HALAMAN PENGESAHAN DISERTASI

MODERN MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES IN SUDAN

disusun dan diajukan oleh:

BUDRADEEN AHMED ABD ALLA ALHAG
A033211017

telah dipertahankan dihadapan Panitia Ujian yang dibentuk dalam rangka
Penyelesaian Studi Program Doktor Program Studi Manajemen
Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Hasanuddin
pada tanggal 30 Januari 2025
dan dinyatakan telah memenuhi syarat kelulusan

Menyetujui,

Promotor

Prof. Dr. Arifuddin, SE., M.Si., Ak., CA.
NIP 196406091992031003

Ko-Promotor I

Andi Aswan, SE.., MBA., Ph.D
NIP 197705102006041003

Ko-Promotor II

Dr. Sabbar Dahham Sabbar, MBA.
NIP 197406062023095001

Ketua Program Studi,

Prof. Dr. Muhammad Yunus Amar, S.E., MT
NIP 196012311988111002

Dekan Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis,

Prof. Dr. Abdul Rahman Kadir, SE., M.Si.
NIP 196402051988101001

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

Public administration serves as the cornerstone of governmental systems, playing a pivotal role in implementing public policy and ensuring the delivery of essential services to citizens. As governments across the world face increasingly complex challenges—from globalization and technological disruption to socio-political unrest and economic volatility—the demand for modern, efficient, and adaptive administrative systems has intensified. The evolution of public administration must, therefore, respond not only to changes in scale and scope but also to citizens' expectations for transparency, accountability, and responsiveness.

Central to the efficacy of public institutions are the people who manage and operate them. Human resources in public administration are not merely facilitators but key drivers of reform and innovation. Effective public service delivery requires well-designed workforce planning, ongoing capacity-building initiatives, leadership development programs, and robust performance evaluation systems. These elements ly ensure that the public sector remains agile, service-oriented, and capable g its mandates in a dynamic policy environment.

Contemporary public administration has increasingly emphasized democratic governance principles. This shift reflects a broader movement from bureaucratic rigidity to participatory governance structures in which citizens are viewed as partners rather than passive recipients. Integrity systems, anti-corruption frameworks, and independent oversight institutions have become vital in promoting trust and legitimacy.

While the technical aspects of management are often shared between public and private sectors, their objectives diverge significantly.

The private sector prioritizes profit and market share, whereas the public sector is accountable to citizens and is tasked with equitable service provision and the public good.

One of the most influential paradigms shaping public administration since the 1980s has been "New Public Management" (NPM).

This model, initially popularized in the United Kingdom under Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and subsequently adopted in countries like the United States, New Zealand, and Australia, proposed applying private sector practices to the public sector. NPM promotes decentralization, output-based performance assessment, competition, and customer satisfaction. It emerged as a response to the inefficiencies and inflexibilities associated with traditional Weberian bureaucracy and sought to reinvent government as a lean, results-oriented enterprise.

Sudan, like many developing countries, has endeavored to adopt NPM s, particularly through privatization. The logic behind privatization was to he financial and managerial burden of state-owned enterprises (SOEs), economic growth, and increase efficiency. However, in practice, Sudan's experience with privatization has yielded disappointing outcomes. Despite its abundant natural resources—including its global leadership in Arabic gum exports, significant livestock and gold reserves—Sudan continues to rank low in global development indices.

Chronic economic instability, institutional decay, and persistent governance failures have hindered the realization of public sector reform.

This paradox—natural wealth amid systemic underdevelopment—forms the crux of the current study. Sudan's attempts at modern public administration, especially through privatization, have neither improved service delivery nor stimulated sustainable development. Instead, the country's institutional weaknesses and socio-political fragmentation have often exacerbated the very problems that reforms aimed to resolve. Moreover, insufficient stakeholder engagement, limited policy coordination, and inadequate monitoring and evaluation mechanisms have further contributed to the ineffectiveness of reform measures.

Modern management theory incorporates tools and techniques from various disciplines, including quantitative analysis, organizational psychology, and behavioral economics. It encourages participatory decision-making, horizontal communication, and innovation. In the context of public administration, modern management emphasizes client satisfaction, accountability mechanisms, transparency, continuous performance monitoring, and adaptive planning. It promotes a shift from input-oriented administration to output and outcome-based service models.

Three dominant models under the umbrella of modern public administration include:

(1) competency- and results-oriented frameworks that align human capital with institutional goals,

(2) decentralized governance structures that empower local agencies and frontline managers,

(3) quality assurance mechanisms emphasizing process improvement,

stakeholder engagement, and evidence-based policy formulation. These models have been widely adopted in reform strategies globally, yet their application in Sudan has been limited or misaligned due to contextual complexities and institutional resistance.

A seminal contribution to this discourse was Osborne and Gaebler's (1993) "Reinventing Government," which advocated for governments to act as facilitators rather than providers. This model underscored the value of competition, entrepreneurship, and accountability in public service delivery. It also encouraged governments to embrace performance measurement and citizen feedback as tools for managerial effectiveness.

While countries such as India, Rwanda, and Bangladesh have recorded measurable success in implementing such reforms, Sudan's reforms have remained superficial and ineffective. These countries invested in institutional ning, capacity building, and participatory governance. In contrast, Sudan's reforms have often lacked coherence, adequate implementation strategies, and political will. Furthermore, these countries established robust frameworks for policy evaluation and feedback, which allowed them to recalibrate reforms over time—a lesson that Sudan has yet to internalize.

This study argues that the challenges facing Sudan's public administration cannot be addressed solely through privatization or NPM. Instead, a more holistic and integrated approach is needed—one that aligns administrative goals with national development strategies and fosters social cohesion. The concept of "goal administration"—emphasizing strategic alignment, stakeholder participation, and long-term sustainability—offers a promising framework for addressing these issues.

Goal administration focuses on defining clear institutional objectives, setting measurable targets, and aligning public resources to achieve developmental goals in a transparent and accountable manner.

1.2 Problem Statement

Despite Sudan's vast natural and human capital, its public administration continues to face chronic challenges. Repeated attempts to reform the sector through privatization have fallen short of expectations.

State-owned enterprises, once considered engines of economic growth, have either collapsed or failed to meet performance targets after privatization. Citizens frequently experience poor service delivery, administrative inefficiency, and lack of [illegible]bility from public institutions.

[illegible]e failure of privatization in Sudan stems from a combination of factors: weak [illegible]al infrastructure, lack of regulatory oversight, endemic corruption, socio-political instability, and the absence of a national strategic vision. Rather than improving efficiency, privatization has in many cases transferred public assets to politically connected individuals or groups without tangible public benefits.

The erosion of public trust and the growing inequality in access to services underscore the need for alternative reform strategies. Sudan's case is unique in that reforms were adopted without adequately addressing foundational issues such as rule of law, civil service professionalism, and public participation.

This research seeks to analyze the root causes of the failure of privatization in Sudan and to explore the potential of goal administration as a more suitable and sustainable alternative.

The study also aims to draw lessons from the experiences of other developing countries that have successfully reformed their public sectors.

Through qualitative analysis of Sudan's institutional environment and comparative benchmarking with high-performing developing nations, the study will contribute to the formulation of practical and context-specific policy recommendations.

1.2.1 Research Questions

1. What are the core principles and objectives of modern management in public administration?
2. To what extent has the privatization policy in Sudan achieved its intended reform outcomes?
3. What internal and external factors contributed to the failure of privatization in the Sudanese context?

4. Can goal administration provide a more effective model for reforming Sudan's public sector?
5. What insights can be drawn from successful public sector reforms in countries like India, Rwanda, and Bangladesh?
6. How can sustainable development principles be integrated into Sudan's public administration reforms?

1.2.2 Gaps in Existing Literature

Although a significant body of literature exists on public sector reform and privatization, most studies either generalize reform experiences across developing countries or focus narrowly on economic impacts.

The Sudanese case has received relatively limited scholarly attention, especially from a comparative public administration perspective. Moreover, the literature rarely addresses the socio-political and institutional variables that affect reform outcomes.

Few studies have examined the intersection of governance, identity politics, and administrative reform in Sudan. Even fewer have explored the applicability of alternative models such as goal administration.

There is a noticeable absence of empirical studies assessing reform implementation challenges within the Sudanese public sector. Furthermore, the potential for integrating sustainable development principles into public administration reform remains largely unexplored.

Most available research tends to overlook the nuanced interdependencies between political will, stakeholder alignment, and institutional resilience in post-conflict or fragile state contexts such as Sudan.

1.3 Research Objectives

1. To examine the theoretical foundations and practical implications of modern management in the public sector.
2. To evaluate the outcomes and limitations of privatization policies in Sudan.
3. To identify the institutional, political, and social challenges that have impeded public sector reform in Sudan.
4. To assess the viability of goal administration as an alternative to privatization.
5. To compare Sudan's reform trajectory with those of other successful reforming nations and extract relevant policy lessons.
6. To explore how sustainable development strategies can inform public sector reform in Sudan and similar contexts.

1.4 Significance of the Study

This study makes a critical contribution to the discourse on governance and public administration reform in developing countries, with a specific focus on Sudan. By evaluating Sudan's experience with privatization and proposing a shift toward goal ation, the research challenges prevailing assumptions about the universality ınd privatization as reform tools.

The study aims to provide evidence-based recommendations for policymakers, development partners, and scholars interested in state capacity building. It also offers a framework for assessing public sector reforms in fragile and post-conflict settings. In doing so, it emphasizes the importance of context-sensitive, inclusive, and adaptive reform strategies that align with national development priorities and social dynamics. In addition, it highlights the need for institutional learning and adaptive governance mechanisms that can respond to changing political and economic conditions.

By focusing on the intersection between administrative practices and broader development outcomes, this research provides a more holistic understanding of public administration reform.

The integration of sustainable development principles into reform planning ensures that economic efficiency is pursued without compromising social equity and environmental integrity—goals that are especially pertinent in the Sudanese context.

1.5 Novelty of the Study

This research presents a novel contribution to the understanding of public sector reform in Sudan by critically analyzing the limitations and failures of privatization policies despite the adoption of modern management concepts. While many studies have either supported or rejected privatization in isolation, this study uniquely evaluates Sudan's experience by comparing it with successful management reforms in countries such as India, Rwanda, and Bangladesh.

Th... lty lies in:

...fying the contextual and structural challenges that hindered the effectiveness ...zation in Sudan,

(2) highlighting the socio-political dynamics—including administrative corruption, weak governance indicators, and cultural fragmentation—that existing literature has overlooked,

(3) proposing an integrated model of goal administration and sustainable development management as a more effective and context-sensitive alternative to privatization.

