POLAC INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ECONS & MGT SCIENCE (PIJEMS)
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS & MANAGEMENT SCIENCE
NIGERIA POLICE ACADEMY, WUDIL-KANO

ASSESSING THE ROLE OF FUNDING AND INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES IN ACHIEVING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOAL ONE IN SELECTED KOGI STATE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA

Ajayi Olajide Department of Political Science, Nasarawa State University Keffi

Ruth Luka Caleb, PhD Department of Political Science, Nasarawa State University Keffi

Abdullahi Mohammed Abdul, PhD Department of Political Science, Nasarawa State University Keffi

Abstract

The SDGs programme implementation has elaborate institutional and financial structures that guarantee community engagement, monitoring and evaluation. The Local Government Areas in Kogi State under study have adopted the Medium Term Fiscal Framework (MTFF) where they incorporate the eradication of poverty and hunger through enhanced food security, poverty reduction and income generation and have also, mainstreamed in their budget SDGs programmes. Equally, the monitoring and evaluation mechanism and the reporting system for SDGs in Kabba-Bunu and Ajaokuta LGAs, Kogi State are the same, in line with the National Implementation Guideline. However, despite these elaborate implementation strategies and structures put in place for the attainment of the SDGs, 1in Kogi State, statistics are showing that the LGAs have a long way to go in eradicating poverty and hunger. Although, it is too early to assess the a programme that is barely 10 years, however, records revealed that the agricultural production of Kogi State has dropped by 52% in 2020 due to the activities of arm bandits and kidnappers. More so, statistics have shown that over 1 million people in Kogi State are in need of food assistance the survey research design was adopted for the work where data were collected through both primary and secondary sources such as interviews, questionnaires and observations. The Bottom-up Development theory was adopted. The study found among others that there is a very wide disparity between the two LGAs in Kogi State in favour of urban areas. it was also observed that the funds for the SDGs are inadequate considering the infrastructural deficits in the two LGAs under study and the release of funds is often untimely and there are cumbersome bureaucratic bottlenecks in accessing the SDGs funds. The study therefore recommends that the wide disparity that existed between Urban and rural LGAs should be bridged and all hands should be on deck to ensure that the implementation of the SDGs is even.

Keywords: Funding, Institutional Structures, Sustainable Development Goal

1. Introduction

In 2000 the United Nations (UN) introduced the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) that fold-up in 2015. They constituted the first set of global development goals covering a broad range of development priorities (Martha, Bettina and Ulrich, 2014), such as the challenges of extreme poverty, hunger, illiteracy, and disease (Kumar, 2013). MDGs have spurred advances, particularly in health (Kassebaum et al., 2014; McArthur and Rasmusse n, 2017). Access to improved water supply has also experienced faster progress, but in other areas, the MDG period has not seen a significant acceleration of progress. Driven in large parts by the perceived (partial) success of the MDGs and the non-inclusion of some aspects of the environment, climate change and sustainability, member states insisted that they negotiate the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) following the Rio +20 Summit (United Nations, 2012). Following the Rio + 20 Summit the SDG was adopted as a successor for MDGs to end poverty in all its ramifications. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) agreed by Heads of Government in 2015 represent a major multilateral effort to shift the world towards more sustainable and resilient pathways, also taking into account the needs of developing countries. The SDG Agenda calls for a global partnership at all levels – between all countries and stakeholders who need to work together to achieve the goals and targets, including a broad spectrum of actors such as multinational businesses, local governments, regional and international bodies, and civil society organizations.

This action at the UN Headquarters was the official endorsement that the UN Member Countries around the world needed to formally adopt, domesticate and integrate the SDGs into the development planning strategies and agenda of their countries. Like the rest of the world, Nigeria not only ratified the SDGs at the UN but also took immediate steps to distil them into the development framework of the country (United Nations, 2017).

The resulting 17 SDGs (United Nations, 2015) represent a political compromise by the 193 member states of the United Nations that has been critically reviewed (International Council for Science, ICSU, and International Social Science Council, ISSC, 2015) and raises major challenges of measurement, financing, and implementation. The SDGs are much broader than the MDGs in that they are very ambitious, and unlikely to be met under a business-as-usual pathway (Joshi et al., 2015; Van Vuuren et al., 2015; Häyhä et al., 2016). Yet, contrary to the early years of the MDG period (McArthur, 2013), governments around the world are already adopting the SDGs as operational goals for sustainable development (United Nations, 2017).

