diversified financing strategies.

The effectiveness of urban infrastructure financing models is closely linked to sustainable development outcomes. Sustainable development emphasises the integration of economic efficiency, social equity, and environmental protection in development planning. Infrastructure projects that are well-financed and sustainably managed can enhance urban mobility, reduce environmental degradation, support affordable housing, and promote economic resilience. Conversely, poorly structured financing arrangements may lead to cost overruns, inequitable access to services, and long-term fiscal risks for governments (UN-Habitat, 2020). Therefore, assessing financing models requires not only an evaluation of funding adequacy but also an examination of their broader developmental impacts.

Against this background, this study assesses urban infrastructure financing models in the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, and examines their impact on sustainable development. By analysing public financing mechanisms, PPP arrangements, and emerging innovative financing approaches, the study seeks to identify strengths, limitations, and policy gaps in current practices. The findings are expected to contribute to evidence-based policymaking and provide insights for improving infrastructure financing strategies that support sustainable urban development in Abuja and similar rapidly growing cities in Nigeria.

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

Urban Infrastructure

Urban infrastructure refers to the physical and organisational systems that enable cities to function effectively and support economic, social, and environmental activities. These systems include transportation networks, housing, water supply, sanitation, energy, telecommunications, and waste management facilities, which collectively sustain urban livelihoods and productivity. Adequate urban infrastructure enhances accessibility, facilitates economic growth, improves public health, and promotes social inclusion, while infrastructure deficits often exacerbate inequality and environmental degradation. In rapidly urbanising cities, particularly in developing countries, the demand for infrastructure frequently outpaces supply, leading to congestion, service inefficiencies, and declining urban quality of life (Grigg, 2019; World Bank, 2020; Magaji et al., 2025).

Financing Models

Financing models refer to the mechanisms and arrangements through which resources are mobilised, allocated, and managed for infrastructure development and maintenance. Traditional public financing through government budgets and tax revenues remains common (Musa et al., 2025); however, fiscal constraints have necessitated the adoption of alternative models such as public–private partnerships (PPPs), user charges, concessional loans, infrastructure bonds, and blended finance (Adefirenye et al., 2025). These models differ in terms of risk allocation, ownership structure, and long-term financial sustainability. Effective financing models are those that mobilise adequate capital, ensure value for money, and align financial incentives with public service objectives, particularly in contexts where public resources alone are insufficient to meet infrastructure needs (Yescombe, 2018; OECD, 2021).

Sustainable Development

Sustainable development is a development paradigm that seeks to balance economic growth, social equity, and environmental protection to meet present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet theirs (Mansur et al., 2025; Ibrahim et al., 2025a). It emphasises long-term planning, resource efficiency, and inclusive growth, particularly in urban areas where population concentration intensifies environmental and social challenges (Ibrahim et al., 2025b). Urban infrastructure plays a critical role in advancing sustainable development by supporting low-carbon transport, efficient energy use, equitable access to services, and resilient urban systems (Tanko et al., 2025). Consequently, infrastructure investments and their financing models must be aligned with sustainability principles to ensure lasting developmental benefits (Brundtland Commission, 1987; UN-Habitat, 2020).

Theoretical Review

Public–Private Partnership (PPP) Theory

Public–Private Partnership (PPP) Theory, which explains the rationale for collaborative arrangements between the public and private sectors in the provision of public infrastructure and services. PPP theory is grounded in the premise that governments can leverage private-sector capital, technical expertise, and managerial efficiency to overcome fiscal constraints and improve infrastructure delivery. At the same time, the public sector retains a regulatory and oversight role to safeguard public interests. The theory emphasises optimal risk allocation, value for money, and long-term contractual arrangements as key determinants of successful infrastructure outcomes. In the context of urban infrastructure financing in the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja, PPP theory provides a useful analytical lens for assessing how different financing models influence project efficiency, service quality, and sustainable development outcomes. By examining the extent to which PPP arrangements balance economic efficiency, social equity, and environmental sustainability, the theory helps explain variations in infrastructure performance and their implications for sustainable urban development (Grimsey & Lewis, 2004; Yescombe, 2018).