Additionally, the study underscores the importance of national identity formation and social reform as prerequisites for the success of administrative restructuring.

This perspective introduces a fresh approach by merging management science with socio-political realities specific to Sudan—an intersection that has been underexplored in current research on administrative reform and public sector performance in developing nations. Moreover, it introduces the concept of reform contextualization, asserting that effective public administration strategies must be rooted in the historical, cultural, and institutional realities of each country rather than being universally imposed models.

1.6 Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study is delimited to the analysis of Sudan's public sector reforms with a focus on the implementation and outcomes of privatization, and the potential for adopting goal administration as an alternative model. While broader public management theories are discussed, the empirical application remains specific to [illegible] drawing selectively from comparative experiences in other developing [illegible] like India, Rwanda, and Bangladesh. The study also concentrates on the post-privatization era in Sudan, particularly since the early 2000s when neoliberal reforms gained momentum.

Limitations of the study include access to data due to political instability, limited official documentation on failed privatization cases in recent time for the situation now because after 17 April the war startup and still continue, and restricted access to policymakers and civil servants involved in the reform processes. In addition, while the study draws lessons from successful countries, it acknowledges that direct transplantation of reforms without considering context-specific conditions could yield skewed results.

The research also considers the goals of sustainable development as a modern administrative system, but it only addressed the general concepts and did not continue to explore the complex relationship between privatization and sustainable development, by measuring goals and achievement.

1.7 Structure of the Thesis

This thesis is organized into five main chapters. Chapter 1 introduces the study by discussing the background, problem statement, research objectives, significance, and novelty of the research. Chapter 2 provides an in-depth literature review, examining theoretical and empirical work on modern public administration, privatization, goal administration, and sustainable development.

Chapter 3 Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses, Chapter 4 research [illegible] data collection methods, sampling strategy, and data analysis techniques [illegible] the results and discussion, highlighting key themes and linking findings to the literature and research objectives. Finally, Chapter 5 offers the conclusion, policy implications, limitations of the study, and suggestions for future research.

Chapter 2: Literatures Review

Navigating Modern Management and the Privatization Paradigm

This chapter delves into the intricate landscape of modern public administration and management, providing a comprehensive review of the theoretical underpinnings that shape contemporary approaches. It meticulously explores the historical evolution of governance models, tracing the intellectual currents that led to the prominence of New Public Management (NPM) and the subsequent consideration of privatization as a transformative strategy.

The chapter elaborates on the diverse forms and models of privatization, dissecting their mechanisms, objectives, and potential challenges. Furthermore, it presents a detailed analysis of privatization experiences in various African contexts, focusing on the specific socio-economic and political factors that have influenced outcomes in Nigeria, Zimbabwe, and particularly Sudan. Finally, it engages with the multifaceted academic and policy debates surrounding privatization, critically examining its purported benefits against its documented drawbacks, especially concerning social equity and national development.

2.1 Theoretical Foundations and Evolving Paradigms in Public Administration

The field of public administration has undergone profound transformations over the last century, driven by changing societal demands, technological advancements, and shifts in economic and political ideologies. Understanding these shifts is crucial [illegible]ehending the contemporary challenges faced by public sector organizations [illegible]ationale behind proposed management reforms, such as privatization.

2.1.1 The Evolution of Public Administration Thought

Traditionally, public administration was characterized by a strong emphasis on bureaucracy, efficiency, and a clear distinction between politics and administration. This era, often associated with Woodrow Wilson's (1887) call for a science of administration and Max Weber's (1922) ideal type of bureaucracy, prioritized impartiality, hierarchy, rules, and merit-based employment. The primary goal was to ensure rational, objective, and consistent delivery of public services, safeguarding against patronage and corruption. This classical view, while providing stability and order, often struggled with adaptability, responsiveness, and citizen engagement.

The mid-20th century saw the emergence of critiques against the rigidities of classical public administration. Scholars began to question the politics-administration dichotomy, recognizing the inherent political nature of policy implementation. The focus shifted towards human relations, organizational development, and a more nuanced understanding of public sector dynamics. However, it was the economic and fiscal crises of the 1970s and early 1980s that catalyzed a more radical rethinking of public sector governance. Governments worldwide faced mounting public debt, inefficient state-owned enterprises, and a perceived inability of traditional bureaucracies to meet rapidly changing citizen expectations.

This context gave rise to two influential, though sometimes conflicting, paradigms: New Public Administration (NPA) and New Public Management (NPM).

ic Administration (NPA): A Call for Relevance and Social Equity

Emerging from the Minnow brook Conferences in the late 1960s and early 1970s, New Public Administration (NPA) represented a significant departure from the value-neutral stance of traditional public administration. NPA scholars, reacting to the social turbulence of the era (e.g., civil rights movements, Vietnam War), argued for a public administration that was more socially relevant, equitable, and responsive to the needs of marginalized communities (Marini, 1970) (Frederickson, 1971)). Key tenets of NPA include:

- **Social Equity:** A primary concern for fairness, justice, and the equitable distribution of public services and opportunities, especially for the disadvantaged.
- **Responsiveness:** A focus on making public organizations more attuned to citizen demands and preferences, moving beyond rigid bureaucratic processes.
- **Client Focus:** Emphasizing the needs and experiences of service recipients, rather than solely internal organizational efficiency.
- **Decentralization and Participation:** Advocating for more localized decision-making and greater citizen involvement in governance processes.
- **Ethics and Values:** Highlighting the importance of moral and ethical considerations in public service, rather than just technical competence.

While NPA injected critical social consciousness into the discipline, its prescriptive utility for widespread administrative reform was sometimes questioned, as its focus was more on values and critique than on concrete managerial techniques.

New Public Management (NPM):

ication of Market Principles

In stark contrast, New Public Management (NPM) became the dominant global reform movement from the 1980s onwards. Driven by the ideologies of neoliberalism and public choice theory, NPM sought to "modernize" the public sector by introducing concepts and practices borrowed heavily from the private sector (Hood, 1992); (Osborne& Gaebler, 1992). The core principles of NPM include:

- **Market Orientation and Competition:** Introducing competition among service providers, whether public or private, to foster efficiency and innovation.
- **Decentralization:** Devolving authority and responsibility to frontline managers and agencies, giving them greater autonomy.
- **Performance Measurement and Management:** Setting clear targets, measuring outcomes, and holding managers accountable for results, often through performance-related pay.
- **Customer Focus:** Viewing citizens as "customers" who demand high-quality services, rather than passive recipients.
- **Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness:** Prioritizing the reduction of waste and the maximization of output per unit of input.
- **Disaggregation and Separation:** Breaking down large public bureaucracies into smaller, more manageable units (agencies) and separating policy-making from policy implementation.
- **Privatization and Contracting Out:** Transferring functions, assets, or services from e public to the private sector.

NPM's emphasis on efficiency, accountability, and a business-like approach resonated with governments grappling with fiscal deficits and public disillusionment with traditional bureaucracies. It led to widespread reforms, including the creation of executive agencies, performance agreements, and a significant increase in contracting out and, notably, privatization.

2.1.2 Contemporary Management Challenges in Public Organizations

Despite these theoretical evolutions and reform efforts, public organizations, particularly in developing countries like Sudan, continue to grapple with a myriad of complex challenges that impede their effectiveness and ability to deliver essential services. These challenges are often systemic and deeply rooted in historical, economic, and political contexts. Based on recent literature and empirical observations, some of the most pressing issues include:

- **Chronic Resource Scarcity and Financial Constraints:** A pervasive problem for public sector entities is the chronic lack of adequate financial resources. This manifests in several critical ways:
    - **Underfunded Operations:** Insufficient budgets hinder day-to-day operations, maintenance of infrastructure, and the implementation of new programs.
    - **Inadequate Equipment and Technology:** The inability to procure or upgrade essential equipment and modern technological tools severely limits efficiency and service quality. This is echoed in findings that **39% of management staff** cite the lack of technical facilities and IT tools as the most significant barrier to implementing improvements, impacting everything from data management to service delivery (Czerniachowicz, 2022)

- **Uncompetitive Remuneration:** Low and uncompetitive salaries are a major deterrent to attracting and retaining skilled talent. As highlighted by (Czerniachowicz, 2022) **80% of employees** express concern that their remuneration will not increase, and **45% of the entire respondent group** report inadequate remuneration for work performed. This leads to demotivation, absenteeism, and a brain drain towards the private sector or international organizations. A wage structure that aligns with employee responsibility and effort is crucial for fostering a motivated workforce and achieving organizational objectives.

- **Human Capital Deficiencies and Competency Gaps:** Beyond basic remuneration, the quality of human capital within the public sector often presents a significant challenge:

    - **Insufficient Managerial Competencies:** A notable finding is that **34% of managerial staff** perceive insufficient competencies among employees as a major obstacle. This indicates a systemic issue with training, professional development, and perhaps a lack of effective performance management systems that identify and address skill gaps.

    - **Lack of Professional Development Opportunities:** The absence of clear pathways for professional growth and skill enhancement is a strong demotivator. For employees with up to 3 years of experience, a **lack of development opportunities** ranks as the second most significant concern (22%).

    - **High Workload and Administrative Burdens:** Public sector employees, including management, often face heavy workloads and excessive administrative duties and formalisms. **65% of managerial staff** identify heavy workload as their greatest nuisance, with **48% citing excessive administrative duties and formalisms**. This can lead to burnout, reduced productivity, and a diversion of effort from core public service functions to bureaucratic processes.

- **Organizational and Structural Impediments:** The inherent characteristics of public bureaucracies can also pose significant challenges:
    - **Hierarchical Rigidity:** Overly hierarchical structures can stifle innovation, communication, and responsiveness. For employees with over 10 years of experience, the **hierarchy barrier in the organization** was most often indicated (55%) as an impediment to implementing organizational improvements. This highlights a culture that may resist change and empower lower-level initiatives.
    - **Lack of Integration and Collaboration:** Concerns about reduced integration within teams suggest silos and a lack of inter-departmental cooperation, hindering holistic problem-solving and service delivery.
    - **Limited Autonomy and Flexibility:** Public sector managers often have limited autonomy compared to their private sector counterparts, constrained by rigid rules, political interference, and complex accountability mechanisms. This can limit their ability to adapt quickly to changing circumstances or implement innovative solutions.