The SDGs consist of 17 goals and a total of 169 constituent targets within these goals. The goals according to UN (2015) are related to eradicating extreme poverty and hunger in all forms everywhere through improved food security nutrition and promoting sustainable agriculture.

Despite the elaborate implementation strategies and structures put in place for the attainment of the SDGs, The SDGs programme operates through some basic institutional structures in Nigeria. Its operation is carried-out through specific Federal, State and Local Governments structures.

A number of specific institutional relationships were highlighted as weak under the MDGs. At the Local Government level, capacity remains low and makes engagement difficult. Local Government Committees have not met or have not been able to coordinate MDG-related activities beyond the narrow entry point of the CGS to LGAs technical assistant. At the federal level, the relationship with the National Planning Commission (NPC) proved challenging. While the MDGs have received high-level policy attention alongside other development frameworks, there has been limited integration of the roles of these institutions in coordinating and monitoring progress. One area in which this has been evident is in the consistency of data produced by the NBS and in coordination over M&E, which is currently fragmented across OSSAP-MDGs, NPC, the Ministry of Finance and MDAs themselves. Finally, one area of weakness that lacked a specific institutional platform was coordination with the private sector. While playing a major part in the implementation and monitoring stages, engagement with the private sector has been ad hoc and fragmented (Nigeria's Road to SDGs country Transition Strategy, 2015).

The funding structure according to the SDGs National Implementation Guidelines is for States and Local Governments to ensure that the SDGs are mainstreamed into their annual budget.

However, despite these elaborate implementation strategies and structures put in place for the attainment of the SDGs, 1 (Goal 1: End of poverty in all its manifestations by 2030 statistics are showing that the two LGAs have a long way to go in eradicating poverty and hunger.

The study is therefore set to address the following research questions:

i. What is the funding structure of SDGs and how has it affected the implementation of SDG goal 1 in selected LGAs of Kogi State?
ii. What is the institutional structure designed for the implementation of SDGs and how has the institutional framework designed affected the

implementation of the SDGs goal 1 in selected LGAs of Kogi State?

The broad aim of this study is to assess the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals and the extent to which the implementation strategies have affects the attainment of SDGs 1 in the selected LGAs of Kogi State.The specific objectives are as follows:

i. To examine the funding structure of SDGs and how it has affected the implementation of SDG goal 1in selected LGAs of Kogi State.
ii. To determine the efforts of the institutional structure on the implementation of SDG Goal 1in selected LGAs of Kogi State.

This study is based on the following Hypotheses:

i. SDGs funding structure has no significant effect on the implementation of SDGs goal 1 in selected LGAs of Kogi State.
ii. The SDGs institutional structure has no significant effect on the implementation of SDG goal 1 in selected LGAs of kogi State.

The study covered the period from 2015 to early part of 2024 in Kogi State of Nigeria. The reason for the choice of the state is as a result of its performances in the implementation of the MDGs programmes and activities. The two LGAs in Kogi state were adjudged to have performed better in the implementation of MDGs than other LGAs in the state. They were adjudged to have used the MDG framework to address poverty and improve their hitherto very poor health indices.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1 Conceptual Review

Conceptions of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): SDGs Programme

In September 2015, the general assembly of the United Nations (UN) adopted resolution A/RES/70/1 "2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development" (henceforth: Agenda 2030) (UN, 2015). The Heads of States committed to achieve 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) with 169 associated targets, by 2030 that should "stimulate action over the next 15 years in areas of critical importance for humanity and the planet" (UN, 2015)". The Agenda builds on the old pre-2015 system on sustainable development, represented by the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) (MDGs Report, 2015). However, in terms of scope, nature and mechanisms, the Agenda 2030 follows a more comprehensive approach. In contrast, to the MDGs, it applies universally to all states, addresses all three dimensions of sustainable development and needs them to be addressed in an integrated manner due to the strong inter-linkage between the goals. As the title of the document says, the aim is nothing less than "transforming our world" to achieve sustainable development (UN, 2015). Its success will depend on the rightful implementation of the goals within all countries. However, the Agenda 2030 is a non-binding agreement that put governments under no legal obligation to implement the goals. Therefore, the question of why and under which conditions states comply with the requirements of the Agenda 2030 is at stake. Due to the complexity of the issue, setting up governance structures that steer the process, are considered to be the first important step for the implementation of the SDGs. As FransTimmermanns (2015) put it during his speech at the Post-2015 Development Summit in New York in 2015: "Ultimately, the implementation of the Agenda 2030 is all about governance".

