sustainability

MDPI

Article

Applying the UNECE PIERS Evaluation Methodology for the SDGs to Support the Implementation of Green PPP Projects and Infrastructure: Lessons from Slovenia

Petra Ferk

Institute for Public-Private Partnership, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia; petra.ferk@pppforum.si

Abstract

Robust evaluation methods are essential for assessing the sustainability of public–private partnerships (PPPs) and advancing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This study examines the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) People-first PPP and Infrastructure Evaluation and Rating System (PIERS) through three green PPP initiatives in Slovenia, focusing on energy efficiency, renewable energy and sustainable mobility. Using structured scoring across five dimensions—access and equity, economic effectiveness, environmental sustainability, replicability and stakeholder engagement—the analysis considers project-level performance, national SDG alignment and methodological applicability. The results indicate strong overall sustainability performance, but identify stakeholder engagement as a significant weakness, largely due to institutional constraints. Comparison with Slovenia's national SDG progress in 2023–2025 shows broad alignment between project outcomes and wider sustainability achievements. The methodological review also identifies scope for improving the applicability and adaptability of PIERS indicators. Although primarily designed as a self-assessment tool, PIERS provides a systematic framework for integrating SDG principles into PPP management, especially in relation to SDGs 7, 9, 11 and 13. The study contributes empirical evidence and methodological insights for more sustainable public investment governance.

Keywords: public–private partnerships (PPPs); People-first PPPs; Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); SDG localisation; UNECE PIERS methodology; sustainability assessment; green investment project implementation; stakeholder engagement; Slovenia

1. Introduction

1.1. Global Context and Relevance

The United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, adopted in 2015 [1], requires a systemic transformation in the way governments plan, finance and evaluate public investments [2,3]. Because implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is not legally mandatory, sustained efforts at the national, subnational and local levels, and across all stakeholder groups, are essential to their realisation [4,5]. These efforts matter not only for present generations but, even more importantly, for future generations [6]. Even during the preparation and adoption of the 2030 Agenda, it was recognised that private financing would play an important role in achieving the SDGs [1,2].

In 2023, the United Nations (UN) published The Sustainable Development Goals Report, which assessed global progress towards the SDGs and identified measures for accelerating their implementation. Its conclusions were alarming: at the halfway point to

Check for updates

Academic Editor: Chaofeng Shao

Received: 26 May 2026
Revised: 26 June 2026
Accepted: 5 July 2026
Published: 14 August 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license.

2030, nearly half of the assessed targets were off track, while more than 30 per cent had either stagnated or regressed below the 2015 baseline [7].

The United Nations General Assembly therefore reaffirmed its commitment to the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs in September 2024 through the adoption of the Pact for the Future [8]. The opening pages of the Pact directly address the issue of "financing for development". The need for private sector participation in financing public infrastructure and public services for sustainable development has not diminished since 2015; on the contrary, it has become even more acute in the light of global instability and recurring crises [9].

Sustainable infrastructure development has accordingly emerged as a key enabler of inclusive economic growth and environmental resilience, particularly under SDG 9, which calls for resilient infrastructure, inclusive and sustainable industrialisation, and innovation [10]. The global infrastructure gap is widening—driven by climate change, geopolitical instability and the deterioration of existing assets—and the available evidence consistently shows that investment needs are rising.

In 2016, the McKinsey Global Institute estimated that, between 2016 and 2030, the world would need to invest an average of USD 1 trillion per year in economic infrastructure merely to support expected growth rates [11]. The OECD now estimates that the gap between current infrastructure investment levels and the level required to achieve the SDGs could reach as much as USD 18 trillion by 2040. According to the OECD, the scale of need is enormous, and substantial investment will be required from both governments and the private sector, as quality infrastructure will play a vital role in achieving the SDGs [12].

Public finances alone will be insufficient to meet these infrastructure needs [13]. Greater public–private cooperation will therefore be required to establish and maintain such infrastructure, and public–private partnership (PPP) models are among the approaches likely to be used more extensively in the future.

The literature confirms that all SDGs are directly or indirectly connected to, and influenced by, the development of adequate infrastructure [14]. Infrastructure, as a fundamental societal subsystem, supports progress towards other SDGs, including those related to health, education and the environment [10]. Although studies show that many actors involved in construction-sector projects wish to measure SDG impact at both business and project levels, this remains a major challenge because appropriate tools, methods and frameworks for assessing SDG progress at the project level are still lacking [15], despite strong motivation at the operational level [16].

The same problem applies to PPP projects intended to support the SDGs. Despite the growing emphasis on sustainability, the systematic evaluation of PPP projects against SDG-related outcomes remains limited and fragmented. Unified, multidimensional assessment tools that integrate economic, social and environmental aspects remain underdeveloped. Traditional PPP evaluation frameworks continue to focus primarily on value for money and fiscal performance rather than sustainability and inclusiveness. Relevant initiatives have nevertheless emerged in business practice, such as the FAST-Infra Sustainable Infrastructure Label [17], and in the literature, including proposals for a contemporary global PPP research agenda [18], the use of the Triple Bottom Line approach—that is, social, environmental or ecological, and economic or financial effects, also reflected in the "three pillars" of people, profit and planet—throughout the project life cycle as a way of linking SDGs with project success criteria [19], and a conceptual methodology for evaluating PPPs that contribute to the SDGs [20], which may be regarded as a predecessor of the PIERS methodology. This methodological gap limits governments' ability to demonstrate how individual projects contribute to national SDG progress.

In this respect, a major advantage of the PIERS methodology is that it was developed and is being promoted under the auspices of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). It is also gradually being recognised and applied by financial actors and international financial institutions (IFIs) in the evaluation of sustainable infrastructure and PPP projects [21], thereby extending its global reach and influence.

This study aims to demonstrate how the UNECE PIERS methodology, although a voluntary self-assessment tool, can support a more systematic understanding and implementation of SDG objectives in PPP and infrastructure projects at the operational, national and methodological levels. Although SDG 9 provides the starting point for the analysis, the study also recognises that the PIERS methodology systematically incorporates all relevant SDGs identified in the assessment process. In doing so, the study seeks to advance three strands of the literature—PPP preparation and governance, SDG evaluation and sustainable infrastructure assessment—by moving beyond the descriptive application of an existing framework towards an empirically grounded, multidimensional evaluation that connects project-level performance with national SDG progress and identifies scope for refining the PIERS indicators.

1.2. The UNECE People-First PPP and PIERS Methodology

The PIERS methodology was developed by UNECE in cooperation with more than one hundred experts from the public and private sectors, academia and civil society organisations. It constitutes a comprehensive analytical framework for assessing the contribution of PPP and infrastructure projects to the SDGs. PIERS offers an integrated and multidimensional approach that enables project developers, policymakers and financiers to evaluate and improve the sustainability performance of projects throughout their life cycle. At its core, the methodology seeks to ensure that infrastructure investments generate value both for people and for the planet, with particular emphasis on equity, social inclusion and the needs of vulnerable groups.

When applied at the early stages of project development and maintained throughout design and implementation, PIERS enables stakeholders to identify areas for improvement systematically and to embed resilience, sustainability and circularity into project planning and execution. From an operational perspective, the methodology can also enhance investor confidence by demonstrating that projects using it adhere to concrete sustainability practices. PIERS is freely accessible as a self-assessment instrument and is further supported through the UNECE PIERS Programme, which offers an expert-led "assisted self-assessment" process. The methodology also encourages continuous project improvement at the stages at which changes are most cost-effective and serves as a capacity-building tool for strengthening institutional understanding of sustainable infrastructure development.

Overall, the PIERS methodology represents an innovative and practical contribution to global efforts to align infrastructure investment with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It provides both a rigorous analytical instrument and an educational platform for promoting more sustainable and socially responsible PPP and infrastructure projects worldwide. It is also flexible and adaptable across sectors, project types and national contexts. Rather than replacing existing PPP and infrastructure standards or assessment frameworks, it complements them by offering an integrative and harmonised evaluation tool [22].

The methodological structure of PIERS is anchored in five key outcome dimensions: (1) access and equity (hereinafter also: the AE dimension); (2) economic effectiveness (hereinafter also: the EE dimension); (3) environmental sustainability and resilience (hereinafter also: the ES dimension); (4) replicability (hereinafter also: the RE dimension); and (5) stakeholder engagement (hereinafter also: the SE dimension). These dimensions reflect

the holistic understanding of sustainability underlying UNECE's approach to PPPs for the SDGs. Access and equity emphasise inclusiveness and the fair distribution of benefits; economic effectiveness focuses on value creation and fiscal responsibility; environmental sustainability and resilience address the reduction in ecological impacts and the capacity to withstand external shocks; replicability supports the transfer of successful practices; and stakeholder engagement promotes transparency and participatory governance. Building on these five outcomes, the PIERS evaluation process comprises twenty-two criteria and ninety-five indicators, providing a structured and measurable approach to scoring and benchmarking projects in relation to the SDGs. The User's Guide to the self-assessment tool is available [23].

The credibility of the PIERS methodology and the PIERS Programme is strengthened in two important ways: first, through the involvement of a Technical Panel [24], composed of experts who address complex technical and project-specific issues; and second, through PIERS Project Evaluators and Peer Reviewers [25], who possess detailed knowledge and understanding of the methodology and assess and review projects for their alignment with the SDGs. UNECE has contributed to this field not only through conceptual guidance but also through practical measures [26].

Nevertheless, the limitations of the methodology must be recognised. PIERS is not mandatory; it is a voluntary instrument intended to support, rather than replace, formal legal, financial, environmental or social assessments. A key shortcoming lies in the potential subjectivity of its application: users may assess projects either too uncritically or too restrictively. Although guidelines exist to steer the assessment process, they are predominantly descriptive and may allow divergent interpretations, leading to inconsistent or non-comparable evaluations across projects.

Although the development and application of PIERS represent a significant and widely recognised achievement within the global professional PPP community, which regularly convenes under the auspices of the UNECE Working Party on Public–Private Partnerships [27] and the UNECE International PPP Forum [28], the methodology has received limited attention in the professional and academic literature. In fact, to the best of the author's knowledge, no academic publication has yet examined the practical application of the PIERS methodology to concrete PPP and infrastructure projects. The present study addresses this gap and, beyond merely applying an existing framework, contributes the first empirical multi-project evaluation using PIERS, a critical appraisal of the applicability and adaptability of its indicators, and an explicit link between project-level sustainability scoring and a country's national SDG progress. Despite originating in the PPP framework, PIERS was designed to apply not only to PPP projects but also to infrastructure projects more generally. It is straightforward to use, functioning both as a self-assessment tool and as a practical guide that helps project developers ensure that the SDGs are systematically addressed throughout the project cycle.

1.3. The Slovenian Context

Slovenia provides an instructive case for examining the practical application of the PIERS methodology in a small EU Member State pursuing green and digital transformation, as defined, among other instruments, in the Slovenian Development Strategy 2030 [29] and the National Energy and Climate Plan (NECP) [30].

Slovenia demonstrates consistently strong overall performance in achieving the SDGs and ranks among the top-performing countries globally. According to the Sustainable Development Reports 2023–2025 [31–33], Slovenia ranked between 11th and 13th worldwide out of 166–167 countries, with a stable country score of approximately 81 points, well above

global and regional averages. This sustained high ranking indicates a mature and relatively coherent national framework for sustainable development implementation.

In thematic terms, Slovenia performs well, or is improving, across several social SDGs, including SDG 1 (No Poverty), SDG 3 (Good Health and Well-Being), SDG 5 (Gender Equality, although the 2025 report indicated stagnation) and SDG 10 (Reduced Inequalities). It also performs comparatively well on infrastructure-related SDGs, including SDG 7 (Affordable and Clean Energy), SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure) and, in particular, SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities), where progress in 2024 and 2025 moved towards SDG achievement. By contrast, persistent challenges remain in environmentally intensive domains, notably SDG 6 (Clean Water and Sanitation), SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production), SDG 13 (Climate Action), SDG 14 (Life below Water) and SDG 15 (Life on Land), as well as in certain social and partnership-related domains. These include SDG 2 (Zero Hunger), where obesity, human trophic level, sustainable nitrogen management and exports of hazardous pesticides significantly affect Slovenia's weaker performance, as well as SDG 4 (Quality Education), SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), SDG 16 (Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions) and SDG 17 (Partnerships for the Goals).

With regard to PPP implementation in Slovenia, the use of PPPs at the central-government level remains relatively limited. However, a significant number of PPP projects, programmes and initiatives have been implemented at the municipal level, particularly in cities [34]. In addition to social services and related infrastructure, including sports infrastructure and public kindergartens, these initiatives predominantly concern environmental protection public services, including drinking-water supply, wastewater drainage and treatment, municipal waste collection, treatment and disposal, and the cleaning of public roads and public spaces. They also address energy efficiency, renewable energy deployment and sustainable mobility. The general perception is that PPP implementation in Slovenia is broadly aligned with the principles of People-first PPPs.

Accordingly, this study analyses the use of the PIERS methodology in three green and sustainable PPP programmes implemented by city municipalities in Slovenia. It does so in order to identify differences and commonalities between the outcomes generated by the PIERS methodology and the findings of the global Sustainable Development Reports 2023–2025 for Slovenia.

1.4. Research Gap and Aim of the Study

Although the PIERS methodology has been conceptually endorsed by UNECE and the global PPP community, there is very little academic literature analysing its practical application. This constitutes a clear research gap. At the same time, the gap raises a further methodological question concerning the appropriate level or levels of analysis at which the use and effects of PIERS should be examined. This study therefore represents one of the first empirical contributions in the field. A multi-level analytical approach is both justified and necessary because it allows methodological implications and policy-relevant insights to be identified across different layers, while also highlighting avenues for future research based on broader datasets and a larger number of case studies.

The analysis is therefore conducted at three interconnected levels: (1) the operational level, focusing on the sustainability performance of individual PPP programmes; (2) the national level, examining the alignment between project-level outcomes and the institutional, legal and policy framework governing PPPs and SDG performance in Slovenia; and (3) the methodological cross-context refinement level, which evaluates the PIERS framework itself in order to identify opportunities for enhancing its adaptability, robustness and applicabil-

ity across different project types, sectors and institutional contexts, drawing on empirical insights from its practical application.

At the operational level, the study focuses on three specific PPP programmes, which serve as empirical case studies for assessing the practical applicability and analytical value of the PIERS methodology. This level of analysis also identifies common strengths and weaknesses across the PIERS outcomes and criteria in all three PPP programmes, thereby indicating areas that could be systematically improved. No comparable project-level analysis aimed at identifying existing challenges and improvement potential has yet been conducted for projects at the national level. This therefore represents a clear research gap.

At the national level, a further research gap arises from the lack of systematic comparative analysis linking PIERS results to national SDG indicators in any country. In particular, no existing studies test the applicability of PIERS or compare its project-level outcomes with national SDG performance data. This limits understanding of how effectively project-level sustainability performance and assessment results reflect macro-level SDG progress. The present study therefore also conducts the analysis at the national level. Although it is based on a small number of case studies, it helps identify pathways for future research using larger samples. It makes a particular contribution to SDG 9 and lays a foundation for further research in this field. UNECE already maintains a substantial body of PPP and infrastructure project cases from a wide range of countries and regions, which are systematically presented at UNECE PPP Forums [35–43]. At these Forums, projects are also recognised as best practice examples by the global PPP community; awards are granted following selection by a global PPP expert jury and, where awards are organised, voting by Forum participants.

