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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADP</td>
<td>Agriculture Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AESR</td>
<td>Annual Education Sector Performance Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>API</td>
<td>Air Pollution Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRM</td>
<td>Africa Peer Review Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQi</td>
<td>Air Quality Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Anti-Retroviral Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBN</td>
<td>Central Bank of Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community Based Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGS</td>
<td>Conditional Grants Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Content Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWIQ</td>
<td>Core Welfare Indicator Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALY</td>
<td>Disability Adjusted Life Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG</td>
<td>Director-General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJSI</td>
<td>Dow Jones Sustainability Indexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Demographic Health Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPRS</td>
<td>Department of Planning, Research &amp; Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAR</td>
<td>Environmental Audit Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Education Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EnvS</td>
<td>Environmental Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPI</td>
<td>Expanded Programme on Immunisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Education Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExCo</td>
<td>Executive Council of a State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>Faith-Based Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGN</td>
<td>Federal Government of Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMoE</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMoH</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRI</td>
<td>Global Reporting Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMIS</td>
<td>Health Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRM</td>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Health Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>Internally Generated Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUD</td>
<td>Intra-Uterine Device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVACG</td>
<td>International Vitamin A Consultative Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Infrastructure Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO</td>
<td>International Standards Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM</td>
<td>Knowledge Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAM</td>
<td>Lactation Amenorrhea Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGA</td>
<td>Local Government Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGC</td>
<td>Local Government Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCH</td>
<td>Maternal and Child Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDA</td>
<td>Ministries, Departments and Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICS</td>
<td>Multiple Indicators Clusters Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTSS</td>
<td>Medium-Term Sector Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFDAC</td>
<td>National Agency for Food and Drug Administration and Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBS</td>
<td>National Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDHS</td>
<td>National Demographic Health Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
<td>National Economic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFRA</td>
<td>National Food Reserve Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGF</td>
<td>Nigeria Governors’ Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGFS</td>
<td>Nigeria Governors’ Forum Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>National Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPHCDA</td>
<td>National Primary Health Care Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFM</td>
<td>Public Finance Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPA</td>
<td>Participatory Poverty Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public Private Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;S</td>
<td>Policy and Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMOS</td>
<td>Reproductive Age Mortality Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBM</td>
<td>Result-Based Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>Research and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBMC</td>
<td>School Based Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>State Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEDS</td>
<td>State Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICOM</td>
<td>Service Compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>State Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHoA</td>
<td>State House of Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLM</td>
<td>Sustainable Land Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPARC</td>
<td>State Partnership for Accountability, Responsiveness and Capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPoA</td>
<td>State Programme of Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRM</td>
<td>State Peer Review Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRR</td>
<td>State Peer Review Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAR</td>
<td>State Self Assessment Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSG</td>
<td>Secretary to the State Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSMP</td>
<td>State Statistical Medium Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYB</td>
<td>Statistical Year Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFR</td>
<td>Total Fertility Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRP</td>
<td>Technical Review Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBEC</td>
<td>Universal Basic Education Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environmental Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAW</td>
<td>Violence against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPV</td>
<td>Wild Polio Virus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Nigeria Governors' Forum (NGF) is a coalition of elected Governors of the 36 states in Nigeria with the mission to provide a platform for collaboration among all the Governors, irrespective of party affiliations, to share experiences; promote cooperation among states and serve as a mechanism for conflict resolution between States, and between States and the Federal Government, respectively. Founded in 1999 after a multi-party conference of all elected state governors held in Abuja between 26 and 29 April 1999 and fashioned after the American National Governor’s Association, the Governors’ Forum has become a major player in Nigeria’s governance and socio-economic development process.

The strategic objectives of the NGF are to:

- Provide a forum for Governors' to discuss issues of mutual interest / national and state concern, share experiences, techniques and good practice and where appropriate reach a consensus; and to present the NGF and governors standpoint and views in discussions with Federal and other institutions / organisations both national and international;

- Act as a link between state governors and governmental and non-governmental institutions on matters affecting governance and service delivery in State;

- Provide a vehicle for States to work together in areas of joint or mutual interest and support the development and implementation of coordinated solutions;

- Play a significant and influential role in dispute resolution at national, state and local government levels;

- Develop and implement a system of peer review at state level in order to encourage efficient and effective service delivery, improved governance and enhanced development performance; and,
• Develop an efficient and effective NGF Secretariat that is able to manage the day-to-day affairs of the NGF and provide specific technical support in a range of areas to States.

The National Economic Council (NEC) in recognition of the mandate of the NGF in 2007 resolved that the Forum should assume responsibility for developing and implementing a States’ Peer Review Mechanism (SPRM). Pursuant to the NEC decision, NGF mandated its Secretariat to develop the SPRM, drawing on resources available within relevant Federal/National organizations, notably National Planning Commission (NPC), the Office of the Senior Special Assistant to the President on the Millennium Development Goals (OSSAP-MDGs) and development partners. As a first step, the Nigeria Governors’ Forum Secretariat (NGFS) embarked on assessment of development projects in the States in early 2009 and 2010. Although the reviews were not based on any benchmarking standards, they provided an opportunity for the States visited to highlight their achievements and share their areas of challenges with the NGF review team.

Flowing from these visits, the Secretariat developed a robust database and a set of report on all 36 States. Also in 2009, the NGF, with the collaboration of the State Partnership for Accountability, Responsiveness and Capability (SPARC) funded by the United Kingdom’s Department For International Development (DFID) articulated and adopted a systematic and robust Peer Review process. This Base Document represents the methodology for the rigorous peer review process for individual States which was launched in Abuja on 17th May, 2011 as part of the 2011 Induction Programme for New and Returning Governors.
The overarching objective of the SPRM is to assist Federating States in Nigeria to accelerate the pace of their development through periodic reviews of progress in the implementation of their development policies, plans and programmes. This would be achieved through experience sharing among the States and the reinforcement of commendable and innovative practices unveiled in the process.

Through participation in the peer review process, State Governors will be able to learn from their peers about innovative and good practices that they could adapt and adopt in their respective states. The SPRM is also expected to contribute to the achievement of the following objectives:

- Enhanced collaboration among States in their quest for development;
- Promotion of good governance through enhancement of transparency, accountability, participation and communication;
- Ensuring better service delivery (timeliness, quality and public access) through the progressive improvement of policies, planning, budgeting and public service reform, on the one hand, and core sectors such as education, health, roads, water supply and agriculture on the other; and
- Enhancement of federal-state cooperation and collaboration through participation of national/federal institutions such as the National Planning Commission, National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) and Office of the Senior Special Assistant to the President on MDGs in the review process.
3.1 The Process

The peer review mechanism will rely fundamentally on the assessment instrument elaborated in this Base Document and a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), which spells out the respective roles and responsibilities of the parties to the conduct of the assessment by the NGF. While the instrument of assessment and the guiding principles are adopted by the NGF, the Government of each state to be reviewed will sign the MoU stipulating the conditions and operational rules for the state self-assessment and review by the Technical Review Panel.

3.2 Assessment Instrument

The assessment instrument covers three areas: (i) the objectives of the assessment for each thematic/sectoral area to be assessed; (ii) the relevant standards, codes and conventions and best practices; and (iii) the questions that the assessment will seek answers to and their specific indicators and benchmarks.

3.3 Guiding Principles

The guiding principles are that every review undertaken must be participatory, gender-sensitive and socially inclusive, credible, politically non-threatening, and professionally competent. It is also designed to inspire confidence and ownership of the process by all stakeholders.

To achieve these goals, the state self-assessment report will be prepared by each participating State using the assessment instrument. The State may engage consulting firms if it wishes, after due consultation with the NGF Secretariat.

The MoU signed by States will guarantee the transparency and openness of the process by ensuring that the State being reviewed will provide all the necessary documents, records and statistical data necessary
for conducting the review. It will also facilitate access to all officials and stakeholders whose participation is vital to the success of the exercise such as the private sector, civil society groups, traditional rulers, leaders of religious groups, women groups and youth leaders.

### 3.4 Methodology

The peer review process will be scheduled by the NGFS in collaboration with the State to be reviewed. Before it commences, the NGFS will assemble documentation on the State to be reviewed including relevant assessments and baseline studies on the state conducted by development partners, international organisations, civil society organisations and academics to provide background information on the State to be utilised by the Technical Review Panel.

The NGFS will forward the instrument of assessment to the state to enable it prepare for the assessment and also in collaboration with the NGFS organize a sensitisation workshop for key officials of the state government and stakeholders on the objectives, questions, indicators and methodology of the assessment process. If the state opts to use consultants to prepare the State Self Assessment Report (SSAR), they will be expected to participate actively in the workshop as well. The State House Assembly (SHoA) and the Judiciary are also expected to attend this workshop.

In addition to the Government's responses to the survey instrument, the views and perceptions of civil society organisations, community-based organisations (CBOs), private sector and the public on service delivery quality will also be elicited through opinion polls. If consultants are engaged for the exercise, the State will be expected to institute quality assurance safeguards to guarantee that the assessment is carried out in accordance with the established principles.

### 3.5 Stages in the Process

The first stage of the peer review process is initiation of stakeholder workshop to sensitise state stakeholders on the methodology, objectives, questions and indicators of the assessment instrument. (See Figure 1 showing the SPRM process map).

![FIGURE 1: SPRM PROCESS MAP](image-url)
The second stage is the preparation of the SSAR and SPoA and their submission to the NGFS. The Secretariat will review both documents (drawing on external advice, where necessary) to ascertain if all the questions in the instrument have been answered in line with the indicators specified. The SPoA will be assessed on the basis of the pertinence and effectiveness of the remedies proposed to address the shortcomings in state governance identified by the SSAR. If either falls short, the NGFS may refer it back to the State for revision. The SSAR’s structure should clearly elucidate the achievements, challenges and shortcomings in the processes and thematic/sectors assessed.

The third stage in the process is the Technical Review Visit and Validation of the SSAR. To carry out the visit, the NGFS will assemble a Technical Review Panel (TRP). The TRP will comprise representatives of the states and seasoned academics selected from the SPRM Roster of Consultants on the basis of criteria such as knowledge, expertise and experience in the study area, representatives of the NPC, APRM, as well as experts nominated by the development partners.

During the Technical Review visit, the mission will validate the perspectives of different stakeholders on governance and socioeconomic development as expressed in the State’s Self-Assessment Report and also inspect some key projects commissioned by the state. The stakeholders to be interacted with would include but not limited to the Executive Council, The Judiciary, the Legislature, Civil Society Actors, representatives of the Private Sector, Women, Youth and Vulnerable groups. The Mission would strive to cover the entire state and also engender a consensus on the SPoA.

Following these consultations, the TRP will produce a State Peer Review Report (SPRR). The NGF Secretariat will forward the Report to the concerned States for their comments and reactions and to sort out factual errors before the report is finalised. The final SPRR will be tabled before the NGF. Like the SSAR, the report will document achievements, best practices, challenges and remedial actions to be undertaken.

The tabling of the SPRR and SPoA before the NGF constitutes the fifth stage of the review process. Attendance at the NGF meeting at which the SPRR and SPoA will be discussed, would be restricted to the Governors and the most senior official that is supervising the State Peer Review process only. This will facilitate frank and candid discussion of the contents of the SPRR.

The Publication of the Report and its wide dissemination will constitute the sixth and final stage.

3.6 Types of Reviews and Periodicity

Four distinct reviews are envisaged in the process. These are:

1. **Base review or the first comprehensive review**, which will be undertaken for all the States. Keeping in mind that States are at different levels of development, a state will be assessed according to the agreed yardstick (the base review) A Programme of Action for effecting progress towards achieving the agreed goals would be drawn up by the state in question, taking into account the particular circumstances of that state. Every reviewed State would subsequently submit progress report on the implementation of the SPoA periodically to the NGF. The first progress report will be due 12 months after the review and every 6 months thereafter;
2. **Periodic or follow-up review**, which would be conducted every four years provided it does not fall within 12 months prior to an election. The four-year interval between reviews gives ample time for States to implement their SPoA, to review the results and to learn from the process. The interval also ensures that the review will not run in lock-step with a political administration so as to avoid politicisation of the process. The follow-up review is to assess the overall progress made in governance and socio-economic development in the period since the base review and distil the discernible impact of the SPRM in the State. It will appraise the extent to which the SPOA has been implemented and its continued relevance, tackle new emerging issues and assist the state in finalising a new SPOA;

3. **Ad-hoc Review**, which might be requested specially by a state; and

4. **Special Review**, which might be initiated at any moment when early warning signs suggest an impending political, economic or social crisis in a state. This type of review would be conducted to render assistance to the concerned state, and would be called by the Governors' Forum, in solidarity with the Governor concerned.

3.7 **Publication / Disclosure**

Following NGF’s discussion of the SPRR and SPoA, a date should be set for the SPRR to be publicly launched in the state reviewed to symbolise the conclusion of the social contract between the government and the governed. Thereafter, the report should be posted on the websites of the State and the NGF. They will also be disseminated as elaborated in Section 5.5.
Overall leadership of the SPRM will be provided at the level of the NGF, supported by SPRM Steering Committee (SC), SPRM Secretariat and a TRP. At the level of individual States, the Governor will provide the political leadership and there will be state-level SPRM Unit. See Figure 2 on leadership Management Structure.

4.1 The NGF

The NGF will provide the political leadership for the SPRM through its Chairman. It will authorize reviews by signing the MoU with States which would signify the formal commencement of the review process. NGF will meet biannually to discuss SPRM reports. It is only after discussion and adoption of the reports that they can be made public and disseminated. At its discretion, NGF can hold an additional or extraordinary meeting on SPRM matters during a calendar year.

4.2 SPRM Steering Committee

An all inclusive Steering Committee (SC) will oversee the SPRM. Membership of the SC will be drawn from Former Governors and senior independent individuals from the judiciary, academia, civil society organisations, media and trade unions. Membership of the SC will always strive towards gender balance and minimally include no less than 35 per cent of either gender (men or women).

The SC will have two main functions: (i) serve as an advisory body to the political leadership of the SPRM and (ii) provide guidance and direction for SPRM operational activities. Specifically, its duties will include approval of the master set of benchmarks, oversight of the independent reporting process by the Technical Review Panel, and assuring the quality and integrity of the SPRM process.

4.3 SPRM Secretariat

A Department within NGFS will have responsibility for managing the various activities relating to the SPRM process. It will provide administrative coordination and support for all the activities relating to the peer review process. The head of the Department will be the Secretary of the SC and will assure
secretarial support to the work of the TRP. Furthermore, the Department will provide technical guidance to the SPRM Units in the States and maintain consistent and effective coordination with them. It will be responsible for organizing the retreats, workshops, exchange visits and seminars.