Implementation Strategy of Sustainable Development:

The role of governance since the emergence of the debates on what is needed to ensure a sustainable future, the question of how it can be achieved has become equally important. The importance of good governance structures has therefore, been widely acknowledged (Glasbergen et al., 2007; Meadowcroft, 2007; Ayre and Callway, 2013; Jordan, 2008; Van Zeijl-Rosema 2008; Pisano et al., 2015). Implementing sustainable development on national level faces various challenges, which is related to its conceptual characteristics.

First, sustainable development is a normative concept. In terms of content, its objectives can be seen as wicked problems, meaning that they are ill-defined and unstructured. The ultimate goal of the Agenda 2030 to transform our world is quite broad and does not imply specific measures to pursue. Moreover, the definition and focus of what needs to be done might shift over time. Second, implementing sustainable development is a complex endeavour. Its process include multiple policy areas (environmental, social, economic), actors (governmental bodies, NGOs, private-sector, civil society, science) and levels (supranational, national, local). With regard to instruments, it requires a holistic change in thinking, tools and methods. Sustainable development thus highly deviates from other policy problems in terms of complexity and comprehensiveness (Van Zeijl-Rosema, 2008).

2.2 Theoretical Framework

For the purpose of this study, the **Bottom-up Development theory** was adopted. Stohr and Todtling (1977) developed a "Theory of Selective Spatial Closure". According to them, over centralization of political power and resources at Federal and National levels of political governance tends to cause "The Backwash Effect" in the sub-national spatial units of these States where they are unable to control the outflow of mobile factors of production, capital, thus undermining their long-term economic development goals. When these sub-national units receive some degree of political autonomy from the Federal level, their capacities to restrict the flow of these mobile factors of production increases. Furthermore, because these regions are closer and more accessible to the citizens, opportunities for participatory development activities like public hearings on policy issues and other forms of civic engagement to hold the government accountable also increase.

A Review of Concepts of the Bottom-up Development Paradigm

A number of concepts and parameters accompanied these new theoretical developments that began to shape the bottom-up paradigm as revealed by Brohman (1996). Like Stohr and Totling (1977), he observed that participatory development was fallout of the "Redistribution before growth' development strategy in the 1970s that emphasized the following:

i. A move towards direct, redistributive measure targeting the poor instead of continued reliance on the eventual indirect trickle-down effects of growth;
ii. A focus on local, small-scale projects, often linked with earlier rural development initiatives or urban community based development programmes; and
iii. An emphasis on basic needs and human resources development especially through the provision of public good and services.

3. Methodology

3.1 Method of Data Collection

Two sources of data collection were employed to generate data for the study. They were primary and secondary sources.

Primary Data: This primary data was generated through the use of questionnaire and interviews.

Administration of Instruments

The method of administration of this research instruments was based on the personal effort of the researcher with the help of the Field Assistants to distribute and assist in completion where necessary and collect the completed questionnaires. The responses of the respondents were measured based on the five points Likert scale: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (U), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD). The study adopted simple census method of administering questionnaire to all the respondents for a successful returned of 80 respondents as presented in table 3:4.4

Reliability of the Instrument

Reliability is used in this study to ensure questions being answered appropriately. In this respect, according to Sekran and Bougie (2013) Alpha values for each instrument under study should not be less than 0.6. Cronbach's coefficient, Alpha (α) method of internal consistency/homogeneity is used; which measures the consistency within the questions/instruments showing how well they measured characteristics and behaviour within the test (Kyokutamba, 2011):

$$n = \frac{K[(1-\Sigma\delta 2k)/\delta 2]}{K-1} \quad (1)$$

Where **δ2k**= Sum of variances of the k questions in the instrument

K= Number of questions in the research instrument

α = Alpha Coefficient

δ2= Variance of the total test

The measurement scales' is computed Cronbach's Alpha (α) results in table 3.4.5 indicate that the all the variables and the measurement scales are reliable as well as above 0.6 threshold which (Kyokutamba 2011;Sabana, 2014) is the recommended coefficient for a given research instrument. Hence the internal consistency reliability of the measures used is considered sufficiently high enough to have adequately measured in the study variables. This shall allow for more testing and further analysis of the linear regression model.

4. Result and Discussions

4.1 Summary of Data Administration

On the whole, 52 questionnaires were administered in the two LGA in Kogi State under study out of which the 52 representing 100% of the total questionnaires administered were returned. Therefore, 52 formed the basis of our analysis and interpretation. The data collection took about 10 weeks due to difficulties in reaching out to the respondents.