At the framework level, the study moves beyond empirical assessment and engages in methodological reflection on the PIERS framework. Drawing on insights from project-level application and national-level comparison, this level seeks to identify the structural strengths and limitations of the methodology, including issues related to indicator coverage, weighting, data availability and applicability across different PPP and infrastructure project types. It therefore constitutes a cross-context assessment aimed at enhancing the methodological robustness, transferability and policy relevance of the PIERS framework. PIERS is currently being applied in its initial version, and further methodological development is envisaged. In this context, research-based and cross-contextually grounded proposals for refinement are particularly timely and relevant.

1.5. Scope of the Study, Objectives, Research Questions, and Contribution

This study examines the application and further development of the UNECE PIERS methodology as a sustainability assessment instrument for public investment projects. Its empirical scope is limited to selected green PPP and infrastructure projects implemented in Slovenia, covering energy efficiency, renewable energy generation and sustainable mobility. Its analytical scope extends beyond individual projects to include the national legal and policy framework governing PPPs, as well as a methodological cross-context refinement of the PIERS framework informed by empirical application. Although the findings are grounded in the Slovenian context, the study is designed to generate insights relevant to broader PPP and infrastructure governance settings.

The primary objective of the study is to assess how the PIERS methodology supports the systematic integration of the SDGs into PPP and infrastructure project implementation. More specifically, the study aims to: (i) evaluate the sustainability performance of selected PPP projects using the PIERS framework; (ii) examine the extent to which project-level PIERS outcomes align with, and contribute to, Slovenia's national SDG performance and PPP regulatory framework; and (iii) identify opportunities for refining the PIERS method-

ology in order to enhance its applicability, robustness and policy relevance across different institutional and project contexts.

In line with these objectives, the study addresses the following research questions:

RQ1: Project-level perspective—How can the systematic application of the PIERS methodology at the PPP project or programme level improve the implementation of specific PPP projects and programmes, while revealing sustainability strengths and weaknesses in the analysed projects and, through a review of PPP-related legislation, identifying underlying causes of performance issues?

RQ2: National-level perspective—To what extent do PIERS project-level results align with and contribute to Slovenia's national SDG performance?

RQ3: Methodological cross-context PIERS refinement perspective—How can the PIERS methodology be further refined, on the basis of cross-context empirical evidence, to improve its adaptability and effectiveness across diverse PPP and infrastructure project types?

This study contributes to the literature and practice of sustainable public investment governance in three main ways. First, it provides empirical evidence on the application of the PIERS methodology in a national PPP context, illustrating its practical value as a sustainability assessment tool. Second, it develops policy-relevant insights by linking project-level evaluation results with national SDG performance and PPP regulation, thereby informing potential legal and institutional improvements. Third, by adopting a methodological cross-context refinement perspective, the study offers research-based recommendations for the further development of the PIERS framework and contributes to ongoing international discussions on the evaluation and governance of People-first PPPs.

2. Materials and Methods

This study adopts a qualitative, multi-level research design combining a targeted review of the academic literature, policy documents and reports with document analysis, case-study analysis, structured self-assessment informed by participant observation, comparative analysis and analytical synthesis. Participant observation refers to the author's direct professional involvement in the preparation, implementation, assessment and evaluation of PPP projects using the PIERS methodology. This involvement enabled contextual understanding of project documentation, evaluation challenges and methodological limitations as they arise in practice. The methodological approach is explicitly aligned with the three analytical levels of the study—operational or project level, national level, and methodological cross-context refinement level—and is designed to answer the three research questions set out in Section 1.5.

First, a targeted review of the academic and policy-oriented literature was conducted in order to establish the analytical context of the study. The review focused on two complementary strands. The first addressed SDG-related research with particular reference to Slovenia, including national SDG performance, infrastructure development, the energy transition, sustainable mobility, and the role of public investment and PPPs in achieving SDG 9 and related goals. This strand drew primarily on official SDG monitoring publications, including the Sustainable Development Reports 2023–2025. The second strand examined the PIERS methodology and the People-first PPP concept. It included UNECE methodological documents, PPP Forum case studies and the limited academic literature discussing sustainability evaluation frameworks for PPP and infrastructure projects. The literature review informed both the design of the empirical analysis and the interpretation of the results.

At the operational level, three PPP programmes implemented in Slovenia—covering energy efficiency, renewable energy generation and sustainable mobility—were assessed using the UNECE PIERS methodology. The assessment was carried out through a structured

self-evaluation process using the official PIERS Excel-based evaluation spreadsheet. Each project was assessed against the full set of PIERS criteria across the five outcome dimensions: access and equity, economic effectiveness and fiscal sustainability, environmental sustainability and resilience, replicability, and stakeholder engagement. Scores were assigned in accordance with the PIERS scoring guidance and were based on project documentation, contractual arrangements, the policy context and available performance data.

The three programmes were selected purposively rather than randomly, according to three explicit criteria. First, each had to be "green by nature", that is, directed at a core domain of environmental sustainability—energy efficiency, renewable energy generation or sustainable mobility. Second, each had to represent the most advanced practice available nationally, being widely regarded, both in Slovenia and within the international PPP community, as a leading or exemplary case of PPP delivery. Third, each had to embody an innovative delivery or financing approach rather than a routine procurement model. This purposive, best-case design was adopted deliberately: the study set out to examine whether, and to what extent, even Slovenia's most advanced and innovative green PPP projects align with and contribute to national SDG objectives. The author acknowledges that selecting exemplary projects entails a positive selection bias, and the findings are therefore not presented as statistically representative of Slovenian PPP practice as a whole. The choice is, however, analytically deliberate and conservative: because the cases represent best practice, the strong sustainability scores reported below should be interpreted as an upper bound rather than as typical performance, whereas any weaknesses that emerge even in these leading projects—most notably in stakeholder engagement—are likely to reflect systemic rather than project-specific constraints. The small, purposively selected sample accordingly supports analytical rather than statistical generalisation.

Because the author was professionally involved in the preparation and implementation of the projects as well as PIERS assessment of the projects analysed—an involvement disclosed above as participant observation—particular care was taken to safeguard the objectivity of the evaluation, and several mutually reinforcing safeguards were applied. First, the underlying project outcomes had already been subject to external validation by the contracting parties themselves, namely the public and private partners involved in each project. Second, the preparation and implementation of each project drew on a multidisciplinary team of independent financial, technical and legal experts, whose inputs provided an additional check on the documentary basis used for scoring. Third, all three case studies were submitted to, and externally reviewed by, the international jury of the UNECE International PPP Forum (see Section 3.1.1), adding a further independent layer of scrutiny beyond the author's own assessment. Fourth, each PIERS score was triangulated against project documentation, contractual arrangements and available performance data rather than resting on the evaluator's judgement alone. The limits of these safeguards should nevertheless be stated transparently: the international jury did not examine the projects in full detail and was therefore not in a position to verify the precise accuracy of each individual self-assessment score, but rather attested to the consistency, plausibility and overall quality of project preparation, implementation and self-evaluation. The objectivity of the project-level scores therefore rests primarily on documentary triangulation and consistency of application, complemented—though not fully independently audited—by these external safeguards. It should further be noted that, in the case of the sustainable mobility project, the international jury observed that certain self-assessment scores might be set too high. In response, the relevant self-evaluation was subsequently reviewed and, for the purposes of this study, confirmed. As explained in greater detail below, this confirmation reflected the specific nature of the project: stakeholder engagement had to be pursued with particular care in order to make implementation feasible, while the

application of the PIERS methodology also prompted consideration of aspects not originally envisaged—most notably, the project's effect on water resources (for example, the ecological washing of vehicles without/with the use of recycled water).

The basic characteristics of all three PPP programmes are described in Section 3 in order to support understanding and ensure consistency in the project-level analysis. It should also be clarified that, although the PIERS methodology is most effective when applied at the project planning stage—where it supports the integration of sustainability considerations into project design—it also provides valuable feedback and learning mechanisms during subsequent phases of project implementation and operation, thereby facilitating continuous improvement and alignment with SDG objectives [26]. Nevertheless, for all PPP programmes analysed in this study, the PIERS methodology was applied after project implementation, namely during the operational and management phase. This post-implementation evaluation enabled a more comprehensive assessment of actual project performance and provided a robust empirical basis for the second- and third-level analyses undertaken in this study.

Following the individual programme assessments, a cross-project comparison was conducted to identify common strengths and weaknesses across the three PPP programmes. Descriptive comparison and qualitative synthesis were used to analyse patterns in the scoring results, with particular attention to criteria that consistently received lower scores. This analysis formed the empirical basis for addressing RQ1.

At the national level, the aggregated results of the three PIERS project assessments were compared with Slovenia's official SDG performance, as reported in the Sustainable Development Reports 2023–2025. This comparison focused on the SDGs most closely aligned with the PIERS framework and the analysed projects, with SDGs 7, 9, 11 and 13 serving as the main analytical reference points, while all other SDGs were also taken into account. The method applied at this stage was qualitative comparative analysis, which examined whether areas of strong or weak performance identified through PIERS at the project level corresponded with national SDG trends and indicator performance. This made it possible to assess coherence, or divergence, between project-level sustainability outcomes and national SDG progress, thereby addressing RQ2.

In parallel with the project-level self-evaluation, the author systematically documented PIERS criteria for which scoring proved difficult, ambiguous or insufficiently applicable to certain types of PPP projects. These observations were recorded during the evaluation process in order to reduce retrospective bias. At the analysis stage, the identified criteria were subjected to systematic methodological review, assessing whether the observed challenges reflected project-specific limitations or more structural methodological issues. The criteria were examined in relation to their conceptual clarity, data requirements, relevance across different project types and alignment with SDG targets. This step employed analytical reflection and cross-context synthesis to determine whether targeted refinement, clarification or adaptation of specific PIERS criteria would be methodologically justified. The results of this analysis informed the development of research-based recommendations for enhancing the PIERS framework and addressed RQ3.

Together, these dimensions form a recursive and multi-scalar framework in which learning at one level informs action at another. Project-level results provide empirical evidence; national frameworks can translate such evidence into policy and regulatory mechanisms; and global methodological development supports the continuous evolution of evaluation standards. This structure enables the study to contribute simultaneously to applied evaluation practice, national policy design and international methodological discourse. Table 1 summarises the analytical framework.

Table 1. Summary of the analytical framework.

Level of Analysis	Analytical Focus	Methods Applied	Main Contribution
Project Level	Application of PIERS to three Slovenian PPP programmes (energy efficiency, solar energy, sustainable mobility)	Qualitative scoring, document analysis, cross-project comparison	Identification of project-specific and common sustainability strengths and weaknesses
National Level	Comparison of the project implementation sustainability strengths and weaknesses with the Sustainable Development Reports for Slovenia	PPP-related law review; comparative analysis of PIERS evaluation with SDG outcomes and national SDG indicators	Policy recommendations for better integration of PIERS outcomes and criteria and SDG principles in PPP regulation
Methodological Cross-Context Refinement Level	Refinement of the PIERS methodology for broader applicability	Comparative analysis drawing from empirical insights of practical PIERS implementation with the PIERS framework itself	Recommendations for enhancement

The study relies in large part on self-evaluation, which is an inherent feature of the PIERS methodology. To mitigate subjectivity, assessments were based on documented evidence and applied consistently across all three PPP programmes. The empirical scope of the study is also limited by the relatively small number of case studies analysed, which restricts the generalisability of the findings. In addition, because the three cases were purposively selected as exemplary, best-case green PPP projects, the findings are subject to a degree of positive selection bias and are intended to support analytical rather than statistical generalisation. The author's direct involvement in the assessed projects constitutes a further potential source of bias; as described in Section 2, this was mitigated through external validation by the contracting partners, the input of independent financial, technical and legal experts, review by the UNECE PPP Forum jury and documentary triangulation, although it could not be entirely eliminated. Relatedly, and as explained in more detail in Section 3.2.1, the study assesses the projects' plausible contribution to national SDG progress rather than empirically demonstrated impact, given its reliance on self-assessed, ex post PIERS scores and a small, purposively selected sample.

Qualitative scoring and narrative assessment were carried out for each PIERS dimension in accordance with UNECE's official guidance. Analysis of project documentation, feasibility studies and available evaluation reports enabled comparison across cases and the identification of common performance patterns. Across all analytical levels, the study employs a qualitative comparative research design that integrates document analysis, secondary data review and interpretative synthesis. Primary materials include publicly available project-level documentation, feasibility studies, contractual documents and policy texts related to PPP implementation. Secondary sources include official statistical datasets, national SDG reports, and UNECE methodological and guidance documents. Data organisation, coding and tabulation were performed using standard office software tools. The research did not involve interviews, personal data or direct research participation by human subjects; therefore, ethical approval was not required.

Generative artificial intelligence tools were used exclusively in a supportive and non-substantive manner, in line with journal ethics and transparency requirements. Specifically, ChatGPT (ChatGPT Plus, GPT-5), provided by OpenAI (San Francisco, CA, USA), was used as an assistive tool for selected initial data-analysis and writing-related tasks. In addition, Elicit Free, provided by Elicit Research, PBC (Covina, CA, USA; originally developed within

Ought, San Francisco, CA, USA), and HyperWrite Premium, provided by OthersideAI (New York, NY, USA), were used as AI-based research assistants to support literature screening and the identification of relevant academic sources. The specific versions used were ChatGPT Plus (model GPT-5) and Claude Max (model Claude Sonnet 4.5); Elicit (Elicit Free, https://elicit.com/) and HyperWrite (HyperWrite Premium, https://www.hyperwriteai.com/) were used in their web-based versions available in timeframe October 2025 till June 2026, as these tools are continuously updated and are not distributed under discrete release version numbers. HyperWrite Premium was also used for rewriting and summarising earlier drafts of the paper. During the revision stage, Claude Max (Claude Sonnet 4.5), provided by Anthropic, PBC (https://www.anthropic.com/, San Francisco, CA, USA), was used to assist in implementing the amendments suggested by the reviewers. All outputs generated with AI assistance were critically reviewed, verified and edited by the author, who takes full responsibility for the accuracy, originality and integrity of the final manuscript.

3. Results

3.1. Project-Level Perspective

3.1.1. Structure of the Project-Level Analysis

At the operational level, three Slovenian PPP projects, which were later, de facto, further developed into programmes due to excellent project results, were assessed using the UNECE PIERS methodology. The case studies were selected from a broader pool of Slovenian PPP initiatives and were deliberately chosen as "green by nature" projects, addressing key domains of sustainable public investment. The selected cases cover energy efficiency and retrofit of public buildings, sustainable mobility, and solar energy generation with an emphasis on local energy self-sufficiency. Together, they reflect diversity in project type, sectoral focus, and implementation scale, while remaining comparable in terms of governance structure and sustainability ambition. The three programmes are widely recognised as examples of good practice in Slovenia, both at the national level and within the international PPP community. Their quality and sustainability performance have been acknowledged beyond the national context, with the international PPP community recognising the projects as examples of sustainable PPP implementation. In particular, for two of the analysed programmes (energy efficiency and retrofit of public buildings [44], and sustainable mobility—both the overall project quality and the application of the PIERS methodology were externally reviewed and validated by an international jury within the framework of the UNECE PPP and Infrastructure Forum. This external validation strengthens the credibility of the self-evaluation results and provides additional assurance regarding the consistency of the scoring process.