4.4. Technical Review Panel

The TRP will comprise subject experts and seasoned practitioners drawn from the Roster of Consultants and experts provided by development partners – to serve as review experts to undertake the validation of states’ self-assessment reports, prepare the State Peer Review Report and execute other relevant assignments in the review process. TRP composition will have a minimum of 35 per cent of either gender. At least one member will have expertise in gender and social inclusion.

4.5. State-level Leadership and Management Structure

The Governor of each State will provide political leadership for all SPRM activities at the state level. There will be an SPRM Unit in each state, located within an appropriate MDA (e.g. Ministry of Planning or Agency responsible for managing intergovernmental relations) with a senior civil servant, preferably the Commissioner, as the Director or Coordinator. The Unit will coordinate all the administrative and technical activities relating to a State’s self-assessment process and other SPRM activities at the state level.

FIGURE 2: SPRM LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE
5.1 Introduction

The SPRM process has many learning and knowledge management opportunities for actors in the state development process, not least of which is the participatory and inclusiveness of the staged process involving different key stakeholders. The peer learning, knowledge and communication strategy of the SPRM begin with a definition of knowledge management and explanation of the knowledge cycle, describe the role of the different stakeholders in knowledge management activities and conclude with an outline of the tasks ahead and potential knowledge products.

5.2 Definition of Knowledge Management

Knowledge Management (KM) within the context of SPRM entails the strategies and processes for assessing, identifying, capturing, sharing, disseminating and using the knowledge generated through the review process. It is aimed at cultivating the culture of sharing and learning in a non-adversarial environment. The SPRM provides the basis for NGF and States to document and share knowledge at various levels as well as learning collectively at interactions during and after the review. Sharing, learning and applying best practices are at the core of the SPRM. In order to draw such lessons, which could be categorised as best practice, systems will be incorporated into the process to identify learning nodes when they arise. In a nutshell, it is about consciously getting the right knowledge across to the right persons at the right time and in the most appropriate methods or means.

The SPRM will enable stakeholders within and between states to access and share innovations emerging from each state. This strategy will support states to document and share their reforms for learning, to enhance replication across states and stimulate innovation.
5.3 The Knowledge Management Cycle

Knowledge management functions in a cyclical manner with distinct but interrelated components as shown in Figure 3.

![Knowledge Management Cycle Diagram]

**Knowledge Audit:** The strategy begins with an audit meant to ascertain what is known about performance at state level and what people — men and women — do with knowledge before SPRM and how best practices can be shared. It will include an assessment of the information sharing infrastructures at all levels.

**Knowledge Creation:** In the course of preparing and conducting the SPRM new information, skills and procedures will be created.

**Knowledge Capture:** Learning will be captured before, during and after the SPRM process using reports and other appropriate tools developed at state levels and the NGF Secretariat. This includes strategies and practices used to identify, create, represent, distribute, and enable adoption of insights and experiences.

**Knowledge Storage:** Instituting a content management system in which all generated information and lessons will be stored in the NGF electronic library and websites to improve access and retrieval.

**Knowledge Sharing:** There will be activities through which knowledge (i.e. information, experiences, skills, or expertise) is exchanged between stakeholders.

**Knowledge Application:** Lessons derived through the process will be applied by governors to improve state performance. Civil servants and other stakeholders will also apply these lessons to the various activities of the state.
### 5.4 Role of stakeholders in Knowledge Management

The SPRM Steering Committee and the NGF Secretariat will coordinate the peer learning process. Knowledge management is central to the success of the SPRM, and is therefore an integral component of all the stages of the review process. The activities of knowledge management for each stage of the SPRM are stated in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Activities/Actions</th>
<th>Lead Group</th>
<th>NGF KM role(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparation</td>
<td>Gather, for the use of the Technical Review Panel (TRP), documentation on the state to be reviewed such as the State Development Plan, Poverty Reduction Strategy, Public Sector Reform Programme, budgets, relevant assessments and baseline studies by the State, international organisations and development partners.¹</td>
<td>NGF Department</td>
<td>Maintain physical library Upload material on content management system (audit, capture, store)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submit the SSAR and SPoA to the NGF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review</td>
<td>Gather documentation on the state such as the State Development Plan, Poverty Reduction Strategy, Public Sector Reform Programme, budgets, relevant assessments and baseline studies by the State, international organisations and development partners which it shares with NGF.</td>
<td>State SPRM Unit</td>
<td>Distribute key documentation and information to all members using the content management systems and alerts by SMS messaging. (capture, store, share)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Gather documentation on the state such as the State Development Plan, Poverty Reduction Strategy, Public Sector Reform Programme, budgets, relevant assessments and baseline studies by the State, international organisations and development partners which it shares with NGF.
| 3. Validation | Receive and review the TRP's draft reports and SPoA. Share the TRP's draft reports with the State and consider its feedback on them, and ensuring that factual errors are corrected. Receive the TRP's final report and SPoA and prepare an 'Executive Summary' to be tabled along with both reports before the NGF. |
| SPRM Secretariat | Log and distribute reports. Commission authors to produce Executive Summaries. Quality assurance procedures (create, capture, store, share) |
| 4. Peer learning, knowledge management and communication | Organise a public launch of the SSAR and SPoA. Identify and disseminate to the States best practices appropriate to the development challenges brought up in the reports. Organise multi-state workshops and facilitate inter-state study visits by Governors and state officials for sharing experiences and to promote peer learning. Organise periodic workshops for State Government officials and relevant stakeholders on |

1. Ideally, the documentation gathered should be sent to the Technical Review Panel experts not later than the date of the State initiation workshop.
2. The TRP is obliged to correct factual errors. However, its judgment on the implications of the facts should be respected.
| the SPRR and SPoA to promote synergy in tackling state development challenges. |
| Ensure the dissemination of review reports through feature articles in newspapers and magazines and CSO networks. |
| Publish and disseminate approved reports among the states. |
| Disseminate report in brief form through CBOs (e.g. Town Unions), religious groups and CSOs in relevant State. |
| Create a database and documentation centre on SPRM, state baseline assessments and analytical reviews by development partners. |
| Maintain a website which uploads SPRM materials for public access. |

### 5.5 Tasks and Potential Knowledge Products

The KM and Communication Unit in NGF will develop communications strategy and plan before the SPRM begins. This will include stating the types of information to be shared, target recipients and packaging of information. The communications strategy will also highlight opportunities for peer learning in the short, medium and long-terms.

A well functioning Content Management System (CMS) has been developed and will host all SPRM materials as they become available. The CMS has been kept simple and is accessible to all stakeholders.

The information generated by the SPRM will be disseminated in a variety of forms (i.e. different knowledge...
products). The main publications of the review process will be the SPRR, and SPoA. These will be disseminated through various channels such as the presentations at meetings, workshops, NGF website (www.nggovernorsforum.org) and individual state websites, production of case studies and technical papers on best practices, newsletters, press releases and media kits. Table 2 illustrates knowledge products that will be developed at all levels of the SPRM process. These will be used to reinforce learning at all levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
<th>Illustrative Knowledge Management Products of the SPRM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Print Materials** | SSAR, SPoA (Flagship products)  
Governors’ Note or “Best practice note”  
Forum working papers  
Toolkits  
Executive summary  
Special reports and case studies |
| **Electronic Products** | Weekly e-mails  
Website  
E-forum  
List-serve |
| **Policy Documents** | Presentations  
Learning / Feedback forums / Special reports and case studies |

In addition, the SPRM Secretariat, with the support of the SPRM Units in the States, will ensure the dissemination of the review reports through feature articles in newspapers and magazines, Radio and TVs including distribution of published materials approved by the SPRM Steering Committee.

The publications from the review process will be made available on the NGF websites. The SPRM Secretariat will regularly update a dedicated webpage on its website which explains the SPRM process.
and includes state self-assessments, the SPoA and other review reports approved for publication by the NGF or the SPRM Steering Committee.

Published and unpublished SPRM-related materials will be stored in a special section in the NGF Secretariat's library under the responsibility of the NGF KM Officer. An electronic library and intranet, as integral parts of the Content Management System, will be developed and functional at the NGF secretariat. They would constitute the information bank where documents from each state would be uploaded and downloaded easily by end users.

The SPRM will forge linkages with researchers and research institutes to spin-off studies that would help push the frontiers of learning and innovations at State levels and NGF will use popular opinions on innovation for civil participation in the process to provide further insights into best practices.
6.1 Introduction
This Framework of Indicators covers the four thematic areas incorporated in the review process. These include Policy and Strategy/Monitoring and Evaluation, Public Finance Management, Service Delivery and Citizen Engagement and Participation. The Monitoring and Evaluation indicators are incorporated in the Policy and Strategy thematic area. The four thematic areas have also been integrated into the core sectors of Health, Education, Agriculture, Infrastructure, and Environment as well as Economic Development.

6.2 Thematic Areas of Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEMATIC AREAS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF RELATED PERFORMANCE ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Strategy</td>
<td>Existence of evidence-based policies; reflection of state priorities; existence of strategies that would actualise policies; existence of targets to measure policy actualisation. This also includes a description of the level of development and state level macroeconomic framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>Prudence in fiscal and budget management; linkages of budget to policies and strategy in the core sectors (Economy, Health, Education, Agriculture, Environment, Energy, Infrastructure); Existence of realistic budgets; timelines of budget implementation with expected deliverables; mechanisms that support better public service delivery; use of State resources to foster economic development and use of evidence for budgeting, planning and implementation of programmes and projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These would facilitate not only efficient and effective management but also a transition from the current practice of “historical budgeting” where old budgets are recycled and renewed for the next fiscal year by adding fixed percentages. In this regard, data gathering, management and use in planning will be promoted and institutionalised in all sectors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Engagement, Social Inclusion and Protection</td>
<td>Participatory and inclusiveness of policy, planning, and budget processes for the citizens and civil society organizations; clarity of the role of civil society in the policy process; existence of feedback mechanism for citizens to report on service delivery perceptions. Others are equal rights and opportunities for women and men, boys and girls; special measures to ensure protection and justice for vulnerable and marginalized groups; citizens’ voice in governance and electoral processes. The indicators for this thematic area are also presented in the relevant sector areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Service Delivery Sectors of Assessment

The following are the core service delivery sectors that will form the basis of the State Peer Review Mechanism:

a) Health;
b) Education;
c) Agriculture;
d) Economic Development;
e) Environment; and
f) Infrastructure including ICT.

Indicators for assessing these sectors incorporate national standards and benchmarks as well as international conventions, codes and best practices.
6.4 **Key Elements of Assessment**