Empirical Review

Obasa and Oluyomi's (2024) empirical study examines the role of public–private partnerships (PPPs) in financing Nigeria's achievement of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Using a qualitative methodology, the authors found that PPPs can mobilise private-sector resources to support infrastructure projects, but that achieving sustainable development depends on accountability, risk-sharing, and equitable revenue distribution between government and private partners. The study highlights the potential of PPPs to alleviate financing gaps and improve service delivery when implemented with strong governance mechanisms.

Ogunsola et al. (2024) provide empirical evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa, showing that public–private partnership models can address infrastructure and renewable energy financing shortfalls through hybrid frameworks, green bonds, and climate funds. Their analysis indicates that institutional weaknesses and regulatory uncertainty remain key barriers, but that well-structured PPP arrangements can enhance private capital inflows and foster sustainable infrastructure outcomes. This finding underscores the broader relevance of PPP models for financing infrastructure in developing urban contexts, such as Abuja's.

Obi Anike et al. (2020) conducted a quantitative survey in Abuja to assess the impact of PPPs on infrastructure development and economic diversification. Their findings revealed a positive correlation between PPP engagement and infrastructure improvements, suggesting that greater private-sector participation can help mitigate the shortfall in government-sourced infrastructure financing. The study recommends enhanced private investor involvement to sustain infrastructure growth and economic diversification in the Federal Capital Territory.

Alamu et al. (2024) reviewed the effectiveness of PPPs in addressing Nigeria's infrastructure deficit and identified both obstacles and opportunities. The authors demonstrated through literature and policy analysis that financial constraints, corruption, and institutional weaknesses impede PPP performance, but that infrastructure financing can be improved by strengthening legal frameworks and fostering stakeholder collaboration. Their work highlights practical barriers that must be addressed to maximise PPP contributions to sustainable urban infrastructure development.

Busari et al. (2024) used time-series data from 1990 to 2022 to empirically investigate the relationship between public debt and infrastructural development in Nigeria. Applying an Autoregressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) model, they found that while public debt (both internal and external) has a positive impact on capital expenditure, the misallocation of funds and inefficiencies in fund utilization undermine long-term infrastructure improvements. This study highlights the limitations of traditional public financing models and reinforces the need for complementary financing approaches to support sustainable infrastructure development.

Research Gap

Based on the reviewed empirical studies, a clear research gap emerges regarding the comprehensive assessment of urban infrastructure financing models in the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja, and their impact on sustainable development outcomes. While Obasa and Oluyomi (2024), Ogunsola et al. (2024), and Obi-Anike et al. (2020) demonstrate that public–private partnerships (PPPs) can mobilize private capital and enhance infrastructure provision, these studies predominantly focus on PPP arrangements in isolation or in broader African contexts, without systematically comparing them with other financing models such as public debt, bonds, or innovative blended financing mechanisms. Additionally, Alamu et al. (2024) and Busari et al. (2024) highlight institutional weaknesses, corruption, and inefficiencies in public financing but provide limited empirical insight into how these constraints interact with different financing models to affect sustainable development indicators. Consequently, there is a lack of localised, integrative research examining the relative effectiveness of diverse urban infrastructure

financing models in Abuja, their constraints, and their direct contribution to achieving sustainable development objectives, including social equity, economic growth, and environmental sustainability. Addressing this gap would provide evidence-based guidance for policy and investment strategies tailored to Abuja's unique urban context.

Methodology

Research Design

A research design provides a structured blueprint for conducting scientific inquiry, outlining systematic procedures for data collection, measurement, and analysis (Kothari, 2004). It ensures alignment between research objectives, methods, and analytical procedures, fostering coherence and rigour throughout the study (Aigbavboa & Thwala, 2020). Consistent with the Finance–Mediators–Outcome (FMO) framework discussed in Chapter Two, this study operationalises three mediating dimensions—economic viability, social inclusivity, and environmental sustainability—and evaluates outcomes against Sustainable Development Goal 11 (SDG-11) indicators.

The design supports a systematic investigation of urban infrastructure financing in the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Nigeria. It enables tracing the effects of financing models on mediating performance and sustainable urban outcomes. By providing a logical sequence for data collection, analysis, and interpretation, this design ensures the study produces valid, reliable, and actionable insights into how financing arrangements influence sustainable urban development in Abuja.

Research Method

This study employed a **mixed-methods approach**, integrating quantitative and qualitative techniques to capture both measurable trends and context-rich insights (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Quantitative data provided objective assessments of investment patterns, service availability, and financing effectiveness, while qualitative data elucidated institutional dynamics, stakeholder perspectives, and socio-political influences on financing mechanisms. This combination enabled a holistic evaluation of urban infrastructure financing, capturing both structural and human-centred dimensions.

