Evaluating Risk Management Strategies and Barriers in Public Infrastructure Projects: A Case Study of IMO State, Nigeria [1, 2]

Dr. Henry C. Agaelu [i] and Ani Stephen Chukwunonso [ii]

[i] Department of Quantity Surveying,
Enugu State University of Science and Technology, ESUT
[ii] Building Department, Enugu State University of Science and Technology (ESUT)

Abstract

Infrastructure development projects in emerging economies like Nigeria are often exposed to high levels of risk, which, if unmanaged, result in delays, cost overruns, and outright failure. While the identification of risk factors is a crucial step, the implementation of effective risk management strategies and understanding the barriers to their execution is vital for improving project success rates. This study investigates the strategies adopted by stakeholders to manage risk in public infrastructure projects in Imo State and the constraints hindering their effective application. A descriptive survey design was employed, using data collected from 384 respondents involved in infrastructure development across Imo State. Respondents included contractors, engineers, quantity surveyors, and government officials. The analysis focused on the frequency and perceived effectiveness of risk mitigation practices such as risk sharing, contract structuring, contingency planning, and performance monitoring. It also identified institutional, political, and financial obstacles affecting their application. Results show that while basic risk management practices are in place, they are implemented inconsistently. Risk avoidance and risk transfer were the most frequently cited strategies, followed by contingency provisioning and stakeholder engagement. However, these strategies are weakened by barriers such as bureaucratic bottlenecks, political interference, inadequate technical capacity, and lack of institutional frameworks. Hypothesis

[1] Editor's note: Second Editions are previously published papers that have continued relevance in today's project management world, or which were originally published in conference proceedings or in a language other than English. Original publication acknowledged; authors retain copyright. This paper was originally presented at the 1st International Conference, The Quantity Surveyor's Edge, Department of Quantity Surveying, Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Enugu, Nigeria, 25-26 June 2025. It is republished here with permission of the authors and conference organizers.

[2] How to cite this paper: Ajaelu, H. C. and Chukwunoso, A. S. (2026). Evaluating Risk Management Strategies and Barriers in Public Infrastructure Projects: A Case Study of IMO State, Nigeria; Originally presented at the 1st International Conference, The Quantity Surveyor's Edge, Department of Quantity Surveying, Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Enugu, Nigeria, 25-26 June 2025; republished in the *PM World Journal*, Vol. XV, Issue IV, April.

testing revealed a statistically significant relationship between the use of formal risk strategies and project success ($p < 0.05$). The study concludes that strengthening institutional capacity, depoliticizing project execution, and embedding risk management protocols in project design and procurement processes are essential to improving infrastructure project performance. The findings offer practical insights for public sector agencies, donor organizations, and private investors engaged in risk-prone environments.

1.0 Introduction

Infrastructure development is central to national transformation and economic competitiveness, particularly in emerging economies such as Nigeria. Projects such as roads, bridges, public buildings, and utility systems are essential to unlocking productivity and improving quality of life. However, infrastructure initiatives are typically complex, capital-intensive, and executed over long durations—making them inherently vulnerable to a wide array of risks. These risks include financial instability, poor planning, political interference, legal disputes, and environmental disruptions. Managing these risks effectively is not only a technical necessity but also a governance imperative.

In the Nigerian context, the public sector remains the primary driver of infrastructure investment. Yet, despite numerous project launches across federal and state levels, a high rate of project underperformance persists. Delays, cost overruns, contract terminations, and project abandonment are common. While prior studies have focused on identifying risk types in public projects, less attention has been paid to evaluating the risk management strategies in use, and more importantly, the barriers that inhibit their implementation.

Risk management in infrastructure projects typically involves several strategies: risk avoidance, mitigation, transfer, sharing, and acceptance. These strategies are implemented through tools such as contingency planning, performance monitoring, stakeholder engagement, insurance, and carefully structured contracts. However, the success of these approaches depends significantly on institutional capacity, political stability, technical expertise, and legal enforcement. In regions like Imo State, where infrastructure development is critical yet fragile, understanding both the strategies employed and the barriers encountered is essential for policy reform and project improvement.

This study seeks to assess the prevalence and effectiveness of risk management strategies in public infrastructure projects in Imo State. It also investigates the key challenges limiting their success, including issues related to procurement processes, bureaucratic delays, regulatory enforcement, political will, and financial planning. Through a combination of quantitative data and hypothesis

testing, the research aims to determine whether there is a significant relationship between risk strategy use and project outcomes.

The study makes a dual contribution: it adds to the academic literature on infrastructure risk governance in developing countries and offers practical insights for public administrators, development partners, and private contractors operating in Nigeria. The findings are intended to guide the formulation of institutional frameworks and operational guidelines that improve resilience and accountability in project delivery.