- **External Pressures and Instability:** Public sectors in many developing nations operate within volatile environments:
    - **Political Instability:** Frequent changes in government, policy shifts, and political interference can disrupt long-term planning and implementation of reforms.
    - **Economic Volatility:** High inflation rates, currency devaluations, and global economic shocks can further exacerbate financial constraints and planning difficulties (e.g., Sudan's high inflation rate in 2014, cited in the original research).
    - **Societal Demands:** Increasing public expectations for transparent, efficient, and equitable services, often without corresponding increases in resources or capacity, place immense pressure on public institutions.

These entrenched challenges often lead policymakers to seek alternative models for service delivery and resource management, with privatization emerging as a frequently considered, albeit controversial, strategy.

The subsequent sections will detail various forms of privatization and critically examine their application in specific African contexts.

2.2 The Global Evolution and Diverse Forms of Privatization

The concept of transferring functions or assets from public to private ownership is not a modern invention; historical precedents for private provision of public services [illegible] raced back centuries. However, the contemporary wave of privatization, largely beginning in the late 20th century, has been driven by a confluence of economic ideologies, fiscal pressures, and global policy directives.

2.2.1 Historical Trajectories of Privatization

The intellectual roots of modern privatization can be found in the classical economic liberalism espoused by **Adam Smith** in *The Wealth of Nations* (1776) (Smith). Smith argued that private ownership and free markets, guided by the "invisible hand," were far more efficient and productive than state control. He contended that the sale of crown lands, for instance, would not only reduce public debt but would also lead to their improved cultivation under private stewardship.

This foundational idea laid the groundwork for future arguments in favor of private enterprise over public ownership.

However, the 20th century witnessed significant pendulum swings. The necessities of the **Second World War (1939-1945)** and the subsequent period of national reconstruction (1945-1955) in Western Europe led to a dramatic expansion of state control over key industries and resources. Wartime economies often necessitated the socialization of production for strategic purposes, which then carried over into the post-war era as a means of planned economic recovery. Countries like Great Britain nationalized coal mines, railways, and utilities, while France brought industries like coal, gas, electricity, civil aviation, and major manufacturing (e.g., Renault) under public ownership.

[illegible]his period was characterized by "corporatization," where existing industrial [illegible] were transformed into public boards and corporations, aimed at rebuilding national economies and narrowing the "technology gap" with the United States ((Thompson, 1990); (Owen, p. 2012).

The underlying assumption was that centralized direction was necessary to acquire critical technologies and steer national economic development.

By the late 1970s and early 1980s, the efficacy of large state-owned enterprises was increasingly questioned. Many public sector entities in Europe and elsewhere faced mounting inefficiencies, high costs, and a perceived lack of innovation. Coupled with rising inflation and severe fiscal deficits, governments began to reconsider the extensive role of the state in the economy. This shift was profoundly influenced by the rise of **neoliberalism**, an economic philosophy that champions individual entrepreneurial freedoms, strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade (Harvey, 2005)

The United Kingdom, under Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher (elected 1979), became a global pioneer in implementing comprehensive privatization programs.

This entailed aggressive deregulation, the sale of numerous state-owned enterprises, and the scaling back of state involvement in social provision.

The success and perceived benefits of the UK's privatization initiatives spurred similar reforms across Europe and subsequently, in developing nations, often driven by the policy prescriptions of international financial institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. These institutions frequently conditioned financial assistance on the adoption of structural adjustment programs (SAPs) that privatization as a core component, particularly in the Global South.

2.2.2 Defining Privatization and Broad Methods

As articulated by (Savas E. S., 2005), privatization is fundamentally the act of decreasing government's role or increasing the private sector's role in fulfilling public needs. This umbrella term encompasses a variety of approaches, each with distinct implications for ownership, control, and service delivery. Savas identifies three broad methods through which privatization occurs:

2.2.2.1 Delegation

Delegation represents a form of **partial privatization** where the government retains ultimate responsibility for a service but transfers the operational tasks or functions to a private entity. The government maintains an active oversight role, setting standards, monitoring performance, and often providing funding. This method is particularly suitable when the government seeks to leverage private sector efficiency, innovation, or specialized expertise without fully relinquishing public accountability. The tools of governance most commonly employed in delegation include:

- **Contracting Out:** This is arguably the most prevalent form of privatization in many countries, including the United States, at federal, state, and local levels. The government enters into a contractual agreement with a private organization (for-profit or non-profit) to provide specific goods or services that were previously, or could be, produced in-house. Examples include waste collection, maintenance services, IT support, or even certain healthcare services. Contracts define the scope of work, quality standards, delivery schedules, and payment terms, allowing the government to maintain control over the 'what' while the private sector manages the 'how'.

- **Public-Private Competition (Managed Competition):** In this model, government internal departments or agencies are encouraged to compete with private sector firms for contracts to deliver services. This approach, often termed 'managed competition' in local government, aims to foster internal efficiency within the public sector by exposing it to competitive pressures, while also ensuring that the most cost-effective and high-quality provider (whether public or private) is chosen.

- **Franchises:** Under a franchise arrangement, the government grants a private organization the exclusive right to sell a specific service or product to the public within a defined geographical area or for a particular period. The private firm often pays a fee to the government for this right. This method is commonly used for services that involve utilizing public infrastructure, such as broadcasting licenses (airways), public transportation (bus routes, taxi services), or utilities (water, electricity distribution). The private entity bears the operational risks and capital investment, while the government regulates the quality and pricing of services.

- **Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs):** PPPs represent a collaborative approach where government and private entities combine resources and expertise to undertake projects, particularly large-scale infrastructure developments. These partnerships are typically long-term arrangements where the private sector takes on significant risks and responsibilities for financing, designing, building, operating, and maintaining public facilities or services. Examples include highways, airports, bridges, and wastewater treatment plants. PPPs often take the form of concessions or long-term leases, aiming to leverage private sector efficiency, access to capital, and technological innovation to deliver projects that might otherwise be too costly or complex for the public sector alone.

- **Subsidies (Grants or Vouchers):** Governments can delegate the provision of services by offering financial assistance to private entities. This can take various forms:
    - **Grants:** Direct financial aid to private organizations (non-profits or for-profits) to deliver services that meet public needs, such as social welfare programs, research, or arts and culture initiatives.
    - **Low-Interest Loans or Favored Tax Treatment:** Financial incentives designed to encourage private investment in sectors deemed strategically important or socially beneficial.
    - **Vouchers:** Direct financial aid given to eligible consumers, allowing them to choose and purchase services from a range of private providers. This is common in education (school vouchers) or healthcare, empowering consumer choice and fostering competition among private providers.
- **Mandates:** While less direct than other forms, government mandates can compel private action that achieves public objectives. These are regulatory requirements that obligate private entities or individuals to provide certain services or adhere to specific standards, thereby implicitly privatizing the burden of provision. For example, environmental regulations that require companies to treat their waste effectively delegate environmental management to the private sector.

A critical consideration in delegation, particularly with methods involving competition or contracts, is the potential for **corruption and distorted market outcomes**. If public sector companies are allowed to compete with private firms without strict transparency or if governments exhibit bias towards their own entities, it can lead to unfair practices and a breakdown of trust.

This necessitates robust regulatory frameworks, transparent bidding processes, and effective oversight mechanisms to prevent conflicts of interest and ensure that delegation genuinely serves the public good rather than private gain. Without such safeguards, the benefits of efficiency and innovation associated with privatization can be undermined by unethical practices.

2.2.2.2 Disinvestment (Divestment)

Disinvestment, often interchangeably used with divestment or denationalization, involves the government permanently shedding its ownership or control over an enterprise, function, or asset. Unlike delegation, which implies ongoing government responsibility, disinvestment is typically a **one-time initiative** that aims to transfer complete control to the private sector. This method is commonly applied to large state-owned enterprises (SOEs) that are deemed inefficient, financially burdensome, or no longer align with core government functions. The primary goal is often to reduce public debt, generate revenue, foster market competition, and stimulate private sector growth. Four common methods are employed for disinvestment:

1. **Sale to a Single Buyer:** The entire enterprise, or a controlling stake, is sold to a single private entity, typically a corporation or an investment fund. This can be achieved through competitive bidding processes or direct negotiations, and it

is often preferred for large, strategic assets where a clear new owner is desired to undertake necessary restructuring and investment.

2. **Issuing Shares to the Public (Public Offering):** This involves selling shares of the state-owned enterprise to the general public through stock market listings (e.g., an Initial Public Offering - IPO). This method aims to broaden ownership, create a liquid market for the shares, and potentially generate significant revenue for the government. It also allows for greater public participation in the ownership of former state assets.

3. **Selling to Managers or Employees (Management/Employee Buyouts - MBO/EBO):** The enterprise is sold to its existing management team or its employees. This method is often favored for promoting internal motivation, preserving employment, and leveraging the specific knowledge of those already familiar with the organization. It can be particularly effective for smaller or medium-sized enterprises.

4. **Selling to Users or Customers:** In some cases, enterprises or specific assets are sold directly to their primary users or customers. This can be seen in sectors like housing (selling public housing to tenants) or utilities (offering shares to existing customers). This method aims to empower service recipients and ensure that the new owners have a vested interest in the quality and continuity of the service.

Beyond these sale-based methods, disinvestment can also occur through **free** ... of assets to employees, users, customers, or the public at large, particularly ...er, non-strategic assets or to foster community ownership. Lastly, **liquidation** is a drastic form of disinvestment, carried out by shutting down the enterprise and selling off its assets, usually when the entity is deemed unviable or beyond rescue.

2.2.2.3 Displacement

Displacement represents a more **passive and indirect** form of privatization, distinguished from delegation and disinvestment by its lack of direct government initiative. Instead, displacement occurs by default, through withdrawal, voluntary action, or deregulation, ultimately relying on the dynamism of local initiatives and entrepreneurship to fill service gaps. This method arises when the private sector identifies and satisfies a public demand that the government is either unwilling or unable to meet adequately. It often signifies a failure or perceived inadequacy of public provision, creating an opportunity for private solutions to emerge organically.

Key mechanisms of displacement include:

- **Displacement by Default:** This happens when public services are perceived as insufficient in quantity or quality, leading private entities to recognize and capitalize on this unmet demand. For example, if government bus services are unreliable or infrequent, private transportation options (taxis, ride-sharing, or informal transport services) may proliferate to fill the void. Similarly, parental preference for private schools over perceived lower-quality government schools, as observed in countries like India, is a classic example of displacement by default.

- **Displacement by Withdrawal:** The government may deliberately withdraw from a particular service area, leaving it open for the private sector to step in. This is less common than other forms of privatization but can occur when a service is deemed non-essential or when the government decides to focus its resources elsewhere.