The framework for the SPRM Indicators is anchored on the following four key elements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTS OF ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSESSMENT ELEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence and Application of Legal &amp; Regulatory Framework</td>
<td>Public Administration and Public Sector Management are aimed at modernisation and efficiency of public sector institutions. The core issues are: what type of organization and management methods are best suited for the tasks to be performed? It is the legal, regulatory and policy framework that conditions the goals or values to be achieved by translating the vision, mission and priorities of the state into mandates and achievement targets. Their quality and appropriateness, therefore, matter for the performance of public institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In its relationship to management, law has to be viewed as framework, object and tool for enhancing development planning, management of reforms, programmes, and projects, and creating an accountability framework between the State Government and citizens of the State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The key questions to be posed include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How does the State Governor's political vision and aspirations translate into Development Plans and reform programmes at State and Sector levels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the State have a comprehensive and consistent framework for crafting the State's Development Plans, and reform programmes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the legal basis for the framework used in framing State Development Plans, programmes or reform plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State's Performance</td>
<td>State performance measurement is concerned with assessing how public executives respond to the performance challenge at State level; how they improve performance in a way that produces results that citizens truly value; how they demonstrate that their organizations possess the competence that generates the resources and flexibility required to do even better in the future; whether they have adequate knowledge, skills, and intellectual sagacity for responding creatively and effectively to any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELEMENTS OF ASSESSMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSESSMENT ELEMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance challenge; whether they have a clear understanding of how to create a performance strategy; their ability to motivate both employees and partners, and their capacity to exercise leadership in a diverse and complex political environment.</td>
<td>The template at this level includes: Describe the institutional framework and/or strategies in place for implementing the State's Development Plans, and/or reform programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness &amp; Efficiency (Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost)</td>
<td>Effectiveness implies the degree to which identified challenges to State development are being resolved and the extent to which the State's objectives are being achieved. The primary issue is to ascertain whether or not targeted populations receive the right outputs during the implementation of the State's Strategic Programmes. This analysis will be carried out for each of the core thematic areas identified in the framework of SPRM indicators. Efficiency is measured as the extent to which State delivery mechanisms are economical in terms of public goods or services delivered to target populations; measuring outputs in relation to inputs to determine whether stakeholders used least costly resources possible to achieve desired targets. The challenge here will be to establish evidence that sufficient value or benefit was generated. It will be useful to assemble information or evidence about the impact of services and programs, their costs, and the consequences of choosing one option over another. For both, effectiveness and efficiency, an attempt should be made to undertake a variance analysis or earned value analysis between planned and actual performance in terms of the intervention programmes and budget management. A qualitative understanding of actual performance is crucial. The assessment of effectiveness and efficiency should be complemented by a qualitative assessment of relevancy of policy, programmes and projects. Relevance is about the degree to which the State's activities meet the needs of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEMENTS OF ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF THE ASSESSMENT ELEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>targeted population or are a solution to the identified socio-economic or socio-political challenges; whether the activities and outputs of State programmes are consistent with and contribute towards attainment of the overall goal and set objectives; whether the State’s programmes are consistent with Nigeria’s policy and agreed fiscal policy arrangements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The key questions at this layer include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the State Development Plan and/or Reform Programme properly costed and aligned to the annual Fiscal and Budgetary targets?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability (Capacity of the generated improvements to endure)</td>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong> refers to both policy framework and the outcome. It is defined in terms of sustained gain in capacity and wellbeing of the target population over time. It is the endurance of the generated economic, socio-political, institutional, and environmental capacity of the State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The key questions to be answered are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the State’s long-term development Vision and Goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the likelihood that the gains and effects of the State investment would be sustained over time, more especially if there were changes in the State's leadership and the structure of State institutions?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SPRM FRAMEWORK OF INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</th>
<th>State Government Performance</th>
<th>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</th>
<th>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Policy & Strategy and Monitoring & Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Development Plans and Strategies</th>
<th>P&amp;S 1.1 Existence of strategic plans to drive state development priorities.</th>
<th>P&amp;S 1.2 Strategic plans for six core sectors of assessment.</th>
<th>P&amp;S 1.3 Sector targets met.</th>
<th>P&amp;S 1.4 State development trajectory linked to strategic plans.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation and Ownership</td>
<td>P&amp;S 2.1 State development plans and strategies developed in collaboration with relevant stakeholders.</td>
<td>P&amp;S 2.2.1 State Economic Development Board established by law.</td>
<td>P&amp;S 2.3.1. Local governments participate in formulating state development plans and strategies.</td>
<td>P&amp;S 2.4.1 State Planning Board composition reflects broad stakeholder participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;S 2.2.2. Institutional framework in place for relevant sector stakeholders to participate in formulation and adoption of development plans and strategies.</td>
<td>P&amp;S 2.3.2. Sector relevant stakeholders participate in formulating and adopting state development plans and strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;S 2.4.2 Number of sectors and stakeholders, including vulnerable groups, CBOs and women groups involved in state/sector policy planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;S 3.1.1</td>
<td>Clarity of roles and responsibilities relating to policy/strategy analysis within Departments of Planning, Research and Statistics (DPRS or equivalent) in all MDAs.</td>
<td>P&amp;S 3.2.1</td>
<td>Number and quality of policies, strategies and plans which are informed by evidence based analysis</td>
<td>P&amp;S 3.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;S 3.1.2</td>
<td>Clarity of roles and responsibilities relating to M&amp;E within Departments of Planning, Research and Statistics (DPRS or equivalent) in all MDAs.</td>
<td>P&amp;S 3.2.2</td>
<td>Extent and quality of regular cross-government (e.g. State Development Plans) and sector (e.g. MTSS) review processes.</td>
<td>P&amp;S 3.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Statistics and surveys/research</td>
<td>P&amp;S 4.1</td>
<td>Extent to which a State Statistical Act has been passed into law and is being applied.</td>
<td>P&amp;S 4.2</td>
<td>Data Quality: Scope, Accuracy, disaggregation and timeliness of state statistics and related analysis; NBS Statistical Standards; UNDP Statistical Standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Level Economic Growth</td>
<td>ED 1.1 Existence of framework to support State Level Economic Growth.</td>
<td>ED 1.2 Institutional Framework for Strengthening and translating strategy into action.</td>
<td>ED 1.3 State level GDP, Agricultural sector’s share of state level GDP, Manufacturing sector’s share of state level GDP and Oil sector’s share of state level GDP.</td>
<td>ED 1.4 State Human Poverty Index, Human Development Index and Unemployment Rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Environment</td>
<td>ED 2.1 State Legislation and Strategic framework for improving the ease of doing business in the state.</td>
<td>ED 2.2.1 Level of support by the state for businesses.</td>
<td>ED 2.3 Number of private sector businesses operating in the state (Banks, Insurance Companies, Stock Brokers and Micro Finance Banks.</td>
<td>ED 2.4.1 Existence of Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanism in the State especially as it relates to the private sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ED 2.2.2 Assessment of the investment climate in the state.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ED 2.2.3 Perceived obstacles to doing business in the state.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(A)</strong></td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Finance Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Planning</th>
<th>PFM 1.1</th>
<th>PFM 1.2</th>
<th>PFM 1.3</th>
<th>PFM 1.4.1</th>
<th>PFM 1.4.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which the State has adopted and localized the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2007.</td>
<td>Institutional framework for fiscal planning and multi-year perspective in expenditure planning and budgeting.</td>
<td>The medium sectors strategies ‘MTSS’(Education, Health, Environment, Agriculture and Infrastructure) with full costing of recurrent and investment expenditure broadly consistent with fiscal forecast.</td>
<td>Level of Stakeholders’ (including women and vulnerable groups) participation in Fiscal Planning and Level of Public accessibility to fiscal information.</td>
<td>Level of Public accessibility to fiscal information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Preparation and Budget Realism</th>
<th>PFM 2.1</th>
<th>PFM 2.2</th>
<th>PFM 2.3</th>
<th>PFM 2.4</th>
<th>PFM 2.4.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Framework of the State Budget Preparation and Implementation Guidelines (processes, activities, roles, responsibilities and timeline).</td>
<td>Extent to which the annual budgets on Education, Health, Environment, Agriculture and Infrastructure are based on State Approved Medium-Term Strategy for each of these five main sectors.</td>
<td>Percentage of State budget allocation to Education, Health, Environment, Agriculture and Infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level of citizens’/stakeholders’ (including women and vulnerable groups) participation and engagement in budget process.</td>
<td>Key budget documents submitted to the State House of Assembly for budget scrutiny and approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Administration</td>
<td>PFM 3.1 Extent to which the State has internalized revenue legislations and procedures.</td>
<td>PFM 3.2 The status of the State Board of Internal Revenue and State Revenue Service.</td>
<td>PFM 3.3 Percentage of State total IGR to Total Revenue for the past two years.</td>
<td>PFM 3.4 Extent to which taxpayers have easy access to comprehensive information on tax liabilities and administrative procedures for major taxes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>PFM 4.1 Extent to which the State has adopted and localized the Public Procurement Act.</td>
<td>PFM 4.2 Evidence of value for money in the 6 biggest contracts awarded in the State in the past three years.</td>
<td>PFM 4.3 Percentage of contracts in excess of N5,000,000 awarded on the basis of open competitive process.</td>
<td>PFM 4.4 Level of awareness by the intended beneficiaries of major projects of the fact that a contract has been awarded and a contractor should be starting work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Recording, Reporting and External Scrutiny</td>
<td>PFM 5.1 Existence of Comprehensive Financial and Auditing Procedure Guidelines.</td>
<td>PFM 5.2.1 Timeliness in preparation of in-year budget reports.</td>
<td>PFM 5.3 Presentation of Audited Accounts to the State House of Assembly.</td>
<td>PFM 5.4 Scrutiny of Audited Accounts by the State House of Assembly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PFM 5.2.2 Timeliness of submission of annual financial statements for audit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Governmental Fiscal Relations</td>
<td>Performance criterion: PFM 6.1 Extent to which the State has internalized the Constitutional provisions for Inter-Governmental Fiscal Relations.</td>
<td>Performance criterion: PFM 6.2 Percentage of available Federal Grants such as UBEC and CGS accessed by the State.</td>
<td>Performance criterion: PFM 6.3 Percentage of LG fund transferred to LGs on transparent and rule-based systems (federation accounts and State IGR).</td>
<td>Performance criterion: PFM 6.4 Level of public access to information on distribution and transfer of revenue to LGs and grants from Federal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Management (External &amp; Domestic)</td>
<td>Performance criterion: PFM 7.1.1 Extent to which the State has adopted and localized Debt Management Act together with Borrowing Guidelines.</td>
<td>Performance criterion: PFM 7.2.1 Debt to GDP ratio.</td>
<td>Performance criterion: PFM 7.2.2 Percentage of debt financing of annual budgets.</td>
<td>Performance criterion: PFM 7.4.1 Level of awareness by stakeholders and Citizens of the State’s level of total indebtedness and fiscal vulnerability risks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Human Resource Management

#### Civil Service Governance
- **HRM 1.1**
  - Extent to which the State has Laws, regulations and policies, including affirmative action, to regulate public service employment, deployment, promotion, and overall management.

- **HRM 1.2**
  - Extent to which open and transparent processes are applied in recruitment, and promotion of personnel.

- **HRM 1.3**
  - Appropriateness of public service workforce to state needs and Recruitment based on need.

- **HRM 1.4**
  - Level of capacity development of civil servants disaggregated by sex.

#### Service Delivery & Performance
- **HRM 2.1**
  - Extent to which the state has prepared and documented clear guidelines of MDA’s structures, mandates, functions and accountabilities.

- **HRM 2.2**
  - Existence of administrative mechanism to support conduct of State MDA’s performance management.

- **HRM 2.3**
  - Regular performance management system reviews linked to mandates and service standards.

- **HRM 2.4**
  - Feedback mechanism to measure service users’ satisfaction and avenues for redress.

#### Incentives and Accountability
- **HRM 3.1**
  - Extent to which there are procedures for incentive planning, payments and monitoring.

- **HRM 3.2.1**
  - How salary structure of the state compares with federal and other states.

- **HRM 3.2.2**
  - Degree of integration and reconciliation between personnel records and payroll data.

- **HRM 3.3**
  - Internal controls of changes to personnel records and the payroll.

- **HRM 3.4**
  - Existence of payroll audits to identify control weaknesses and/or ghost workers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</th>
<th>State Government Performance</th>
<th>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</th>
<th>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education Sector Indicators**

**Access and Equity**
- **ES 1.1** Extent to which the State has adopted and localized laws ensuring access to quality education for all children.
- **ES 1.2.1** Level of participation of children from disadvantaged groups.
- **ES 1.3.1** Gross and Net enrolment rates and completion rate by gender, level, location and economic status.
- **ES 1.3.2** Youth and adult literacy rate by gender, location and economic status.
- **ES 1.4.1** Infrastructure and staff provision in line with forecast requirement.
- **ES 1.4.2** SBMC and other community actions to promote access and equity.

**Teaching and Learning Environment**
- **ES 2.1** Extent of adoption and localization of policies setting minimum standards for teaching and learning environment.
- **ES 2.2** Measures undertaken to ensure compliance with established minimum standards.
- **ES 2.3.1** Percentage of classrooms in need of major repairs.
- **ES 2.3.2** Pupil per functional toilets.
- **ES 2.3.3** Pupil per functional classroom.
- **ES 2.3.4** Percentage of schools with potable water.
- **ES 2.3.5** Proportion of schools with secure environment.
- **ES 2.4.1** Level of Community participation in school management.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Performance criterion</th>
<th>Performance criterion</th>
<th>Performance criterion</th>
<th>Performance criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Management &amp; Systems</td>
<td>ES 3.1 Teacher Performance Management and Deployment System.</td>
<td>ES 3.2.1 Commitment to assessment of teaching competence through measuring pupil learning achievement.</td>
<td>ES 3.3.1 Pupil to teacher ratio.</td>
<td>ES 3.4.1 Arrangements for ensuring appropriate staffing and attendance standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ES 3.2.2 Extent to which appropriate instructional materials and information technology are infused in curriculum and instruction.</td>
<td>ES 3.3.2 Pupil per qualified teacher ratio.</td>
<td>ES 3.4.2 Institutionalization of M&amp;E system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ES 3.3.3 Percentage of teaching staff that received in-service training.</td>
<td>ES 3.4.3 Institutionisation of State EMIS Committee/ Unit.</td>
<td>ES 3.2.3 Arrangements to ensure reliability and relevance of education management information system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>ES 4.1 Existence of policies on teaching and learning standards.</td>
<td>ES 4.2.1 Establishment of functioning and effective quality assurance system.</td>
<td>ES 4.3.1 Percentage of schools inspected using quality assurance instruments.</td>
<td>ES 4.4 Extent to which recommendations from quality assurance and annual education sector performance report continue to inform State education policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ES 4.3.2. Percentage of students who obtained pass certificate in standard examinations.</td>
<td>ES 4.3.3. Per pupil teaching cost by level of education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Health Sector Assessment Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Strategic Health Development Plan</th>
<th>HS 1.1 Existence and implementation of Strategic Health Development Plan.</th>
<th>HS 1.2 Strategic plans for the Health Sector exist and institutionalised.</th>
<th>HS 1.3 Extent to which Sector targets are being met.</th>
<th>HS 1.4 Extent to which developments in the health sector are linked to the plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery &amp; Performance</td>
<td>HS 2.1.1 Institutional arrangements for Primary and secondary health care and financing of healthcare in the State.</td>
<td>HS 2.2.1 Extent of collaboration with the Primary Health Care Development Agency.</td>
<td>HS 2.3.1 Health Sector indicators such as Health spending per capita, number of tertiary, secondary and primary health care facilities by ownership; and bed per population (rural and urban).</td>
<td>HS 2.4.1 Proportion of wards with functioning public health facility providing minimum health care package according to quality of care standards; including availability of safe water and sanitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS 2.2.2            Number and type of health management and integrated supportive supervision mechanism put in place and implemented.</td>
<td>HS 2.3.2 Prevalence of Tuberculosis.</td>
<td>HS 2.4.2 Number of health facilities and services with client/patient feedback and complaint mechanism and structures existing at all levels of care.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS 2.3.3            HIV prevalence rate and number of People Living with HIV and AIDS (PLHA) with access to Antiretroviral drugs (ART) and the range of services rendered to them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS 2.3.4            Number of reported cases of new Wild Polio Virus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunization, Child and Maternal Mortality</td>
<td>HS 3.1 Framework for immunization, child and maternal mortality in the state.</td>
<td>HS 3.2 Number of wards and LGAs with functional, well equipped and staffed immunizable diseases surveillance system and structures.</td>
<td>HS 3.3.1 Proportion of 12 -23 months-old children fully immunized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS 3.3.2            Percentage of children 6-59 months-old receiving Vitamin A supplements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS 3.3.3 Malaria Incidence among under-five children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS 3.3.4 Total fertility Rate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS 3.3.5 Number of newly reported Wild Polio Virus cases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS 3.3.6 Infant, Child and Maternal mortality ratio.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS 3.3.7 Contraceptive prevalence rate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS 3.2.8 Percentage of pregnant women with 4 ANC visits performed according to national standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>HS 4.1 Framework for staffing and capacity development of health personnel in the state</td>
<td>HS 4.2 Proportion of health professionals per population (physician, nurses and health workers per population (rural/urban)).</td>
<td>HS 4.3 Number and types of plans and programmes for strengthening and motivating the human resource capacities in the health sector implemented.</td>
<td>HS 4.4 Quantity and quality of schools for training health professionals in the state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceutical Management Programme</td>
<td>HS 5.1 Existence of Drug Revolving Fund modelled after public-private partnership</td>
<td>HS 5.2 Number of Health facilities experiencing stock-outs of drugs within the last one year.</td>
<td>HS 5.3 Efficiency of the procedures including the service delivery points.</td>
<td>HS 5.4 Options for recapitalizing the DRF including public-private partnership schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of Health Information and Management System, Communication and Advocacy</td>
<td>HS 6.1 Existence of fully established HMS in the state.</td>
<td>HS 6.2.1 Proportion of state annual health budget earmarked and utilized for health research, generation of evidence, and research capacity strengthening.</td>
<td>H.S. 6.3.1 Number of health programmes and interventions plans and strategies for improved coverage and high quality impact developed based on information generated from routine HMIS data.</td>
<td>HS 6.4 Extent of collaboration with communities (active participation of women groups, traditional rulers, opinion leaders, CBOs, NGO and CSOs).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Management</th>
<th>EnvS 1.1.1 Existence of waste management policies, strategies and plans that align with Federal equivalents.</th>
<th>EnvS 1.2.1. State institutional framework for waste management and its alignment with relevant Federal institutions.</th>
<th>EnvS 1.3.1 Availability of final waste disposal sites.</th>
<th>EnvS 1.4.1 Establishment of solid waste sanitary landfills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EnvS 1.1.2 Existence of Policy encouraging waste to wealth programme.</td>
<td>EnvS 1.3.2 Frequency of waste evacuation.</td>
<td>EnvS 1.3.3 Number of illegal refuse disposal sites and black spots.</td>
<td>EnvS 1.4.2 Existence and extent of State maintenance and improvement of waste management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management (DM)</td>
<td>EnvS 3.1 Existence of state policy on Data Management (DM).</td>
<td>EnvS 3.2 Existence of baseline data on different components of the environment.</td>
<td>EnvS 3.3.1 Number of environmental studies carried out.</td>
<td>EnvS 3.4.1 Research and Development Units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity Management</td>
<td>EnvS 2.1 Existence of updated laws on biodiversity, Status of biodiversity management policies, strategies and plans that align with Federal equivalents.</td>
<td>EnvS 2.2 Inventory of state biodiversity resources, Institutional framework for biodiversity management and its alignment with relevant Federal institutions.</td>
<td>EnvS 2.3.1 Existence of conservation facilities (e.g. zoo, parks, botanical gardens).</td>
<td>EnvS 2.3.2 Number of wildlife parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EnvS 2.3.3 Comprehensive Biodiversity report.</td>
<td>EnvS 2.3.4 Percentage of hectares of natural forest improved or retained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EnvS 2.4.1 Increase in capacity building/ equipment and increase of prosecuted polluters/year.</td>
<td>EnvS 2.4.2 Increase in forest cover; percentage hectares of degraded land restored; percentage of invasive species removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EnvS 2.4.3 Maintenance and improvement extent of biodiversity management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B) Performance criterion</td>
<td>(C) Performance criterion</td>
<td>(D) Performance criterion</td>
<td>(E) Performance criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution</td>
<td>EnvS 4.1.1 Existence of Management policies, strategies and plans that align with Federal equivalents and best practice.</td>
<td>EnvS 4.2. Encouragement of non-pollution sources of energy.</td>
<td>EnvS 4.3.1 Low level of untreated industrial effluents.</td>
<td>EnvS 4.4 Percentage level of compliance by all sectors with pollution-free policies and guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EnvS 4.1.2 Existence of institutional framework and enforcement mechanism</td>
<td>EnvS 4.3.2 Availability of data and monitoring mechanism.</td>
<td>EnvS 4.3.3 Number of companies with Environmental Audit Report (EAR) processed.</td>
<td>EnvS 4.3.4 Number of industries with abatement measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EnvS 4.3.5 Reduction of Air quality index (AQI).</td>
<td>EnvS 4.4.2 Budgetary provision of effective equipment, funding, capacity building and manpower for data collection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Governance</td>
<td>EnvS 5.1 Environmental policies and presence of environmental laws and enforcement.</td>
<td>EnvS 5.2.1 Coordinated approach to environmental management.</td>
<td>EnvS 5.3 Level of interference in prosecution of environmental offenders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EnvS 5.2.2 State of environment report.</td>
<td>EnvS 5.2.3 Level of implementation of National Council on Environment (NCE) resolution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Erosion Management</td>
<td>EnvS 6.1.1 Existence of soil erosion management, conservation policies, strategies and plans which align with federal equivalents.</td>
<td>EnvS 6.2.1 State institutional framework for soil erosion management and its alignment with federal institutions.</td>
<td>EnvS 6.3.1 Availability of erosion rehabilitation sites in the state.</td>
<td>EnvS 6.4 Establishment of Erosion control/ Management Authority/ Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EnvS 6.1.2 Existence of Policy encouraging rehabilitation of erosion sites.</td>
<td>EnvS 6.2.1</td>
<td>EnvS 6.3.2 Frequency of monitoring development at erosion site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EnvS 6.3.3</td>
<td>EnvS 6.3.3 Number of identified erosion sites and bad land topography in the state.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agriculture**