The project-level analysis was structured in two sequential steps. First, each PPP programme was analysed individually in order to provide a concise description of its objectives, scope, governance model and sustainability focus. These descriptions contextualise the PIERS assessment and clarify the relevance of each project to the People-first PPP principles. Sections 3.1.2–3.1.4 therefore present brief overviews of the scoring results for the three case studies.

Second, a comparative analysis of the PIERS results was conducted across the three case studies. This comparison identifies common patterns in scoring outcomes, highlighting the PIERS dimensions and criteria in which all three projects achieved the highest scores, as well as those in which scores were consistently lower. The comparative assessment makes it possible to identify cross-cutting strengths and weaknesses that are not project-specific but instead indicate broader characteristics of PPP implementation in Slovenia.

From a PPP project-management perspective, outcome areas with consistently lower scores may indicate systematic challenges affecting the successful implementation of sustainability-oriented PPPs. Given the scope and limitations of the present study, the subsequent analysis focuses exclusively on the PIERS outcome dimension that received the lowest scores across the three projects. This targeted focus allows for a more detailed examination of underlying causes and provides a structured basis for the following sections, in which these findings are analysed further in relation to national-level conditions and methodological implications.

3.1.2. Energy Retrofit of Public Buildings in the City of Ljubljana Under the Energy Performance Contracting PPP Approach

Launched in 2013 following the adoption of a Decree by the City Council [45], the Energy Retrofit of Public Buildings in the City of Ljubljana programme (the EOL programme) represents one of the largest energy performance contracting (EPC)-based PPP initiatives in Central and Eastern Europe. The programme addresses Ljubljana's extensive stock of energy-inefficient public buildings through successive public tenders (EOL 1–4, with EOL 5 in preparation), covering more than one hundred facilities by the end of 2025, including schools, kindergartens, cultural institutions and administrative buildings.

The project was implemented under the Slovenian Public–Private Partnership Act (PPP Act) [46], using the EPC model. The total investment amounts to approximately EUR 60 million, excluding VAT, with a contract duration of 15 years. It is financed through a blended structure combining EU Cohesion Fund grants, municipal contributions and private capital from energy service companies (ESCOs). The tendering process was conducted in accordance with EU law through competitive dialogue and was fully digitised, using certified e-procurement platforms to ensure transparency and accountability [47].

The programme is expected to generate cumulative savings of approximately 400,000 MWh of energy and a reduction of around 80,000 tonnes of CO_2, equivalent to the sequestration capacity of 3.2 million trees or approximately 8000 hectares of forest, over the project life cycle. It demonstrates the scalability of aggregated EPC projects, the effectiveness of competitive dialogue for complex PPPs and the potential of EPC-based models to deliver significant environmental benefits while maintaining fiscal sustainability for local authorities [48].

EPC is a financing mechanism for energy efficiency measures based on the involvement of an ESCO. The ESCO typically provides financing and guarantees a defined level of energy savings, with its remuneration directly linked to the achievement of those savings. Throughout the repayment period, the ESCO remains responsible for measuring and verifying savings [49].

As shown in Table 2 below, and in greater detail in Appendix A, the PIERS evaluation of the EOL programme yields an overall composite score of 88 per cent (Excellent rating), with dimension scores ranging from 79 to 95 per cent. The highest score is in replicability (95 per cent), which is attributable to the programme's standardised contractual model and aggregated tender structure (EOL 1–4), both of which facilitate transfer to other municipalities. Access and equity, economic effectiveness and fiscal sustainability, and environmental sustainability and resilience score identically (89 per cent each), reflecting the programme's inclusive service delivery, the value-for-money structure of the EPC model and measurable energy efficiency and emission outcomes.

By contrast, stakeholder engagement (79 per cent) is the relatively weakest dimension of the assessment, although it still attains a Good rating. This result suggests that, while basic mechanisms for information provision, public participation and grievance handling are in place, more systematic and institutionalised approaches to stakeholder

involvement—such as mandatory structured engagement plans, measurable participation outcomes or independent oversight mechanisms—could further strengthen project performance. Overall, the dimension-specific variation locates the programme's principal scope for improvement not in its technical or economic design but in the formalisation of stakeholder engagement practices.

3.1.3. Implementing Electromobility in Slovenia Under the PPP Approach

In November 2019, the City Council of Kranj adopted a decree establishing a public–private partnership for the implementation of the "Electromobility in the City of Kranj" project [50] in accordance with the PPP Act [46]. The public tender was published in February 2020 [51] and conducted under the competitive dialogue procedure. The project was structured as an EPC scheme, enabling capital investment to be financed through operational savings generated by the transition from fossil-fuel vehicles to electric mobility. The concession contract was signed at the end of 2020, with a total project value of approximately EUR 5.1 million, excluding VAT.

A comprehensive and integrated approach was embedded in the decree. The central premise of the project was that the introduction of electric vehicles should not place additional pressure on the electricity distribution system. The project was therefore structured around an integrated three-pillar concept: (i) replacement and long-term management of the municipal vehicle fleet with electric vehicles equipped with domicile charging stations; (ii) establishment and operation of public electric charging infrastructure; and (iii) installation of solar power plants to ensure renewable energy supply for electromobility.

The project was also structured in accordance with the EPC model, which had until then been applied primarily to the energy refurbishment of public buildings in Slovenia and across the EU. Because the operating costs of fossil-fuel vehicles are substantially higher than those of electric vehicles, the replacement of the fleet—combined with further optimisation opportunities and improved vehicle use through sharing—generated measurable savings that were then used to cover the project's investment costs.

Upon full implementation, the project is expected to achieve annual energy savings of at least 452 MWh and a reduction of approximately 150 tonnes of CO_2, equivalent to the amount absorbed by about 7700 trees. It thereby demonstrates a scalable and replicable model for sustainable urban mobility through public–private partnerships [34].

The programme records an overall composite score of 97 per cent—the highest of the three cases. Its dimension scores range narrowly, from 94 to 100 per cent, with access and equity and replicability both at 100 per cent. These scores indicate that the project ensures universal and equitable access to clean energy solutions while relying on a highly transferable and scalable implementation model that can be adapted to other local contexts.

Equally strong performance is observed in economic effectiveness and fiscal sustainability (95 per cent) and environmental sustainability and resilience (95 per cent), confirming that the programme delivers substantial environmental benefits, particularly in terms of renewable energy generation and emission reduction, while maintaining a sound economic structure and long-term fiscal viability. Stakeholder engagement (94 per cent) also achieves an Excellent rating, suggesting that transparent communication and effective feedback processes are well-embedded throughout the project life cycle. Nevertheless, stakeholder engagement remains the lowest-scoring dimension for this project. Overall, the narrow spread across dimensions (94–100 per cent) indicates a balanced profile.

3.1.4. Green Energy on Public Buildings in the City of Ljubljana Under the PPP Model

The Green Energy Project in the City of Ljubljana is a larger-scale renewable energy initiative implemented through a PPP concession model, primarily structured as a

design–finance–build–operate–transfer (DFBOT) scheme and complemented by features typical of a power purchase agreement (PPA). Following the adoption of the decree by the City Council [52], the procurement was conducted through a competitive dialogue procedure [53] in accordance with EU and national law. The concession contract for Green Energy I was signed in October 2023, while the public tender for Green Energy II was published in July 2025.

Green Energy I is valued at approximately EUR 5 million in capital expenditure (CAPEX), financed primarily by the concessionaire and supplemented by contributions from the EU Cohesion Fund, the Republic of Slovenia and a minor share from the City of Ljubljana. The project focuses on the installation, operation and maintenance of photovoltaic power plants on public buildings, combined into a community self-supply scheme that enables the internal distribution of electricity among municipal users.

To the greatest extent possible, the project was designed as an off-grid solution in order to avoid imposing unnecessary burdens on the distribution grid, whose capacities are often limited even in urban areas. The concession duration is 17 years. The project envisages nearly 5 MW of installed photovoltaic capacity and annual electricity production exceeding 5200 MWh. By maximising on-site consumption and minimising grid dependency, it enhances energy resilience and price stability for public institutions while avoiding additional public debt. Over its lifetime, the project is expected to reduce CO_2 emissions by approximately 2500 tonnes, equivalent to the sequestration capacity of approximately 95,000 trees. It therefore illustrates the application of hybrid PPP–PPA models to urban renewable energy deployment [54].

The PIERS evaluation of the Green Energy Ljubljana programme yields an overall composite score of 89 per cent (Excellent rating), closely mirroring the EOL programme's profile. Replicability (95 per cent) is again the highest-scoring dimension. This reflects a robust project structure, clear contractual arrangements and high potential for scaling and transferability to other municipalities and project contexts.

High scores in access and equity (91 per cent), economic effectiveness and fiscal sustainability (91 per cent), and environmental sustainability and resilience (91 per cent) further demonstrate that the programme delivers inclusive and affordable energy solutions, achieves sound economic performance over the project life cycle and generates substantial environmental benefits aligned with climate and energy objectives. By contrast, stakeholder engagement (79 per cent) is the comparatively weakest dimension, although it still attains a Good rating. This result suggests that, while basic engagement and communication mechanisms are in place, there remains scope for more systematic and structured stakeholder involvement, particularly in relation to formal participation processes and the monitoring of engagement outcomes. Overall, as with the EOL programme, stakeholder engagement is the dimension with the clearest scope for improvement.

3.1.5. Comparative Analysis of the Three Programmes

Overall, the PPP programmes achieved their strongest results in replicability (97 per cent), access and equity (93 per cent), environmental sustainability and resilience (92 per cent), and economic effectiveness and fiscal sustainability (92 per cent). These results reflect advanced technical capacity and a strong focus on performance, feasibility, bankability and environmental objectives. Conversely, stakeholder engagement received the lowest average score (84 per cent), indicating persistent challenges in participatory governance.

A closer examination of the results suggests that the consistently strong performance in the first four PIERS dimensions—access and equity, economic effectiveness and fiscal sustainability, environmental sustainability and resilience, and replicability—can largely be attributed to the Slovenian legal and institutional framework governing public projects and

PPPs. These outcomes are either directly regulated or indirectly shaped by mandatory procedural and substantive requirements, which require public partners to devote systematic attention to the relevant policy objectives.

Table 2. Performance comparison of PPP programmes across PIERS outcome categories [55].

PIERS Outcome	EPC Ljubljana	Green Energy Ljubljana	e-Mobility Kranj	Average Performance
Access and Equity	89% (Excellent)	91% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)	93% (Excellent)
Economic Effectiveness and Fiscal Sustainability	89% (Excellent)	91% (Excellent)	95% (Excellent)	92% (Excellent)
Environmental Sustainability and Resilience	89% (Excellent)	91% (Excellent)	95% (Excellent)	92% (Excellent)
Replicability	95% (Excellent)	95% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)	97% (Excellent)
Stakeholder Engagement	79% (Good)	79% (Good)	94% (Excellent)	84% (Excellent)
Overall PIERS Composite	88%	89%	97%	92% (Excellent)

With regard to access and equity, Slovenian PPP legislation explicitly anchors PPP projects in the concept of public interest. Article 2 of the Public–Private Partnership Act (hereinafter also: the PPP Act) [55] stipulates that PPP projects must pursue the public interest, which in Slovenian legal doctrine is understood as an interest defined and regulated by law. This inherently requires consideration of access, availability and equal treatment of users. In addition, many essential services, such as healthcare, education and municipal utilities, are predominantly organised and delivered either directly by the public sector or through PPP arrangements rather than through purely private provision. This structural characteristic is partly the result of historical development: Slovenia, as part of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, inherited a strongly socially oriented model of service provision, in which universal access and equity remain deeply embedded normative principles [56,57].

Similarly, the high scores achieved under economic effectiveness and fiscal sustainability are closely linked to the comprehensive public–private partnership and public finance framework. Article 23 of the Public Finance Act [58] requires feasibility analyses to be prepared for all public projects with budgetary implications at all stages of the project. This obligation is further elaborated by the Government Decree on the Uniform Methodology for the Preparation and Assessment of Investment Documentation in the Field of Public Finance [59], which precisely defines the content and sequence of mandatory documents, including the project fiche, pre-feasibility study with mandatory updates, feasibility study, implementation study and project implementation reports, referred to collectively here as feasibility studies. These requirements impose rigorous ex ante and ex post economic scrutiny and significantly raise the standard of fiscal discipline and value-for-money assessment.

Additional safeguards apply in PPP-specific contexts. The PPP Act mandates the preparation of a "PPP Test" under Article 34 in cases involving unsolicited proposals, requiring comparison and evaluation between the prepared feasibility study and unsolicited proposals. Only if the test is positive may the public tender be prepared. Moreover, Article 25 of the Certain Concessions Act requires a "Study on Justification for the Award of a Concession", including additional analytical elements, inter alia state-aid analysis, for all concessions exceeding approximately EUR 5.4 million in combined CAPEX and OPEX over the concession life cycle.

Environmental sustainability and resilience are likewise strongly supported by mandatory legal requirements. Feasibility studies must explicitly address environmental impacts, and projects with significant environmental effects are subject to environmental impact assessment procedures. Environmental considerations are therefore systematically inte-

grated into project preparation and decision-making, which is reflected in the uniformly high PIERS scores for this dimension.

By contrast, replicability is not formally regulated as a standalone requirement. The excellent results observed in the analysed projects are therefore best explained by the proactive approach of municipal contracting authorities in Slovenia, which develop individual projects into broader programmes. In particular, the full publication of tender documentation, including contractual arrangements, on the national public procurement portal reflects a strong commitment to transparency and aligns with the principles of open contracting. This practice facilitates knowledge transfer, benchmarking and replication by other public authorities, even in the absence of explicit legal obligations.

The weakest and most variable dimension across the projects is stakeholder engagement. Unlike other PIERS outcomes, stakeholder engagement in Slovenia is not mandated at any specific stage of the PPP procedure and is largely left to the discretion and institutional maturity of public partners. Meaningful stakeholder engagement [60] is time- and resource-intensive and may affect project timelines, which often makes contracting authorities reluctant to implement it systematically. The relatively favourable scores achieved in the three analysed projects can be attributed to the high level of awareness and proactivity of the two public partners, who recognised that effective project delivery is difficult without stakeholder involvement. However, it is reasonable to assume that stakeholder engagement scores in many other PPP projects in Slovenia might be significantly lower.

Notably, the higher score for stakeholder engagement in the e-Mobility Kranj project reflects the fact that such engagement was essential to the project's success. The project incorporated a sharing-economy dimension, whereby two or more schools, each of which had previously operated its own combined vehicle, would jointly use a shared vehicle. Resistance to implementation was considerable, as the public perceived that vehicles would effectively be "taken away" from them. Successful implementation therefore required a significantly higher level of stakeholder engagement than would ordinarily be expected in comparable projects.