- **Displacement by Voluntary Action:** Private organizations or individuals may voluntarily provide services that traditionally fall within the public domain, often driven by philanthropic motives, community needs, or entrepreneurial spirit, without direct government impetus or contract.
- **Displacement by Deregulation:** The removal of regulations that previously restricted private sector entry into certain markets can lead to displacement. By liberalizing a sector, the government creates an environment where private competition can flourish and displace former public monopolies.

Displacement, while often leading to increased choice and innovation, can also raise concerns about equitable access to services, particularly for low-income populations, if the private alternatives are expensive or not universally available. It underscores the importance of a robust regulatory framework even in the absence of direct government provision.

2.3 Comprehensive Models of Privatization

Beyond the broad classifications of delegation, disinvestment, and displacement, a more granular understanding of privatization involves recognizing specific models that governments implement. These models often overlap or combine elements of the broader categories, reflecting the diverse approaches to reconfiguring public and private sector roles. The most common privatization models include:

1. **Full Divestiture:** This is the most complete form of privatization, involving the outright sale of 100% of state-owned assets or enterprises to private entities. The overnment completely relinquishes ownership and control, aiming for maximal venue generation, market liberalization, and the introduction of private sector ficiency.

2. **Partial Privatization:** In this model, the government sells only a portion of its shares or assets, retaining a significant stake or a "golden share" that allows it to maintain some level of control or influence over the entity's strategic decisions, particularly in sectors deemed strategically important (e.g., defense, critical infrastructure, utilities). This approach balances the benefits of private sector involvement with continued public oversight.

3. **Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs):** As discussed under delegation, PPPs are formalized collaborative agreements where the government and private sector jointly undertake projects or deliver services. They are characterized by shared risks, responsibilities, and benefits over a long-term period. PPPs are commonly used for large-scale infrastructure development where public funds alone are insufficient or where private sector expertise in project management, financing, and innovation is crucial.

4. **Concessions:** Under a concession agreement, the government grants a private entity the exclusive right to develop, operate, and maintain a public service or asset for a specified period (e.g., 20-30 years). The private concessionaire typically invests in the asset, covers operational costs, and collects revenues directly from users (e.g., tolls for a highway, tariffs for water supply). Ownership usually reverts to the government at the end of the concession period.

5. **Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT):** This is a specific type of PPP and concession model. A private entity designs, finances, builds, and operates a facility (e.g., a power plant, a idge) for a defined period to recoup its investment and make a profit. After this eriod, ownership and operational responsibility are transferred back to the overnment at no cost.

6. **Build-Own-Operate (BOO):** Similar to BOT, but in a BOO arrangement, the private entity not only builds and operates the facility but also owns it indefinitely. There is no transfer of ownership back to the government. This model is often used for projects where the government wants to permanently offload the asset and its associated risks.

7. **Management Contracts:** In this model, the government retains ownership of the assets and responsibility for policy and funding, but contracts a private company to manage and operate specific public services or assets for a fee. The private manager typically brings in specialized expertise, technology, and management systems to improve efficiency and service quality. This is a lower-risk form of privatization for the government, allowing it to test the waters of private involvement.

8. **Leasing:** The government leases public assets (e.g., public buildings, land, equipment) to private entities for operation and management. The private entity pays rent to the government and assumes operational responsibility, often making investments to improve the asset. This allows the government to retain ownership while outsourcing operational burdens and generating revenue.

The selection of a particular privatization model is a complex decision, influenced by the specific context, the nature of the service, the government's objectives (e.g., revenue generation, efficiency improvement, service expansion), the political environment, and the capacity of the private sector. Each model presents a unique balance of risk, reward, and control between the public and private sectors.

2.4 Privatization Experiences in African Contexts

rivatization programs have been extensively implemented across African argely influenced by structural adjustment policies advocated by international financial institutions. These experiences offer valuable insights into the opportunities and challenges of transferring public functions to the private sector in developing economies.

2.4.1 Privatization in Nigeria

Nigeria, a pivotal economy in Sub-Saharan Africa, provides a compelling case study of privatization driven by a combination of domestic economic challenges and external pressures. Following independence in 1960, the Nigerian government actively pursued an industrial development agenda, establishing numerous state-owned enterprises (SOEs) across various sectors. This interventionist approach was motivated by the nascent private sector, the desire to prevent foreign monopolies, and the goal of achieving rapid and equitable national development ((Ake, 1981); (Ogbuagu, 1983); (Ajayi, 2011)).

However, by the early 1980s, Nigeria, like many other Sub-Saharan African countries, faced severe economic distress. A drastic fall in global primary commodity prices, particularly oil, led to a liquidity crisis, crippling the ability to finance crucial imports and development projects (Helleiner, 1983).In response, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank stepped in, making policy recommendations encapsulated in the **Structural Adjustment Program (SAP)**. Implemented in Nigeria from 1986, SAP was a comprehensive economic reform package designed to address macroeconomic imbalances. Its core conditionalities included:

- **Fiscal Austerity:** Strict measures to reduce government expenditure and budget deficits.

- **Monetary Policy Contraction:** Efforts to control money supply and curb inflation.
- **Trade Liberalization:** Reduction of tariffs and non-tariff barriers to promote free trade.
- **Dismantling Foreign Exchange Controls:** Moving towards market-determined exchange rates.
- **Privatization of Public Enterprises:** The divestiture of state-owned companies to foster efficiency and competition.
- **Labor Market Deregulation:** Increased flexibility in labor laws and reduction of public sector employment.

These measures often resulted in severe social consequences, including cutbacks in national budgets for education and healthcare, and the elimination of subsidies on essential goods and agricultural products (Ismi, 2004). While the IMF posited that these measures would spur export-led growth, attract foreign direct investment, and ultimately reduce debt and poverty, critics argued that such austerity disproportionately affected the poor and often failed to account for the unique socio-political realities of developing nations, sometimes exacerbated by external manipulation of exchange rates (Dominguez, 2019).

Nigeria's path to privatization was not linear. The military government of Muhammadu Buhari (1983-1985) initially resisted a full IMF loan, implementing its own structural adjustment based on the Economic Stabilization Act of 1983, which included t retrenchment of public sector workers and commercialization of public es (making them charge commercial rates).

However, it largely avoided outright privatization.

The subsequent military administration of Ibrahim Babangida (1985-1993), despite a national debate that saw Nigerians reject the IMF loan, ultimately implemented most of the Fund's conditionalities. This included a significant currency devaluation, a market-oriented foreign exchange rating (the Second-tier Foreign Exchange Market - SFEM), deregulation of banking, trade liberalization, and crucially, setting the stage for massive privatization of public enterprises (Bangura, 1987) .

The privatization drive in Nigeria covered sectors such as banking, cement, oil marketing, and later, telecommunications and power, with mixed results in terms of efficiency gains, revenue generation, and impact on service accessibility.

2.4.2 Privatization in Rwanda

In a study sponsored by the World Bank, Rwanda presented a successful experiment in privatizing tea cultivation only. And found that tea is a significant source of foreign exchange and potentially an important means of poverty reduction. It is in fact one of the few labor-intensive crops that provide regular cash income to farmers and employment opportunities to some of the rural population. The Poverty Reduction Strategy of the Government of Rwanda seeks to unlock this potential by reforming its agricultural policy in general while focusing particularly on the key factors that constraint growth in the tea sector. An important component of this program of reforms involves the privatization of tea factories.

2.4.3 Privatization in Zimbabwe

Zimbabwe's post-independence economic policies initially leaned towards a socialist model, with significant state intervention and the establishment of numerous parastatals. However, similar to Nigeria, by the late 1980s and early 1990s, Zimbabwe faced mounting economic challenges, including a ballooning budget deficit, high inflation, and declining economic growth. These pressures led the Zimbabwean government to adopt its own Economic Structural Adjustment Program (ESAP) in 1991, which was largely aligned with the IMF and World Bank's policy prescriptions.

ESAP's key pillars included trade liberalization, deregulation, public sector reforms, and, critically, **privatization of state-owned enterprises**.

The rationale was to improve efficiency, reduce the drain on the national fiscus, attract foreign investment, and stimulate economic growth. Privatization efforts targeted sectors such as mining, manufacturing, tourism, and financial services.

However, Zimbabwe's privatization program faced significant obstacles and yielded mixed results. Challenges included:

- **Valuation Issues:** Difficulty in accurately valuing state assets, often leading to accusations of undervaluation and corrupt sales.
- **Transparency and Governance:** Concerns about the transparency of the privatization process, favoritism, and inadequate regulatory frameworks to govern newly privatized entities.

- **Social Impact:** Critics argued that privatization led to job losses, increased costs for basic services, and a decline in access for the poor, as newly privatized entities prioritized profit over social welfare.

- **Political Interference:** The process was often subjected to political interference, which undermined market principles and long-term sustainability.

While some privatized entities showed initial improvements in efficiency, the overall impact on the Zimbabwean economy was contentious. The program's outcomes were often overshadowed by broader macroeconomic instability, political turmoil, and the complex interplay between economic reforms and social equity concerns.

2.5 Privatization Experiences in Asian Contexts

2.4.1 Privatization in Bangladesh:

The intervention of the private sector must be strictly enforced. Also, can categorically assert that India has absolutely succeeded in managing public sector institutions without the participation of the private sector, this means that it has overturned the first obstacle in using modern management techniques with high efficiency and professionalism. On contrary, if compared to what happened in Bangladesh, where 75% of the country's economy is in the hands of micro and micro-enterprises, the government has turned the face of Bangladesh to industry and

e by giving financing 50 million loans to 50 million poor people in Bangladesh,

hout guarantees and without interest, then only goal is to use these funds to

ngladesh, the result was to achieve self-sufficiency in agricultural products, industrial sector today contributes to 19% of the gross domestic product, state directed a large part of the budget for education, development and digital technology. The percentage of spending on education increased from 1.09% to 20% of the budget

In the year 2000, more than half of its population is below the poverty line, more than 8,5 million do not know how to read or write. Electricity reaches less than half of the country's population. After program implement severe privatization system, as we mentioned, the GDP reached 346 billion dollars. Poverty decreased by 30%. It increased. The percentage of educated people in the country is 30%. Electricity reaches all residents of the country (@simply-info, 2023)

I attribute the reason for a difference in the extent of the state's success in managing the public sector to do with the culture of peoples and the extent of society's interaction and response to privatization and its support for the specific project. We see this in the success of the program in Bangladesh, the success of the Indian government in managing the public sector brilliantly without involving the private sector, and the failure and success of programs in Sudan from time to time.