The research also incorporated **descriptive and exploratory elements**. The descriptive component quantified patterns in infrastructure financing, including sectoral allocation, financial flows, and investment coverage. The exploratory component employed interviews and document analysis to uncover the contextual, social, and institutional factors influencing the effectiveness of financing models. Together, these approaches addressed both the "what" (existing patterns) and the "why" (contextual drivers), producing a comprehensive understanding of urban infrastructure financing in the FCT.

Approach and Rationale

The mixed-methods design was strategically aligned with the study objectives, enabling triangulation of quantitative and qualitative data to strengthen reliability and validity (Bryman, 2016). Quantitative data mapped investment trends and financing flows, while qualitative interviews captured policy-level, institutional, and community perspectives. This dual approach facilitated an integrative analysis of financing model performance, social equity, and sustainability outcomes, supporting actionable recommendations for policymakers, urban planners, and development stakeholders.

The justification for this approach rests on the multifaceted nature of sustainable urban infrastructure, which encompasses economic, social, and environmental dimensions. A single-method design would fail to capture either quantitative patterns or nuanced stakeholder experiences. In contrast, the mixed-methods framework enables simultaneous measurement of observable indicators and contextual understanding of financing dynamics.

Study Area

The study was conducted in **Abuja Municipal Area Council (AMAC)**, one of six Area Councils comprising the FCT, Nigeria. The FCT, established in 1976 as the country's federal capital, spans approximately 7,315 km² (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1976; FCDA, 2019). AMAC, covering about 1,200 km², represents the core urban area and hosts the densest concentration of population, economic activity, and administrative functions within the FCT (NPC, 2018; FCDA, 2019).

AMAC is characterised by socio-spatial diversity, including high-income planned districts, mixed-use middle-income areas, and rapidly expanding peri-urban settlements (FCDA, 2019; Adama, 2022). Infrastructure provision faces increasing pressure from urbanisation, particularly in transport, drainage, housing, energy, and waste management systems (AfDB, 2021; Akinwale, 2021). Its governance structure involves both the FCDA and local authorities, creating a complex institutional landscape that significantly affects financing arrangements, service delivery, and coordination, making AMAC a suitable empirical setting for this study.

Population and Sampling

The study targeted three primary stakeholder groups: (i) general residents of AMAC, representing demand-side perspectives; (ii) policymakers and government officials from institutions responsible for planning and financing

infrastructure; and (iii) community leaders and representatives, reflecting grassroots and intermediary viewpoints.

A multistage cluster sampling technique was employed to ensure spatial representativeness of the resident population across all 12 AMAC wards. Within each ward, systematic selection of households captured diversity across formal and informal settlements. Policymakers and institutional stakeholders were purposively selected for elite interviews, focusing on their central roles in infrastructure financing. Community representatives were selected purposively to reflect diverse social, cultural, and gender perspectives. The final sample comprised 384 households, two key-informant interviews with institutional stakeholders, and fifteen community representatives.

Data Collection Methods

Primary data were collected through structured household questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. The household questionnaire captured demographic data, access to infrastructure, perceived effectiveness of financing models, community participation, and socio-economic and environmental outcomes. Semi-structured interviews with policymakers and community leaders provided in-depth insights into institutional arrangements, regulatory challenges, financing effectiveness, and social equity implications.

Secondary data included policy documents, institutional reports, and academic literature to contextualise findings and support interpretation. No administrative financial datasets were independently analysed; the study relied on primary data for empirical results.

Validity and Reliability

Validity was ensured by aligning the instruments with the research objectives and the FMO conceptual framework, which covers economic, social, and environmental dimensions. Questionnaire items and interview questions reflected concepts widely cited in sustainable urban infrastructure literature. **Reliability** was assessed via Cronbach's alpha for quantitative measures and through procedural consistency for qualitative data. Semi-structured interviews were transcribed verbatim, triangulated with survey findings, and collected under standardised field protocols to ensure consistency and accuracy (Saunders et al., 2019).