Nevertheless, an important formal safeguard indirectly supporting stakeholder participation is the requirement that, before launching a PPP, a government regulation for state-level PPPs or a municipal decree adopted by the municipal or City Council for local-level PPPs must be adopted. These acts are publicly disclosed before adoption, enabling the general public to submit comments and proposals. This mechanism resembles the approach commonly referred to as "notice-and-comment rulemaking", whereby draft legislation or regulatory acts are published in advance to enable public participation in the decision-making process [61]. While valuable, this safeguard remains limited in scope and cannot substitute for systematic stakeholder engagement throughout the project life cycle.

To make the basis of the stakeholder engagement scores explicit and comparable across the three cases, the assessment can be read against a consistent set of governance factors: institutional arrangements, stakeholder participation, communication mechanisms, conflict management, responsiveness to feedback and independent oversight. In terms of institutional arrangements, all three projects rest on an equivalent basis—anchoring in the PPP Act and the adoption of a municipal decree—which explains the absence of significant differences in their underlying governance structures. Communication mechanisms were likewise comparable and relatively strong across all three projects, reflecting the preliminary market consultation with potential private partners (regulated in Articles 31—35 of the PPP Act), pre-adoption disclosure of the enabling decree, which functions as a notice-and-comment opportunity for the public; later publication of the decree itself in the national Official Gazette; publication of tender documentation on the national notification platform and the Supplement to the Official Journal of the EU (TED—Tenders Electronic

Daily); the use of fully digitised competitive dialogue procurement; and a full publication of the contracts in all three PPPs being analysed in this paper as the open-contract principle in Slovenia applies fully to PPP and concession contracts as well. The principal divergence in scores arises from the remaining factors. Stakeholder participation, conflict management and responsiveness to feedback were exercised far more intensively in the e-Mobility Kranj project, where active engagement was indispensable to overcoming public resistance to vehicle-sharing arrangements; this is reflected in its markedly higher score (94 per cent, Excellent). In the EPC and Green Energy programmes in Ljubljana, both rated Good, engagement relied principally on the formal notice-and-comment safeguard and standard contractual dispute-resolution provisions, without comparable participatory intensity or documented feedback loops. Independent oversight was present in each case through the energy savings measurement and verification obligations inherent in the EPC and concession structures, although this oversight is contractual and operational in nature rather than the product of a dedicated independent body. Read together, these factors account for both the consistently solid and the comparatively lower stakeholder engagement scores, and confirm that the principal scope for improvement lies in formalising wider stakeholder participation—extending engagement beyond the potential private partners already reached through the preliminary market consultation—and feedback mechanisms rather than in institutional or oversight arrangements.

3.1.6. Findings on Research Question 1

The systematic application of the PIERS methodology at the project and programme level demonstrably enhances the implementation of PPP projects and programmes by providing a structured framework for evaluating critical performance dimensions, including all PIERS outcomes. The high scores achieved in the first four PIERS dimensions across the analysed programmes show how procedural and substantive legal requirements embedded in Slovenian PPP legislation require public partners to address key policy objectives systematically, thereby improving project outcomes.

Access and equity outcomes benefit from the explicit legal anchoring of PPP projects in the public interest, which requires equal availability and equal treatment of users. This legal basis ensures that projects inherently consider social dimensions and is reinforced by Slovenia's historically socially oriented model of service provision.

Economic effectiveness and fiscal sustainability are strengthened through rigorous public finance regulations requiring comprehensive feasibility studies and economic scrutiny both before and after project implementation. These legislative provisions foster fiscal discipline and value-for-money assessment, which are crucial for project viability and sustainability.

Environmental sustainability and resilience are systematically integrated into project planning through mandatory environmental impact assessments and the explicit inclusion of environmental considerations in investment documentation, which the PIERS methodology captures effectively.

Although replicability is not a formal legal requirement, proactive transparency practices in Slovenia, such as the publication of full tender documentation and contracts, promote knowledge sharing and benchmarking, thereby facilitating the replication and scaling of successful projects.

By contrast, stakeholder engagement emerges as the weakest dimension, primarily because there are no explicit legislative mandates for participatory stakeholder engagement throughout the PPP life cycle. Its reliance on the discretion and institutional maturity of public partners leads to inconsistent application and lower scores. Although procedural safeguards, such as public disclosure of regulatory acts before the launch of a PPP, provide

limited opportunities for public input, they are not sufficient substitutes for systematic stakeholder involvement. This gap shows how the PIERS methodology can reveal critical weaknesses and encourage stronger governance practices.

In summary, when applied systematically at the project and programme level, the PIERS methodology not only improves the implementation of PPP projects by aligning evaluation with existing legal and procedural frameworks, but also identifies sustainability strengths and weaknesses rooted in those frameworks. This dual role supports evidence-based improvements in PPP design and execution and highlights the need for stronger stakeholder engagement requirements to address persistent governance challenges.

3.2. National-Level Perspective

3.2.1. Structure of the National-Level Analysis

The analysis in this section integrates macro-level SDG performance trends for Slovenia, as reported in the Sustainable Development Reports 2023–2025, with micro-level sustainability evidence derived from the UNECE PIERS evaluation of three representative green PPP programmes. This multi-scalar perspective allows both structural convergence, where project performance reinforces national progress, and divergence, where systemic or institutional barriers prevent project success from translating into national acceleration, to be identified.

This analysis assesses plausible contribution rather than demonstrated impact. It goes beyond conceptual alignment by testing whether project-level PIERS results are coherent with national SDG trends, but stops short of demonstrated impact, which would require project-attributable, counterfactual data and a larger, systematic sample. The PIERS assessments were conducted ex post, during implementation or operation, but rest on structured self-assessment rather than independent verifiable or even certified measurement. Findings of an SDG "contribution" are therefore qualitative and directional, following the logic of contribution analysis as developed by Mayne [62], rather than statistical attribution. In particular, effects of this kind cannot be measured or attributed at the level of a single project: the e-Mobility Kranj programme, for instance, is mapped to SDG 3 (Good Health and Well-Being) on the basis of reduced air pollution from electric vehicles, yet no project-level data demonstrate an actual improvement in public health in Kranj, and such an improvement could not realistically be isolated at the scale of one project.

To answer RQ2—"To what extent do PIERS project-level results align with Slovenia's national SDG performance and contribute to it?"—two types of analysis are conducted. First, all 17 SDGs are examined from the perspective of the contribution of individual projects to each specific SDG, including their degree of alignment and potential contribution. On the basis of this analysis, the SDGs most relevant to the three programmes under consideration are identified, followed by a more detailed assessment of the projects' contribution to those SDGs.

3.2.2. Comparative Analysis of Average PPP Programme Performance Across PIERS Outcome Categories and Contribution to Slovenia's National SDG Performance

From the project perspective, as described above, the EPC Ljubljana programme achieves excellent scores in environmental and fiscal dimensions, underscoring strong alignment with SDG 7 (Affordable and Clean Energy) and SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure). However, lower results in stakeholder engagement (79 per cent) reveal limitations in public participation processes, corresponding to weaker national performance under SDG 17 (Partnerships for the Goals) and certain aspects of SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities). The project shows significant potential for replication and scaling, with very high scores under the replicability dimension, suggesting that the EPC model

could be expanded further nationally if institutional support for participatory governance were strengthened.

The Green Energy Ljubljana programme has an almost identical sustainability profile to EPC Ljubljana, with environmental and economic dimensions above 90 per cent. It is particularly notable for strong outcomes in transparency, fiscal management and replicability, which relate to Slovenia's improved national SDG 11 performance in 2024 and 2025. However, stakeholder engagement (79 per cent) remains lower, indicating that project benefits could be better internalised by the local community. Although technological and financial indicators are strong, societal participation and behavioural change lag behind.

The e-Mobility Kranj PPP demonstrates the most balanced and comprehensive performance among the three programmes, reaching near-perfect scores across all five PIERS dimensions, including 94 per cent in stakeholder engagement. This exceptional result positions the Kranj e-Mobility initiative as a model People-first PPP, reflecting direct contributions to SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure), SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities) and SDG 13 (Climate Action). The project's success in community engagement, participatory planning and transparent communication contrasts with the weaker engagement observed in the other two cases and provides evidence of how inclusive governance can strengthen environmental and replicability outcomes.

The analysis below as also summarised in Table 3 examines the alignment between the SDGs and the performance of the three PPP projects evaluated using the PIERS methodology. Although the PIERS framework is structured primarily around PIERS outcomes and criteria, its results have varying degrees of direct, indirect, neutral and corrective alignment with national SDG targets. In other case studies, negative alignment could also arise, although that is not the case here. By reviewing each SDG individually, the analysis shows how PIERS outcomes support, complement or remain neutral in relation to Slovenia's progress towards the global goals. This provides a more nuanced understanding of how local project impacts resonate with broader sustainability objectives.

SDG 1—No Poverty

Slovenia consistently ranks among the top countries for poverty reduction, maintaining a very low at-risk-of-poverty rate and broad access to social protection systems. Between 2023 and 2025, progress remained stable, with no significant new initiatives altering the trajectory. The PIERS methodology does not directly address poverty alleviation, but its employment and affordability elements, particularly the AE and EE dimensions, indirectly support SDG 1 through local job creation and reduced municipal energy expenditure. The alignment is therefore indirect. As all three analysed projects achieved Excellent results in the PIERS AE and EE dimensions, they indirectly contribute to SDG 1.

SDG 2—Zero Hunger

Food security has been achieved nationally, although major challenges remain, as described above. Performance remains stable. The three PPP projects are not food-sector initiatives, although improved municipal budgets resulting from energy savings may release resources for programmes related to SDG 2. The alignment is therefore indirect and positive.

SDG 3—Good Health and Well-Being

Health outcomes remain strong, although air quality externalities related to mortality remain a continuing challenge. The e-Mobility Kranj project contributes directly to urban air quality improvement by reducing transport emissions and therefore supports SDG 3. The EPC Ljubljana programme also contributes to improved air quality by reducing the energy consumption required for the operation of public buildings. This reduction decreases

reliance on energy sources traditionally associated with air pollution, including district-heating plants. Similarly, the Green Energy Ljubljana initiative ensures that the energy needed for public-building operations is generated from an environmentally friendly, non-polluting source. Collectively, all three programmes have a direct impact on SDG 3, particularly on the indicator measuring the age-standardised death rate attributable to household and ambient air pollution per 100,000 population, which remains a significant challenge in Slovenia.

Table 3. Comparative classification of SDG alignment and contribution patterns in PIERS-evaluated PPP programmes.

Alignment Group	SDGs	Main Characteristics of Alignment
Strong direct reinforced alignment	SDG 3; SDG 5; SDG 7; SDG 11; SDG 16	Projects directly advance SDGs by enhancing environmental quality, reducing emissions, promoting gender inclusion, ensuring transparent governance, and improving sustainable urban infrastructure and energy efficiency. They strengthen national achievements in these SDGs, often surpassing national trends, particularly in SDG 7 (and SDG 13, which we categorised below in category of corrective alignment).
Direct corrective incremental or transformative alignment	SDG 6; SDG 13;	Projects directly address relevant SDG dimensions, but impacts remain partial, developmental, or corrective. Contributions are visible in innovation diffusion, employment support, resilience planning, and water-efficiency measures, although broader structural national challenges persist. Micro-level projects outperform macro-level trends.
Direct reflective alignment	SDG 8; SDG 9	Projects reflect the same structural limitations as observed nationally. Their contribution is direct and coherent with national SDG priorities, but also reproduces broader systemic weaknesses.
Indirect positive alignment	SDG 1; SDG 2; SDG 4; SDG 10; SDG 15; SDG 17	Projects indirectly support these SDGs by enhancing affordability, educational infrastructure, equitable service access, and biodiversity through reduced pollution, as well as generating financial savings that bolster public sector capacity, social programmes, and related partnerships. Their contributions are supportive rather than primary.
Indirect partial/limited alignment	SDG 12; SDG 14	Projects demonstrate positive project-level practices, particularly regarding circular economy and environmental sustainability, but impacts remain insufficiently systemic or only indirectly connected to broader SDG targets.

SDG 4—Quality Education

Education and skill indicators continue to face persistent challenges, with progress remaining stagnant in national SDG performance. Each of the three programmes incorporates training and capacity-building elements in accordance with the PIERS EE4 criterion. At the same time, all three programmes improve educational conditions by focusing on the infrastructure, equipment and energy standards necessary for the effective and high-quality operation of schools. These initiatives therefore contribute to the development of human capital and generate micro-level improvements that align indirectly with SDG 4.

SDG 5—Gender Equality

Slovenia demonstrates relatively strong performance on SDG 5; however, the 2025 report indicates stagnation in progress. All three initiatives address gender inclusion

through employment and equal-opportunity clauses under EE 4.5, and women were proactively engaged in all three initiatives. The connection with SDG 5 is therefore direct.

SDG 6—Clean Water and Sanitation

The continuing challenge of scarce-water consumption embodied in imports negatively affects Slovenia's performance on SDG 6, although performance on this indicator improved between 2023 and 2025. None of the projects is primarily or directly linked to SDG 6 in terms of water consumption and wastewater discharge. However, after applying the PIERS methodology, opportunities were identified in all three projects for influencing water consumption and wastewater discharge, including ecological waterless vehicle cleaning, the installation of drinking fountains in schools and analysis of the feasibility of solar-panel cleaning solutions. The alignment is therefore direct, with all three programmes affecting freshwater withdrawal and use in a corrective way.

SDG 7—Affordable and Clean Energy

Slovenia demonstrates strong performance in achieving SDG 7, although challenges remain, particularly in increasing the share of renewable energy in the overall energy mix. PIERS scores for all projects reach 100 per cent on energy efficiency and GHG reduction under ES1. The projects directly operationalise SDG 7 by achieving energy savings and renewable energy integration at the municipal level. This demonstrates strong convergence, as the projects reinforce national leadership in SDG 7.

SDG 8—Decent Work and Economic Growth

Progress towards Decent Work and Economic Growth in Slovenia is hindered by several factors. These include the prevalence of modern slavery and modern slavery linked to imports, the significant number of young people not in employment, education or training, and fatal work-related accidents. These issues limit the potential for improved employment rates and productivity growth. PIERS project results for EE4, ranging from 71 to 84 per cent, show that systematic challenges also exist at the project level, namely that issues related to enhanced employment and economic opportunities are addressed implicitly rather than explicitly. Alignment between the PIERS results for all three projects and national SDG 8 results is direct and coherent, reflecting structural constraints. In other words, the projects reflect the same structural limitations as those observed nationally.

SDG 9—Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure

SDG 9 is one of Slovenia's flagship SDGs. Slovenia performs well on all indicators in the 2025 report, with the exception of expenditure on research and development as a percentage of GDP, which has been achieved but is stagnating, similarly to the female share of graduates from science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields at the tertiary level. Internet access by income also lags slightly behind, although remaining challenges are improving.