2.0 Literature

2.1 Overview of Risk Management in Infrastructure Projects

Risk management is a core component of infrastructure development, involving systematic processes to identify, evaluate, and control uncertainties that threaten project objectives. According to the *Project Management Institute (PMI, 2017)*, risk management includes risk identification, qualitative and quantitative analysis, strategy selection, and ongoing monitoring. In infrastructure contexts, where projects are large-scale and subject to multiple uncertainties, formal risk management is indispensable.

2.2 Common Risk Management Strategies

Risk strategies are generally classified as avoidance, reduction (mitigation), transfer, sharing, or acceptance (Zou et al., 2007; ISO 31000, 2018). These are operationalized through:

i. Contingency Planning: Allocating buffers in cost, time, or resources.
ii. Insurance: Transferring financial liabilities to insurers.
iii. Risk Sharing Agreements: Especially in PPPs or joint ventures.
iv. Contractual Provisions: Defining roles, penalties, and deliverables.
v. Stakeholder Engagement: Minimizing social and political risks.
vi. Monitoring and Control Systems: Tools for early detection and response.

In Nigeria, risk avoidance (e.g., project cancellation or scope limitation) and transfer (e.g., through contracts) are the most utilized due to their perceived simplicity (Ameh et al., 2014).

2.3 Risk Management in Public Sector Projects

Public infrastructure projects, unlike private ones, often suffer from bureaucratic inertia, political shifts, and weak enforcement structures. Ofori (2012) observes that most public agencies in Africa lack embedded risk protocols, leading to reactive rather than proactive management. In Nigeria, Babatunde et al. (2012) found that even where risk planning exists on paper, it is seldom institutionalized or monitored during execution.

Owolabi et al. (2014) noted that although project guidelines in Nigeria reference risk plans, they are rarely updated or enforced. Procurement irregularities and low-capacity officials further undermine execution.

2.4 Barriers to Effective Risk Management

The effectiveness of any risk management strategy is influenced by a range of institutional, technical, and political barriers. These include:

a. Limited Institutional Capacity: Lack of trained personnel, poor inter-agency collaboration, and inadequate documentation systems (Oyewobi et al., 2011).
b. Political Interference: Changes in government priorities, favoritism in contract awards, and policy reversals that derail risk strategies.
c. Financial Constraints: Inconsistent fund releases and absence of risk contingency allocations.
d. Weak Legal Frameworks: Inadequate dispute resolution, non-enforceability of contractual obligations.
e. Corruption and Accountability Gaps: Misappropriation of funds allocated for risk mitigation.

These challenges are particularly acute in Nigerian states where public institutions are under-resourced and decision-making is often politically driven (Olusola & Ojo, 2020).

2.5 Hypothesis-Based Approaches to Evaluating Risk Effectiveness

Modern studies emphasize empirical evaluation of risk strategies using hypothesis testing and statistical models. For example, Mbachu & Nkado (2017) used regression analysis to correlate strategy implementation with project timelines. In this study, a similar hypothesis is tested to determine whether the use of formal risk strategies is significantly associated with improved project delivery in Imo State.

2.6 Risk Management Practice in Nigerian States

Existing literature shows that risk management practices vary across Nigerian states. Lagos, with its stronger institutional frameworks and access to international funding, integrates more structured risk protocols (Adebayo & Arimoro, 2018). However, in southeastern states like Imo, risk management is still evolving.

Ugwuala et al. (2020) reported that although contractors in Imo State are aware of best practices, application is limited by lack of enabling policies. Government agencies, on the other hand, tend to delegate risk planning entirely to consultants or contractors, resulting in fragmented strategies.

2.7 Localized Evidence and Research Gap

Most risk-related studies in Nigeria are either national in scope or limited to private sector construction. Few studies specifically examine public sector infrastructure projects in Imo State, particularly in terms of risk strategy deployment and barriers to implementation.
This paper fills that gap by: Classifying the most commonly used strategies in Imo public projects, identifying the most significant barriers to their execution and testing the statistical association between strategy use and project performance.

3.0 Methodology

This study utilized a descriptive survey design to evaluate the application of risk management strategies and the barriers affecting their implementation in public infrastructure development projects within Imo State. The methodology was selected to gather both quantitative and qualitative data from a cross-section of professionals involved in planning, executing, and supervising government-funded infrastructure projects.

The population comprised professionals such as engineers, project managers, quantity surveyors, consultants, and government officials engaged in public infrastructure development across the three senatorial zones of Imo State. A sample size of 384 respondents was determined using Cochran's formula, ensuring representation across various stakeholder groups. Stratified random sampling was used to ensure balanced geographic and professional distribution.