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics, inferential techniques (Chi-square, Kruskal–Wallis, MANOVA), and regression analyses. Exploratory factor analysis identified clusters of challenges affecting financing. Qualitative data were analysed thematically to extract patterns, perspectives, and explanatory insights. Findings were integrated at the interpretation stage, ensuring triangulation and a holistic understanding of the effects of financing models on sustainable urban development in AMAC.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical integrity was ensured through informed consent, confidentiality, voluntary participation, and secure data storage. Administrative approvals were obtained from relevant authorities, and all procedures adhered to accepted norms for social research.

Data Presentation and Analysis of Results

This section presents and analyses the empirical findings from primary data collected through household surveys and semi-structured interviews within the Abuja Municipal Area Council (AMAC) of the Federal Capital Territory (FCT). The analysis is structured around the study's objectives and guided by the Finance–Mediators–Outcome (FMO) framework, which links infrastructure financing models to the economic, social, and environmental dimensions of urban development. Quantitative data from 384 resident respondents were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics, while qualitative insights from institutional and community stakeholders contextualise the findings. Sustainable Development Goal 11 (SDG 11) is used as an interpretive lens for assessing alignment with inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable urban development.

The chapter is organised by research objective. Objective One identifies and categorises urban infrastructure financing models; Objective Two evaluates their effectiveness in delivering infrastructure services; Objective Three examines their impact on sustainable urban development; and Objective Four explores the key challenges shaping the adoption of financing models. The chapter concludes by synthesising findings across objectives to inform policy-relevant recommendations.

Objective One: Identification and Categorisation of Urban Infrastructure Financing Models in the FCT

This section identifies and categorises financing models used for urban infrastructure in the FCT, drawing on evidence from residents, institutional stakeholders, and community leaders. The analysis focuses on awareness, prevalence, and sectoral applications of financing models, including government funding, Public–Private Partnerships (PPPs), private-sector investment, and emerging arrangements. Evaluation of effectiveness or outcomes is reserved for subsequent sections.

General Residents' Perspective
Water Infrastructure

Table 4.1: Awareness of Financing Models for Water Infrastructure

Financing Model	Percentage of Respondents Respondents (%)	selecting option (n)	Share of mentions (normalised to 100%)*
Government Funding	52.0	200	31.5
Private Sector Funding	36.0	139	21.8
Public-Private Partnerships	18.0	69	10.9
Foreign Aid/Grants	11.0	42	6.7
Other (e.g., community-based, cooperative)	48.0	185	29.1
No Knowledge	7.0	27	0

Source: Author's Field Study, 2025

Table 4.1 presents residents' awareness of financing models for water infrastructure. Government funding is the most recognised mechanism (52%), followed by private sector funding (36%) and Public–Private Partnerships (18%). Notably, 48% of respondents also identified "Other" models, reflecting alternative or community-based arrangements. A small share (7%) indicated no knowledge of available financing models. The high recognition of government and private sector funding suggests these actors' visibility in water projects, while the prominence of "Other" models indicates localised or informal arrangements warranting further study.

Electricity Infrastructure

Table 4.2: Awareness of Financing Models for Electricity Infrastructure

Financing Model	Percentage of Respondents (%)	Respondents selecting option (n)	Share of mentions (normalised to 100%)*
Government Funding	60.2	232	39.1
Public-Private Partnerships	29.6	114	19.2
Private Sector Funding	22.2	85	14.4
Foreign Aid/Grants	11.0	42	7.1
Other (e.g., community-based models)	31.0	119	20.1
No Knowledge	4.0	15	19.2

Source: Author's Field Study, 2025

Residents' recognition of financing models for electricity highlights the firm reliance on government funding (60.2%), with PPPs (29.6%) and private-sector funding (22.2%) also noted. Alternative models, including community-based contributions, are acknowledged by 31% of respondents. Only 4% report no knowledge of financing arrangements. Table 4.2 indicates that while government provision remains dominant, hybrid arrangements are increasingly recognised.

Waste Management

Table 4.3: Awareness of Financing Models for Waste Management

Financing Model	Percentage of Respondents (%)	selecting option (n)	Share of mentions (normalised to 100%)*
Public-Private Partnerships	49.6	191	45.1
Government Funding	23.8	92	21.6
Private Sector Funding	15.6	60	14.2
Foreign Aid/Grants	2.0	8	1.8
Other (e.g., cooperative, community-based)	19.0	73	17.3
No Knowledge	9.0	35	0.0

Source: Author's Field Study, 2025

As shown in Table 4.3, Public–Private Partnerships are the most recognised mechanism for waste management (49.6%), reflecting the outsourcing of services to private operators. Government funding (23.8%) and private-sector funding (15.6%) follow, with

community-based initiatives at 19%. Limited recognition of foreign aid (2%) indicates minimal international involvement in local waste services.