All three projects perform excellently on economic effectiveness and replicability, with scores of at least 90 per cent, indicating strong capacity for innovation diffusion. However, the PIERS score for the environmental sustainability and resilience criterion ES5 is slightly lower, ranging from 76 to 86 per cent. ES5 aims to ensure that a comprehensive risk and resilience assessment is carried out, addressing climate change, acute shocks and chronic stressors, while ensuring that adequate funding is allocated for project and community resilience and disaster management. The criterion also focuses, inter alia, on securing resources for research, innovation, capacity-building and awareness programmes. Alignment between PIERS results for all three projects and national SDG 9 results is therefore direct and coherent but also reflective, as the projects reproduce the same structural limitations as those observed nationally.

SDG 10—Reduced Inequalities

Slovenia performs well on SDG 10, although the elderly poverty rate prevents full achievement of the goal. PIERS access and equity scores, ranging from 89 to 100 per cent and most closely linked to SDG 10, confirm equitable access and affordability in the analysed projects, indicating that PPP benefits are not regressive. The projects therefore maintain Slovenia's strong equity profile and reinforce SDG 10 outcomes, although the alignment is indirect.

SDG 11—Sustainable Cities and Communities

National trends for SDG 11 between 2023 and 2025 were mixed but steadily improved over the three-year period observed. According to the 2025 report, only the annual mean concentration of PM2.5 is stagnating, and there are no data for access to an improved piped water source as a percentage of the urban population in the SDG report for Slovenia, although the situation in terms of piped water supply is favourable [63,64]. All three projects demonstrate excellent average performance overall, directly and correctively supporting the achievement of SDG 11, which is already on track according to the 2025 report. Notably, the projects exhibit outstanding replicability scores, which was a critical factor in their development into broader programmes. The replicability outcome is a composite measure: if other evaluation criteria do not receive very good or excellent scores, a project is unlikely to progress into a programme.

SDG 12—Responsible Consumption and Production

Slovenia faces major challenges in achieving SDG 12, and progress is stagnating. Project evidence in the ES dimension is excellent across all three projects: ES1 scores 100 per cent for all projects; ES2 ranges from 72 to 100 per cent; and ES3 ranges from 87 to 100 per cent. These results show substantial integration of circular practices and a generally strong corrective and indirect contribution to achieving SDG 12, especially in relation to production-based air pollution and production-based nitrogen emissions in kg per capita. The alignment is nevertheless partial, as project-level excellence has not yet scaled into system-wide behavioural change.

SDG 13—Climate Action

Slovenia remains nationally off track on SDG 13, as emission reductions are insufficient and adaptation is lagging. However, all three PPPs achieve outstanding environmental performance, with scores between 89 and 95 per cent and quantified CO_2 and GHG reductions, as well as risk-management planning. This represents direct convergence and corrective alignment: micro-level projects outperform macro-level trends, indicating implementation strength but insufficient policy diffusion.

SDG 14—Life below Water

Although Slovenia is largely landlocked, it remains nationally off track on SDG 14. All three projects contribute only indirectly and to a minor extent to progress on SDG 14 through their influence on water and air quality affecting biodiversity. This indicates indirect neutral-corrective alignment.

SDG 15—Life on Land

Challenges remain in relation to SDG 15, and progress is stagnant. Biodiversity pressures and import-related deforestation remain relevant. Projects involving nature-conservation components achieve strong ES4 biodiversity scores, ranging from 75 to 100 per cent, and therefore indirectly and correctively influence SDG 15. Micro-level leadership thus complements moderate national progress.

SDG 16—Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions

Governance indicators remain relatively high nationally. The projects also achieve scores of 96 to 100 per cent under Zero Tolerance to Corruption (EE1), ensuring transparency and legality in PPP procurement. The projects therefore show strong alignment with SDG 16, particularly in relation to the corruption perception index indicator.

SDG 17—Partnerships for the Goals

Slovenia faces significant challenges in relation to SDG 17, although it is moderately improving. At the project level, the initiatives are not explicitly associated with SDG 17. However, they may indirectly improve outcomes by reducing the financial resources required to operate the physical infrastructure necessary for delivering health and educational services. These savings could then be reallocated to other sectors.

3.2.3. Findings on Research Question 2

The analysed case studies demonstrate outstanding environmental and fiscal sustainability, as shown in Section 3.1, suggesting a solid micro-foundation for achieving targets under SDGs 7, 9, 11 and 13. At the national level, however, the Sustainable Development Reports 2023–2025 show that progress on SDG 7 (Affordable and Clean Energy) and SDG 9 (Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure) is moderately improving rather than accelerating. Nevertheless, the vast majority of indicators for SDGs 7 and 9 have been achieved: the 2025 report states that, for SDG 7, only the renewable energy share indicator has not been achieved, while for SDG 9, the gap in the Internet access indicator has not yet been closed.

By contrast, SDG 13 (Climate Action) faces major challenges and is stagnating, primarily because of structural and institutional factors beyond the control of individual projects. Public opinion is also not strongly supportive of Climate Action, which may correlate with weaker stakeholder engagement results. Social cost–benefit analyses are not mandatory [65]. In a 2023 survey, only 41 per cent of Slovenians, compared with an EU average of 46 per cent, identified climate change as one of the four most serious problems facing the world [66,67].

Among the most relevant SDGs to which these programmes contribute and which serve as analytical reference points, only SDG 11 (Sustainable Cities and Communities) showed stronger results in 2024 and 2025, with the trend on track or maintaining SDG achievement. This is also because cities in particular are acting proactively and implementing various projects, including the three PPP programmes analysed in this paper, often replicating good results achieved by other cities [68]. Unfortunately, municipalities without urban-municipality status often lack sufficient administrative capacity, expertise and project scale to achieve measurable progress, owing to the high degree of territorial fragmentation in Slovenia. The country has a population of approximately two million inhabitants and 212 municipalities, of which only 12 have urban-municipality status, while the smallest municipality has fewer than 1000 inhabitants [69].

Accordingly, the alignment between the three analysed PPP programmes and the most relevant SDGs is: strong direct reinforced alignment for SDGs 7 and 11, as national progress is on track or maintaining SDG achievement and the projects reinforce it; direct corrective alignment for SDG 13, as national progress is weak and the projects act as corrective exemplars; and direct reflective alignment for SDG 9, as the projects reproduce broader systemic weaknesses.

This pattern underscores a key finding: Slovenia's PPPs are technically and environmentally mature but institutionally under-leveraged. To translate excellent project outcomes into greater national SDG acceleration, stronger stakeholder engagement frameworks, horizontal policy integration and systematic upscaling mechanisms are required.

3.3. Methodological Cross-Context Refinement of PIERS as a Global Framework

3.3.1. Analysis Structure

The cross-context methodological refinement was conducted alongside the application of the PIERS methodology to the three PPP programmes. The evaluation focused not only on project performance but also on the operational functionality, adaptability and contextual sensitivity of the PIERS framework. The analysis therefore assessed both project outcomes and methodological behaviour across different project environments.

This level of analysis emphasised methodological observation and refinement. Systematic records were kept on the applicability of individual PIERS indicators across projects; the methodology's flexibility in relation to project-specific characteristics; the clarity of indicators and scoring criteria; sensitivity to local governance, institutional and infrastructural contexts; and the balance between quantitative and qualitative elements.

Particular attention was given to identifying indicators that were consistently effective across all projects and those whose usefulness depended on sectoral or contextual factors. This distinction enabled the identification of both universally transferable elements and elements requiring contextual adaptation.

These observations informed the development of a cross-context refinement framework designed to enhance the adaptability, analytical precision and operational relevance of the PIERS methodology across diverse PPP and infrastructure projects.

A limitation of this research is that all three PPP programmes, despite differing in design and implementation, relate to connected sectors, namely energy efficiency, sustainable infrastructure and urban environmental transition. The empirical foundation for broad cross-sector methodological refinement is therefore limited. The findings accordingly generate context-specific proposals rather than universally applicable adaptations. Future research should extend the empirical application of PIERS to markedly different sectors, such as healthcare, water management, waste management, digital and social infrastructure, nature preservation, heritage, or transport logistics. Such broader application would allow more robust validation of indicator adaptability, contextual sensitivity and methodological transferability across diverse governance and infrastructure settings.

3.3.2. Analysis and Findings for Research Question 3

On the basis of the analysis of the PIERS User Guide and the comparative assessment logic, one of the strongest recommendations for methodological refinement is the broader and more systematic introduction of an explicit "Not Applicable" (N/A) option for indicators whose relevance depends heavily on sectoral, geographical, governance or operational context. Although PIERS acknowledges contextual flexibility, the current absence of a clear operational N/A option in certain places often requires users to select numerical scores for indicators that are not substantively relevant to the project being assessed. This may artificially distort project evaluation outcomes and negatively affect the overall PIERS score, particularly in projects with limited environmental, social, operational or stakeholder-related impacts in specific assessment areas. The introduction of more explicit and consistently applicable N/A mechanisms would therefore improve methodological proportionality, scoring accuracy and cross-sector comparability.

The analysed projects and the structure of PIERS suggest that several criteria or indicators require clearer or expanded N/A applicability options, as presented in Table 4.

Table 4. PIERS criteria and indicators requiring clearer or expanded N/A applicability options.

Criteria/Indicator	Reasoning for Additional N/A Option
AE1.3: Evidence that improved access to essential services is changing the lives of affected stakeholders.	Demonstrating measurable "transformation" of stakeholder lives may not be proportionate or realistically measurable for smaller-scale projects. Alternatively, the word "transformed" could be replaced with "improved".
AE3.2: Use of an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment to identify and reduce the project's direct and indirect social effects on host and affected communities.	Full Environmental and Social Impact Assessments may not be proportionate for small, medium-sized or low-impact projects with minimal direct social disruption. Alternatively, the wording should allow for adequate measures that do not require a full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment. This indicator also appears to duplicate indicator 4.1, "Is the project conducting an ESIA?", which is mandatory and has an N/A option.
EE4.3: Targeted training and capacity-building to close local workforce skill gaps for groups facing employment barriers.	Formal workforce-transition or labour-market transformation measures may not apply where projects involve limited employment restructuring.
ES1.1.1: Calculation of annual greenhouse-gas emissions across the project's lifetime.	Although this is not the case in the initiatives analysed in this paper, certain projects may not have material direct GHG-emission sources requiring detailed annual life cycle calculations.
ES1.1.2 (mandatory indicator): A plan or strategy to cut or offset greenhouse-gas emissions over the project's lifetime.	Although this is not the case in the initiatives analysed in this paper, some projects may not realistically develop standalone GHG-offset strategies.
ES1.1.3: Measures to cut or offset greenhouse-gas emissions relative to global norms or recognised industry standards, including possible certification.	Although this is not the case in the initiatives analysed in this paper, comparison against global norms or certification systems may not be proportionate for certain types of projects or for smaller and medium-sized projects.
ES4.2: An environmental management plan (EMP) to avoid, mitigate or restore impacts in the affected area.	Development of a full environmental management plan for biodiversity impacts may not be proportionate for some projects, as was the case in the analysed projects. Because the projects indirectly contribute to biodiversity protection through reduced pollution, they were scored 5 in the PIERS methodology, although no EMP specifically protecting biodiversity was developed. An N/A option would have been more appropriate had it existed.
ES4.2: Preservation or improvement of terrestrial and aquatic habitat functionality with local authorities or recognised conservation initiatives.	Habitat-preservation partnerships are not equally relevant for all projects, for example, urban energy efficiency or public-building modernisation programmes with minimal ecosystem interaction.
ES5.4.2: A community-driven development (CDD) programme that plans poverty-related measures to inform its design.	Poverty-oriented resilience planning may not directly relate to all projects.
ES5.4.3: A community-driven development (CDD) programme using a socio-economic resilience indicator to inform its design.	Socio-economic resilience indicators may be disproportionate for certain projects.
ES5.4.4: A community-driven development (CDD) programme aligned with the Disaster Mitigation Law in its targets, standards, best practices and institutional set-up.	Alignment with formal disaster-law institutional frameworks may not apply equally across governance and project contexts.
RE1.2: Project replicability or scalability that enables economies of scale and wider economic benefits, such as the circular economy.	In certain, although rare, cases, a project may not be replicable despite achieving excellent project results. The methodology should clearly acknowledge this possibility rather than requiring users to choose one of the numerical options.
SE1.3: Metrics to measure the effectiveness, inclusiveness and outcomes of stakeholder engagement and public participation.	Comprehensive public participation structures and metrics may be disproportionate for certain projects with a low public interface or for small and medium-sized projects. Their costs could significantly increase project preparation and implementation costs. An N/A option would be preferable, similar to that for indicator SE1.4, which acknowledges this reality.

As shown above, the comparative application of the PIERS self-assessment tool revealed potential improvements in the treatment of several indicators. Although certain

indicators already include an explicit N/A option, this approach is not implemented consistently across the methodology or the Excel-based assessment tool. As a result, users may in practice be required to assign numerical scores to indicators that are not substantively relevant to the specific project type, sectoral context or operational characteristics. This may artificially influence category-level and overall PIERS scores. A more systematic and consistently operationalised N/A framework would therefore improve methodological proportionality, scoring accuracy and cross-sector comparability, while preserving the integrity and flexibility of the methodology.

4. Discussion

This study sheds light on how the PIERS methodology functions across project-level, national-level and methodological dimensions in Slovenia's sustainable PPP landscape, revealing both significant achievements and important challenges.

These findings also speak directly to the bodies of literature identified at the outset. The literature on sustainable infrastructure assessment has noted the absence of unified, multidimensional tools that integrate economic, social and environmental performance at the project level; by operationalising PIERS across three cases, this study provides empirical evidence of how such a tool performs in practice and where its indicators require refinement. The PPP-governance literature has tended to evaluate partnerships primarily through value-for-money and fiscal lenses; the present analysis extends this by foregrounding stakeholder engagement and institutional arrangements as decisive—and frequently limiting—factors in sustainability performance. Finally, the literature on SDG evaluation has struggled to connect project-level outcomes to national progress; by reading the PIERS results against Slovenia's national SDG trends, the study offers a concrete, if exploratory, means of linking the project and national levels. In this way, the analysis engages with, rather than merely restates, the gaps set out in Section 1.

With regard to RQ1, the project-level analysis shows that the PIERS methodology is a robust framework for evaluating the sustainability dimensions of PPP projects. Its systematic application demonstrates how Slovenia's legal and procedural framework embeds key sustainability criteria into project design and implementation. The strong outcomes achieved in access and equity (AE), economic effectiveness and fiscal sustainability (EE), environmental sustainability and resilience (ES), and replicability (RE) indicate that the analysed projects are firmly rooted in the public interest and fiscal rigour, and are supported by strong regulatory and environmental safeguards.