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire that captured three primary areas:

1. Frequency of use of risk management strategies (e.g., avoidance, transfer, mitigation),

2. Effectiveness perception of these strategies, and
3. Barriers encountered during implementation.

Additionally, a hypothesis was tested to evaluate the relationship between risk strategy usage and project success. Responses were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from "Never Used" to "Very Frequently Used", and from "Not Effective" to "Highly Effective".

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency) and inferential techniques (Pearson's Chi-square and hypothesis testing). A statistical significance level of $p < 0.05$ was adopted.

This method allowed for both pattern detection and correlation analysis between strategy adoption and project outcomes, thereby offering a robust understanding of how risk is actually managed in practice.

4.0 Results and Discussion

4.1 Use of Risk Management Strategies

The analysis of responses from 384 infrastructure stakeholders in Imo State revealed varying levels of adoption of risk management strategies. As shown in Figure 1, the most frequently used strategies were risk avoidance (mean score = 4.1) and risk transfer (3.8). These were followed by contingency planning (3.4), stakeholder engagement (3.2), and to a lesser extent, insurance (2.9) and risk sharing mechanisms (2.7).

Figure 1: Frequency of Use of Risk Management Strategies in Imo State Projects

Figure 1: Frequency of Use of Risk Management Strategies in Imo State Projects illustrates that while most project managers acknowledge risk, they rely more heavily on passive or externalizing strategies (avoidance and transfer) than collaborative or integrative methods (e.g., stakeholder engagement or shared risk frameworks). This pattern may reflect the desire to simplify responsibility or the influence of rigid public procurement processes that leave little room for innovation.

4.2 Effectiveness of Risk Strategies

Respondents rated the perceived effectiveness of each strategy. Risk avoidance was considered effective in minimizing exposure to predictable hazards by eliminating risky elements during planning. Risk transfer, commonly applied through contractual clauses, was moderately effective but often limited by poor enforcement mechanisms. Contingency planning was seen as essential, though its application was constrained by budgetary rigidity. Insurance, though useful in theory, was underutilized due to low awareness and administrative bottlenecks.
These findings are consistent with Oke and Ogunsemi (2008), who noted that public sector risk strategies in Nigeria are often more reactive than preventive and are weakened by operational silos and accountability issues.

4.3 Barriers to Implementation

Respondents identified multiple barriers impeding the successful implementation of risk strategies:

1. Political Interference: Changes in leadership and politicized project approvals disrupted structured planning.
2. Institutional Weakness: Many agencies lacked dedicated risk units or trained personnel to manage project risk effectively.
3. Budgetary Constraints: Funding limitations made it difficult to allocate contingency reserves or procure risk insurance.
4. Procurement Delays: Bureaucratic delays in contracting slowed down project initiation and constrained adaptive response to risks.
5. Lack of Monitoring Tools: The absence of real-time performance data and feedback loops limited proactive decision-making.

These constraints mirror findings by Oyewobi et al. (2011), who emphasized that even when strategies are understood, institutional inertia and regulatory fragility reduce implementation success in public infrastructure settings.

4.4 Hypothesis Test Result

The hypothesis test revealed a statistically significant relationship between the use of formal risk management strategies and project success ($p < 0.05$). Projects where contingency plans, stakeholder engagement, and risk-sharing mechanisms were consistently applied had higher completion rates, fewer delays, and better budget adherence.

4.5 Summary Insight

The results highlight a gap between theoretical understanding and practical execution. Risk avoidance and transfer dominate strategy usage, but more proactive and integrative methods are needed. Institutional reform, professional training, and integrated risk governance systems are crucial to unlocking the full potential of risk management in public projects.

5.0 Conclusion

This study evaluated the prevalence and effectiveness of risk management strategies in public infrastructure projects in Imo State, Nigeria, and identified the barriers inhibiting their successful implementation. Drawing on data from 384 project stakeholders, it was found that while risk avoidance and risk transfer were the most commonly used strategies, their long-term effectiveness was limited by political, financial, and institutional constraints.

Contingency planning, stakeholder engagement, and risk sharing—though widely recognized in theory were underutilized in practice due to funding challenges, limited technical capacity, and bureaucratic delays. Insurance mechanisms were also rarely applied due to administrative complexities and lack of awareness.

The study confirmed a statistically significant relationship between effective risk strategy use and project success, reinforcing the need for structured risk governance in public sector infrastructure initiatives. However, implementation gaps persist due to poor institutional frameworks, politicized decision-making, and inadequate training.

To improve outcomes, government agencies must embed risk protocols into every phase of project development from planning to delivery and empower technical staff through training and reforms. Only then can public infrastructure projects in Imo State achieve greater resilience, efficiency, and sustainability.