**Food and Agricultural Raw Material Supply**

- **AS 1.1.** Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework: Framework put in place to ensure and stimulate an increase in food and agricultural raw material supply (crops, livestock, fisheries and forestry products etc.)
- **AS 1.2.1.** State Government Performance: Existence and extent of effectiveness of livestock/fisheries health facilities.
- **AS 1.3.1** Performance criterion: Percentage change in the quality and quantity of farm inputs (e.g. fertilizer, seed, livestock/fisheries production inputs etc.) delivered to farmers by government and/or private companies.
- **AS 1.4.1** Performance criterion: Percentage Growth in Agricultural Production.
- **AS 1.2.2** Existence and extent of effectiveness of meteorological services (climate information centre) facilities in the state.
- **AS 1.3.2** Performance criterion: Annual count of private organizations/companies involved in the farm inputs (e.g. fertilizer, seed etc.) market and number/volume marketed.
- **AS 1.4.2** Percentage Growth in Agricultural Production resulting from FGN/states partnership.
- **AS 1.3.3** Annual count of Public Private Partnership and government investment directed at financing and maintaining inputs and their supply (e.g. tractors)
- **AS 1.4.3** Performance criterion: Extent of farmers output commercialization.
- **AS 1.4.4** Extent of farmers’ output commercialization for export.

**Agricultural Research and Extension Systems**

- **AS 2.1** Existence of programmes at State level aimed at ensuring dissemination of appropriate new technology.
- **AS 2.2** Annual count of new varieties (by commodities) and technologies made available for transfer
- **AS 2.3** Ratio of farmers to extension agents
- **AS 2.4** Proportion of farmers getting information from extension services and frequency of information supply measured as a % of the baseline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</th>
<th>State Government Performance</th>
<th>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</th>
<th>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land management and tenure systems</td>
<td>AS 2.1.2 Existing programmes at State level aimed at engaging local research centres in the development and dissemination of appropriate new technology.</td>
<td>AS 3.1 Framework that is gender and socially inclusive to promote land management and tenure systems for agricultural purpose.</td>
<td>AS 3.2 Measures undertaken by the State to ensure access to land and conserve land for good agricultural practices including for women and marginalized groups</td>
<td>AS 3.4 Annual count of Training mounted for extension agents in SLM techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS 3.3 Proportion of land area with Sustainable Land Management (SLM) practices measured as a percentage of the baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AS 3.3.2 Proportion of land area demarcated/gazetted as grazing reserves/stock routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Access</td>
<td>AS 4.1 Framework that ensures access to market</td>
<td>AS 4.2 Status of State rural infrastructures in ensuring market access</td>
<td>AS 4.3 Proportion of certified service providers and Price information systems measured as % of the baseline</td>
<td>AS 4.4 Proportion of men and women small-scale producers and farmers’ association linked to value chains and marketing companies/organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and irrigation supply and control</td>
<td>AS 5.1 Framework for water irrigation supply and control</td>
<td>AS 5.2 Existence of institutional structure to manage and control water irrigation supply systems in the State</td>
<td>AS 5.3 Volume and value of irrigated water capacity developed or rehabilitated</td>
<td>AS 5.4 Proportional increase in yield of crop/fish and farm income measured as a % of the baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit supply and insurance</td>
<td>AS 6.1 Framework for credit supply and insurance</td>
<td>AS 6.2 No. of Financial Institutions (Savings/Credit/Insurance) and products offered in rural areas</td>
<td>AS 6.3 Annual count of financial institutions (e.g. insurance, savings, loan) and products offered in rural areas</td>
<td>AS 6.4 Proportion of farmers with access to credit and insurance measured as a percentage of the baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for Undertaking Infrastructural Investments</td>
<td>IS 1.1 Extent to which the State has laws, regulations and policies to regulate investments in infrastructure, including private and public/private partnerships.</td>
<td>IS 1.2 Evidence that locations for infrastructure investment were in areas of greatest need</td>
<td>IS 1.3 Extent to which stakeholders, including women and vulnerable groups were involved in project identification/selection and implementation</td>
<td>IS 1.4 Evidence that community concerns were addressed before, during and after project implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Public Access to Infrastructure (i.e., Roads, Water and Power)</td>
<td>IS 2.2.1 Good Paved Asphalt Road link from state capital to all local governments' headquarters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B) Performance criterion</td>
<td>(C) Performance criterion</td>
<td>(D) Performance criterion</td>
<td>(E) Performance criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS 2.2.2 Daily per capita litres of water supply.</td>
<td>IS 2.2.3 Connectivity to Power (National Grid and Rural Electrification).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IS 2.2.4 Telecommunications coverage in the State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability and Maintenance</td>
<td>IS 3.1 Extent to which the state has laws, regulations and policies to ensure/guarantee sustainability and maintenance of investments in infrastructure.</td>
<td>IS 3.2 Existence of institutions and organizations responsible for sustainability and maintenance of investments in infrastructure.</td>
<td>IS 3.3 Percentage of state budget earmarked for sustainability and maintenance of investments in infrastructure</td>
<td>IS 3.4 Existence of cost recovery mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deployment of Computer-based ICT in the State</td>
<td>IS 4.1 Existence of policy on ICT in the State</td>
<td>IS 4.2.1 Level of deployment of ICT in the State (internet, cyberspace and the worldwide web (WWW).</td>
<td>IS 4.3 The governance structure and backend architecture for managing the State’s website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 4.2.2</td>
<td>The capacity of IT staff around the Chief Executive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 4.2.3</td>
<td>Existence of an interactive State website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS 4.2.4</td>
<td>The contents and functionality of the state website; is there sufficient depth and breadth of content offerings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Citizen Participation, Social Inclusion and Protection**

<p>| Promoting Competitive &amp; Electoral Politics | CP 1.1.1 Existence of mechanisms and institutions in the state to protect the right of citizens and political parties to free and fair elections on a periodic basis under the country’s constitution and relevant electoral laws. | CP 1.2.1 Extent to which the State has domesticated International Conventions, Codes and Standards on elections. | CP 1.1.2 Compliance with and efficacy of regulations governing | CP 1.2.2 The ability of all political parties to |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</th>
<th>State Government Performance</th>
<th>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</th>
<th>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political parties’ activities, such as intra-party democracy, political financing, political campaigns and resource allocation.</td>
<td>engage in a participatory and inclusive way in the electoral process.</td>
<td>CP 1.1.3 Neutrality of the state public service (MDAs) in the electoral process.</td>
<td>CP 1.2.3 Assessment of the independence and role of the electoral body in the electoral process, and its ability to conduct free and fair elections in the state.</td>
<td>CP 1.2.4 Election-related disputes, if any and their impartial adjudication by the electoral body and the courts, as applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Civil &amp; Political Rights</td>
<td>CP 2.1.1 Institutional framework for managing diversity and for promoting and protecting civil and political rights in the state.</td>
<td>CP 2.2.1 Platforms and mechanisms exist for easy and ready access to courts and other adjudication mechanisms to the</td>
<td>CP 2.3.1 Results accruing from police-community relationship.</td>
<td>CP 2.4.1 Proportion of population with access to Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanisms to resolve their legal complaints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizens, and especially to the poor, women, children and other vulnerable groups of citizens.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 2.1.2 Institutional framework in place in the state for ensuring that prosecutors, especially the Police and Director of Public Prosecutions are insulated from partisan political control and influence in practice.</td>
<td>CP 2.2.2 Mechanisms exist for ensuring safety of citizens and their properties are ensured at the state level.</td>
<td>CP 2.3.2 Results of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms in the state.</td>
<td>CP 2.4.2 State budget support to Police, other security agencies and CSOs, including community-based and faith-based organizations and vulnerable groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 2.1.3 Institutional framework to promote, encourage and protect civil society organizations, community-based and faith-based organizations in their civil and political rights and other democracy-promoting activities in the state.</td>
<td>CP 2.2.3 Crime incidence rate that threaten or violate civil and political rights of the citizen at State Level disaggregated by type (i.e. theft, murder, assault, kidnapping, rape and robbery).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 2.1.4 Legal Framework in place for managing police-community relationships &amp;</td>
<td>CP 2.2.4 Platforms exist which support community participation in crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanisms in the state</td>
<td>prevention as well as support Alternative Dispute Resolution.</td>
<td>CP 3.1.1 Existence of Affirmative Action Legislation (to ensure representation of women in key aspects of Governance) passed by SHoA and accented to by State Governor.</td>
<td>CP 3.2.1 Extent to which the State has domesticated International Conventions on domestic violence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 3.1.2 Institutional framework for affirmative action in appointive and elective positions.</td>
<td>CP 3.2.2 Gender disaggregated data available to facilitate effective analysis and monitoring of gender balance in appointive and elective positions.</td>
<td>CP 3.1.3 Existing Institutional framework for combating domestic violence.</td>
<td>CP 3.2.3 The Gender Gap Index as measured by Economic participation, Economic opportunities, Political Empowerment, Educational attainment and Health and Well being.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevancy, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 3.2.4</td>
<td>Number of reported cases of violence against women in the State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 3.2.5</td>
<td>Proportion of reported cases of violence against women that are prosecuted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Promoting and Protecting the Rights of Youths and Children | CP 4.1.1 Child Rights Act and African Youth Charter enacted into Law in the State, in line with international and regional codes and standards such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child; Optional Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children and Child Prostitution and Child Pornography. | CP 4.2.1 Extent to which the state has adopted and localised international conventions and national Acts on the rights of children. | CP 4.3.1 Existence of institutions and mechanisms to promote and protect the rights of the Child. | CP 4.4.1 State budget support to MDAs, CSOs, including community-based and faith-based organizations, working to promote and protect the rights of the Child in the state. |
| CP 4.1.2 Measures and policies (institutional framework) for promoting and protecting | CP 4.2.2 Extent to which the state has adopted and domesticated, as applicable | CP. 4.3.2 Existence of institutions and mechanisms to promote and protect the rights of the Youth. | CP 4.4.2 State budget support to MDAs, CSOs, including community-based and faith-based organizations, |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Assessment</th>
<th>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</th>
<th>State Government Performance</th>
<th>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</th>
<th>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>working to promote and protect the rights of the Youth in the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the rights of the Child, especially (i) from child abuse, such as : harmful cultural and social practices affecting the girl-child, prostitution, child trafficking, child labour; and (ii) through provision for child health care and child welfare, child education, custody and guardianship.</td>
<td>international and regional codes and standards on the rights of the youth.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 4.1.3 Measures and policies put in place and aimed at promoting and protecting the rights of the Youth, such as (i) promoting youth employment; (ii) preventing subjection of young girls to early marriage; (iii) providing equal opportunities for the education of young girls, and preventing the expulsion or rustication of pregnant young girls from school; (iv) prohibiting other abuses, such as trafficking in young persons and political thuggery that prevent youths from realizing their full</td>
<td>CP 4.2.3 Other legislative policy and institutional framework and mechanisms in place to promote the rights of children and to implement issues highlighted in the various international and regional codes and standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>potential; (iv) the inclusion in school curriculum courses to prepare young persons for employment; (v) the positive participation of the youth in the political and governance processes in the state, through their representation in governmental institutions; and (vi) designed to reform and improve the juvenile justice system and to provide for rehabilitation mechanisms for young offenders.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CP 4.3.4 Assessment of effectiveness of the measures and policies to promote and protect the rights of the youth, especially youth employment, and of those designed to sustain, monitor and evaluate the implementation of the measures and policies, such as training, education, and rehabilitation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 4.3.5</td>
<td>Outline the Youth unemployment rate in the state and disaggregate it (i) as a per cent of the national unemployment rate; and (ii) into comparative figure of urban and rural unemployment rate, i.e. what per cent of the youth unemployment rate is urban, and what per cent rural.</td>
<td>CP 4.3.6</td>
<td>Itemise and explain the challenges, including shortfalls and capacity deficits, faced in promoting and protecting the rights of the Child in the state and indicate steps taken to address them by state and non-state stakeholders in the state.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Vulnerable Groups, particularly</td>
<td>CP 5.1.1 Existence of laws on disability rights in the State.</td>
<td>CP 5.2.1 Extent to which the state has domesticated international Conventions on the rights of the</td>
<td>CP 5.3.1 Assessment of effectiveness of the measures and policies to promote and protect the rights of vulnerable groups in the state, and of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 5.4.1</td>
<td>State budget support to MDAs, CSOs, including community-based and faith-based organizations, working to promote and protect the rights of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Assessment</td>
<td>Existence and Application of Law on Mandate, Regulation, and Policy Framework</td>
<td>State Government Performance</td>
<td>Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)</td>
<td>Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (Sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
<td>Performance criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Physically and Visually Impaired</td>
<td>physically challenged.</td>
<td>those designed to sustain and monitor and evaluate the implementation of the measures and policies, such as training, education and rehabilitation.</td>
<td>vulnerable groups in the state.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP 5.1.2</td>
<td>CP 5.2.2</td>
<td>CP 5.2.3</td>
<td>CP 5.2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional framework for enforcement of compliance with equal opportunity principle in employment.</td>
<td>Number of persons with disability employed in MDAs disaggregated by sex.</td>
<td>Number of disability issues mainstreamed in public service reform.</td>
<td>Number of public buildings with disability access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This section presents detailed explanatory notes on the SPRM framework of indicators.