However, the persistent weakness in stakeholder engagement (SE) exposes a governance gap that is not adequately addressed by existing legislation. The absence of mandatory structured participatory processes results in uneven stakeholder involvement, often depending on institutional discretion rather than formal policy requirements. The resources required for meaningful engagement also play an important role: where engagement is not mandatory, it may not be applied consistently. The same resource logic applies to oversight: a dedicated independent oversight body is not standard practice in Slovenian PPPs, and where an oversight committee is established, it tends to be formed ad hoc and drawn from members of the implementation team rather than from independent experts, since genuinely independent oversight would entail additional cost. Importantly, this gap is concentrated in the project preparation and implementation phases. Once a project enters its operational phase, monitoring and grievance procedures are typically a contractual responsibility funded by the private partner, complemented by the public partner's standard administrative oversight, and at that stage they function adequately; the principal shortfall therefore lies in securing wider stakeholder engagement and independent scrutiny earlier in the project cycle, before and during implementation. PIERS's ability to identify

this shortcoming highlights its value not only as a measurement instrument but also as a diagnostic tool capable of informing governance reform. Strengthening stakeholder engagement through clearer mandates and structured practices could substantially enhance the social legitimacy and long-term sustainability of PPP and infrastructure initiatives.

The PIERS scores reported here should also be read in the light of the project life cycle. A project's PIERS profile is not static: scores may evolve as a project moves from preparation through implementation to operation, and the methodology arguably delivers its greatest value when applied at the preparation stage, since weaknesses identified at that point can still be addressed in design and during implementation. In the present study, the three programmes were assessed ex post, during their implementation or operation phase, rather than at preparation; a single-point, retrospective assessment of this kind cannot fully capture how a project's scores shift across phases, which is a limitation of the analysis. The case programmes, however, are replicated initiatives—repeated by the same municipality and, in part, taken up by other municipalities—so that lessons from earlier editions informed improvements in subsequent ones. This cross-edition learning, reflected in the programmes' strong replicability scores (Section 3.1.5), provides a degree of dynamic, life cycle-oriented improvement, even though each individual evaluation was conducted at a single point in time.

With regard to RQ2, the relationship between Slovenia's PPP project outcomes and national SDG progress reveals a complex and nuanced pattern of alignment, characterised by varying degrees of reinforcement, correction, reflection and indirect support across different SDGs.

The projects make a strong and proactive contribution to SDGs such as Good Health and Well-Being (SDG 3), Gender Equality (SDG 5), Affordable and Clean Energy (SDG 7), Sustainable Cities and Communities (SDG 11), and Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions (SDG 16). Through tangible improvements in environmental quality, emission reductions, the promotion of gender inclusion, transparent governance, and improvements in urban infrastructure and energy efficiency, these initiatives reinforce national sustainability achievements and, in some respects, go beyond prevailing national trends. This is especially evident in relation to SDG 7 and in the corrective contribution of the analysed projects to SDG 13, confirming the strategic value of Slovenia's green PPP portfolio.

For Clean Water and Sanitation (SDG 6) and Climate Action (SDG 13), the projects act as important corrective forces. Their contributions to resilience planning, water-efficiency measures and emission reduction are visible and meaningful at the project level, but remain partial and developmental in relation to broader national challenges. This suggests that, although systemic issues persist, these PPP initiatives provide valuable examples that could inform policy refinement and scaling.

In areas such as Decent Work and Economic Growth (SDG 8) and Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure (SDG 9), the projects tend to reflect the structural limitations visible at the national level. Their performance aligns with national priorities and contributes directly to these goals, but it also reproduces challenges that extend beyond individual project boundaries.

Beyond direct contributions, the projects indirectly support SDGs related to poverty reduction, Zero Hunger, Quality Education, Reduced Inequalities, Life on Land, and Partnerships for the Goals (SDGs 1, 2, 4, 10, 15 and 17). By improving affordability, enhancing educational infrastructure, ensuring equitable access to services, reducing pollution and strengthening public sector financial capacity, the projects support broader sustainability goals even where their impact is not primary. Similarly, with regard to Responsible Consumption and Production (SDG 12) and Life below Water (SDG 14), the projects demonstrate promising practices, especially in relation to circular economy and environmental

sustainability. However, their influence remains indirect and insufficiently systemic to drive transformative national progress.

A notable divergence appears in the area of stakeholder engagement, where the projects score lower despite their technical and environmental maturity. This governance gap mirrors national challenges in participatory governance and multi-sector partnerships, limiting the ability to scale and integrate sustainability outcomes effectively. It also constrains the translation of project-level technical success into broader national SDG acceleration.

Overall, the integrated analysis shows that Slovenia's PPPs strongly reinforce, and in some cases correct, national SDG trajectories. At the same time, they reflect systemic constraints and provide indirect support where direct impact is less feasible. To move beyond steady progress towards accelerated national SDG achievement, Slovenia should strengthen institutional frameworks for stakeholder engagement, improve horizontal policy integration and develop mechanisms for replicating and scaling successful project models. These priorities are essential for bridging the gap between micro-level project excellence and macro-level sustainability impact.

Future research could examine whether similarly high levels of direct alignment can be identified in other countries and in other institutional contexts.

With regard to methodological refinement and cross-context adaptability (RQ3), the study identifies opportunities to improve the adaptability and evaluative precision of the PIERS framework. Although the analysis is limited to three initiatives in related sectors, the main methodological challenge identified concerns the imposition of numerical scores on indicators that may lack substantive relevance in specific project contexts. This can distort evaluation outcomes and compromise cross-sector comparability. Introducing a more explicit and consistently applied "Not Applicable" (N/A) option would mitigate this problem, enabling assessments that are more accurate, proportionate and context-sensitive.

Such methodological enhancement would strengthen the validity and flexibility of PIERS across a diverse range of PPP and infrastructure projects. It is particularly relevant for sectors or project types in which certain sustainability criteria may be peripheral. A clearer and more systematic N/A mechanism would help prevent artificial score inflation or deflation and would support more nuanced decision-making and policy-relevant evaluation. By incorporating such refinements, PIERS would be better positioned to support international discussions on sustainable public–private partnerships and the assessment of People-first infrastructure projects.

At the same time, the analysis conducted across all three analytical levels confirms that all 17 SDGs are reflected within the PIERS methodology. PIERS can therefore be regarded as a comprehensive sustainability assessment framework. Future research could further examine the relationship between national SDG indicators and PIERS indicators and explore whether the methodological framework should be expanded accordingly. However, any such expansion would likely increase the need for a broader and more systematically operationalised use of N/A categories in order to preserve methodological proportionality and cross-sector applicability.

A further consideration concerns why PIERS, rather than another framework, was selected for these cases. One key reason for choosing PIERS over other frameworks is its accessibility and purpose. PIERS was chosen because it is freely available and functions as a self-assessment and self-improvement tool rather than a certification scheme, which makes it suitable for small and medium-sized PPP and infrastructure projects that do not require—or cannot bear the cost of—formal certification, as well as for the exploratory, learning-oriented aims of this study. By contrast, the most prominent international reference point, the FAST-Infra Sustainable Infrastructure Label [70], is an investor-facing labelling system

grounded in ESG and resilience considerations that explicitly builds on a number of existing standards. The FAST-Infra Label is obtained through a third-party verification process, and certification is fee-based, with costs depending on the characteristics of the project and the verification scope. In the process of certification, the self-assessment is only the first step of the process [71]. The two instruments therefore serve different purposes: FAST-Infra provides an externally verified, investment-grade label oriented towards capital markets, whereas PIERS offers a voluntary, cost-free, SDG-oriented self-assessment designed to guide project preparation and continuous improvement. The latter is better suited to the public sector and mixed PPP contexts examined here, and to projects that do not require—or cannot bear the cost of—formal certification. It should be clarified that the FAST-Infra Label was reviewed only as one of several international reference frameworks for sustainable infrastructure as exemplarity listed in Section 1.1 of this paper.

5. Conclusions

Slovenia's PIERS-assessed PPP projects demonstrate a strong capacity to implement sustainability at the project level, particularly in relation to energy, innovation, environmental resilience and sustainable cities. The application of the PIERS methodology also identified areas for improvement in specific projects that had not originally been considered, including the potential influence of all three projects on drinking-water-related issues.

However, broader progress towards the SDGs depends on addressing institutional barriers, especially in participatory governance and Climate Action. By introducing mandatory participatory stakeholder engagement in PPP project preparation and implementation, and by embedding the PIERS methodology more extensively into project preparation, Slovenia could translate project-level successes into more systematic, widespread and coherent progress across all SDGs. This would help close the gap between isolated achievements and nationwide sustainability impact.

From a methodological perspective, refining the PIERS framework by improving its adaptability and introducing clearer options for context-specific relevance would enhance its effectiveness across diverse projects and sectors.

These conclusions should be read with their generalisability in mind. The findings derive from three exemplary, purposively selected green PPP programmes in a single EU Member State, Slovenia, and in the energy, environmental and mobility sectors; they cannot therefore be assumed to extend automatically to other sectors, to less successful or underperforming projects, or to different national and institutional settings. The PIERS methodology itself, however, is applied globally—including in less-developed countries and for less sophisticated projects—so that, while the specific scores reported here are context-bound, the assessment approach is transferable well beyond the cases examined.

Future research could therefore extend the analysis in several directions: to a broader range of infrastructure sectors, including, e.g., water utilities and waste management, to less successful cases, which would test the methodology's diagnostic value under weaker performance, and to other countries including non-EU contexts, in order to examine how differing governance and regulatory environments shape the results. A particularly promising resource in this respect is the publicly available library of PPP case studies already self-assessed according to the PIERS methodology and presented at successive UNECE International PPP Forums [72]. Although only the case presentations are published, while the underlying self-assessment workbooks are not publicly accessible, this growing collection offers a clear basis for comparative research and for analysing sustainability trends across different continents and sectors.

A more detailed comparative framework would further strengthen the transferability of these conclusions. Future research could define and test specific institutional

variables—such as rule-of-law indicators, the strength of civil society and the legal maturity of the public–private partnership framework—that may moderate how effectively PIERS can be applied in a given setting, and could develop a corresponding agenda for comparative, cross-country studies. A broader study of this kind could confirm or refute the correlations identified in the present article and surface additional ones. It should be emphasised, however, that the use of PIERS is not confined to the national level or to governments contemplating its adoption: as a voluntary self-assessment tool, it can be applied directly by any individual public or private partner to its own projects, so that its practical relevance extends well beyond state-level policy decisions.

Funding: This research received no external funding. However, the legal concepts for the projects analysed in this paper were developed and their implementation or replication supported by the technical assistance through the ELENA (European Local Energy Assistance) programme (https://www.eib.org/en/products/advisory-services/elena/index, accessed on 26 June 2026), which was at the time of the assistance a joint initiative by the EBRD/EIB and the European Commission under the Horizon 2020 programme (EBRD ELENA C33905/6526/27632, EIB ELENA-2018-136, EIB ELENA-2019-138).

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: The original contributions presented in this study are included in the article. Further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Boštjan Ferk for his constructive comments and suggestions for this paper. The author further acknowledges the use of AI-assisted technologies in the preparation of this manuscript, namely ChatGPT Plus (model GPT-5; OpenAI, San Francisco, CA, USA), Elicit Free (https://elicit.com/, Elicit Research, PBC, Covina, CA, USA), HyperWrite Premium (https://www.hyperwriteai.com/, OthersideAI, New York, NY, USA) and Claude Max (model Claude Sonnet 4.5); Anthropic, PBC (https://www.anthropic.com/, San Francisco, CA, USA), the versions and specific tasks of which are described in Section 2. All outputs generated with AI assistance were critically reviewed, verified and edited by the author, who takes full responsibility for the accuracy, originality and integrity of the final manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Appendix A

Nr.		EPC Ljubljana	Green Energy Ljubljana	e-MobilityKranj
	ACCESS AND EQUITY			
AE1.	PROVIDE ESSENTIAL SERVICES			
AE1.1	Identification of people's real needs from their economic and social situation through the stakeholder engagement process.	5	5	5
AE1.2	Organised contribution to expanding and improving essential services, including through circular economy processes.	5	5	5
AE1.3	Evidence that improved access to essential services is changing the lives of affected stakeholders.	5	5	5

Nr.		EPC Ljubljana	Green Energy Ljubljana	e-MobilityKranj
AE1.4	Avoidance, mitigation or offsetting of impacts on existing essential services.	N/A	N/A	N/A
AE1 score:		100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)
AE2.	ADVANCE AFFORDABILITY AND UNIVERSAL ACCESS			
AE2.1	Affordability: the project clearly and conservatively addresses the affordability capacity of its intended users across the life cycle, such that, inter alia:			
AE2.1.1 AE2.1.2	for a concessions PPP, the service provided by the project is and can be expected to remain reasonably affordable for the users including, if necessary, through special rules for those most vulnerable and disadvantaged. for a government-pay PPP, the costs of the service provided by the project can be accommodated within the available public sector budget.	5	5	5
AE2.1.3	Plans to monitor and regulate the effectiveness of affordability measures—preserving the project's financial balance and confirming costs below any alternative procurement form.	5	5	5
AE2.2	Accessibility: the project addresses the accessibility needs of its intended users across the life cycle under varying economic-development scenarios, such that, inter alia:			
AE2.2.1	Service accessible to all users, including the most vulnerable and disadvantaged.	4	4	5
AE2.2.2	Plans to monitor and regulate accessibility measures through nominal- and effective-access indicators and targets.	5	5	5
AE2 score:		88% (Excellent)	92% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)
AE1.	IMPROVE EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE			
AE3.1	Account taken of the historic equity and social justice context, with remedies delivered through the project.	5	5	5
AE3.2	Use of an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment to identify and reduce the project's direct and indirect social effects on host and affected communities.	3	3	5
AE3 score:		67% (Good)	67% (Good)	100% (Excellent)
AE4.	PLAN FOR LONG-TERM ACCESS AND EQUITY			

Nr.		EPC Ljubljana	Green Energy Ljubljana	e-MobilityKranj
AE4.1	Evaluation of accessibility- and equity-related impacts on performance and financial equilibrium across the life cycle.	5	5	5
AE4.2	Design, structuring, management and contracting of the project (via the tender contract template) so as to:			
AE4.2.1	Anticipate and respond to future affordability, accessibility and equity performance needs across the life cycle.	5	5	5
AE4.2.2	Share the project's benefits fairly among contract parties, users and affected communities over the life cycle.	5	5	5
AE4.3	Monitoring and orderly contract-adaptation mechanisms to sustain service delivery at acceptable performance over the project's life.	4	5	5
AE4 score:		93% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)
AE5.	AVOID/MINIMISE AND MITIGATE PHYSICAL AND ECONOMIC DISPLACEMENT			
AE5.1	Land acquired or temporarily used only for the project's unavoidable, exclusive and necessary needs.	5	5	5
AE5.2	Where land acquisition is unavoidable, the displacement process follows the UN Basic Principles and Guidelines on Development-based Evictions and Displacement (2007) [73].	N/A	N/A	5
AE5 score:		100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)
AE score:		89% (Excellent)	91% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)
	ECONOMIC EFFECTIVENESS AND FISCAL SUSTAINABILITY			
EE1.	AVOID CORRUPTION AND ENCOURAGE TRANSPARENT PROCUREMENT			
EE1.1	Adherence to the UNECE Zero Tolerance Approach to Corruption in PPP Procurement (ZTC) standard or its principles.	5	5	5
EE1.2	Approval of the project, PPP contract and private sponsor processed lawfully and with full transparency.	5	5	5
EE1.3	Transparent award of the project, namely:			
EE1.3.1	Through an open, transparent competitive tender.	5	5	5