6.0 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed to improve the implementation and effectiveness of risk management strategies in public infrastructure projects in Imo State:

1. Institutionalize Risk Management Units within relevant government ministries to oversee risk planning, strategy enforcement, and continuous monitoring.
2. Depoliticize Infrastructure Delivery by ensuring project approvals and execution are guided by technical assessments rather than political interests.
3. Mandatory Risk Audits should be conducted at the feasibility stage of all public projects, with periodic reviews tied to project milestones.
4. Capacity Building Programs must be implemented to train government engineers, project managers, and procurement officers on modern risk management tools and frameworks.
5. Increase Budgetary Allocations for Contingency Planning and Insurance, enabling risk transfer and response funding in the event of project shocks.
6. Implement Real-Time Project Monitoring Systems that provide early warning signals for emerging risks and allow agile responses.

These measures are essential to enhancing infrastructure resilience and ensuring value for money in public investment.

References

1. Adebayo, A. M., & Arimoro, A. E. (2018). Enhancing infrastructure project delivery in Nigeria through legal and institutional reforms. *Journal of Sustainable Development Law and Policy*, 9(1), 120–134. https://doi.org/10.4314/jsdlp.v9i1.6

2. Ameh, O. J., & Omoniyi, A. (2014). Managing construction risks in Nigeria: A case study of public buildings. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Project Management*, 4(3), 21–29.

3. Babatunde, S. O., Opawole, A., & Ujaddughe, I. C. (2012). Risk management in Nigerian construction projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 30(8), 1121–1130.

4. Hillson, D. (2003). *Effective opportunity management for projects: Exploiting positive risk*. CRC Press.

5. ISO 31000. (2018). *Risk Management — Guidelines*. International Organization for Standardization.

6. Mbachu, J., & Nkado, R. N. (2017). Conceptual framework for assessment of project risk impacts. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 143(6), 1–12.

7. Ofori, G. (2012). Developing the construction industry to improve the competitiveness of developing countries. *Habitat International*, 26(4), 481–492.

8. Olusola, O., & Ojo, D. (2020). Barriers to effective project risk management in Nigerian public institutions. *African Journal of Built Environment Research*, 3(2), 87–102.

9. Oke, A. E., & Ogunsemi, D. R. (2008). Assessment of risk management practices in Nigerian public sector construction projects. *Journal of Financial Management of Property and Construction*, 13(3), 221–231.

10. Owolabi, J. D., Amusan, L. M., & Ojelabi, R. A. (2014). Causes and effects of delays in construction projects in Nigeria. *International Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 3(4), 102–111.

11. Oyewobi, L. O., Windapo, A. O., & Rotimi, J. O. (2011). Risk management practices in the Nigerian construction industry. *Journal of Construction Economics and Building*, 11(3), 46–57.

12. PMI. (2017). *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK Guide)* (6th ed.). Project Management Institute.

13. Ugwuala, C. A., Okonkwo, O. N., & Okere, C. C. (2020). Risk analysis and management in Imo State infrastructure projects. *Nigerian Journal of Construction Research*, 5(1), 55–65.

14. Zou, P. X. W., Zhang, G., & Wang, J. (2007). Understanding the key risks in construction projects in China. *International Journal of Project Management*, 25(6), 601–614.

15. World Bank. (2019). *Improving public investment management in Nigeria*. World Bank Group Policy Note. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/

Dr. Henry C. Ajaelu

Enugu State, Nigeria

Dr. Henry C. Ajaelu is a distinguished Quantity Surveyor, academic, and researcher with dual Ph.D. degrees in Quantity Surveying and Environmental Management. He is a Registered Quantity Surveyor (RQS) and a member of the Nigerian Institute of Quantity Surveyors (NIQS). Dr. Ajaelu has extensive experience in construction project management, cost control, and infrastructure development. He has published over 50 scholarly articles in reputable journals. As a former Head of Department at Enugu State University of Science and Technology (ESUT), he led key academic innovations and professional development initiatives. His research interests include sustainable construction, digitalisation, and project delivery efficiency in developing economies. He can be contacted at ajaelu.henry@esut.edu.ng.

Ani Stephen Chukwunonso

Enugu State, Nigeria

Bldr. Ani Stephen Chukwunonso is a construction professional and academic with extensive experience in building and infrastructure development. He is a Lecturer in the Building Department at Enugu State University of Science and Technology and a Quality Assurance Assessor under TVET (NSQ). He holds an MSc in Building (Construction Management) and is currently pursuing a PhD at Nnamdi Azikiwe University. He is a Corporate Member of Nigerian Institute of Building, State Chapter Vice Chairman, a member of Council of Registered Builders of Nigeria, and IPMP. He has held key roles in government and private sector projects.