### 8.1 Policy & Strategy and Monitoring & Evaluation

Strategy is very crucial to the development and performance of any state government. It occupies a central position in the focus and proper functioning of any organization. This is because it is a plan that integrates the state's major goals, policies and action into a cohesive whole. A well-formulated strategy should therefore help to marshal and allocate a state's resources into a unique and viable posture based on its relative internal competencies and shortcomings and anticipated changes in the environment. Strategies help to create a sense of politics, purpose and priorities.

This aspect thus examines policy and strategy and the interrelated monitoring and evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Detailed Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Development Plan and Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P&amp;S 1.1</strong></td>
<td>The strategic plan of a state is a comprehensive policy document of the state that identifies the priority areas of the state. The strategic plan should define policy targets in the core sectors of economy, health, education, agriculture, environment and energy and infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existence of strategic plans to drive state development priorities</strong></td>
<td>This indicator will be measured by the existence of a document, which can be described as the State strategic plan. Most states developed the State/Economic Empowerment Development Strategy (SEEDS) between 2004 and 2009. It is important to note that this indicator looks at the current strategic plan that the state is using. Any document that sets out clear and comprehensive state plans and strategies with policy priorities, targets and strategies for achieving them should be regarded as state strategic plan. The most important criterion is that the strategic plan must be comprehensive, current and being utilised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The reviewers should determine how far the state strategic plan and/or development plan is aligned with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Vision 20:2020 Economic Transformation blueprint for Nigeria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The reviewers should note that the state strategic plan and/or development plan do not need to reflect all the priorities in the MDG or the vision 2020 blueprint but the priorities should be broadly consistent.

In summary, performance of this indicator is the existence of a comprehensive strategic plan and/or development plan with clear priorities, targets, programmes and strategies. The key assessment questions will be:

i. Is there a state strategic plan and/or development plan?
ii. Was the plan informed by a gender and social analysis of the state?
iii. Do the state strategic plan and/or development plan contain clear priorities, targets, programmes and strategies?
iv. Are the priorities aligned with the MDGs, vision 20:2020?
v. Are there clear policy targets that describe the outcome of the policy in terms of a better service delivery or improvement of the welfare of citizens?
vi. What programmes are in place to accomplish the objective of the strategic plan?
vii. Does the plan contain a clear means of achieving the targets?

If there is no strategic plan and/or development plan document produced by the state in the last 5 years, then the reviewers should ask the Commissioners and Permanent Secretaries in charge of economic planning and budget what documents they are using. The Reviewers should then assess these documents as to their suitability as state strategic plan and/or development plans.

Information should be sourced from Commissioners and Permanent Secretaries in charge of economic planning and budget; sector MDAs.

P&S 1.2

Strategic plans for six core sectors of assessment

This indicator examines whether there are specific sector strategic plans for the six core sectors of Health, Education, Economic Development, Agriculture, Environment and Infrastructure (i.e. Medium Term Sector Strategy ‘MTSS’ for each of the sectors).

It will be measured by analysing the state development plans and how it addresses the six core sectors. The following issues will be examined:

i. Are the six priority sectors sufficiently covered?
ii. Has the plan identified the key challenges in the six core sectors?
iii. Are there specific targets and instruments to address the challenges identified?

iv. Are the priority programmes and projects adequate to address the challenges?

v. Are there programmes that address gender and social inclusion issues in the situational analysis?

vi. Is there sufficient capacity in the state to address the challenges? Are there plans to address any capacity gap?

The evidence for this indicator can be found in the state development plan, sectoral plans, strategies and policies.

The effective implementation of the state development plans will depend on meeting the targets set in the plan. The targets should be specific, measurable and time-bound. For instance, to meet the policy of increasing access to education in the education sector, the target can be 20 percent more children completing basic education by 2012. This target is measurable and reviewers can determine by scrutinising available factual information if the target has been met.

This indicator considers whether the targets set in the six core sectors of the SPRM are met; it should be measured in two ways:

i. The reviewers should establish arrangements put in place by the government to monitor service provision against targets for each of the five core areas; and

ii. The reviewers should judge the targets against the reality on the ground from data available.

For example:

i. What are the targets set for each of the six core areas in the state development plan or any sectoral plans/policies or programmes in the core areas?

ii. How realistic are the targets, given the situational analysis of the six core areas in the state?

iii. Are there mechanisms for collecting data and monitoring achievement of the targets?

iv. Are the data disaggregated by sex and by local government areas?

v. Have the targets been met?
In the absence of data, alternative way of gauging performance will be discussion with relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries.

The evidence for this indicator will be monitoring and evaluation reports of the state planning commission or the various ministries responsible for the six core sectors.

**P&S 1.4**
*State development trajectory linked to strategic plans*

Every state should have a projected development trajectory that draws from international and national projections, including the frameworks of the MDGs and Vision 2020. Success in pursuing the development trajectory will depend on how the development plan squares with the development trajectory. This indicator will therefore examine whether there is a linkage between the development trajectory and the strategic plans.

It will be measured by reviewing the strategic intent of the development plan with the actual plans and determining whether there is linkage. For example;

i. Is there a linkage between the development trajectory of the state and the strategic plans?

ii. Are the strategic goals and objectives directly linked to the plans?

In the absence of a state development plan, the reviewers should find out from the relevant commissioners, permanent secretaries and Directors the documents that guide the plans and policies of the state government.

The main source of information for this indicator is the state development plan.

**Participation and Ownership**

**P&S 2.1**
*State development plans and strategies developed in collaboration with relevant stakeholders.*

This indicator examines the way the state development plan was developed. It sets out to investigate whether the process of developing the plan was participatory. It reviews the process to see the level of participation of members of the state executive council, the legislature, the private sector, women groups, youth groups, CBOs, faith-Based organisations, labour and civil society organizations. As noted above, a participatory process of developing a state development strategy will increase its acceptance and potential for success. This indicator measures the participation of relevant stakeholders in the process of developing the development plan. The relevant stakeholders are the executive, the legislature, women groups, youth groups, CBOs, faith-Based organisations,
private sector and CSOs. The reviewers should determine whether relevant stakeholders participated in the process and their levels of participation: information sharing, consultation, collaboration or delegation.

There are a number consultative Techniques—Guidance from the SEEDS Manual that can be applied here:

Techniques suggested in the SEEDS manual include:

1. Direct consultation of elected officials;
2. Forums to provide opportunities for community representatives (such as women groups, youth groups, NGOs, CSOs and business leaders) to express their voices;
3. Use of radio and other media to transfer public preferences to policy makers; and
4. Application of participative techniques for collecting information. The techniques include:
   a) Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPAs);
   b) Service delivery assessments (perhaps using scorecards techniques) and
c) Core Welfare Indicator Questionnaire (CWIQ surveys).

Some of these techniques especially the CWIQs can be conducted quickly. They provide the dual advantage of allowing for popular views on priority needs to be obtained, while at the same time establishing a baseline for monitoring progress with policy targets.

In general we recommend that participatory techniques should carry more weight than forums or summits. Large public meetings are difficult to manage. They normally yield a large variety of different and sometimes impressionistic perspectives but a limited amount of detailed and definitive information. (Public meetings focused on a specific issue can yield better results). Participative survey techniques identify popular preferences with a measure of objectivity, leaving the decisions about choosing priorities with those who rightfully bear this responsibility—the political leaders.

To determine whether the concerns of the relevant stakeholders are reflected in the final document, the evaluator should do a content analysis of the draft documents before consultation, the submissions by the relevant stakeholders and the final document in addition to opinions of government officials and the relevant stakeholders. The reviewers should seek
information from both government officials and the relevant stakeholders. In the absence of relevant reports, the reviewers should discuss with relevant stakeholders to gauge performance.

The evidence for this indicator can be obtained from reports of meetings held with relevant stakeholders, draft documents shared with stakeholders, documents prepared and submitted by relevant stakeholders and the extent to which the contributions of the stakeholders influence the final product.

P&S 2.2.1
State Development Board established by law.

This indicator defines the setting up of a state development board by law. It will be measured by the existence and responsibility for formulating and supervising the state development plan. Performance of this indicator will be measured by the existence and functioning of the state development board. In the absence of the law, the Reviewers should find out if there is any committee charged with this responsibility.

Sources of Information: The law establishing the state development board and minutes of meetings of the board.

P&S 2.2.2
Institutional framework in place for relevant sector stakeholders to participate in formulation and adoption of the state development plans and strategies.

This indicator examines whether there is an institutional framework for relevant sector stakeholders to participate in the formulation and adoption of the State development plan. This indicator will be measured by the existence or otherwise of an institutional framework for participation. It will examine whether there is a framework at the State level and in the six core sectors. It is not sufficient to just have meetings, but whether there exist frameworks that will aid informed decisions by stakeholders in the formulation and adoption of strategies and programmes as well as a mechanism for feedback.

The evidence for this indicator is the law establishing the state development board.

P&S 2.3.1
Local governments participate in formulating state development plans and strategies.

This indicator measures the participation of local government councils in the formulation of the state development plan and strategy. The reviewers will determine the quality and level of participation of local government councils in the formulation of the state development plan and strategy.
It is not sufficient to have a representative of the local government in the state development process. Good performance is to have a mechanism for the local government councils to have a systematic way of making input into the state development plan.

The reviewers should discuss with state and local government officials the extent to which local governments are involved in the planning process, as well as review submissions by local government.

This indicator should be sourced from memos (by state or local government), submission by local government officials and evidence of their adoption by the State.

The indicator measures whether relevant sector stakeholders participate in formulating the state development plan.

The reviewers will determine the level, quality and outcome of participation in the process of promoting the state’s development plan. The indicator should be investigated by asking the following questions:

i. Was there a direct consultation with elected officials?
ii. How many forums were organized with relevant stakeholders (sectoral stakeholders, women and youth groups, CBOs, traditional and religious groups, CSOs, labour and professional organizations)? Was sufficient information given to stakeholders before consultation?
iii. What suggestion did the stakeholders make?
iv. Were the suggestions incorporated in the final document?

It is not sufficient to hold consultations or meetings without availing participants with adequate information. It is also necessary to incorporate the recommendations emanating from such meetings. The reviewers must therefore determine whether adequate information was given to participants before the meetings and whether their contributions were reflected in the final document.

In the absence of the reports of consultative meetings and submission by stakeholders, reviewers should interview relevant stakeholders to determine the level, quality and outcome of their participation.

The evidence for this indicator can be obtained from reports of consultative meetings, submissions by various stakeholders and various drafts of the development plan.
This area of assessment seeks to examine the existence and standard of M&E system in the State. It also looks at the mechanisms the State has instituted to ensure that policy and strategy performance analysis are evidence based and that policy revisions are based on their outputs.

**P&S 3.1.1**

*Clarity of roles and responsibilities relating to*

This indicator seeks to ascertain whether the Ministry of Economic Planning or its equivalent has an outlined function that serves as their mandate to perform fact-based policy and strategy analysis (situation analysis which

---

**P&S 2.4.1**

*State planning board composition reflects broad stakeholder participation.*

This indicator assesses the composition of the state planning board to determine whether it reflects the diversity of the state and the stakeholders.