Nr.		EPC Ljubljana	Green Energy Ljubljana	e-MobilityKranj
EE1.3.2	For unsolicited or non-competitive proposals, observance of the UNECE ZTC safeguards or their principles.	5	5	5
EE1.4	Absence of corruption or undue influence across identification, development and implementation.	5	5	5
EE1.5	A balanced contract reached through structured negotiation, based on the tender contract template.	4	5	5
EE1 score:		96% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)
EE2	MAXIMISE ECONOMIC VIABILITY AND FISCAL SUSTAINABILITY			
EE2.1	Delivery of "value-for-people", meaning:			
EE2.1.1	Net tangible and intangible social benefits from consistently higher service standards.	5	5	5
EE2.1.2	Positive externalities generated over the project's life in line with national strategy and programmes.	5	5	5
EE2.2	Generation of positive "value-for-money", meaning:			
EE2.2.1	Costs net of benefits of the chosen PPP model lower than a modern public procurement model.	5	5	5
EE2.2.2	A cost/benefit analysis favourable to the public party, weighing taxpayer outlay against the project's economic benefits and fees.	5	5	5
EE2.3	Transparent reflection of any budgetary impacts and revenues in public accounts, meaning:			
EE2.3.1	Positive assessment of the contract's fiscal sustainability and the authority's creditworthiness.	5	5	5
EE2.3.2	Open disclosure of direct-payment burdens, fiscal returns and contingent-liability debt to interested parties.	5	5	5
EE2.4	Maximisation of development impact and support for women's empowerment.	3	4	4
EE2 score:		90% (Excellent)	95% (Excellent)	95% (Excellent)
EE3.	MAXIMISE LONG-TERM FINANCIAL VIABILITY			
EE3.1	A private sponsor of sufficient technical, financial and reputational standing to finance, deliver, operate and adapt the project across its life and varying economic scenarios.	5	5	5
EE3.2	Contract revenues sufficient to cover operating and maintenance costs and repay capital plus a risk-commensurate target IRR over the life cycle.	5	5	5

Nr.		EPC Ljubljana	Green Energy Ljubljana	e-MobilityKranj
EE3.3	Identification and appropriate mitigation, allocation or sharing of the PPP's material risks and rewards in the contract or governing regulations.	4	5	5
EE3 score:		94% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)
EE4.	ENHANCE EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES			
EE4.1	Creation of a significant number of new local jobs during identification, development and implementation.	4	4	4
EE4.2	Creation of quality jobs consistent with the ILO Decent Work Indicators.	5	5	5
EE4.3	Targeted training and capacity-building to close local workforce skill gaps for groups facing employment barriers.	3	3	4
EE4.4	Plans, programmes and KPIs to ensure workforce diversity and inclusion.	3	3	3
EE4.5	Commitments to protect workers' rights, including:			
EE4.5.1	Women's rights.	4	3	5
EE4.5.2	Non-discrimination.	4	3	5
EE4.5.3	Prevention of workplace violence and harassment.	4	3	5
EE4.5.4	Equal pay for equal work.	4	3	5
EE4.5.5	Access to education and other essential services.	4	3	5
EE4 score:		76% (Good)	71% (Good)	84% (Excellent)
EE score:		89% (Excellent)	91% (Excellent)	95% (Excellent)
	ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY AND RESILIENCE			
ES1.	REDUCE GHG EMISSIONS AND IMPROVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY			
ES1.1	Greenhouse-gas emissions:			
ES1.1.1	Calculation of annual greenhouse-gas emissions across the project's lifetime.	5	5	5
ES1.1.2	A plan or strategy to cut or offset greenhouse-gas emissions over the project's lifetime.	5	5	5
ES1.1.3	Measures to cut or offset greenhouse-gas emissions relative to global norms or recognised industry standards, including possible certification.	5	5	5

Nr.		EPC Ljubljana	Green Energy Ljubljana	e-MobilityKranj
ES1.2	Energy efficiency:			
ES1.2.1	Regular calculation of the project's annual energy consumption per unit of output or service.	5	5	5
ES1.2.2	A plan or strategies to improve energy efficiency and cut the project's energy consumption.	5	5	5
ES1.2.3	Measures to reduce energy consumption per unit of output or service below national norms.	5	5	5
ES1.2.4	Improvement of building and facility energy performance indices (EPI, EUI) or compliance with the EU EPBD or an equivalent standard, measured as annual energy per built-up area against national norms.	5	5	5
ES1 score:		100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)
ES2.	REDUCE WASTE AND RESTORE DEGRADED LAND			
ES2.1	Circular economy:			
ES2.1.1	Investigation of using waste or excess resources from, or supplying them to, other local projects for beneficial reuse.	N/A	N/A	5
ES2.1.2	Calculation of material input per unit of service (MIPS) and reduction in raw-material intensity below national norms.	N/A	N/A	N/A
ES2.1.3	Preparation of an operational waste management plan that reduces waste, including hazardous waste, over the project's life.	N/A	3	N/A
ES2.1.4	Reduction in waste generation, including hazardous waste, per unit of output or service below the national industry norm.	N/A	5	5
ES2.1.5	Reduction in landfill diversion of residual waste, including hazardous waste, per unit of output or service below the national industry norm.	N/A	3	N/A
ES2.2	Siting on previously developed, barren or degraded land unsuitable for farming.	N/A	5	N/A
ES2.3	Restoration of equivalent degraded land within the project's impact area but outside its boundary.	N/A	N/A	N/A
ES2 score:		N/A	72% (Good)	100% (Excellent)
ES3.	WATER CONSUMPTION AND WASTEWATER DISCHARGE			

Nr.		EPC Ljubljana	Green Energy Ljubljana	e-MobilityKranj
ES3.1	Compliance with statutory treated-wastewater discharge norms, with features that minimise water-use and watershed impacts.	5	5	5
ES3.2	Strategies to cut freshwater use per unit of output or service below national norms.	5	N/A	4
ES3.3	Net-zero impact on the quantity and availability of fresh surface water and groundwater.	5	5	4
ES3 score:		100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)	87% (Excellent)
ES4.	PROTECT BIODIVERSITY			
ES4.1	Conduct of an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA).	3	N/A	5
ES4.2	An environmental management plan (EMP) to avoid, mitigate or restore impacts in the affected area.	5	5	5
ES4.3	Preservation or improvement of terrestrial and aquatic habitat functionality with local authorities or recognised conservation initiatives.	5	5	5
ES4 score:		75% (Good)	100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)
ES5.	ASSESS RISK AND PREPARE FOR DISASTER MANAGEMENT			
ES5.1	A well-articulated risk-reduction and mitigation strategy, with a response and recovery coordination mechanism agreed with host and affected communities.	5	4	4
ES5.2	Identification of funding from various sources, or provision of a budget, for:			
ES5.2.1	Asset losses.	5	5	5
ES5.2.2	Well-being losses.	5	5	5
ES5.3	Allocation of funds for research, innovation, capacity-building or awareness programmes.	5	3	5
ES5.4	A community-driven development (CDD) programme that:			
ES5.4.1	Identifies preventive, emergency and recovery actions for natural and human-induced disasters.	4	5	5
ES5.4.2	Plans poverty-related measures to inform its design.	3	3	4
ES5.4.3	Uses a socio-economic resilience indicator to inform its design.	2	3	4

Nr.		EPC Ljubljana	Green Energy Ljubljana	e-MobilityKranj
ES5.4.4	Aligns with the Disaster Mitigation Law in its targets, standards, best practices and institutional set-up.	3	4	5
ES5 score:		80% (Excellent)	76% (Good)	86% (Excellent)
ES score:		89% (Excellent)	91% (Excellent)	95% (Excellent)
	REPLICABILITY			
RE1.	ENCOURAGE REPLICABILITY AND SCALABILITY			
RE1.1	PPP designed using lessons learnt on common PPP issues and solutions.	5	5	5
RE1.2	Project replicability or scalability that enables economies of scale and wider economic benefits, such as the circular economy.	5	5	5
RE1.3	Higher revenue or lower life cycle costs through optimised design, resource efficiency, commercialisation or an innovative business model.	5	5	5
RE1 score:		100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)
RE2.	STANDARDISE PPP PREPARATION AND TENDER			
RE2.1	National template contracts providing financial and economic equilibrium, public adaptation rights in the public interest, and matching compensation rights for the private partner.	4	4	5
RE2 score:		75% (Good)	75% (Good)	100% (Excellent)
RE3.	ENHANCE GOVERNMENT, INDUSTRY AND COMMUNITY CAPACITY			
RE3.1	Assessment or successful transfer of knowledge, technology and skills from the private party to the public party or local community.	5	5	5
RE3.2	PPP strengthening government and project or industry capacity.	5	5	5
RE3.3	PPP strengthening local community capacity.	5	5	5
RE3 score:		100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)
RE4.	SUPPORT INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER			

Nr.		EPC Ljubljana	Green Energy Ljubljana	e-MobilityKranj
RE4.1	Innovative methods, technologies or processes that remove major barriers or create scalable, transferable solutions.	5	5	5
RE4.2	Transfer of technology or know-how supporting inclusive growth, service quality, sustainability and replicability.	5	5	5
RE4.3	Pursuit of recognition for the project's contributions to sustainability and resilience.	5	5	5
RE4.4	Initiation of further opportunities to enhance public, private and community capacity, efficiency and effectiveness.	5	5	5
RE4 score:		100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)
RE score:		95% (Excellent)	95% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)
	STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT			
SE1.	PLAN FOR STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION			
SE1.1	A stakeholder-mapping exercise identifying all parties directly or indirectly affected by, or interested in, the project.	4	3	5
SE1.2	A stakeholder engagement plan, including public participation, addressing each stakeholder's needs and the project's key issues.	4	3	5
SE1.3	Metrics to measure the effectiveness, inclusiveness and outcomes of stakeholder engagement and public participation.	2	3	3
SE1.4	An independent oversight committee monitoring the engagement and public participation process and the dissemination of project information.	2	3	5
SE1 score:		55% (Satisfactory)	50% (Satisfactory)	88% (Excellent)
SE2.	MAXIMISE STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION			
SE2.1	Stakeholder engagement and public participation plans implemented effectively, timely and inclusively across the project life cycle.	3	3	5
SE2.2	Members of the public, including environmental defenders, free to express views and participate without penalty, persecution or harassment.	5	5	5

Nr.		EPC Ljubljana	Green Energy Ljubljana	e-MobilityKranj
SE2.3	Stakeholder feedback that is:			
SE2.3.1	Incorporated into project plans, designs and processes, or used to inform decisions.	5	5	5
SE2.3.2	Treated fairly and equitably, in line with principles of social and environmental justice.	5	5	5
SE2.3.3	Sought to gauge satisfaction with the engagement process and the resulting decisions.	4	4	5
SE2 score:		83% (Excellent)	83% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)
SE3.	PROVIDE TRANSPARENT AND QUALITY PROJECT INFORMATION			
SE3.1	Quality, pertinent project information on PPP-for-SDGs outcomes made available to all stakeholders transparently, in a timely manner and accessibly, and embedded in the PPP contract.	4	4	5
SE3.2	Regular, publicly accessible reports summarising the outcomes of stakeholder engagement meetings.	5	5	3
SE3 score:		85% (Excellent)	85% (Excellent)	80% (Excellent)
SE4.	MANAGE PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND END USER FEEDBACK			
SE4.1	A process and mechanisms to manage public grievances and end-user feedback.	5	5	5
SE4.2	Public grievances and end-user feedback successfully addressed or resolved.	5	5	5
SE4.3	Public grievances, feedback and outcomes tracked and made available, subject to data-protection rules.	5	5	5
SE4 score:		100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)	100% (Excellent)
SE score:		79% (Good)	79% (Good)	94% (Excellent)

References

1. United Nations. Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development; Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly on 25 September 2015, A/RES/70/1; United Nations 2015. Available online: https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda (accessed on 10 October 2025).
2. Schmidt-Traub, G. Investment Needs to Achieve the Sustainable Development Goals: Understanding the Billions and Trillions; Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN). 2015. Available online: https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep15864 (accessed on 13 October 2025).
3. Miralles-Quirós, M.M.; Miralles-Quirós, J.L. Sustainable Finance and the 2030 Agenda: Investing to Transform the World. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 10505. [CrossRef]
4. Cernev, T.; Fenner, R. The Importance of Achieving Foundational Sustainable Development Goals in Reducing Global Risk. *Futures* **2020**, *115*, 102492. [CrossRef]