Bangladesh has also succeeded in creating job opportunities for all members of society, instead of owning the specific sector to one company, which reduces workers and thus increases the unemployment rate. In the opinion of this model, this model deserves to be emulated.

2.4.2 Privatization in India:

The privatization of agricultural extension services in India presents both ities and challenges. While privatization can potentially enhance efficiency, n, and the availability of specialized services, it also raises concerns about access, affordability for small-scale farmers, and the potential commercialization of agricultural knowledge. The transition towards privatization requires careful consideration of governance structures, regulatory frameworks, and mechanisms to ensure that the needs of all farmers are addressed while fostering sustainable agricultural development. Collaboration between public and private sectors, along with active engagement of stakeholders, will be essential to navigate the complexities of privatization and realize its potential benefits for India's agricultural sector (Anshuman, 2024).

2.6 Privatization in Sudan

Sudan's experience with privatization offers a particularly complex and cautionary tale, highlighting the profound socio-economic and political implications of transferring public assets to private control, especially in a context characterized by chronic instability and institutional weaknesses.

The push for privatization in Sudan, similar to other African nations, was often framed as a necessity to address fiscal deficits, improve service delivery, and stimulate economic growth, aligning with global trends and international financial institution recommendations.

A prominent and highly criticized case of privatization in Sudan involves the **Sudan Airlines Company**. In a controversial move, 49% of its shares were transferred to the Kuwaiti Aref Group, with the Sudanese government retaining 30%, and 21% allocated to the Sudanese private sector (Abdelhadi, 2007). This partial privatization raised a [illegible] of "question marks" and drew strong opposition from various experts and [illegible]s of Sudanese society.

[illegible]isms leveled against the privatization of Sudan Airlines were multifaceted:

- **Social Role and National Sovereignty:** Experts argued vehemently that public transport companies, including airlines, railways, and river transport, play a vital social role in connecting diverse regions of Sudan and serving as a national institution that embodies national sovereignty. They contended that prioritizing commercial interests over this inherent social function was detrimental to the nation. The report from the Ministry of Finance and National Economy itself acknowledged Sudan Airlines as the "main national air carrier and national sovereignty representative," further fueling the debate.
- **Lack of Government Support:** Critics pointed out that instead of privatizing, the government should have supported the company through various means to enable it to face challenges. Such support could include providing preferential prices for locally produced aviation fuel, granting reductions in landing fees and air navigation charges, and offering tax and customs exemptions. These measures would compensate the airline for its social and economic role in connecting different parts of Sudan and help modernize its fleet and network.
- **Transparency and Valuation Concerns:** Economist Mohamed Ibrahim Kabbaj (Abdelhadi, 2007)voiced strong criticism against what he termed a "sudden reversal in the mood of the Ministry of Finance," leading to the sale. He highlighted concerns about the total investment being set at $1 billion, while the Kuwaiti Aref Group reportedly paid only $250 million, without a clear, independent valuation of the company's extensive and valuable properties. There was significant fear that these assets were undervalued, depriving the public treasury of their true market worth.

- **Alternative Funding and Public Ownership:** Kabbaj further argued that the approximate $490 million that the Kuwaiti Aref Group would eventually pay for its stake could have been procured from the federal government's own resources, with the remaining 21% being covered by the Sudanese private sector and the public directly. He emphasized the importance of keeping such public institutions under public ownership.

- **Government's Financial Motivation:**

  Economic expert Hassan Sati attributed the sale of national institutions to the Sudanese government's desperate attempt to resolve its financial problems, particularly the collapse of the state's general budget. He contended that institutions of national sovereignty, like Sudan Airlines, should not be sold without a broader societal consensus. Sati expressed concern that this policy would lead to foreign capital regaining control over state institutions, a situation Sudan had previously sought to overcome, describing the government's policy as contradictory, as it simultaneously sold established institutions while establishing new, ostensibly "parasitic" companies that competed with the private sector. He suggested that the privatization program might be in compliance with directives from international institutions.

- **Losing Institution Argument:**

  On the other hand, Professor of Economics at El Neelan University, Dr. Hassan Bashir, provided a counter-argument, asserting that the sale was artial and that Sudan Airlines had been a "losing institution" in its later years.

He also noted the inability of the Sudanese private sector to provide the necessary resources for operating the company and pointed to the declining profits of several international airlines as a motivation for divestment. This perspective suggests that privatization, in some cases, might be a pragmatic decision for financially unviable entities.

The Sudanese case underscores a fundamental tension: while some view privatization as a necessary step to offload financial burdens and introduce efficiency, others strongly argue for the preservation of public ownership, especially for strategic assets that serve critical social and national functions.

The experience suggests that even partial privatization, if not carefully managed with transparency and a clear vision for public welfare, can lead to widespread public skepticism and accusations of asset stripping.

Drawing from the broader experiences, including the Indian context where government institutions played a crucial role in treating patients during the COVID-19 pandemic while private hospitals remained focused on profit, the current research reinforces the argument against the complete privatization of the public sector.

It is argued that the complete privatization of public institutions often leads to failure, particularly for entities that operate in unstable social and political environments and are burdened with broad social responsibilities. While the success of a privatized airline in India after its government ownership is noted as an exception, the general conclusion here is that the private sector should be given opportunities to [illegible]e to national development through roles in small and large industries, as exemplified by Bangladesh, rather than through wholesale privatization of essential public services, especially given the implications for the poor's access to vital services.

All this is contrary to (Nouradeen, 2013). head of committee to managing the public sector, who said in a television interview that public sector privatization program was absolutely successful, increase the GPD a general income, created job opportunities, and towards economic reform in country.

2.7 Debates and Contending Perspectives on Privatization

The decision to privatize public services and assets invariably ignites fervent debates among policymakers, academics, practitioners, and civil society, reflecting diverse ideological stances, economic theories, and practical experiences. These debates revolve around the fundamental question of optimal governance and the appropriate division of labor between the state and the market in fulfilling societal needs.

2.5.1 Arguments in Favor of Privatization

Proponents of privatization typically champion its potential to foster efficiency, innovation, and economic growth, drawing heavily from neoclassical economic theory and New Public Management principles. Key arguments include:

- **Enhanced Efficiency and Productivity:**

This is perhaps the most central argument. Private firms, driven by the ofit motive and exposed to market competition, are believed to be inherently ore efficient and innovative than state-owned enterprises. They are presumed to have stronger incentives to minimize costs, optimize resource allocation, and respond quickly to market signals.

As (Gouri, 2023) notes, managerial efficiency is often curbed in public entities by undue emphasis on using public funds for non-enterprise purposes, suggesting that a shift towards a more enterprise-like focus, driven by privatization, can rectify this.

- **Reduced Fiscal Burden on the State:** Privatization can alleviate financial pressure on government budgets by eliminating subsidies to loss-making SOEs, reducing public sector debt, and generating revenue from asset sales. This frees up public funds for other essential services or deficit reduction.
- **Increased Competition and Consumer Choice:** Transferring monopolies to the private sector can introduce competition, which is expected to lead to lower prices, higher quality services, and greater choice for consumers.
- **Access to Capital and Investment:** Private companies often have better access to capital markets and are more willing to invest in modernization, technology, and expansion than cash-strapped governments. This can lead to improved infrastructure and service capabilities.
- **Innovation and Flexibility:** The private sector is generally perceived as more agile and innovative, capable of adopting new technologies and management practices more quickly than rigid public bureaucracies.
- **Improved Management and Governance:** Privatization can lead to improved corporate governance, professional management, and clearer accountability structures compared to politically influenced state management.

2.5.2 Arguments Against Privatization and Its Criticisms

Despite the compelling arguments for its adoption, privatization has faced substantial criticism, particularly from those concerned with social equity, public accountability, and market failures. These criticisms often draw from public interest theory, institutional economics, and critical development studies.

- **Loss of Social Equity and Access for the Poor:** A primary concern is that privatized services, driven by profit, may become unaffordable or inaccessible to low-income populations. The market mechanism often excludes those who cannot pay, leading to a decline in universal access to essential services like healthcare, education, water, and transport. The research highlights this explicitly, stating "the inability of poor to access many services if they are privatized." This aligns with concerns raised by critics of IMF-mandated SAPs, which often led to cutbacks in social services and increased costs for basic necessities.

- **Public Accountability Deficit:** While private firms are accountable to shareholders, their accountability to the broader public can be weaker than that of public institutions. This can manifest in reduced transparency, less responsiveness to public complaints, and a prioritization of profit over public interest or social welfare. Regulatory oversight can be challenging to implement effectively, particularly in developing countries with weak institutional frameworks.

- **atural Monopolies and Regulatory Capture:** In sectors that are natural onopolies (e.g., water, electricity), privatizing without robust regulation can lead to private monopolies exploiting consumers through high prices and poor service quality. There is also the risk of "regulatory capture," where the privatized entities exert undue influence over regulatory bodies, undermining their effectiveness.

- **Job Losses and Labor Market Impacts:** Privatization often involves significant restructuring and rationalization, leading to job losses in the public sector as private firms seek to cut costs and improve efficiency.

  This can have severe socio-economic consequences, particularly in economies with high unemployment rates.

- **Short-Term Fiscal Gains vs. Long-Term Costs:** While asset sales generate immediate revenue, critics argue that governments may be selling valuable, revenue-generating assets for short-term fiscal relief, potentially sacrificing long-term public revenue streams. Concerns about asset undervaluation, as seen in the Sudan Airlines case, further exacerbate this criticism.

- **Strategic Assets and National Sovereignty:** For certain sectors (e.g., defense, national airlines, critical infrastructure), privatization raises concerns about national security and sovereignty. Critics argue that control over such assets should remain with the state to protect national interests, as echoed by experts regarding Sudan Airlines.

- **"Cream Skimming" and Undesirable Outcomes:** Private providers may focus on e most profitable segments of the market or easily manageable clients cream skimming"), leaving the less profitable or more challenging services to the public sector. This can further strain public resources and exacerbate inequalities.

- **Contextual Factors and Institutional Capacity:**

The success of privatization is highly dependent on the specific institutional, political, and economic context. In countries with weak governance, corruption, and underdeveloped regulatory frameworks, privatization can easily lead to undesirable outcomes, including corruption, asset stripping, and elite capture, rather than improved efficiency or public welfare.

The failures in agricultural, industrial, and service sectors in Sudan due to privatization programs, as briefly mentioned by (Alshzaly, 2015), underscore the importance of robust institutional capacity for successful privatization.