Table 1: Numbers of Respondents

Sample Size	No of Returned Questionnaires	No of Unreturned Questionnaires	Total
52	52 (100%)	- (-)	52 (100%)

Table 2 below shows the percentage distribution of the returned questionnaires per Local Governments Areas.

Table 2: The Distribution of the Returned Questionnaires Administered

States &LGAs	Questionnaires administered	Questionnaires returned	Questionnaires unreturned
SDGs Implementation Planning Committee in Kabba-Bunu LGA, Kogi State	17	-	
SDGs Implementation Planning Committee in Ajaokuta LGA, Kogi State	17	-	
SDGs Technical Team in Kabba-Bunu LGA, kogi State	9	-	
SDGs Technical Team in Ajaokuta LGA,Kogi State	9	-	
Total Frequency/Percentage	52 (100)	-	

Table 3: Age Range of the Respondents

Age Range	Frequency
18-30 Years	12
31-40 Years	15
41-50 Years	8
51 Years and Above	17
Total	52

Table 3 Summarises the age distribution of the respondents.

4.2 Financing Framework of SDGs

Funding is the act of providing financial resources, usually in a form of money, or other values such as efforts or time, to finance a need, programme, and project, usually by an organisation or company. Sources of funds for the SDGs were identified and the adequacy was assessed. The dependence of the States and even the Federal Government on Donor Agencies has not produced the desired results for various reasons. The private sector can and should become a key partner in the process while large scale government funding remains essential.

Table 4: Inter-governmental partnerships in funding SDGs

Items	**5 (SA)**	**4 (A)**	**3 (N)**	**2 (D)**	**1 (SD)**
The Inter-governmental partnerships for funding of SDGs programmes are adequate.	11 (21.15%)	8 (15.38%)	15 (28.85%)	10 (19.24%)	8 (15.38%)

Where: SA= Strongly Agree, A =Agree, N=Neutral, D=Disagree and SD=Strongly Disagree

It is recorded based on table 4 that: 21.15% of the respondents strongly agreed that there are Inter-governmental partnerships for funding SDGs programmes in the selected LGAs of kogi State, while, 15.38% of the respondents agreed and 28.85% of the respondents were undecided. 15.38% of the respondents strongly disagreed that there is Inter-governmental partnerships for funding SDGs programmes and 19.24% of the respondents disagreed. This implies that states governments do not frequently provide finance to actualized implementation of SDGs goal 1 to local governments.

Table 5: Private sector funding of SDGs in selected LGAs of Niger Oyo State

Items	**5 (SA)**	**4 (A)**	**3 (N)**	**2 (D)**	**1 (SD)**
Private Sector used their capital to finance SDGs goals in selected LGAs of Kogi State`	10 (19.24%)	8 (15.38%)	8 15.38%	14 (26.92%)	12 (23.08%)

Source: Field Survey, 2020

The table 5 shows that 19.24% of the respondents strongly agreed that Private Sector used their capital to finance SDGs goals in Nigeria, 15.38% of the respondents agreed and 15.38% of the respondents were undecided. 23.08% of the respondents strongly disagreed that private sector do not use their capital to finance SDGs goals 1 and 2 in the selected LGAs of Kogi State, Nigeria and 26.92% of the respondents also, disagreed. This shows that the private sectors do not support the funding of SDGs 1 in the study areas.

Table 6: Bilateral funding of SDGs

Items	**5 (SA)**	**4 (A)**	**3 (N)**	**2 (D)**	**1 (SD)**
Bilateral donors are frequently involved in actualizing SDGs goals	10 (19.24%)	8 (15.38%)	(15.38%)	6 (11.54%)	20 (38.46%)

Source: Field Survey, 2020

Table 6 shows that 19.24% of the respondents strongly agreed that bilateral donors are frequently involved in actualising SDGs goal 1 in the selected LGAs of Kogi State, Nigeria, another 15.38% of the respondents agreed that bilateral donors are frequently involved in actualizing SDGs goal 1 in the study areas. 15.38% of the respondents were undecided. Whereas, 11.54% of the respondents disagreed that bilateral donors are frequently involved in actualizing SDGs goas 1 and 38.46% of the respondents strongly disagreed that bilateral donors are frequently involved in actualizing SDGs goal 1.