5. Arimoro, A.; Elgujja, A. Public-Private Partnership and the Achievement of Sustainable Development Goals: The Role of Subnational Governments. *SSRN Electron. J.* **2019**. [CrossRef]
6. Vasconcellos Oliveira, R. Back to the Future: The Potential of Intergenerational Justice for the Achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. *Sustainability* **2018**, *10*, 427. [CrossRef]
7. United Nations. *The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2023: Special Edition—Towards a Rescue Plan for People and Planet*; United Nations: New York, NY, USA, 2023. Available online: https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2023/The-Sustainable-Development-Goals-Report-2023.pdf (accessed on 25 September 2025).
8. United Nations. *The Pact for the Future; Draft Resolution Submitted by the President of the General Assembly; A/79/L.2, Seventy-Ninth Session, Agenda Item 123, Strengthening of the United Nations System*; United Nations: New York, NY, USA, 2024; p. 2. Available online: https://www.un.org/pga/wp-content/uploads/sites/109/2024/09/The-Pact-for-the-Future-final.pdf (accessed on 4 October 2025).
9. Kryshtal, H.; Briukhovetska, I.; Khimich, S. State and Business in Financing the Goals of Sustainable Development. *Sustain. Dev.* **2024**, *32*, 1–5. [CrossRef]
10. Singh, S.; Ru, J. Goals of sustainable infrastructure, industry, and innovation: A review and future agenda for research. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.* **2023**, *30*, 28446–28458. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
11. Woetzel, J.; Garemo, N.; Mischke, J.; Hjerpe, M.; Palter, R. *Bridging Global Infrastructure Gaps*; McKinsey Global Institute: New York, NY, USA, 2016. Available online: https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/capital-projects-and-infrastructure/our-insights/bridging-global-infrastructure-gaps (accessed on 3 November 2025).
12. OECD. Infrastructure. Available online: https://www.oecd.org/en/topics/policy-issues/infrastructure.html (accessed on 3 November 2025).
13. Guijie. Public–Private Partnerships for Sustainable Infrastructure Development. *J. Lifestyle SDGs Rev.* **2024**, *5*, e06622. [CrossRef]
14. Thacker, S.; Adshead, D.; Fay, M.; Hallegatte, S.; Harvey, M.; Meller, H.; O'Regan, N.; Rozenberg, J.; Watkins, G.; Hall, J.W. Infrastructure for Sustainable Development. *Nat. Sustain.* **2019**, *2*, 324–331. [CrossRef]
15. Mansell, P.; Philbin, S.P.; Konstantinou, E. Delivering UN Sustainable Development Goals' Impact on Infrastructure Projects: An Empirical Study of Senior Executives in the UK Construction Sector. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 7998. [CrossRef]
16. Mansell, P.; Philbin, S.P.; Konstantinou, E. Redefining the Use of Sustainable Development Goals at the Organisation and Project Levels—A Survey of Engineers. *Adm. Sci.* **2020**, *10*, 55. [CrossRef]
17. FAST-Infra Initiative. *Providing Market Confidence and Fostering Investment in Sustainable Infrastructure through a Global Label (FAST-Infra Sustainable Infrastructure)*; FAST-Infra: Paris, France, 2023. Available online: https://assets-global.website-files.com/64869a932dab4d8c36a88774/656c4fc90f0f381df2966da4_Revised-Label-Brochure-22.11.23.pdf (accessed on 13 October 2025).
18. Hodge, G.; Greve, C. Contemporary Public–Private Partnership: Towards a Global Research Agenda. *Financ. Account. Manag.* **2018**, *34*, 3–16. [CrossRef]
19. Mansell, P.; Philbin, S.P. Measuring Sustainable Development Goal Targets on Infrastructure Projects. *J. Mod. Proj. Manag.* **2020**, *8*, 42–63. [CrossRef]
20. Berrone, P.; Ricart, J.E.; Duch, A.I.; Bernardo, V.; Salvador, J.; Piedra Peña, J.; Rodríguez Planas, M. EASIER: An Evaluation Model for Public–Private Partnerships Contributing to the Sustainable Development Goals. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 2339. [CrossRef]
21. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). *Guidelines on the State of Public-Private Partnerships and Infrastructure Finance Midway to 2030*; United Nations, Economic and Social Council: New York, NY, USA, 2024; p. 3. Available online: https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2024-11/ECE_CECI_WP_PPP_2024_06-en.pdf?utm (accessed on 3 November 2025).
22. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). *UNECE PPP and Infrastructure Evaluation and Rating System (PIERS): An Evaluation Methodology for the SDGs*; UNECE: Geneva, Switzerland, 2021. Available online: https://unece.org/ppp/em (accessed on 27 October 2025).
23. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). *PPP and Infrastructure Evaluation and Rating System (PIERS): An Evaluation Methodology for the SDGs—User's Guide to the Self-Assessment Tool*; UNECE: Geneva, Switzerland, 2024. Available online: https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2024-02/English%20-%20User%20Guide%20-%20PIERS%20Self-Assessment%20Tool.pdf (accessed on 27 October 2025).
24. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). *PIERS Technical Panel (in Alphabetical Order, as of 30 June 2024)*; UNECE: Geneva, Switzerland, 2024. Available online: https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2024-07/PIERS%20Technical%20Panel.pdf (accessed on 27 October 2025).
25. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). *Roster of PIERS Project Evaluators and Peer Reviewers (in Alphabetical Order, as of 30 June 2024)*; UNECE: Geneva, Switzerland, 2024. Available online: https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2025-05/Roster%20of%20PIERS%20Project%20Evaluators%20and%20Peer%20Reviewers.pdf (accessed on 27 October 2025).
26. Zapatrina, I.; Shatkovska, A. PPP for Sustainable Development Goals: Still Untapped Potential. *Eur. Procure. Public Priv. Partnersh. Law Rev.* **2024**, *19*, 5–13. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

27. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). Terms of Reference: Working Party on Public-Private Partnerships (WP PPP); UNECE Executive Committee Decision, 87th Session, November 2016. Available online: https://unece.org/ppp/tor (accessed on 3 November 2025).
28. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). PPP Forum—Editions. Available online: https://unece.org/ppp/forums (accessed on 3 November 2025).
29. Šooš, T.; Lautar, K.; Urbančič, H.; Logonder, N.K.; Zupančič, R.K.; Fajić, L. *Slovenian Development Strategy 2030*; Government Office for Development and European Cohesion Policy: Ljubljana, Slovenia, 2017. Available online: https://www.gov.si/assets/ministrstva/MKRR/Strategija-razvoja-Slovenije-2030/Slovenian-Development-Strategy-2030.pdf (accessed on 13 October 2025).
30. Jožef Stefan Institute, Centre for Energy Efficiency (IJS-CEU). *Integrated National Energy and Climate Plan (NECP) of the Republic of Slovenia; No. 36000-7/2024/7*; Government of the Republic of Slovenia: Ljubljana, Slovenia, 2024. Available online: https://commission.europa.eu/publications/slovenia-final-updated-necp-2021-2030-submitted-2025_en (accessed on 13 October 2025).
31. Sachs, J.D.; Lafortune, G.; Fuller, G.; Drumm, E. *Implementing the SDG Stimulus: Sustainable Development Report 2023*; Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN): Paris, France, 2023; pp. 430–431. Available online: https://www.sdgtransformationcenter.org/reports/sustainable-development-report-2023 (accessed on 13 October 2025).
32. Sachs, J.D.; Lafortune, G.; Fuller, G. *The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2024*; United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA): New York, NY, USA, 2024; pp. 392–393. Available online: https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2024/ (accessed on 13 October 2025).
33. Sachs, J.D.; Lafortune, G.; Fuller, G.; Iablonovski, G. *Sustainable Development Report 2025; Financing Sustainable Development to 2030 and Mid-Century*; Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN): Paris, France, 2025; pp. 372–373. Available online: https://www.sdgtransformationcenter.org/reports/sustainable-development-report-2025 (accessed on 13 October 2025).
34. Ferk, P.; Ferk, B. Slovenia—Implementing Electromobility in Slovenia under a PPP Approach: A Case Study. *Eur. Procure. Public Priv. Partnersh. Law Rev.* **2021**, *16*, 255–259. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
35. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). UNECE PPP Forum 1: Compendium of Case Study Material. Available online: https://unece.org/ppp/forum1 (accessed on 12 January 2026).
36. UNECE. UNECE PPP Forum 2: Compendium of Case Study Material. Available online: https://unece.org/ppp/forum2 (accessed on 12 January 2026).
37. UNECE. UNECE PPP Forum 3: Compendium of Case Study Material. Available online: https://unece.org/ppp/forum3 (accessed on 12 January 2026).
38. UNECE. UNECE PPP Forum 4: Compendium of Case Study Material. Available online: https://unece.org/ppp/forum4 (accessed on 12 January 2026).
39. UNECE. UNECE PPP Forum 5: Compendium of Case Study Material. Available online: https://unece.org/ppp/forum5 (accessed on 12 January 2026).
40. UNECE. UNECE PPP Forum 6: Compendium of Case Study Material. Available online: https://unece.org/ppp/forum6 (accessed on 12 January 2026).
41. UNECE. UNECE PPP Forum 7: Compendium of Case Study Material. Available online: https://unece.org/ppp/forum7 (accessed on 12 January 2026).
42. UNECE. UNECE PPP Forum 8: Compendium of Case Study Material. Available online: https://unece.org/ppp/forum8 (accessed on 12 January 2026).
43. UNECE. UNECE PPP Forum 9: Compendium of Case Study Material. Available online: https://unece.org/ppp/forum9 (accessed on 12 January 2026).
44. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). UNECE Announces Winners of Its PPP and Infrastructure Awards. Available online: https://unece.org/media/Economic-Cooperation-and-Integration/press/378549 (accessed on 23 January 2026).
45. City of Ljubljana. Decree on the Public-Private Partnership for the Implementation of the Contractual Energy-Savings Project Aimed at the Energy Renovation of Public Buildings Owned by the City of Ljubljana [Odlok o javno-zasebnem partnerstvu za izvedbo projekta pogodbenega zagotavljanja prihrankov rabe energije z namenom energetske sanacije javnih objektov v lasti Mestne občine Ljubljana]. In *Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia*; Nos. 74/15, 83/16, 9/20 and 52/22; City of Ljubljana: Ljubljana, Slovenia, 2022; 83/16.
46. National Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia. Public–Private Partnership Act [Zakon o javno-zasebnem partnerstvu]. In *Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia*; No. 127/06; National Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia: Ljubljana, Slovenia, 2006.
47. Tender Documentation and PPP Contracts Concluded for the EOL Programme are Available Under the Following Publication Numbers: EOL 1: PJN JN8916/2015, TED 2015/S 247-448809; EOL 2: PJN JN000001/2017-B01, TED 2017/S 001-000079; EOL 3: PJN JN001085/2020-U01, TED 2020/S 037-088687; EOL 4: PJN JN002797/2022-U01, TED 2022/S 082-222628. Available online: https://ted.europa.eu/en/ (accessed on 25 May 2026).

48. Ferk, P.; Ferk, B.; Šeme, P. Slovenia: Energy Retrofit of Public Buildings in Ljubljana under the Energy Performance Contracting PPP Approach. *Eur. Procure. Public Priv. Partnersh. Law Rev.* **2025**, *20*, 327–330. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
49. Wacinkiewicz, D.; Słotwiński, S. The Statutory Model of Energy Performance Contracting as a Means of Improving Energy Efficiency in Public Sector Units as Seen in the Example of Polish Legal Policies. *Energies* **2023**, *16*, 5060. [CrossRef]
50. City Municipality of Kranj. Decree on the Public–Private Partnership for the Implementation of the Project "Electric Mobility in the City Municipality of Kranj" [Odlok o javno-zasebnem partnerstvu za izvedbo projekta «Električna mobilnost v Mestni občini Kranj»]. In *Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia*; No. 77/2019; City of Kranj: Kranj, Slovenia, 2019.
51. National Notification Portal, Publication No. JN000646/2020-U01; EU-TED, publication No. 2020/S 025-057922. Available online: https://ted.europa.eu/en/ (accessed on 25 May 2026).
52. City of Ljubljana. Decree on the Public–Private Partnership for the Implementation of the Project "Green Energy on the Surfaces and Buildings of the City Municipality of Ljubljana" [Odlok o javno-zasebnem partnerstvu za izvedbo projekta »Zelena energija na površinah in objektih MOL«]. In *Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia*; No. 92/22; City of Ljubljana: Ljubljana, Slovenia, 2022.
53. National Notification Portal, Publication No. JN005478/2025-EUe19/01. Available online: https://www.enarocanje.si/#/pregled-objav/926462 (accessed on 8 October 2025).
54. Ferk, P.; Ferk, B.; Šeme, P. Slovenia: Green Energy on Public Buildings in the City of Ljubljana under the PPP Concession Model. *Eur. Procure. Public Priv. Partnersh. Law Rev.* **2025**, *20*, 400–404. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
55. Public–Private Partnership Act: English Translation. Available online: https://www.ppiaf.org/documents/1667 (accessed on 9 May 2026).
56. Strmecki, M. Regulative Aspects of Public Services in Slovenia. *Transylv. Rev. Adm. Sci.* **2006**, *17*, 69–79.
57. Rakar, I. Delegated Legislation and Public Participation in Slovenia. Theory and Practice. In *Trends in Development of Public Administration in South East Europe*; Vintar, M., Kovač, P., Eds.; Faculty of Administration: Ljubljana, Slovenia, 2007; pp. 78–94.
58. National Assembly of the Republic of Slovenia. Public Finance Act [Zakon o Javnih Financah (ZJF)]. Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, Nos. 11/11—Official Consolidated Text, 14/13—Corr., 101/13, 55/15—ZFisP, 96/15—ZIPRS1617, 13/18, 195/20—Constitutional Court Decision, 18/23—ZDU-1O, 76/23, 24/25—ZFisP-1, 39/25, 85/25—ZPJS and 112/25. Available online: https://pisrs.si/pregledPredpisa?id=ZAKO1227 (accessed on 13 May 2026).
59. Government of the Republic of Slovenia. Decree on the Uniform Methodology for the Preparation and Assessment of Investment Documentation in the Field of Public Finance [Uredba o Enotni Metodologiji Za Pripravo in Obravnavo Investicijske Dokumentacije na Področju Javnih Financ]. Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, Nos. 60/06, 54/10 and 27/16. Available online: https://pisrs.si/pregledPredpisa?id=URED3708 (accessed on 13 May 2026).
60. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). *Guidelines on Enhancing Stakeholder Engagement in Public-Private Partnerships for the Sustainable Development Goals*; United Nations Economic Commission for Europe: Geneva, Switzerland, 2025. Available online: https://unece.org/eci/documents/2025/10/informal-documents/draft-guidelines-enhancing-stakeholder-engagement-public (accessed on 13 May 2026).
61. Fikfak, A.; Pličanič, S.; Bugarič, B.; Nikšič, M.; Mujkić, S.; Konjar, M.; Grom, J.P.; Koritnik, B.; Blaganje, M.; Pirnat, R. Public–Private Partnerships for Urban Development: Stakeholder Views in Slovenia. *Eur. Public Law* **2019**, *25*, 325–345. [CrossRef]
62. Mayne, J. Addressing attribution through contribution analysis: Using performance measures sensibly. *Can. J. Program Eval.* **2001**, *16*, 1–24. [CrossRef]
63. Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia (SURS). Access to Drinking Water. Available online: https://www.stat.si/StatWeb/en/News/Index/9877 (accessed on 8 May 2026).
64. Slovenian Environment Agency (ARSO). [ZD05] Access to Safe Drinking Water. Available online: https://kazalci.arso.gov.si/en/content/access-safe-drinking-water-8 (accessed on 8 May 2026).
65. Institute for European Energy and Climate Policy (IEECP). *Implementing the Energy Efficiency First Principle in Regional Planning; Policy Brief*; IEECP: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2025. Available online: https://ieecp.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/12/Policy-Brief-Slovenia-Regio1st.pdf (accessed on 9 May 2026).
66. European Parliament. *Roadmap to EU Climate Neutrality—Scrutiny of Member States: Slovenia's Climate Action Strategy; Briefing*; European Parliamentary Research Service: Brussels, Belgium, 2025. Available online: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2025/769559/EPRS_BRI%282025%29769559_EN.pdf (accessed on 9 May 2026).
67. European Commission. Special Eurobarometer 538: Climate Change. Available online: https://europa.eu/eurobarometer/surveys/detail/2954 (accessed on 9 May 2026).
68. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). *Building More Competitive Regions in Slovenia; OECD Multi-Level Governance Studies*; OECD Publishing: Paris, France, 2026; p. 62. Available online: https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/building-more-competitive-regions-in-slovenia_7dd44220-en/full-report/making-multi-level-governance-work-for-slovenia-s-regions_f2c32b83.html (accessed on 13 May 2026).
69. Government of the Republic of Slovenia. Municipalities and Population [Občine in Število Prebivalcev]. Available online: https://www.gov.si/teme/obcine-v-stevilkah (accessed on 13 May 2026).

70. FAST-Infra. Welcome to FAST-Infra Label. Available online: https://www.fastinfralabel.org/ (accessed on 25 June 2026).
71. Bureau Veritas. Fast-Infra Label Verification Services—Accelerating Sustainable Infrastructure Development. Available online: https://group.bureauveritas.com/industries/buildings-infrastructure/fast-infra-label-verification-services (accessed on 25 June 2026).
72. UNECE. Case Studies. Available online: https://unece.org/ppp/casestudies (accessed on 25 June 2026).
73. United Nations. Basic Principles and Guidelines on Development-Based Evictions and Displacement. Available online: https://www.ohchr.org/en/documents/thematic-reports/basic-principles-and-guidelines-development-based-evictions-and (accessed on 25 May 2026).

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.