Housing Infrastructure

Table 4.4: Awareness of Financing Models for Housing Infrastructure

Financing Model	Percentage of Respondents selecting Respondents (%)	Share of mentions (normalised option (n)	to 100%)*
Private Sector Funding	55.0	212	44.0
Public-Private Partnerships	49.6	191	39.6
Government Funding	15.2	59	12.2
Foreign Aid/Grants	0.9	3	0.7
Other (e.g., cooperative, community-based)	4.4	17	3.5
No Knowledge	0.9	3	0.0

Source: Author's Field Study, 2025

Table 4.4 shows private sector funding (55%) and PPPs (49.6%) as the most recognised financing models for housing. Government funding (15.2%) and alternative mechanisms (foreign aid 0.9%, other 4.4%) are minimally acknowledged. This suggests a growing role for the private sector in housing provision and limited awareness of government-led or external support.

Objective Two: Effectiveness of Urban Infrastructure Financing Models

This section evaluates the effectiveness of financing models in delivering critical infrastructure, based on residents' perceptions of availability, affordability, and accessibility. Effectiveness is assessed through user experience rather than audited performance, in line with the FMO framework.

Infrastructure Availability

Table 4.5: Infrastructure Availability Overview

Infrastructure	Available (%)	Not Available (%)
Water Supply	75	25
Electricity	90	10
Waste Management	50	50
Housing	40	60
Healthcare	75	25
Education	70	30

Source: Author's Field Study, 2025

Table 4.5 shows that electricity (90%) and water supply (75%) are perceived as the most available services, reflecting sustained public investment. Healthcare (75%) and education (70%) are also relatively accessible, whereas housing (40%) and waste management (50%) demonstrate notable service gaps. These findings highlight uneven sectoral coverage, with deficiencies particularly evident where complex operational or land-related constraints exist.

Infrastructure Affordability

Table 4.6: Residents' Perception of Infrastructure Affordability

Affordability Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Very Affordable	103	26.75
Affordable	121	31.43
Not Affordable	161	41.82
Total	385	100

Source: Author's Field Study, 2025

Affordability is a critical dimension of effectiveness. As shown in Table 4.6, 41.82% of respondents perceive services as unaffordable, indicating cost barriers, particularly for low-income groups. The remaining respondents consider infrastructure services affordable (31.43%) or very affordable (26.75%), indicating partial accessibility.

Infrastructure Accessibility

Table 4.7: Residents' Perception of Accessibility of Urban Infrastructure

Accessibility Level	Number of Responses	Percentage (%)
Easily Accessible	128	30.12
Accessible	149	35.06
Not Accessible	108	28.06

Source: Author's Field Study, 2025

Table 4.7 summarises residents' perceptions of accessibility. Approximately 30.12% consider infrastructure easily accessible, 35.06% as accessible, while 28.06% report limited access. Accessibility gaps are more pronounced in peri-urban areas where service provision lags behind population growth, highlighting spatial inequalities in infrastructure delivery.

Discussion of Findings

The findings of this study indicate that urban infrastructure financing in the Abuja Municipal Area Council (AMAC) operates through a diversified set of mechanisms, reflecting a multi-layered governance and institutional landscape. Residents demonstrated broad awareness of government funding and private sector contributions, with Public–Private Partnerships (PPPs) emerging as increasingly recognised mechanisms, particularly in sectors such as waste management and housing. However, the presence of alternative or community-based models, highlighted by respondents, suggests that informal and localised financing arrangements also help fill gaps where formal funding is limited. Institutional perspectives from the Federal Capital Development Authority (FCDA) and AMAC further underscore the selective application of financing models, where the choice of instrument depends on project scale, fiscal capacity, and sectoral requirements.