The perception of our stakeholders from the Focus Group Interviews revealed that SDGs projects and programmes in Kogi State are not mainstreamed into the medium and long term plans of the States and Local Governments. This could be responsible to high rates of abandoned projects in most of the communities like the Skills Acquisition Centre in the local governments.

One relevant take away from the focus group discussion is the clarification that there is no "designated external funds" to implement the SDGs, though there could be support from various stakeholders both local and foreign. The SDGs are just like any other plan we could make to improve the wellbeing of the country; the difference is that the SDGs is a global agreement tying countries together to achieve some uniform goals. States relied on annual budget to fund the activities of the SDGs.

4.3 The Institutional Structure of the SDGs

Nigeria has established a strong institutional framework to ensure proper coordination of the SDGs implementation across the three tiers of government. These include coordination within the private sectors, CSOs, communities, MDAs, the parliament and others. The office of the SSAP-SDGs has made advances in establishing coordinating structures across the tiers of government for purposes of horizontal and vertical coherence of program information and effective performance management. The structure has according to them, within it, MDA focal persons, State focal persons, LGAs focal persons as well as an Inter-Ministerial Committee (IMC) on SDGs.

Table 6: Partnership between different Stakeholders in the implementation of SDGs

Items	5 (SA)	4 (A)	3 (N)	2 (D)	1 (SD)
There are effective partnership between the various stakeholders in implementing the SDGs Programmes	18 (34.6%)	7 (13.46%)	7 (13.46%)	10 (19.24%)	10 (19.24%)

Source: Field Survey, 2020

It is recorded based on table 7 that 34.6% of the respondents strongly agreed that there is effective partnership between the various stakeholders in implementing the SDGs Programmes, 13.46% of the respondents agreed that there is effective partnership between the various stakeholders in implementing the SDGs Programmes and 13.46% of the respondents were undecided. 19.24% of the respondents strongly disagreed and 19.24% of the respondents disagreed that there is effective partnership between the various stakeholders in implementing the SDGs Programmes in the selected LGAs of Kogi State.

Table 8: Partnership between governments at various levels

Items	5 (SA)	4 (A)	3 (N)	2 (D)	1 (SD)
Partnership on SDGs between Governments at various levels and private sector in selected LGAs of Kogi State are successful	18 (34.61%)	11 (21.16%)	8 (15.38%)	7 (13.46%)	8 (15.38%)

Source: Field Survey, 2020

The table 8 shows that 34.61% of the respondents strongly agreed that Partnership on SDGs between Governments at various levels and private sector in the selected LGAs of Kogi State are successful, 21.16% of the respondents further agreed to that claim. 15.38% of other respondents were undecided. 15.38% of the respondents strongly disagreed to the claim that Partnership on SDGs between Government and private sector in the selected LGAs of Kogi State were successful and 13.46% of the respondents further disagreed to the claim. This simply show that there is some level of partnership and collaboration between governments and all levels and the private sectors in the implementation of SDGs 1 in the LGAs under study.

4.4 Test of Hypotheses

The study formulated two hypotheses thus;

i. SDGs funding structure has no significant effect on the implementation of SDGs goal 1 in selected LGAs of Kogi State.
ii. The SDGs institutional structure has no significant effect on the implementation of SDG goal 1 in selected LGAs of Kogi State.

Frequency and percentages were used to compare results of responses to the questionnaire administered. The responses were corroborated with the results from interviews, observations and secondary data. Simple liner regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses. The decision rule was that if the P-value is less than 5% we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate but if the P-value is greater than 5% we accept the null hypothesis.

The regression result shows that the model is fit for the study since the f-statistics is significant at 5% level of significant. The result also shows that the SDGs institutional structure has positive effect on the implementation of SDGs 1 in the selected LGAs of Kogi State. This positive effect is significant since the P-value is less than 5%. Thus, we can reject the null hypothesis and concluded that the SDGs institutional structure has a positive significant effect on the implementation of SDGs 1 in the selected LGAs of Kogi State, Nigeria.

The $R^2 = 0.87$ indicates that 87% of variation on SDGs institutional structure can be used to explain by the implementation of SDGs 1 but 13% can explained by other factors not noted in the regression model which is refer to as error term.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

This study assesses the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGS) in Kabba-Bunu and Ajaokuta Local Government Areas of Kogi State.

The study covered the period from 2015 to early 2024. However, due to time constraint and resource and also for in-depth study, the research covered only two Local government areas in the state. The local government areas are divided into urban and rural. Two hypotheses were tested for the research.