This indicator will be measured by analysing how broad the composition of the board is both in terms of diversity and stakeholder affiliation. It is not sufficient for the composition to reflect the diversity of the state, the board must also be inclusive, representing diverse stakeholder groupings such as civil society, the press, youth and women.

The evidence for this indicator is the list of names of members of the state planning board, their local government areas and professional/stakeholder affiliation.

---

**P&S 2.4.2**

*Number of sectors and Stakeholders, including vulnerable groups, CBOs and women groups involved in state/sector policy planning.*

This indicator measures the extent of stakeholder participation by analysing the number of sectors and stakeholders involved.

The development of any state requires interventions in various sectors including: agriculture, manufacturing, solid mineral development, oil and gas, trade, banking and finance, culture and tourism, security, education, health, water, energy, transport, ICT, housing, public service, private sector, environment, women, youth, persons living with disability and children.

It is not enough to have few representatives of stakeholders (or a handful of women) participate in the implementation of the state development plan. Development of a state requires the mobilization of all sectors of the economy to perform their respective roles. Participation will not only improve the quality and ownership of the plans but the implementation, which is a major problem in Nigeria.

In the absence of data, the reviewers should discuss with relevant stakeholders to gauge the extent of their participation.

Data source: Attendance list at stakeholders’ meetings.
policy/strategy analysis within Departments of Planning, Research and Statistics (DPRS or equivalent) in all MDAs.

incorporates gender and social inclusion issues) upon which policy decisions are based. Such functions ensure the development of evidence-based policies and strategies.

The evidence for this indicator is required in two forms. First is the existence of a written mandate that includes the function of policy and strategy analysis. This could be in form of circulars issued by the Head of Service, Council resolutions, and existence of an M&E Policy Framework in the State development plan. Better still, a separate document as M&E policy framework for the State approved by ExCo with a back-up law is useful.

The second level is to ascertain whether staff of the department understand in clear terms, their roles towards the attainment of such mandate. Evidence for the second level of assessment of this indicator is explanation by at least 4 key staff of the Agency and the responsible Department (Permanent Secretary, Director, Deputy Director, and the Desk Officer).

The performance benchmark is the M&E reform framework in the Vision 20:2020 approved by ExCo with a back-up law.

Having a good policy does not automatically translate to good implementation. With the development and existence of evidence-based policies, performance management function is key to result actualization. In this regard, the function and role of performance management is required to be part of an institutional mandate. In some States, this could be included in the mandate of the Ministry of Economic Planning or its equivalent, while some States might choose to have a separate Central Agency for M&E with the responsibility for Policy performance management function.

This indicator seeks to ascertain whether the Ministry of Economic Planning or its equivalent has clearly stated functions that serve as their mandate towards carrying out performance management of plans. Such functions ensure that progress reviews and evaluations are carried out. Caution should be exercised so as not to mistake project supervision with performance management.

The evidence for this indicator is required in two forms. First is the existence of a written mandate that includes the function of policy and strategy analysis. This could be in form of circulars issued by the Head of Service, Council resolutions, or the existence of an M&E Framework in the State development plan. Better still, a separate document as M&E policy framework for the State approved by ExCo with a back-up law may suffice.
The second level is to check whether the staff of the department understand in clear terms, what is required of them by such mandate. Evidence for the second level of this indicator assessment will come from interviews with at least 3 key staff of the responsible Department/unit within the Agency (Director, Deputy Director and the desk officer).

The performance benchmark is the M&E reform framework in the NV 20:2020 approved by ExCo with a back-up law.

P&S 3.2.1

Number and quality of policies, strategies and plans that are informed by evidence based analysis.

This indicator assesses whether the task of policy and strategy analysis is being performed by the Agency that is so mandated (reference to 1.1 above).

This could be ascertained by reading the policy statements and targets set in the State development plan to verify whether such statements have a preceding situation report providing the basis for it. Such reports could be found in the same document or contained in another document. Either way, the focus is to establish logical link between the situation analysis report and the follow-up policy thrust and targets which will serve as the required evidence for this indicator.

The performance benchmark is the OECD DAC Results Based Management (RBM) Guidelines.

P&S 3.2.2

Extent and quality of regular cross-government (e.g. State Development Plans) and sector (e.g. MTSS) review processes

This indicator seeks to assess the function of performance management that is being carried out by the Agency that has the mandate to do so (reference to 1.2 above). The function of performance management of plans and policies are undertaken through periodic conducts of annual progress reviews, mid-point evaluations, end point evaluations and ex-post evaluations. Effective performance management requires annual progress review of plans to ensure that resources are being utilised towards the otherwise, desired results.

The required evidence for this indicator is the approved guidelines for progress reviews and various performance evaluations of plans (State Development Plans and MTSS). More supportive evidence will be the first year progress report of any plan that is more than a year old.

This could be ascertained by reading the policy statements and targets set in the state development plan to check if such statements have a preceding situation report that provides the basis for it. Such reports could either be
found in the same document or could be contained in another document. Either way, the focus is to establish logical link between the analysis report and the follow-up policy thrust and targets which will serve as required evidence for this indicator.

The performance benchmark is the OECD DAC Evaluation Standards.

P&S 3.3.1
Extent to which the findings/recommendations from progress/performance review of state plans, MTSS and budgets are utilised

The purpose of conducting progress review is to identify early warning signals, if any, and to establish that resources are being channelled to actions/activities/projects that would lead to desired results. Thus, the review report is not an end in itself, but the resulting actions (e.g. amendments) initiated by the review findings and recommendations. This indicator therefore seeks to assess whether recommendations from the progress reviews have introduced any changes in the State Development Plan, MTSS and/or budget.

The required evidence for this indicator are the logical links between the review findings and recommendations and the revised/contingency plan. The benchmark is the approved action plan informed by the review recommendations.

P&S 3.3.2
Extent to which the budget performance reviews are linked to results in the plans and MTSSs

The common practice regarding budget performance review has been to ascertain the amount of funds released in line with approved estimates and time of release. However, good practice requires going beyond this stage to establishing the proportion of the desired result (outcome or output target) that the allocation contributed to their attainment. Setting this good practice as benchmark, this indicator seeks to assess the state’s effort towards this benchmark of result based budget performance review/evaluation.

The method for assessing this indicator is by reading the budget review/evaluation report to ascertain whether the reports are linked to the output/outcome targets in the plans. This assessment could be easily done if the State Plan had earlier disaggregated each multi-year policy targets into annual performance standards/benchmarks.

The required evidence is the report showing the contribution of timely release to the relevant results. These reports could be found in the Ministry of Finance or Budget Office, Ministry of Economic Planning or the designated office for this task (budget performance reviews) in each State.
P&S 3.4.2
Number of skilled staff for the performance of M&E/statistics functions in the State disaggregated by sex and level of qualification.

Level of political commitment to any policy is expressed in the level of resource allocation to that policy. Any policy statement not backed up with resource allocation is considered a wishful statement. Many States still confuse project field/technical supervision with the M&E, thus resource allocation to project supervision is considered allocation to M&E. Technically speaking, many States are yet to establish functional M&E systems and therefore do not have clear budget allocated to the M&E functions. Except for Health and Education with Management Information Systems (MIS), M&E resource allocations are typically limited to project supervision and data collection.

This indicator therefore seeks to establish the proportion of the State budget allocated to State-wide M&E system (data availability, MIS and performance management, knowledge management- in some cases). The data for the assessment of this indicator could be obtained from the State budget for the assessment year.

The benchmark is the generic SSMP.

Available of Statistics

P&S 4.1
Extent to which a State Statistical Act has been passed into law and is being applied.

The National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) was supported by the World Bank to develop a generic State Statistics Master Plan (SSMP). States are required to review this generic SSMP and adapt/adopt its contents in the context of each State’s Administrative convenience.

This indicator seeks to assess the extent to which the State has...
domesticated the generic SSMP and the related Act.

The evidence required for this indicator is; a copy of the domesticated SSMP and the Act. It is important to note that some States are merging the SSMP with a State-wide M&E framework as M&E/Statistics policy framework. This is commendable and should be encouraged. The report should reflect the status of progress and indications of areas of improvement (if any).

The benchmark is the NBS Generic State Statistical Master Plan.

Quality data can be described as data that is accurate, timely, sufficiently disaggregated, adequate, cost-effective and user-friendly. As explained in the background, statistics provided when the need for them have passed, or with limited scope on issues is just a waste of time and resources. This challenge is predominant in data/statistics generated through survey and/or operational research.

A practical example is the CWIQS report. The current CWIQ survey report was not available when some states needed the data/statistics for the development of their SEEDS-2. Similarly, some issue-based surveys such as, tool development, enumeration, training of enumerators, data collection, collation, analysis, presentation, etc. are delayed at various stages. This contributes to delay in finalising and presenting timely data/statistics. What is required is proactive actions on issue identification that will inform the tool development and scope definition. The starting time often determines completion time if adequate finance is provided.

This indicator therefore seeks to ascertain 1) the scope of the State data/statistics; and 2) whether they are finalised and presented early enough to inform policy decisions and subsequent reviews.

The main document for this will be the State Statistical Year Book (SYB). Data/Statistics contained in the SYB should not be limited to those generated from the administrative records, but should also include those from other valid surveys and researches such as the State central statistics document/resource. The method of assessing this indicator will be a review of the latest SYB in relation to the State Development Plan (SDP). The focus should be:

i. Whether the data/statistics in the SYB covers all the policy areas in the SDP;
ii. Whether the year of publication precedes the base year of the SDP.

The desirable practice is that the Statistical Year Book be updated annually. Before updating, the collected data should be validated with the sources/process owners to ensure accuracy. The updating should take cognisance of the future data/statistics needs based on previous reviews of the State development progress and should not be more than 3 years old; best practice is 6 to 12 months old.

Most States currently use the Statistical Year Book (SYB) as the central document for presentation of the approved State statistics on generic development data/statistics as guided by the NBS. The policy makers have described the presentation pattern of these SYBs as not user-friendly. Though the required data for analysing an issue might be available, if the producers do not have the client in mind while presenting the product (statistics), there will be low demand and eventual low utilisation of the product. Thus, this indicator seeks to assess whether development data/statistics are presented in a way that the current and potential users (politicians and SG officials) can easily understand it and be able to relate it to the policies.

The method for assessing this indicator is by reviewing the SYB and checking whether some of the tables are derived from the SDP’s KPIs/statistics standards (see 1.7 and 1.8 above). The assessment should also report on efforts by the State to convert it to the KPI format.

While indicator 4.3 is focusing on the supply side of statistics, this indicator is focusing on the demand side. Non user-friendly presentation of data/statistics also contributes to poor demand for data/statistics by the politicians and senior SG officials, since it apparently might not be making sense to them. This indicator seeks to establish the level of demand for data/statistics by SG officials.

The demand could be expressed in form of request letters from Permanent Secretaries, Commissioners, SSG, Deputy Governor and/or Governor or Council resolution on the need/request for data/statistics. It could also be expressed as a request for updating the SYB or request for statistics of any sort. These letters or similar correspondences will serve as evidence for this indicator and could be obtained from the Agency responsible for producing
8.2 Economic Development

Economic development refers to a sustainable increase in living standards. In its simplest form, it is the creation of economic wealth for all citizens within the diverse layers of society so that all people have access to potential increased quality of life. Economic development implies increased per capita income, better education and health as well as environmental protection. Public policy generally aims at continuous and sustained economic growth and expansion of national economies. The economic development process presupposes that legal and institutional adjustments are made to give incentives for innovation and for investments so as to develop an efficient production and distribution system for goods and services.

The indicators in this section assess the progress states are making in development and to what extent the developmental process is inclusive and broad-based. Within the context of the SPRM, it encompasses two main areas: state level economic growth and the business environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Detailed Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Level Economic Growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ED 1.1**  
Existence of framework to support State Level Economic Growth.

Economic growth is a process by which a nation's wealth increases over time or there is a positive change in the level of production of goods and services by a State/country over a certain period of time (usually one fiscal year). Nominal growth is defined as economic growth including inflation, while real growth is nominal growth minus inflation. Technological innovation and positive external forces usually induce economic growth.

This indicator aims to ascertain if the State has a framework to encourage and/or support economic growth. This will be in form of comprehensive strategies for growth. The strategies for economic growth may be in a section of the state strategic plan and/or development plan. Alternatively, it may be in the form of a separate document.

The assessment will not be restricted to the existence of strategies for economic growth but also a review of the State strategies to ascertain that they meet the following conditions:

i. Stimulate primary production (agriculture)  
ii. Support private sector-led growth  
iii. Attain high level of efficiency and productivity  
iv. Increase production of processed and manufactured goods
Therefore; the two aspects of the assessment are:

i. Whether the State has strategies for economic growth; and

ii. Secondly, if the strategies covered most of the above-listed conditions

The extent to which government can effectively translate their strategic intent into action and results are determined by the systems they have in place.

This indicator seeks to confirm if the State has the institutional mechanism and framework to translate their strategic plan for economic growth into action.

In applying this indicator the main question is; Does the State have the capacity to translate the strategic plan for economic growth into action and results? It is important to note that this indicator will not be assessed in States without operational strategies for economic growth.

Examples of an institutional framework to stimulate primary production are:
Agriculture- (State Level Agriculture Research Institutions, State-promoted farm settlements and/or irrigation schemes, etc.) (processed and manufactured goods - industrial parks, industrial clusters, incubators, industrial park development agency, State-promoted parks, clusters, incubators, etc.).

The existence of institutions is not sufficient, the assessment will analyse extent of funding of the institutions, existence of the right crop of professionals – men and women- and their level of motivation to perform their functions. And in the case of farm settlements, parks, clusters, and incubators, if basic facilities (such as power, internal link to major roads, water, security, communication, funding, proper management, etc.) are in place.

The rationale for this set of indicators is to access the performance of the State economy in areas such as:

i. State level Gross Domestic Product (GDP) Per Capita;
GDP, Manufacturing sector’s share of State level GDP and Oil sector’s share of State level GDP.

ii. Contribution of Agriculture and Manufacturing sectors to State level GDP calculated using yearly economic activities for - Crop Production; Livestock; Fishing; and Manufacturing

While there is information on State Level GDP, the index of economic activities will be used as a proxy of State level GDP because of paucity of data to calculate percentage contribution of the sectors to State level GDP. However, yearly economic activities of the sectors remain a useful gauge of their performance.