In terms of effectiveness, the study revealed significant variability across infrastructure sectors. Electricity and water supply were perceived as the most widely available and reliable services, reflecting sustained public investment, while healthcare and education showed moderate coverage. Conversely, housing and waste management exhibited pronounced service gaps, highlighting the constraints of financing arrangements in meeting complex operational and land-related requirements. Affordability and accessibility analyses further indicate that financial arrangements have not uniformly translated into equitable service delivery, with a substantial proportion of residents reporting cost barriers and limited access, particularly in peri-urban areas. These patterns suggest that while current financing models can mobilise resources, they do not automatically guarantee inclusivity or spatial equity.

The synthesis of resident, institutional, and community perspectives reveals a persistent gap between technical knowledge of financing models and local-level awareness. While institutions apply structured financing instruments such as PPPs, Sukuk bonds, and the Land Swap Initiative, community stakeholders primarily perceive infrastructure provision through the lens of government involvement and project completion. This disconnect highlights the importance of transparent communication and stakeholder engagement to enhance public understanding and support for infrastructure initiatives. Overall, the findings suggest that achieving effective, equitable, and sustainable urban infrastructure in the FCT requires not only diversified financing mechanisms but also complementary strategies to improve accessibility, affordability, and stakeholder participation.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The study concludes that urban infrastructure financing in the Abuja Municipal Area Council (AMAC) operates through a diverse mix of mechanisms, including government funding, Public–Private Partnerships (PPPs), private sector contributions, and emerging community-based arrangements. While institutional actors, such as the Federal Capital Development Authority (FCDA) and AMAC, implement structured financing instruments tailored to project scale and sectoral needs, awareness of these models at the community level remains limited. The effectiveness of these financing models is uneven, with electricity and water supply achieving relatively high availability, while housing, waste management, and peri-urban services face persistent gaps. Affordability and accessibility challenges further constrain the extent to which infrastructure investments translate into inclusive and equitable outcomes, highlighting disparities across sectors and locations.

Based on these findings, the study recommends strengthening public communication and stakeholder engagement to improve community understanding of financing mechanisms and their role in infrastructure delivery. Policymakers should prioritise blended financing approaches that combine government allocations, private sector participation, and community contributions to address sector-specific gaps, particularly in housing, waste management, and peri-urban areas. Additionally, strategies to enhance affordability, expand coverage, and ensure spatial equity should be integrated into project planning and implementation. By fostering greater transparency, inclusivity, and adaptive financing strategies, the FCT can enhance the sustainability, resilience, and social impact of urban infrastructure development.

References

1. Abubakar, U. S., Magaji, S., & Ismail, Y. (2025). Assessing The Social and Environmental Justice of Compensation Mechanisms for Road Infrastructure Projects in Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Environmental Studies Research*, 13(2):101-116, doi:10.5281/zenodo.15482657

2. Adama, A. (2022). *Urban expansion and planning challenges in the Abuja Municipal Area Council*. Abuja University Press.

3. Adefiranye, A. T., Magaji, S., & Jafaru, Y. (2025). Challenges and opportunities associated with implementing PPPs for poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Global Academic and Scientific Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies (GASJMS), 3(10), 1–9.

4. AfDB. (2021). *Urban infrastructure and service delivery in Nigerian cities: Challenges and opportunities*. African Development Bank.

5. Aigbavboa, C., & Thwala, W. (2020). Research methodology in construction and urban studies. *Journal of Construction Management*, 15(2), 45–57.

6. Akpan, N.E., Magaji, S., & Ismail, Y. (2025). Assessing the Multifaceted Impact of Innovative City Initiatives on Housing Affordability, Environmental Sustainability, and Social Equity in Abuja, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Economic and Finance Research,* 02(07): 552-561. DOI: 10.55677/GJEFR/10-2025-Vol02E7

7. Alamu, O. I., Hassan, A. O., Jayeola, K. A., & Odunayo, H. A. (2024). *Addressing infrastructure deficits through public-private partnership funding of public projects in Nigeria: A review*.

8. Brundtland Commission. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford University Press.

9. Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

10. Busari, O., Shamsideen, O., Okeowo, E., Oluwajumoke, & Toru, O., Afolabi. (2024). *Public debt and infrastructural development in Nigeria: An empirical investigation*. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(07), 1148–1162. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.807095.

11. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

12. Federal Capital Development Authority (FCDA). (2019). *Annual report on infrastructure development in the FCT*. Abuja: FCDA.