This failure was clearly demonstrated by the inflation index issued by the Central Bank.

المصدر : *إعداد الباحث من بيانات الجهاز المركزي للإحصاء.*

الجدول 4 *معدلات التضخم في السودان خلال الفترة 2014- 1990*		
تسلسل	العام	المتوسط
1	1990	67.4
2	1991	122.5
3	1992	117.7
4	1993	98.3
5	1994	115.4
6	1995	68.4
7	1996	132.7
8	1997	46.7
9	1998	17.1
10	1999	16.0
11	2000	8.0
12	2001	4.9
13	2002	8.3
14	2003	7.4
15	2004	8.8
16	2005	8.4
17	2006	7.2
18	2007	8.1
19	2008	14.3
20	2009	11.2
21	2010	13.1
22	2011	18.1
23	2012	35.1
24	2013	37.1
25	2014	37.5

المصدر : *الجهاز المركزي للإحصاء.*

Source: Public Statistic Centre in Sudan

There is another important study with overview the Privatizations used in which clarified privatization policies in Sudan. While claiming the efficiency benefits and the public finance imperatives of privatization, the ruling elites, dominated by the NCP, exploited the program to expand their economic and political power. Two main issues arose: self-dealing and inequality. In terms of self-dealing, it is clear that all of the potentially profitable privatized enterprises are managed and controlled by NCP affiliates. In many cases, enterprise shares were sold by invitation to specific personalities. In fact, some of the successful companies, such as Sudatel, have been allowed to exercise monopoly power for an extended period of time and to reap exorbitant profits within a short period of time.

The rudimentary nature of public capital markets and the absence of democratic accountability and institutions precluded public participation and eroded the credibility of privatization policies. Furthermore, selective over-taxation and speedy market liberalization (inflationary) policies have increased inequality and caused poverty rates to soar well over fifty percent. (Suliman, 2017)

The researcher Khalid Elbeely find that Sudan privatization program has overlooked the necessary prerequisites for privatization as is often the case in its counterparts MENA and Sub-Saharan African countries, where a large number of public enterprises were privatized even before both an adequate regulatory or competitive framework were put into place. As Buchs argued "In most Sub-Saharan countries privatization was pushed ahead before a sound regulatory framework was which both prejudiced the process of privatization itself and laid it open to the creating private monopolies which would exploit the consumer Furthermore, acks a dynamic capital market, as well as a financial infrastructure of brokerage houses, banks, lawyers. In addition, the program's timetable is inadequate. Moreover, despite the progress made in disseminating the necessary information about the implementation of the privatization program, the government should make more efforts in this area, possibly by disclosing the necessary information to the media on a regular basis. Alternatively, the establishment of a privatization fund to look after the retrenched employees of the privatized enterprises came almost ten years after the introduction of the privatization policy, which aggravated their sufferings. Also, most of enterprises privatized through this privatization model had failed to register any improvement in its performance (i.e., those enterprises which were transferred from the central or federal government to state governments), and the adoption of this formula indicates clearly the inordinate power of the President's Office, as well as the lack of co-ordination between the different government bodies. What is being suggested in this study is that Sudan Government might have put the cart before the horse in implementing its privatization program in the hope that it will improve the performance of SOEs.

The government should start first by creating the enabling environment, which will facilitate the implementation of the privatization program. Accordingly, an effective privatization program requires the government to spell out how a sector is to be regulated after privatization; where the formation of an effective regulatory framework should always be regarded as an integral component of any privatization program; otherwise, consumers will be badly affected. Moreover, successful privatization requires a financial infrastructure of brokerage houses, banks, accountants, lawyers, dynamic capital market, and since these infrastructures have been veloped in Sudan, their development must be given priority as part of an trategy of private-sector development. Furthermore, the inadequacy of the program’s timetable led us to suggest the adoption of a gradual implementation process, especially in the light of the small capacity of the domestic market.

This privatization model mechanism should be abolished immediately.

The implementation of such bold action may send positive signals to the domestic and the foreign investors, as well as helping to eliminate or reduce the element of distrust, which exists between the government and the business community. (Elbeely, 2015)

2.5.3 Reconciling Perspectives and Future Directions

The debates surrounding privatization are not merely theoretical; they have tangible consequences for millions of people, particularly in developing nations.

The experiences in Nigeria, Zimbabwe, and Sudan illustrate that while privatization can address certain fiscal pressures and potentially introduce efficiencies, its outcomes are highly contingent on the specific design, implementation, and regulatory oversight.

The notion that "complete privatization of the public sector always leads to the failure of public institutions," as put forth in the original text, is a strong claim that warrants nuanced interpretation. While evidence from Sudan's aviation sector and the contrasted Indian experience during COVID-19 (where government hospitals provided essential services while private ones prioritized profit) lend support to concerns about social responsibility, the success of India's privatized airline (which was once state- offers a counter-example. This suggests that the impact of privatization is form and depends heavily on:

- **Sectoral Nuances:** Strategic sectors with significant social roles (e.g., basic utilities, healthcare, transport infrastructure) often require different privatization approaches and stricter regulation than non-strategic industries.

- **Regulatory Environment:** A robust and independent regulatory body is crucial to ensure fair pricing, quality standards, and equitable access in privatized sectors, mitigating the risks of private monopolies and consumer exploitation.

- **Transparency and Accountability:** Transparent processes for asset valuation, bidding, and contract management are essential to prevent corruption and ensure public trust.

- **Social Safety Nets:** Governments must implement adequate social safety nets and subsidies to ensure that vulnerable populations are not excluded from essential services due to market-driven pricing.

- **Phased Approaches and Learning:** A gradual, phased approach to privatization, with continuous monitoring and evaluation, allows governments to learn from initial experiences and adapt policies.

In conclusion, the literature suggests that while privatization can be a tool for modern management and economic development, it is not a panacea. Its effectiveness is highly context-dependent and requires careful consideration of potential trade-offs between economic efficiency and social equity.

lanced approach, where the private sector is strategically engaged to e to development (e.g., in small and large industries, as seen in Bangladesh), necessarily relinquishing core public responsibilities, may offer a more sustainable path for nations facing complex management challenges. The ongoing debates emphasize the need for governments to prioritize public welfare, foster robust governance, and build strong institutional capacities to navigate the complexities of modern public administration effectively.

2.8 Sustainable Development:

Meanwhile, several steps were also taken with a scientific and systematic understanding of the interrelationships between natural species, populations, and their environments as in Darwin's Theory of Evolution and the origins of ecological science. This picture of Malthus in the past has raised awareness, as in the 1960s, which gave rise to the presence of movements against environmental pollution from the effects of industrialization, which paid more attention to the inter-relationship between human activities and the natural environment. Using a “systems” approach and computer model, in 1972 was born Limit of Growth, a project of the Club of Rome, an organization of individuals who share a common concern for the future of humanity. Funded by the Volkswagen Foundation, Limit of Growth is a study of the interrelationships between population, industrial growth, food production, and the limitations of ecosystems on Planet Earth.

Various ideas about "sustainable development" then flowed and became more widespread, especially in the mid-1980s, when the International Union for the Conservation of Nature Influential World Conservation Strategy (1980) or the International Union for Conservation of Nature proposed the concept of Sustainable nent or a development that considers the function of ecosystems and ity to be maintained. However, despite the large number of literature/works that have been published related to the concept of sustainable development the concept is not necessarily widely accepted. Only later in 1987, in a conference forum through the Brundtland Commission report, it was stated that Sustainable Development took the concept of "borrowing" instead of "legacy", where a development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. (Prayogi, 2023)

In the past century, many countries have been exploring ways to achieve sustainable development. This topic has become a popular subject of discussion at various conferences and forums, and nations have taken an interest in understanding their resources, social components, and cultures. However, not many people know that Islam laid down the principles for sustainable development from the earliest time in the Qur'an and Sunnah.

In recent years, sustainable development has become a primary goal for organizations. Initially, it was not considered an essential element of business strategy. However, due to the growing demand for corporate social responsibility, organizations have started to focus on sustainability issues. It has now become a competitive advantage for organizations to priorities sustainability. At our company, sustainability is a vital component of our business and a responsibility that we continuously strive to fulfil. With our innovative strength, we aim to create long-term value for society by promoting human progress for all people and living beings.

The concept of sustainability encompasses both environmental aspects and economic and social development. It is directly or indirectly linked to the building and of a company, enhancing competitiveness, promoting creativity, engaging ning talent, and improving the organization’s profitability."

It is worth noting here that the traditional management concept, management by objectives, was introduced to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The most important issues and primary goals are the eradication of poverty, and what are the criteria used to measure the global poverty rate? Much of the world's population suffers from poverty. The reality of sustainable economic development is that sustainable economic development is economic development that takes poverty into account.

This criterion varies from country to country. For example, it differs in the Americas, Asia, and Africa. This criterion is not considered the true standard for measuring the poverty line, but rather is adopted by international organizations, institutions, and bodies. Also, what are the agencies supporting sustainable economic development? There are several agencies supporting sustainable economic development.

Many countries in Africa and Asia have succeeded in achieving at least the minimum level of each SDG.

Sustainability is defined as the company's ability to achieve long-term shareholder value by integrating economic, environmental, and social opportunities into business strategies. (Shodh, 2020) the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. (Emas, 03 February 2020.)

There are 17 goals of sustainable development listed as follows:

The sustainable development goals are:

verty

unger

health and well-being

4. Quality Education

5. Gender equality

6. Clean water and sanitation

7. Affordable and clean energy

8. Decent work and economic growth

9. Industry innovation and infrastructure

10. Reduced inequalities

11. Sustainable cities and communities

12. Responsible consumption and production

13. Climate action

14. Life below water

15. Life on land

16. Peace and justice

17. Partnerships for the goals.

The second type of modern management is privatization. In the second paragraph, the research discusses in some detail the history and emergence of the concept of privatization.

use the same methods of modern management.

2.9 Privatization and sustainable development:

have complex relationships. Here are some key points:

l benefits:

1. Increased efficiency: Private sector involvement can lead to more efficient management of resources.

2. Investment: Privatization can attract foreign investment, stimulating economic growth.

3. Innovation: Private companies may introduce new technologies and practices, enhancing sustainability.

Potential challenges:

1. Environmental concerns: Private companies may prioritize profits over environmental protection.

2. Social inequality: Privatization can exacerbate social disparities if access to essential services becomes unaffordable.