Information should be sourced from CBN Annual Reports, CBN Statistics Bulletin, NBS National Accounts, NBS Human Development Indicators, and UNDP Human Development Reports.

ED 1.4 State Human Poverty Index, Human Development Index and Unemployment Rate.

The structure of production and nature of growth of a state to a large extent account for the level of human poverty and human development indexes. As highlighted by many studies, changes in economic growth and poverty may move in opposite direction.

Human poverty index brings together in a composite index the different features of deprivation in the quality of life to arrive at an aggregate judgment on the extent of poverty in a community. Human Development Index is a summary of composite index that measures average achievement in three basic aspects of human development – health, knowledge and income. It is good practice to disaggregate the Human Development Index by gender to get a better sense of quality of life and real economic growth.

Unemployment occurs when people are without jobs and have actively searched for work in the past four weeks. The unemployment rate is a measure of the prevalence of unemployment and it is calculated as a percentage by dividing the number of unemployed individuals by all individuals in the labour force.

The human poverty index, human development index and unemployment rate is used to measure impact of state’s interventions, particularly in respect to economic growth.

Information should be sourced from CBN Annual Reports, CBN Statistics Bulletin, NBS National Accounts, NBS Human Development Indicators, and UNDP Human Development Reports.
ED 2.1
State Legislation and Strategic framework for improving the ease of doing business in the State.

Business environment refers to the enabling conditions for private enterprise and business competitiveness in the economy.

This indicator aims to assess whether the State has laws and/or a strategic framework to provide incentives for private sector investments. This may be in the form of a law and/or policy statement. If it is in the form of a policy statement, the policy statement will be binding and enforceable. The law and/or policy statement should be gender and socially inclusive and provide for the following:

i. Land facilitation, especially for women-owned businesses
ii. Waivers
iii. Special concession
iv. Infrastructure/utilities provisioning
v. Credit guarantees, especially for small enterprises
vi. Special programmes that will facilitate business take-off, etc.

The assessment will determine if the State has laws and/or policy statement with the provisions listed above that are meant to promote business.

ED 2.2.1
Level of support by the State for businesses.

This indicator assesses the performance of government in the support of businesses. The actual support may be in the form of:

I. Publishing an up to date investment and business information guide to enlighten investors;
II. Publishing an up to date directory of business firms in the State;
III. Funding of small and medium enterprises promotion/development centre and/or agency;
IV. Funding programmes that promote linkages between large firms and small & medium enterprises;
V. Funding of small and medium enterprises credit scheme.

Each State will be evaluated using these parameters.

ED 2.2.2
Assessment of the investment climate in the State.

For years, Nigerian businesses have been confronted with a tough environment characterised by an acute shortage of energy, poor transportation network, as well as low levels of education and growing insecurity. These factors have contributed immensely to the declining contribution of the manufacturing sector to the GDP and reduced competitiveness. However, Nigeria’s inventive businessmen and women continue to find ways of coping. The resilience of the private sector promises a much-improved performance, if government and the private sector can partner to remove some of the largest obstacles to doing business. This indicator is thus concerned with the challenges that Nigeria’s businesses face.
Data should be sourced from the World Bank Investment Climate Assessment Reports for Nigeria, which evaluates the country’s business environment at the subnational level by (i) analysing barriers to private sector investment and growth and how they vary among different types of firms, (ii) benchmarking the State’s investment climate and firm performance to that of other States, Nigeria as a whole as well as other countries and (iii) providing recommendations to promote and strengthen the private sector. The Report is largely based on the analysis of Enterprise Survey data mostly manufacturing, formal sector enterprises in the major industrial centres of an economy and the perception of entrepreneurs in the country. They highlight the main obstacles to business activity as reported by entrepreneurs. Among the factors that the surveys have identified as important to businesses have been electricity, access to finance, taxes (tax administration as well as tax rates), macroeconomic environment, corruption and insecurity. As a diagnostic tool, they identify bottlenecks as well as highlight good practices that are easily replicable in other settings sharing a similar legal framework.

ED 2.2.3
Perceived obstacles to doing business in the state.

The private sector provides an estimated 90% of jobs in developing economies according to World Bank estimates. A growing body of evidence suggests that policy makers seeking to strengthen the private sector need to pay attention not only to macroeconomic factors but also to the quality of laws, regulations and institutional arrangements that shape daily economic life. This indicator sought to examine how microeconomic issues such as business regulations affecting local firms especially small and medium sized firms at different states of their life cycle- starting a business, dealing with permits, registering property and enforcing contracts.

Information should be sourced from World Bank Doing Business Subnational Surveys specifically for Nigeria, that seeks to measure business regulations for domestic firms in the 36 States of the Federation. Assessors should present ‘absolute’ indicators for each State in the four regulatory areas as well as the State’s ranking nationally and in the Geopolitical Zone. Where applicable, changes over time should also be presented to gauge the extent of reform.

ED 2.3
Number of private sector businesses operating in the state (Banks, Insurance Companies, Stock Brokers and Micro Finance Banks).

The number of private sector businesses operating in the State refers to the numerical count of enterprises operating in the State. However, this might pose some problems in States without the requisite data. In that case, the number of financial institutions operating in the State will be used as a proxy for the number of businesses operating in that State. The indicators are therefore assessed by the relative number of head offices/branches of the following:
i. Banks;  
ii. Insurance Companies;  
iii. Stock Brokers; and  

Information on these variables can be obtained from the Corporate Affairs Commission and the Central Bank.

**ED 2.4.1**  
*Existence of Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanism in the State; especially as it relates to the private sector.*

The assessment will determine if there are Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) facilities in the State. In this regard, assessment will not be restricted to the existence of ADR facilities; it should include whether the ADR facilities are funded and businesses and private individual cases are resolved in the facilities.

**8.3 Public Financial Management**

An open and efficient PFM is essential for the implementation of State government policies and achievement of developmental objectives. It is also a critical element for maintaining aggregate fiscal discipline, ensuring strategic allocation of resources and promoting efficient service delivery and value for money. The PFM assessment seeks to ascertain the performance of PFM system in the State in six key areas:

- Fiscal Planning  
- Budget Preparation and Budget Realism  
- Revenue Administration  
- Procurement  
- Financial Recording, Reporting and External Scrutiny  
- Inter-Government Fiscal Relation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Detailed Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Planning</td>
<td>This area of PFM assessment examines the nature of the State government framework and basis for effective and efficient resource allocation and use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PFM 1.1.**  
*Extent to which the State has adopted and localized the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2007*  

This indicator will primarily ascertain whether the State has adopted and localized the Fiscal Responsibility Act of the Federal Government. The main goal of the Fiscal Responsibility Law is to strengthen the State’s finances so that delivery of services and infrastructure can be maintained regardless of fluctuations in revenue. However, the assessment will not be restricted to the existence of a Fiscal Responsibility Law but will also review the State Fiscal Responsibility
Law, to ascertain whether the key elements of a Fiscal Responsibility Law are incorporated in the State Law.

The key elements of a Fiscal Responsibility Law are:

i. Statement of Fiscal Principles (how State will conduct fiscal policy).

ii. Medium-Term Fiscal Framework (making it mandatory for Governors to make public and present before the legislature, State Medium-Term Fiscal Framework).

iii. Annual Budget (showing that funds can only be disbursed within the set limit in the Appropriation Law and that projects identified therein must be executed within a fiscal year).

iv. Savings and Assets Management Rules (particularly rules for setting aside a proportion of, for example, excess crude earnings as savings).

v. Conditions for borrowing (guidelines for borrowing that is in line with requirements of Debt Management Office Act).

vi. Fiscal Transparency Rules (preparation of State quarterly budget execution report as well as making available the report to the public).

vii. Measures to Enforce Compliance.

Therefore; the two aspects of the assessment are:

i. Whether the State has a Fiscal responsibility Law; and

ii. If it does, to what extent is the above listed key elements covered in the State’s Fiscal Responsibility Law.

Fiscal planning and multi-year perspective in expenditure planning and budgeting will not be attained without the existence of strong institutional arrangements in the State. In applying this indicator, the focus is primarily to ascertain whether the State has the capacity to perform the fiscal planning functions as provided in the Fiscal Responsibility Law. It is important to note that this indicator will not be assessed in a State without a Fiscal Responsibility Law or equivalent legislation.

An example of an institutional framework for fiscal planning and multi-year perspective in expenditure planning and budgeting is an independent commission or an equivalent institution with fiscal planning and multi-year expenditure planning and budget as its mandate. Existence of an
PFM 1.3
The Medium-Term Sectors Strategies (MTSS) (Education, Health, Environment, Agriculture and Infrastructure) with full costing of recurrent and investment expenditure broadly consistent with fiscal forecast.

State governments’ policy decisions have multi-year implications and must be aligned with availability of resources in the medium term. Multi-year forecasts and estimates of forward expenditures (including recurrent expenditure and multi-year investment commitments) are required to determine whether current and new policies are affordable, within aggregate fiscal targets.

Expenditure policy decisions or options should be described in sector strategy documents, which are fully costed in terms of estimates of forward expenditures (including expenditures both of a recurring nature as well as those involving investment commitments and their recurrent cost implications) to determine whether current and new policies are affordable within aggregate fiscal targets. On this basis, policy choices should be made and medium-term sector allocations established. The extent to which forward estimates include explicit costing of the implication of new policy initiatives, involve clear, strategy-linked selection criteria for investments and are integrated into the annual budget formulation process will completes the policy-budget link.

The questions to be answered by this indicator are:

i. Whether the State forecasts fiscal aggregates for at least three years on a rolling annual basis (on the basis of the main categories of economic and functional/sector classification)

ii. Strategies for Health, Education, Agriculture, Environment and Infrastructure sectors exist with full costing of recurrent and investment expenditure, broadly consistent with fiscal forecasts

Costing of strategies tend to be an iterative process. Once a government’s desired strategies are costed, it usually (if not always) finds that the resources available to implement them are insufficient. At this point where tough development decisions have to be made, what strategies are used to determine the priorities? This is an important part of the democratisation process.

The evidence required for assessing this indicator are the State fiscal aggregates for at least three years and MTSS for Health, Education,
Agriculture, Environment and Infrastructure. The documents should be sourced from the State.

A State without an MTSS for any of the above-mentioned sectors will not be assessed. However, if the State has an MTSS for any of the sectors, this indicator assessment will be confined to the sector(s) only.

**PFM 1.4.1**

*Level of Stakeholders’ participation in Fiscal Planning and Level of Public accessibility to fiscal information*

The growth of Nigeria’s democracy requires that the populace are given opportunity to contribute to fiscal decisions. The first aspect of this indicator looks at the extent to which consultations take place on fiscal planning. This involves establishing whether the following key stakeholders were consulted in the process of fiscal planning:

i. The State House of Assembly;
ii. The State Executive Council;
iii. Women and youth groups;
iv. Special needs groups such as the physically challenged and Persons Living with HIV/AIDS;
v. Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), CBOs, FBOs, traditional and religious groups and other Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and the private sector;
vi. The wider public (through forums in senatorial districts, Local Governments, etc).

States should provide evidence to confirm that consultations took place, the nature of the consultations and what effect the consultations has had on the process. It will not be out of place to seek opinions from outside Government about the nature and effectiveness of consultations on fiscal planning.

**PFM 1.4.2.**

*Level of Public accessibility to fiscal information.*

This indicator sets out to examine whether or not the public have access to fiscal information. There is no particular way of doing this as it is up to States to decide the best way to propagate or disseminate fiscal information to a wider audience. The assessment will determine how effectively the State has achieved these two goals:

i. Fiscal information is readily available in an accessible location to members of the public;
Framework of the State Budget
Preparation and Implementation Guidelines (processes, activities, roles, responsibilities and timeline).

**PFM 2.1**  
*Framework of the State Budget Preparation and Implementation Guidelines*  
(processes, activities, roles, responsibilities and timeline).

**PFM 2.2.1.**  
*Extent to which the annual budgets on Education, Health, Environment, Agriculture and Infrastructure are based on State Approved Medium-Term Strategy for each of these five main sectors.*

Budget Preparation and Budget Realism
This area of assessment looks at budget preparation and implementation.

A budget is a tool that gives substance to a plan or a strategy. Budgeting is an annual process, which enables a State Government to implement and achieve the goals stated in its policy documents for a particular fiscal year. Budget management involves planning, organizing, coordinating, monitoring and reporting the various activities contained in the budget cycle.

For effective budget management there should be formal rules in respect of the budget processes, activities, roles, responsibilities and timelines. The rules should also provide standard budget procedures to be followed by all Ministries, Departments and Agencies.

The rules may be in the form of a Budget Manual or Organic Budget Law. The assessment will, therefore, ascertain whether or not there is a Budget Manual or Organic Law and where it exists, if the manual or law contains comprehensive State budget processes, activities, roles, responsibilities and budget timetable.

Failure to link policy, planning and budgeting is about the single most important factor responsible for poor budgeting outcome at the State level. In many states, the systems are fragmented such that one office performs policy and planning activities, while a separate office performs budgeting activities. Thus, policy making, planning and budgeting take place independently of each other. Planning is often confined to developing State long-term and medium-term strategies. Budgeting is reduced to allocating resources on annual basis (capital and recurrent) without reference to the strategies developed by planning office. Under this arrangement MDAs tend to budget and spend on an ad-hoc basis.

The indicators scrutinise only the budget, not actual fund releases. The main source of information is approved budgets and MTSS for the six sectors. The assessment will calculate the percentage of current year capital budget
that directly flows from the MTSS as well as percentage not in the MTSS. A state without an MTSS for any of the core sectors will not be assessed. However, if the state has an MTSS for any of the sectors, this indicator assessment will be limited to that sector or sectors only.

Integrated policy, planning and budgeting is fundamentally about having revenue and expenditure programmes that are driven by policy priorities and disciplined by budget realities. This indicator is therefore to determine the percentage of capital budget directly linked to the MTSS of the five sectors. It suffices that this indicator will be applied for only sectors that have developed their MTSS.

**PFM 2.2.2**

*Date of Key Budget Activities and Proper Legislative Scrutiny of Appropriation Bill*

This indicator looks at the:

i. Timeliness of budget call circular to ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs),

ii. Timeliness of presentation of the budget to the State Assembly,

iii. Extent of Legislative scrutiny, and

iv. Timeliness of passage and Governor’s assent to Appropriation Law.

