

AFRICAN UNION

الاتحاد الأفريقي

UNION AFRICAINE

UNIAO AFRICANA

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

P.O. Box 3243

--

Tel: 517 700

Fax: +254-1-517844



An integrated, prosperous and peaceful Africa

Call for Papers

**“Investing in Infrastructure for Productive Transformation in
Africa”.**

7th Congress of African Economists (CAE)

Decembre 2025

CAE CONFERENCE RESEARCH PAPER

**What policy-relevant evidence exists to support the use of
alternative financing models (PPPs) in reducing Sub-Saharan
Africa's rural education infrastructure investment gap relative to
inaction or stagnant investment?**

Mayaki, Alfred Anate Bodurin¹
Nigeria

Royal Economic Society (UK)
Open University Business School, Open University (UK)

Tel: +44 203 745 5372

Abstract

¹ alfred.mayaki@ou.ac.uk

DECLARATION

All aspects of this conference publication and all supplementary data has been authored by the signatory, prior to formal submission, and all sources of information included herein have been attributed to the appropriate sources accordingly.



30 APRIL 2025

Alfred Anate Bodurin Mayaki-----
Date

Student ID: O8309334

FOREWORD

I would firstly like to congratulate the newly appointed Chairperson of the African Union Commission, H.E. Mahamoud Ali Youssouf of Djibouti, on his recent appointment to High Office in March 2025, subsequent to the proceedings of the 38th Ordinary Session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government. Nigeria wishes the Chair every success in his professional endeavours in his capacity as Chair and send our best wishes and regards to the outgoing Chairperson of the AU Commission, H.E. Moussa Faki Mahamat of Chad. Secondly, Nigeria sends compliments to Mr. Nuur Mohamud Sheekh, the newly appointed Spokesperson for the Chairperson of the African Union Commission. We wish Mr. Sheekh every continued success in his new executive role promoting and supporting peace and security across the African continent as a spokesperson, on behalf of the Office of the Chair.

INTRODUCTION

Many academics will agree that AfCFTA presents a strategic opportunity for many African states to mobilize regional investment for social infrastructure, specifically for a medium-term horizon targeted at the alleviation of conditions of resource scarcity and deficiency in rural education in Sub-Saharan Africa. Over four years in, as Member States continually align with one another, creating greater trade links, investment prospects, and frameworks of co-operation, AfCFTA can serve as a catalyst for scalable, cross-border financing models such as social infrastructure public-private partnerships (PPPs). This review highlights the potential for AfCFTA-aligned strategies to diminish infrastructure gaps in the design of mechanisms to finance rural education, enabling broader access to better quality education and supporting the development of a skilled, trans-continental workforce essential to Africa's single market ambitions. Closing this infrastructure gap is not only a social imperative but a foundational enabler of inclusive growth under AfCFTA.

This is not another rebuffed article intended to argue for greater public-private partnerships (PPP) frameworks, or for more suitable infrastructure-related funding for African governments. It is, however, a study of existing studies, so to speak. Using the PICOS framework (*Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcomes, Study Design*) to define the specific and necessary research question, it is possible to survey what solutions have been proposed and what findings have emerged.

Indeed, out of the 144 measurable Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) targets, Africa is on track to achieve only 10 SDG targets by 2030 (Ramaite and Le Roux, 2024). Social infrastructure PPPs and the other capital investment needs of countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, relating specifically to core social infrastructure and government-provided educational facilities is in a circumstance of small-scale crisis, a crisis within a crisis. As attention is drawn away, and funding deflected away from social infrastructure in support of climate change, deforestation and biodiversity, the take up of the lion share of SDG gap financing is shifting, policy aspects such as the Pareto-effect created via free continental trade, fall by the waste-side, becoming nonchalant issues.

However, as we will come to see, when Member States operate inwardly like this, not only are disadvantages, but there are inefficiencies which have great cost. According to reports, just 12% of schools in rural Sub-Saharan Africa have reliable internet, and more than 50% of schools in Sub-Saharan Africa lack adequate access to electricity, clean water and sanitation facilities. Teaching quality and academic retention is also a matter of concern. While the perceived investment gap (i.e. the gap between the *actual* and the *required* level of social infrastructure investment) varies in range by country-specific requirements in educational resources across studies on the subject, what continues to characterise this crisis is an inadequacy, not merely of *access* to basic amenities, but of effective and credible financial *solutions*.

Upon responding to this call for submissions by the Congress of African Economists (CAE), it was imperative that the author(s) ask its various audiences: What hurdles continue to hinder Africa's development of social infrastructure for education according to previously published literature on this mission critical SDG?

RESEARCH DESIGN AND EMPIRICAL METHODOLOGY

This research takes the form of an evidence-based, empirically designed systematic literature review into the financial outcomes of investment into social infrastructure in Sub-Saharan Africa. It will aim to assess the contribution of a narrow theme of literature taken from specific academic journals. PICO is a valuable framework for assessing the relevant aspects which underpin a systematic review. We attribute a significant proportion of the paper to this concept.

- *Population*: The population is defined as participants and active users of the rural school system in Sub-Saharan African countries
- *Intervention*: Social infrastructure PPPs, private sector philanthropy, social bonds, and government tranche loans (repayable at interest)
- *Comparison*: A counterfactual scenario of stagnant investment from 2025 to 2030
- *Outcomes*: A level-playing field in school infrastructure on the world stage
- *Study Design*: Systematic review and Meta-Analysis

Across the nine-year research timeline, the first five consecutive years encompass the span of the systematic review², and the remaining consecutive years make up the empirical element of the study with monthly data. Crucially, we shall navigate around the 1 January 2021 as a key date where a discursive turn of AfCFTA enforcement takes place. The dedicated timescale of the study will range from a) the date of inauguration of the SDG programme itself, beginning 1 January 2016 through to b) the date with which the AfCFTA agreement was legally enforceable - on 1 January 2021. Thereafter, we shall use data sourced from the likes of the United Nations, and the African Development Bank to project two counterfactual scenarios.