3. Lack of accountability: Private companies may not be held accountable for environmental or social impacts

Sustainable development considerations:

1. Regulatory frameworks: Governments must establish and enforce regulations to ensure private companies adhere to sustainability standards.

2. Public-private partnerships: Collaborations between government and private sector [illegible] promote sustainable development.

3. Stakeholder engagement: Involving local communities and stakeholders in decision-making processes can help ensure sustainable outcomes.

2.10 Literature’s Gabs:

Existing studies of privatization focus on the development process, but limited to discuss it how the impact to sustainability of modern management (Alshzaly, 2015) this study focus only on the bad impact of privatization on the inflation rate in a specific period, without discussing its impact on economic reform and the problems that prevented the success as a whole.

Also head manager of technical Committee for Privatize Public Sector, (Nouradeen, 2013),believe that experiment is successful absolutely by interduce several examples as Evidence from sectors such as telecommunications, postal and telegraph services, cement industry. He did not address their impact on economic reform and sustainable development, or obstacles faced.

The short outcome of (Alshzaly, 2015)study, and limitations (Nouradeen, 2013),there are clear contradiction, farther more the credibility of second one provides space to explore the obstacles and challenges facing development, given that the country's economy is still in crisis.

After studying privatization and evaluating Sudan's experience in public sector economic reform and activating the developmental role of the private sector, the researcher reached the following conclusions:

fluctuations in the contribution of various sectors to the gross domestic onfirm a flaw in the economic reform program implemented in Sudan.

The high inflation rates demonstrate that economic reform programs have failed to achieve the desired social welfare.

The privatized enterprises became weak private sectors, not growing public joint-stock companies, leading to a decline in production rates in key economic sectors.

The literature has not discussed the relationship between privatization and important sustainable development goals such as combating poverty and education.

All the sold enterprises destroyed and weakened the country's economy and contributed to the enrichment of the new owners at the expense of vulnerable segments of society.

Literature on privatization as a successful administrative system by all standards and traditional management is also considered successful to some extent, which makes the literature on the management system and sustainable development very extensive, leaving the relationship between administrative systems and which is privatization or research into the goals of sustainable development. Sudan has recently suffered from an economic decline and the literature has not discussed this issue by studying which administrative systems are suitable for application in Sudan and what are the challenges facing it.

The experience in Bangladesh also clearly demonstrated that the experiment was successful, as was the case in Rwanda.

The problem here is that despite all these successes in other developing , Sudan remains at the bottom of these developing countries, demonstrating is a water problem that deserves further investigation and exploration.

The studies proofed the failure of the experiment, and others demonstrating its success, yet the result remains that the country remains poor. Even the government

References

@simply-info. (2023, June 15). Bangladesh Renaissance. Estanbul, Turkiye, Turkiye.

Abdelhadi, E. (15/6/2007). *Economists criticize the privatization of Sudanese Airlines.* Khartoum: Aljazeera new net work.

Ahmed, B. (2024, March 2024). What did the elites in Sudan do? (A. o. Indonesia, Interviewer)

Ahmed, O. S. (2013). *Privatization of some companies and government institutions in Sudan.* Khartoum: Aljazeera News.

Allam, P. (n.d.). London Symposium: Sudan at the crossroads: a vision for the future and youth empowerment. Landon: World Association for Sustainable Development (WASD).

ALmehelan, A. (2024, March 36). A narrative history of conflicts in Sudan. (G. A. Osman, Interviewer)

Alshzaly, D. (2015). Public Sector Reform and Activation of the Developmental Role of the Private Sector" Analytical Study to assess the experience of Privatization in Sudan. *The Islamic University Journal for Economic and Administrative Studies*, 73-74.

Anshuman, J. (2024, April). Privatization of Agricultural Extension in India. *Vigyan Varta an International E-Magazine for Science Enthusiasts*, 2024-2028.

Aziz, K. A. (2018). *Privatization of 173 government companies - Sudanese articles.* Khartoum: Sudania 24.

Bangura. (1987). *The IMF/World Bank Conditionality and Nigeria's Structural Adjustment .* The IMF and the World Bank in Africa.

Czerniachowicz, B. (2022). Implementing modern management orientation with the use of IT. *ScienceDirect*, 5-6.

D. Rich, R. S. (2020). *ICAT SERIES OF ASSESSMNTS GUIDES.* Washington D.C.: World Resources Institute.

(2023, March). Political restrictions and agricultural investment opportunities in udan. *The policy note to support strategy*.

Emas, R. (03 February 2020.). The Concept of Sustainable Development: Definition and Defining Principles. *George Washington University*.

Ezemenari, K. (2008, January). Reading Tealeaves on the Potential Impact of the privatization Tea Estates in Rwanda.

Gouri, V. (May 2023). *Governance as a Catalyst for Public Sector Sustainability (pp.200- 221).* IGI Global Publishers.

Heidrich, O. (2005). *The influence of data quality in selecting a sustainable waste management.* Newcastle : https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306067037.

Jha, H. (January 2012). Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty (review). *Journal of Southeast Asian Economies 29(2)*, 168-169.

Knowlegde, S. (n.d.). Sudan's Economic Future Symposium 2022 Roadmap and Budget Problems.

Kwaghe, Z. E. (2021, June 10). A History of Privatisation: The Global Perspective.

Kwaghe, Z. E. (2021). A History of Privatisation: The Global Perspective. *International Journal of Humanitatis Theoreticus. Vol. 3. (Issue: 1); May, 2020*, 148 - 149.

M., P. J. (2021). SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES: LIMITATIONS AND RISKS. *National Research University , Moscow, Russia*.

Naim, A. (2020). PUBLIC ENTERPRISES: THEIR ROLE, IMPORTANCE AND NEED IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. *American Journal of Business Management, Economics and Banking*, 2 - 2.

Nouradeen, A. (2013). *Privatization of some Sudanese companies and institutions.* Khartoum: Aljazeera Arabic Chanell.

Powell, J. (May 2022.). *Community Quality of Life Indicators and Well-Being.* Public Administration, University of Alaska Southeast.

Prayogi, A. (2023, January 1). The Role of History as a Science in Sustainable Development. pp. 16 - 23.

Robinson, D. A. (2015). *Why do nations fail.* Cairo : Inernational House for Culturel investiment .

Savas, E. S. (2005). Privatization and Public-Private Partnerships. In Privatization in the City: Successes,Failures. *achademia.edu*.

D. A. (2021, Febrary 17). Retrieved from tps://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xc7yaWSVQzc

Shodh. (2020). ORGANIZATIONAL CONTENTION AND CONFRONTATION TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. *AN INTERNATIONAL BILINGUAL PEER REVIEWED REFEEREED RESEARRCH JOURNAL*, 69-73.

Spangenberg, J. H. (2005). *Economic sustainability of the economy: Concepts and indicators.* Bad Oeynhausen, Germany: International Journal of Sustainable Development.

Sudan, P. S. (2014). *Inflation Rate.* Khartoum: Public Statistic Centre In Sudan.

Switzerland, R. c. (2020). Creating and Sustaining Community , Indicators projects: form engagement to Result. In C. S. Wray, *Community Quality-of-Life Indicators* (pp. 9-13). Issaquah, WA, USA.

TV, A. (2019). *Alshorooq Channel* . Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uZ5YjXbyKyE

@simply-info. (2023, June 15). Bangladesh Renaissance. Estanbul, Turkiye, Turkiye.

Abdelhadi, E. (15/6/2007). *Economists criticize the privatization of Sudanese Airlines.* Khartoum: Aljazeera new net work.

Ahmed, B. (2024, March 2024). What did the elites in Sudan do? (A. o. Indonesia, Interviewer)

Ahmed, O. S. (2013). *Privatization of some companies and government institutions in Sudan.* Khartoum: Aljazeera News.

Allam, P. (n.d.). London Symposium: Sudan at the crossroads: a vision for the future and youth empowerment. Landon: World Association for Sustainable Development (WASD).

ALmehelan, A. (2024, March 36). A narrative history of conflicts in Sudan. (G. A. Osman, Interviewer)

Alshzaly, D. (2015). Public Sector Reform and Activation of the Developmental Role of the Private Sector" Analytical Study to assess the experience of Privatization in Sudan. *The Islamic University Journal for Economic and Administrative Studies*, 73-74.

Anshuman, J. (2024, April). Privatization of Agricultural Extension in India. *Vigyan Varta an International E-Magazine for Science Enthusiasts*, 2024-2028.

Aziz, K. A. (2018). *Privatization of 173 government companies - Sudanese articles.* Khartoum: ıdania 24.

1987). *The IMF/World Bank Conditionality and Nigeria's Structural Adjustment .* ıe IMF and the World Bank in Africa.

Czerniachowicz, B. (2022). Implementing modern management orientation with the use of IT. *ScienceDirect*, 5-6.

D. Rich, R. S. (2020). *ICAT SERIES OF ASSESSMNTS GUIDES.* Washington D.C.: World Resources Institute.

Diselva, B. (2023, March). Political restrictions and agricultural investment opportunities in Sudan. *The policy note to support strategy*.

Emas, R. (03 February 2020.). The Concept of Sustainable Development: Definition and Defining Principles. *George Washington University*.

Ezemenari, K. (2008, January). Reading Tealeaves on the Potential Impact of the privatization Tea Estates in Rwanda.

Gouri, V. (May 2023). *Governance as a Catalyst for Public Sector Sustainability (pp.200- 221).* IGI Global Publishers.

Heidrich, O. (2005). *The influence of data quality in selecting a sustainable waste management.* Newcastle : https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306067037.

Jha, H. (January 2012). Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty (review). *Journal of Southeast Asian Economies 29(2)*, 168-169.

Knowlegde, S. (n.d.). Sudan's Economic Future Symposium 2022 Roadmap and Budget Problems.

Kwaghe, Z. E. (2021, June 10). A History of Privatisation: The Global Perspective.

Kwaghe, Z. E. (2021). A History of Privatisation: The Global Perspective. *International Journal of Humanitatis Theoreticus. Vol. 3. (Issue: 1); May, 2020*, 148 - 149.

M., P. J. (2021). SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES: LIMITATIONS AND RISKS. *National Research University , Moscow, Russia*.

Naim, A. (2020). PUBLIC ENTERPRISES: THEIR ROLE, IMPORTANCE AND NEED IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. *American Journal of Business Management, Economics and Banking*, 2 - 2.

Nouradeen, A. (2013). *Privatization of some Sudanese companies and institutions.* Khartoum: Aljazeera Arabic Chanell.

Powell, J. (May 2022.). *Community Quality of Life Indicators and Well-Being.* Public Administration, University of Alaska Southeast.