The specific objectives of this study include to; examine the extent to which the funding structure has affected the implementation of SDG goals as it relates to eradication of poverty in all its forms everywhere.

In line with the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made:

1. Since the annual budget alone either at the State and Local Governments cannot fund the activities of the SDGs, hence, the need for the institutionalization of funds, working closely with the National Assembly to make sure that the bill on funding of SDGs scale through for the benefit of all. Also, Government at all levels should intensify their domestic resource mobilization efforts and explore other innovative financing mechanisms, including channelling remittances to development projects through the issuance of diaspora bonds and securitization of future streams of revenue from government infrastructure assets, among other things to compliment other revenue sources.
2. Effective collaboration between the State/LGAs SDGs officers and the financing institutions such as World Bank, Central Bank of Nigeria, International Monetary Fund, Multilateral developing finance and so forth,

should be strengthen to past track the implementation process.

3. Advocacy campaigns should be organised by States and Local Governments to mobilise and sensitise the local people on the operations and implementation of the SDGs programmes and the roles expected of them, in both print and electronic Media. In other words, deliberate efforts must be made to create necessary awareness about the SDGs across the length and breadth of the LGAs. Also, there is the need to carry along local and state bureaucrats and political leaders, so as to become conversant with the SDGs programmes and their targets.
4. Community engagement should be strengthened through community participation in planning, decision making, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the SDGs programmes and projects to guarantee ownership of the projects.
5. The top down approach implementation strategy should give way to bottom-up approach to project implementation, to strengthen community engagement and participation of SDGs.

References

Adejoke, O. A. (2017). Nigeria's Voluntary National Review on the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda and SDGs. A Presentation to the United Nations High Level Political Forum, available at www.sustainabledevelopment.un.org>content >document. Retrieved on 12th January, 2020

Aluko, M.A and Adesopo, A. A. (2002). An Appraisal of the Two Faces of Bureaucracy in Relation to the Nigerian Society. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(1): 12 – 21.

Agenda 2030 (2018). Sustainable Development Goals. Published by the Office of the Special Advisor to the President on Sustainable Development Goals, Vol. 6, December, 2018.

Agenda 2030 (2019). Sustainable Development Goals. Published by the Office of the Special Advisor to the President on Sustainable Development Goals, Vol. 7, February, 2019.

Agenda 2030: Sustainable Development Goals, published by the Office of the Special Advisor to the President on Sustainable Development Goals, Vol. No 9, August, 2019

Ajiye, A. (2014). Achievements of Millennium Development Goals in Nigeria: A Critical Examination. *International Affairs and Global Strategy*, 25(1): 24 - 30

Alamu, A. (2017). Sustainable Development Goals in Nigeria: What Role(s) For Nigeria's Indigenous Languages? *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences*, 5(4): 1 - 8

International Council for Science (ICSU) and International Social Science Council (ISSC) (2015). Review of Targets for the Sustainable Development Goals: The Science Perspectives. Available at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272355248, Retrieved on 13th September, 2019 for monitoring Sustainable Development Goals. ESDN Case Study, 21.

Mabogunje, A.L. (1978). Towards an Urban Policy in Nigeria. In: P. O. Sada and J. S. Oguntoyinbo (Ed), *Urbanisation Processes and Problems in Nigeria.* Ibadan University Press, Ibadan, Nigeria, pp. 10–11

MDGs Conditional Grants Scheme to LGAs (2014). Conditional Grants Scheme: Accelerating progress in the Millennium Development Goals and improving lives. Available at http://www.sparcnigeria.com/RC/files/4.2.16_SPARC_CGS_factsheet.pdf retrieved on 30th February, 2019

MDGs Report (2015). The Millennium Development Goals Report 2015. United Nations, New York, https://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2015_MDG_Report/pdf/MDG%202015%20rev%20(July%201).pdf retrieved on 26th April, 2019

Muoghalu, L.N. (1992). Rural Development in Nigeria: A Review of Previous Initiatives. In Olisa,

Nigeria Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) Indicators Baseline Report, published by the Office of the S.A to President on SDGs, 2017.

M.S.O. &Obiukwu, J.I. (Ed), *Rural Development in Nigeria: Dynamics and Strategies*. MEKSLINK Publishers, Awka, Nigeria

Ndukwe, E. C.(2005). Sustainable Cities and Socio-economic Development. In *Proceedings of NIOB Conference,* Lagos; Nigeria. 27th June, 2006

Nigeria's Road to SDGs (2015). Nigeria's Road to SDGs Country Transition Strategy. A mission