13. Federal Capital Territory Administration. (2019). *Budget performance and infrastructure development report*. FCTA.

14. Federal Republic of Nigeria. (1976). *Federal Capital Territory (FCT) decree*. Government Press.

15. Grigg, N. S. (2019). *Infrastructure engineering and management* (2nd ed.). Wiley.

16. Grimsey, D., & Lewis, M. K. (2004). *Public-private partnerships: The worldwide revolution in infrastructure provision and project finance*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

17. Hafizu, S. L., Magaji, S., & Ismail, Y. (2025). Role of Community Engagement in Reducing Inequalities and Promoting Sustainable Cities in Nigeria. *ISRG Journal of Economics, Business & Management (ISRGJEBM),* 3(5), 199–208. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.17423283

18. Ibrahim M., Nnah M. & Magaji, S. (2025a). "Linking Internet Connectivity with Sustainable Development in Ezeagu Local Government Area, Enugu State". American Journal of Sustainable City and Society (AJSCS), vol. 15, no. 5, 2025, pp. 452–477. DOI: 10.26808/RS.2025.6e9b90

19. Ibrahim, M., Olusola, A.T. & Magaji, S (2025b). Effects of Climate Change on Environmental Security among Vulnerable Groups in Zango Kataf Local Government Area of Kaduna State. *Loka: Journal Of Environmental Sciences* 2 (2), 228-250

20. Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques* (2nd ed.). New Age International.

21. Magaji, S., Oyinloye, A. A., Musa, I., Ismail, Y. (2025). Evaluating the Housing and Living Conditions of Migrants in Lafia, Nasarawa State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS), 9(7).*6357–6368. DOI:https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.907000504

22. Mansur, M. M., Musa, I., & Magaji, S. (2025). Leveraging Entrepreneurship to Achieve Sustainable Economic Growth in Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Social Sciences & Humanities Research* 13(3):392–410. doi:10.5281/zenodo.17213628

23. Musa, I., Magaji, S. &Tsauni, A.M. (2022). Analysis of the Basic Infrastructures Affecting Child Labour in North-Eastern Nigeria. *Applied Journal of Economics, Management and Social Sciences* 3 (4), 13-22

24. Musa, I., Magaji, S., Ismail, Y., El-Yaqub, A. B., Wafure, O. G., Bappayo, M. G., &Sani, S. B. (2025).Impact of Tax Structure on Economic Growth in Nigeria: An Empirical Analysis Using Vector Error Correction Model. *New Advances in Business, Management and Economics Vol. 8,* 128–155. eBook ISBN: 978-93-49970-64-9, DOI: https://doi.org/10.9734/bpi/nabme/v8/5586

25. National Population Commission (NPC). (2018). *Population projections for the Federal Capital Territory*. Abuja: NPC.

26. Obasa, S. O. O., &Oluyomi, O. O. O. (2024). *Public-private partnerships and Sustainable Development Goals in Nigeria*. *African Journal of Stability and Development (AJSD)*, 16(2), 390–417.

27. Obi-Anike, O. H., Abomeh, S. O., & Okafor, C. N. (2020). *Public-private partnership and infrastructural development: Implications for economic diversification in Abuja, Nigeria*. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 19(1).

28. OECD. (2021). *Infrastructure governance*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

29. Ogunsola, O. Y., Adebayo, Y. A., Dienagha, I. N., Ninduwezuor-Ehiobu, N., & Sikhakhane Nwokediegwu, Z. (2024). *Public-private partnership models for financing renewable energy and infrastructure development in Sub-Saharan Africa*. *Gulf Journal of Advanced Business Research*, 2(6).

30. Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students* (8th ed.). Pearson.

31. Suleiman, H., Magaji, S. & Musa, I. (2025). Assessing the Effect of Green Loans and Carbon Finance on Sustainable Cities and Community Development in Nigeria: An Analysis of Urban Sustainability Indices. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology* 10 (5)

32. Tanko, Y., Magaji, S., & Musa, I. (2025). Effect of green finance on climate change mitigation in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economic Perspectives,* 19(7), 1–22.

33. UN-Habitat. (2020). *World Cities Report 2020: The Value of Sustainable Urbanisation*. United Nations Human Settlements Programme.

34. World Bank. (2020). *Nigeria infrastructure diagnostic: Investing in sustainable growth*. World Bank Group.

35. Yescombe, E. R. (2018). *Public–private partnerships for infrastructure: Principles of policy and finance* (2nd ed.). Butterworth-Heinemann.