. (2023, January 1). The Role of History as a Science in Sustainable Development.). 16 - 23.

D. A. (2015). *Why do nations fail.* Cairo : Inernational House for Culturel vestiment .

Savas, E. S. (2005). Privatization and Public-Private Partnerships. In Privatization in the City: Successes,Failures. *achademia.edu*.

Shamon, D. A. (2021, Febrary 17). Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xc7yaWSVQzc

Shodh. (2020). ORGANIZATIONAL CONTENTION AND CONFRONTATION TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. *AN INTERNATIONAL BILINGUAL PEER REVIEWED REFEEREED RESEARRCH JOURNAL*, 69-73.

Spangenberg, J. H. (2005). *Economic sustainability of the economy: Concepts and indicators.* Bad Oeynhausen, Germany: International Journal of Sustainable Development.

Sudan, P. S. (2014). *Inflation Rate.* Khartoum: Public Statistic Centre In Sudan.

Switzerland, R. c. (2020). Creating and Sustaining Community , Indicators projects: form engagement to Result. In C. S. Wray, *Community Quality-of-Life Indicators* (pp. 9-13). Issaquah, WA, USA.

TV, A. (2019). *Alshorooq Channel* . Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uZ5YjXbyKyE

@simply-info. (2023, June 15). Bangladesh Renaissance. Estanbul, Turkiye, Turkiye.

Abdelhadi, E. (15/6/2007). *Economists criticize the privatization of Sudanese Airlines.* Khartoum: Aljazeera new net work.

Ahmed, B. (2024, March 2024). What did the elites in Sudan do? (A. o. Indonesia, Interviewer)

Ahmed, O. S. (2013). *Privatization of some companies and government institutions in Sudan.* Khartoum: Aljazeera News.

Allam, P. (n.d.). London Symposium: Sudan at the crossroads: a vision for the future and youth empowerment. Landon: World Association for Sustainable Development (WASD).

ALmehelan, A. (2024, March 36). A narrative history of conflicts in Sudan. (G. A. Osman, Interviewer)

Alshzaly, D. (2015). Public Sector Reform and Activation of the Developmental Role of the Private Sector" Analytical Study to assess the experience of Privatization in Sudan. *ne Islamic University Journal for Economic and Administrative Studies*, 73-74.

ı, J. (2024, April). Privatization of Agricultural Extension in India. *Vigyan Varta an ternational E-Magazine for Science Enthusiasts*, 2024-2028.

Aziz, K. A. (2018). *Privatization of 173 government companies - Sudanese articles.* Khartoum: Sudania 24.

Bangura. (1987). *The IMF/World Bank Conditionality and Nigeria's Structural Adjustment .* The IMF and the World Bank in Africa.

Czerniachowicz, B. (2022). Implementing modern management orientation with the use of IT. *ScienceDirect*, 5-6.

D. Rich, R. S. (2020). *ICAT SERIES OF ASSESSMNTS GUIDES.* Washington D.C.: World Resources Institute.

Diselva, B. (2023, March). Political restrictions and agricultural investment opportunities in Sudan. *The policy note to support strategy*.

Emas, R. (03 February 2020.). The Concept of Sustainable Development: Definition and Defining Principles. *George Washington University*.

Ezemenari, K. (2008, January). Reading Tealeaves on the Potential Impact of the privatization Tea Estates in Rwanda.

Gouri, V. (May 2023). *Governance as a Catalyst for Public Sector Sustainability (pp.200- 221).* IGI Global Publishers.

Heidrich, O. (2005). *The influence of data quality in selecting a sustainable waste management.* Newcastle : https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306067037.

Jha, H. (January 2012). Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty (review). *Journal of Southeast Asian Economies 29(2)*, 168-169.

Knowlegde, S. (n.d.). Sudan's Economic Future Symposium 2022 Roadmap and Budget Problems.

Kwaghe, Z. E. (2021, June 10). A History of Privatisation: The Global Perspective.

Kwaghe, Z. E. (2021). A History of Privatisation: The Global Perspective. *International Journal of Humanitatis Theoreticus. Vol. 3. (Issue: 1); May, 2020*, 148 - 149.

M., P. J. (2021). SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES: LIMITATIONS AND RISKS. *National Research University , Moscow, Russia*.

Naim, A. (2020). PUBLIC ENTERPRISES: THEIR ROLE, IMPORTANCE AND NEED IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. *American Journal of Business Management, Economics and Banking*, 2 - 2.

n, A. (2013). *Privatization of some Sudanese companies and institutions.* ıartoum: Aljazeera Arabic Chanell.

(May 2022.). *Community Quality of Life Indicators and Well-Being.* Public dministration, University of Alaska Southeast.

Prayogi, A. (2023, January 1). The Role of History as a Science in Sustainable Development. pp. 16 - 23.

Robinson, D. A. (2015). *Why do nations fail.* Cairo : Inernational House for Culturel investiment .

Savas, E. S. (2005). Privatization and Public-Private Partnerships. In Privatization in the City: Successes,Failures. *achademia.edu*.

Shamon, D. A. (2021, Febrary 17). Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xc7yaWSVQzc

Shodh. (2020). ORGANIZATIONAL CONTENTION AND CONFRONTATION TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. *AN INTERNATIONAL BILINGUAL PEER REVIEWED REFEEREED RESEARRCH JOURNAL*, 69-73.

Spangenberg, J. H. (2005). *Economic sustainability of the economy: Concepts and indicators.* Bad Oeynhausen, Germany: International Journal of Sustainable Development.

Sudan, P. S. (2014). *Inflation Rate.* Khartoum: Public Statistic Centre In Sudan.

Switzerland, R. c. (2020). Creating and Sustaining Community , Indicators projects: form engagement to Result. In C. S. Wray, *Community Quality-of-Life Indicators* (pp. 9-13). Issaquah, WA, USA.

TV, A. (2019). *Alshorooq Channel* . Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uZ5YjXbyKyE

Bibliography

@simply-info. (2023, June 15). Bangladesh Renaissance. Estanbul, Turkiye, Turkiye.

, E. (15/6/2007). *Economists criticize the privatization of Sudanese Airlines.* ıartoum: Aljazeera new net work.

. (2024, March 2024). What did the elites in Sudan do? (A. o. Indonesia, terviewer)

Ahmed, O. S. (2013). *Privatization of some companies and government institutions in Sudan.* Khartoum: Aljazeera News.

Allam, P. (n.d.). London Symposium: Sudan at the crossroads: a vision for the future and youth empowerment. Landon: World Association for Sustainable Development (WASD).

ALmehelan, A. (2024, March 36). A narrative history of conflicts in Sudan. (G. A. Osman, Interviewer)

Alshzaly, D. (2015). Public Sector Reform and Activation of the Developmental Role of the Private Sector" Analytical Study to assess the experience of Privatization in Sudan. *The Islamic University Journal for Economic and Administrative Studies*, 73-74.

Anshuman, J. (2024, April). Privatization of Agricultural Extension in India. *Vigyan Varta an International E-Magazine for Science Enthusiasts*, 2024-2028.

Aziz, K. A. (2018). *Privatization of 173 government companies - Sudanese articles.* Khartoum: Sudania 24.

Bangura. (1987). *The IMF/World Bank Conditionality and Nigeria's Structural Adjustment .* The IMF and the World Bank in Africa.

Czerniachowicz, B. (2022). Implementing modern management orientation with the use of IT. *ScienceDirect*, 5-6.

D. Rich, R. S. (2020). *ICAT SERIES OF ASSESSMNTS GUIDES.* Washington D.C.: World Resources Institute.

Diselva, B. (2023, March). Political restrictions and agricultural investment opportunities in Sudan. *The policy note to support strategy*.

Emas, R. (03 February 2020.). The Concept of Sustainable Development: Definition and Defining Principles. *George Washington University*.

Ezemenari, K. (2008, January). Reading Tealeaves on the Potential Impact of the privatization Tea Estates in Rwanda.

Gouri, V. (May 2023). *Governance as a Catalyst for Public Sector Sustainability (pp.200- 221).* IGI Global Publishers.

Heidrich, O. (2005). *The influence of data quality in selecting a sustainable waste management.* Newcastle : https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306067037.

nuary 2012). Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty eview). *Journal of Southeast Asian Economies 29(2)*, 168-169.

e, S. (n.d.). Sudan's Economic Future Symposium 2022 Roadmap and Budget oblems.

Kwaghe, Z. E. (2021, June 10). A History of Privatisation: The Global Perspective.

Kwaghe, Z. E. (2021). A History of Privatisation: The Global Perspective. *International Journal of Humanitatis Theoreticus. Vol. 3. (Issue: 1); May, 2020*, 148 - 149.

M., P. J. (2021). SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES: LIMITATIONS AND RISKS. *National Research University , Moscow, Russia*.

Naim, A. (2020). PUBLIC ENTERPRISES: THEIR ROLE, IMPORTANCE AND NEED IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. *American Journal of Business Management, Economics and Banking*, 2 - 2.

Nouradeen, A. (2013). *Privatization of some Sudanese companies and institutions.* Khartoum: Aljazeera Arabic Chanell.

Powell, J. (May 2022.). *Community Quality of Life Indicators and Well-Being.* Public Administration, University of Alaska Southeast.

Prayogi, A. (2023, January 1). The Role of History as a Science in Sustainable Development. pp. 16 - 23.

Robinson, D. A. (2015). *Why do nations fail.* Cairo : Inernational House for Culturel investiment .

Savas, E. S. (2005). Privatization and Public-Private Partnerships. In Privatization in the City: Successes,Failures. *achademia.edu*.

Shamon, D. A. (2021, Febrary 17). Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xc7yaWSVQzc

Shodh. (2020). ORGANIZATIONAL CONTENTION AND CONFRONTATION TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. *AN INTERNATIONAL BILINGUAL PEER REVIEWED REFEEREED RESEARRCH JOURNAL*, 69-73.

Spangenberg, J. H. (2005). *Economic sustainability of the economy: Concepts and indicators.* Bad Oeynhausen, Germany: International Journal of Sustainable Development.

Sudan, P. S. (2014). *Inflation Rate.* Khartoum: Public Statistic Centre In Sudan.

Switzerland, R. c. (2020). Creating and Sustaining Community , Indicators projects: form engagement to Result. In C. S. Wray, *Community Quality-of-Life Indicators* (pp. 9-13). Issaquah, WA, USA.

TV, A. (2019). *Alshorooq Channel* . Retrieved from tps://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uZ5YjXbyKyE