Table 1.1 - Timeline for Primary Research

Date of Study ³	Start / End	Significance to the Study
1 January 2016	Start of sys review	Inauguration date of SDG programme
1 January 2021	End of sys review	Enforcement date of AfCFTA
1 January 2021	Start of analysis	Enforcement date of AfCFTA
1 January 2025	End of analysis	Cut-off date for empirical analysis
1 January 2025	Start of forecast	Start date for statistical forecast
31 Decembre 2030	End of forecast	Completion date of SDG programme

The selected methodology used in modelling the forecasted scenarios with economic data will simply be an extrapolation of two counterfactual events 1) a standard forecasted event premised on data from real world sources and 2) a *Pareto-optimal* forecasted event which assumes the required level of infrastructure investment is achieved. Each event, estimated by Maximum Likelihood Estimation will then be contrasted to the AU Commission's policy environment on economic development.

² There are a total of sixty-two articles presently being returned upon an initial search for the term "social infrastructure PPPs" and thirty-six results for the term "infrastructure for educational institutions" both including specific reference to the situation in Africa.

³ To be absolutely clear, the empirical research dates are representative of projections using real world data (as opposed to synthetic data), whereas the applied systematic review dates apply to dates with which selected pieces of academic literature were originally published.

A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF THE AVAILABLE LITERATURE

Geng *et. al* (2020) argue that unlike economic PPPs, social infrastructure PPPs are procured with a ‘*more performance-based*’ service specification(s). Their comparative study sides with the view that ‘*perceived service quality*’ frameworks have KPI-ready factors that can be used to assess investment in the schools within the study’s reach. Michelitsch *et. al* (2017) propose the example of Colombia in the Latin America and Caribbean region, who’s National Planning Department procured on several occasions social infrastructure funding via the Inter-American Development Bank Group for its ‘*Program to Support Private Participation and Concessions in Infrastructure (PPCI-1)*’.

Michelitsch *et. al* (2017) explore synergies and operation efficiencies in social infrastructure PPP more broadly but focuses on the example of investment in health and education, namely an approved \$165 million loan to modernize and expand El Dorado International Airport in Bogotá and a \$158 million loan, approved in 2015, to co-finance the Perimetral Oriental de Bogotá, a 154 km highway upgrade.

‘Colombia’s objectives were to (i) consolidate and strengthen the regulatory framework and technical and institutional capacity of policy, regulatory, and oversight agencies in several sectors (transport, energy, water, and social infrastructure such as health and education); and (ii) support the technical, economic, financial, and/or legal development of processes for private participation’ (pp. 18).

But more relevant to social infrastructure PPPs is the idea of wear and tear or as Mukuvari (2020) puts it ‘*obsolescence*’ or the state of being obsolete. The author explores the concept of a ‘*minimal acceptable standard*’ related to the performance of a service facilities (namely, hospitals) over the core asset’s lifecycle (National Research Council, 1993).

‘The School Construction Systems Development (SCSD) project—initiated in 1962 with funds from the Ford Foundation’s Educational Facilities Laboratories—was intended to reduce construction costs; improve the ability to accommodate change; enhance lighting, acoustics, and air conditioning standards; and demonstrate the viability of involving manufacturers in building research based on a common set of modular specifications’ (pp. 40).

More notably, the article’s audience are redirected to the construction and design of Stanford University’s Palo Alto campus, originally designed and constructed in 1967 using SCSD project specifications. Ostensibly, this view, which permeates throughout various other books (Lee, 2018) defines SCSD as an applaudable architectural context worth studying further. Lee (2018) also establishes how the University of California’s University Residential Building System (URBS) is an important context to discern for African social infrastructure PPPs, albeit, to a less comparative extent.

REFERENCES

Geng, L., Herath, N., Zhang, L., Kin Peng Hui, F., and Duffield, C. (2020). Reliability-based decision support framework for major changes to social infrastructure PPP contracts. *Applied sciences*, 10(21), 7659 (Accessed on 30 April 2025)

Lee, J.D. (2018). *Flexibility and Design: Learning from the School Construction Systems Development (SCSD) Project* (1st ed.). Routledge. Available at <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203732083> (Accessed on 30 April 2025)

Michelitsch, R., Szwedzki, R., Sembler, J. I., Haarsager, U., Carbajo, J., Murcia, J. F., Seiwald, R., Oliveira, P., Funes Aguilera, R., Cabrera, M., & Sadeghi, P. (2017). *Evaluation of Public-Private Partnerships in Infrastructure*. Available at <https://doi.org/10.18235/0010673> (Accessed on 30 April 2025)

Mukuvuri, B. (2020) ‘A Study on the Impact of Obsolescence on Public Private Partnership Projects – Focus on Hospitals’, *Masters’ Thesis Dissertation – University of Witwatersrand* (Accessed on 30 April 2025)

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (1993) ‘Fourth Dimension in Building: Strategies for Avoiding Obsolescence’, Washington, DC: *The National Academies Press*, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.17226/2124> (Accessed on 30 April 2025)

Ramaite, A. and La Roux, A. (2024) ‘Accelerate, extend or abandon? Africa’s SDG dilemma’, *Institute for Security Studies*, Available at: <https://issafrica.org/iss-today/accelerate-extend-or-abandon-africa-s-sdg-dilemma> (Accessed on 29 April 2025)