A good budget process should begin with circulation of a call circular that defines expected budget ceilings for each MDA, summary of state policy statement, priorities, etc. Good practice is for this to be issued before July 1 each year. To allow appropriate time for deliberation, November 1, has also been suggested as benchmark for presentation of appropriation bills to the State House of Assembly. The budget also needs to be passed by the State House of Assembly and receive the Governor’s assent on or before December 31.

The assessment will note the dates that these three key budget activities were performed for the current year and the two preceding years’ budgets. This will be ascertained through interviews and reviews of relevant documents.

Assessment of the legislative scrutiny of the annual Appropriation Bill requires consideration of several factors including:

i. The scope of the legislature’s review. Ideally, the legislature should review and agree on fiscal policies and any medium-term fiscal framework, in advance of review of details of expenditure and revenue;
ii. The extent to which the legislature’s procedures are well-established, provide adequate time, and involve scrutiny of the budget by specialised committee(s); and

iii. The adequacy and user-friendliness of the information received by the legislature.

An example of effective scrutiny of the budget is when the legislature challenges any item in the budget on grounds of value for money. If the budget has been reduced because some expenditure in the original version could not be justified, this would be evidence of an effective scrutiny of the budget.

This will also be ascertained through discussion with officials and, if possible, legislators to obtain evidence of details and quality of legislative scrutiny of the budgets.

**PFM 2.3.1**

*Percentage of State Budget Allocation to Education, Health, Agriculture, Environment and Infrastructure*

This indicator identifies the percentage of the state budget allocated to the key sectors of Education, Health, Agriculture, Environment and Infrastructure. The purpose is to determine the pattern of state budgetary allocation to the core sectors over a three-year period.

The assessment will calculate the percentage of total budget allocation for each of the core sectors over the total state budget, the percentage of each of the sectors’ capital budget over the total state capital budget, the percentage of each of the sectors’ personnel budget over total state personnel budget, and the percentage of each of the sectors’ overhead budget over the total state overhead budget.

The assessment will cover the current year’s budget and the two preceding years’ budgets. The indicator is restricted to the budget and not actual fund releases. The main source of this information is the approved budget.

**PFM 2.3.2**

*Level of Budget Deviation and/or Variance*

This indicator ascertains if the budget is being used as an effective tool for fiscal discipline and fiscal planning. Thus, the indicator will calculate:

i. Percentage deviation of actual from budgeted expenditure

ii. Percentage of expenditure out-turn compared to budgeted expenditure for Education, Health, Environment, Agriculture and Infrastructure

iii. Percentage of actual revenue collection in relation to projections
The assessment will cover the two preceding years' budgets. The source of documents for these should be audited accounts (i.e. the Auditor-General's report). Where the audited accounts are unavailable, reviewers may decide to use the Budget performance reports (the particular documents used should be noted in the assessment report).

For the purposes of this indicator, a positive variance (expenditure less than budget) is no better than a negative variance (expenditure more than budget).

**PFM 2.4.1**

*Level of citizens’/stakeholders’ (including women and vulnerable groups) participation and engagement in budget process.*

Effective participation in the annual budget process impacts the extent to which the budget reflects fiscal and sectoral policies. This requires an integrated top-down and bottom-up budgeting process, involving central agencies, spending agencies, political leadership and members of the public through civil society organisations, women and youth groups, non-governmental organisations, faith-based organisations, professional organisations and private sectors bodies.

This indicator is to assess the level of state government engagement with citizens and stakeholders in the budget process. States should provide evidence of whether the state engaged with citizens and stakeholders, and what effect the engagement had on the budget.

It may be necessary to seek opinions from outside government cycles on how effectively the Government engaged during budget processes as follows:

i. Justification of budget appropriations for financing of targeted new programmes, and

ii. Explanation of budget implication of new policy initiatives.

The source of information for this indicator is Ministry of Finance and State House of Assembly.

**PFM 2.4.2**

*Key budget documents submitted to the State House of Assembly for budget scrutiny and approval.*

All the key budget information should be included in the budget documentation (the annual budget and budget supporting documents) to the State House of Assembly. This is to allow for proper legislative scrutiny and approval of budget.

The annual budget documentation should include the following:
i. Prior years’ budget out-turn presented in the same format as the current year; and
ii. Summarised budget data for both revenue and expenditure according to budget main heads, including data for the current and previous year.

PFN 2.4.3
Level of access of key budget documents as submitted to State House of Assembly and approved budget by the public

This indicator is directly linked to indicator 2.4.2 above. This is to ascertain if the key budget documents submitted to the State House of Assembly and the approved budget are available to the public.

There is no prescribed method of achieving this— it is up to the State to decide how best to make available the key budget information to a wider audience. The assessment will determine how effectively the State has achieved two goals:

i. Key budget information is readily available in an accessible location to members of the public; and

ii. The members of the public know and would on their own have access to this information.

It may also be necessary to seek opinions from outside Government on whether the two goals were met.

Revenue Administration

This area of assessment looks at State Revenue Administration.

PFN 3.1
Extent to which the State has internalized the revenue legislations and procedures

Internally generated revenue of states comes mainly from taxes. By the laws of Nigeria the legislation and setting of policy decisions in respect of personal income tax, withholding tax, capital gains tax, stamp duties and road taxes are the responsibility of Federal Government and Joint Tax Board, respectively. However, collections of these taxes are the responsibility of respective States and Federal Government for some classes of persons and/or residents of federal capital territory.

The States are required to set up a policy framework to perform the functions of collecting these taxes. This indicator seeks to ascertain if effective policy framework exists in states for collecting these taxes.
PFM 3.2

The status of the State Board of Internal Revenue and State Revenue Service

The placement of the internal revenue administration within the government structure and operations has direct relationship with the internal revenue potentials of the State. A Board of Internal Revenue with greater financial and administrative autonomy under normal circumstances will perform better than a Board that depends on another MDA for managerial and operational direction and control.

Section 85A(1) of Personal Income Tax provides that there shall be a Board to be known as the State Board of Internal Revenue (BIR) whose operational arm shall be known and called State Internal Revenue Service (IRS). In Section 85A (2), this law states that the membership of the Board shall be Executive Head of the State Internal Revenue Service as Chairman, Directors and Heads of Department of State Service, a Director from the State Ministry of Finance and three other members nominated by the Commissioner for Finance.

The essence of this indicator is to verify if the State revenue administration entity operates in line with this provision. The current status of the State Internal Revenue Administration will be compared with the requirements of Section 85A(1) and (2) by interacting with functionaries of state Internal Revenue Administration.

PFM 3.3

Percentage of State total IGR to Total Revenue for the past two years.

This indicator identifies the percentage of total internally generated revenue to the total revenue of the State for the two preceding years. The essence of this indicator is to determine the State’s level of reliance on Federation Accounts revenue. States only have control over internally generated revenue resources. In the event of shortfalls in Federation Accounts revenue allocations, States that depend heavily on this source would be forced to shrink the budgetary resource envelope, thus, affecting the State government’s ability to implement its policies and programmes and provide public services. Unexpected dips in federation accounts receipts will also cause budget cuts that result in major inefficiencies in public expenditure management. This indicator will identify States that are susceptible to these shocks.

This assessment is restricted to actual revenue performance of the State for the two preceding years. The indicators look at actual receipts and not budget revenue.

The source of information for this comparison should be audited accounts (i.e. the Auditor-General's report). Where the audited accounts are not available, decision may be taken to rely on Budget performance reports (Documents used should be noted in the assessment report).
Taxpayer education is crucial to facilitating taxpayer compliance with registration, declaration and payment procedures. Actual and potential taxpayers need easy access to user-friendly, comprehensive and up-to-date information on the laws, regulations and procedures (e.g., posted on government websites, made available through taxpayer seminars, widely distributed guidelines/pamphlets and other taxpayer education measures). Potential taxpayers also need to be made aware of their liabilities through taxpayer education campaigns.

This indicator will assess extent to which the State Board of Internal Revenue make available to the public, information on tax registration, declaration and payment procedures.

There is no sacrosanct way of doing this – it is up to the State Board of Internal Revenue to decide how best to make available the key budget information to a wider audience. The assessment will determine how effectively the State Board of Internal revenue has achieved two goals:

i. Key revenue information is readily available in an accessible location to members of the public;

ii. The members of the public know and do have access to the information when it is desired.

It will also be appropriate to seek opinions from outside Government on whether the two goals are being met.

**Procurement**

This area of assessment looks at the State Procurement Processes.

Public procurement is a major component of the PFM system, which directly impacts efficiency and economy of expenditures and also contributes to the budget formulation and expenditure management process. The regulatory framework should promote competition, transparency and value for money and contain effective control, sanction and feedback mechanisms.

This indicator will ascertain whether the State has a regulatory framework that promotes competition, transparency and value for money, as well as an effective control, remedy and feedback mechanism. The regulatory framework may be in form of legislation (i.e., State Procurement Law) or provisions in the State's updated Financial Instruction.

The assessment will also review the State Procurement Law or relevant sections of the Financial Instruction to determine if key elements of a Due Process Mechanism in Procurement are provided for in the law and/or
Financial Instruction. The key elements of a Due Process Mechanism in Procurement are:

i. Roles and Responsibilities in Procurement Process;
ii. Procurement Thresholds;
iii. Competitive, Transparent and Value for Money Bidding and Award Processes;
iv. Control Mechanism;
v. Feedback Mechanism; and
vi. Penalties and Sanctions.

Therefore, the two aspects of the assessment are whether the State has in place a regulatory framework for procurement, and if it does, whether the above-mentioned key elements are covered in the regulatory framework. Secondly, how is the framework being implemented? Is there a due process office and is it effective?

**PFM 4.2**
Evidence of value for money in the Six (6) biggest contracts awarded in the State in the past three years.

The essence of this indicator is to obtain evidence of value for money in the award of the six most expensive contracts awarded in the State in the past three years.

The assessment will compare the process of awarding each of the contracts against the Federal Government's procurement procedure to determine if they pass the value for money test. This will be accomplished by matching the contract sums of the six projects against the Federal Bureau of Public Procurement national price index for similar projects.

**PFM 4.3**
Percentage of contracts in excess of N5, 000, 000.00 awarded on the basis of open competitive process.

This indicator evaluates the level of compliance with open competitive and transparent process in award of contracts in excess of N5 million. The assessment will crosscheck the data on the method used to award all contract above this threshold and calculate the percentage that were awarded on the basis of open, competitive and transparent processes. The benchmark of open, competitive and transparent processes is as provided in the Federal Procurement Act or its variant adopted by the State.

**PFM 4.4**
Level of awareness, by the intended beneficiaries of major projects.

This indicator will seek evidence on whether the State government keeps intended beneficiaries of major projects in the loop about contract awarded for projects that will benefit them and that a contractor is expected to be starting work. For the purpose of this indicator, major projects are contracts exceeding N50 million.
There are a number of ways these may be accomplished. These may be by public signing of works contracts on the project site, publication in a newspaper, or on a signboard at the site where the construction is due to take place. Any method likely to communicate effectively to local communities (who can be enlisted to report on whether or not work is done) will assist in transparency of contract payments.

On this indicator, it may also be useful to seek opinions from outside Government on whether the intended beneficiaries are aware of the contract, the contractor and contract sum.

**PFM 5.2.1**
Timeliness in preparation of in-year budget reports

In order for expenditure to be controlled against the budget, and in accordance with the law, it is necessary to keep sound and up-to-date accounts. The ability to “bring in” the budget requires timely and regular information on actual budget performance to be available both to the Finance Ministry and to line ministries. The Finance Ministry needs this document to monitor performance and if necessary to identify new actions to get the budget back on track. Line ministries need the information to manage affairs for which they are accountable.

This indicator focuses on the ability to produce comprehensive in-year budget performance reports on a timely basis. Therefore the assessment will determine whether in-year budget performance reports are prepared quarterly or more frequently, and issued within 4 weeks of end of period.

The assessment will be for completed quarters of the current year and four quarters of the preceding year.
The sources of information for this assessment is quarterly budget performance and review of documents in the Ministry of Finance and Office of the Accountant General to establish the time each quarter budget performance report was issued.

**PFM 5.2.2**

*Timeliness of submission of annual financial statements for audit.*

The end-of-year financial statements are important elements of transparency by governments. The ability to prepare year-end financial statements in a timely fashion is a key indicator of how well the accounting system is operating, and the quality of records maintained.

It is a requirement for the accounts of a State government to be presented to the Auditor-General by the 1st of July the following year. Not all States comply with this requirement. Some do not produce accounts for several years.

This assessment is to be made through the review of documentary evidence of dates the last two years’ accounts were presented to the Auditor-General. This should be in the form of a formal, signed letter from the Accountant-General and an acknowledgement by the Office of the Auditor-General.

**PFM 5.3**

*Presentation of Audited Accounts to the State House of Assembly.*

A high quality external audit is an essential requirement for creating transparency in the use of public funds. Once the Auditor-General receives the accounts, he/she is expected to submit his/her report to the State House of Assembly within 90 days. Slippages in doing so may be a reflection of shortage of resources in the Auditor-General’s Office.

This assessment will be accomplished through review of documentary evidence of the dates that the last two years’ accounts that are due at the time of assessment were presented to the Auditor-General. This should be in the form of a formal, signed letter from the Accountant-General and an acknowledgement by the Office of the Auditor-General.

**PFM 5.4**

*Scrutiny of Audited Accounts by the State House of Assembly.*

On receiving the Auditor-General’s report, the scrutiny process by the State House of Assembly is a key element of democratic accountability. A typical approach to doing this is through a legislative committee - the Public Accounts Committee that peruses the external audit reports and questions relevant parties about findings in the reports. The smooth operation of the Committee depends on adequate financial and technical resources, and on allocation of sufficient time to reviewing the audit reports. The Committee may also recommend remedial or follow-up actions or impose sanctions on the executive.
Scrutiny of the Auditor-General’s report does not stop at the level of the space of time the House uses to consider it. In fact if the State House of Assembly takes too long to scrutinise the report, which may result in the report not being made public until long after the event (or not at all), this may indicate a lack of accountability.

The quality of scrutiny should be measured by looking at:

i. The process (e.g. is there a designated Public Accounts Committee to review the report?); and

ii. The output (e.g. has the Public Accounts Committee asked questions on the report, and were MDAs summoned to the House of Assembly to clarify relevant sections of the report?).

Inter-Governmental Fiscal Relation

**PFM 6.1**
*Extent to which the State has internalized the Constitutional provisions for Inter-Governmental Fiscal Relations.*

The nature of fiscal relationships between State and Local Governments are outlined in the Constitution. This indicator is restricted to only two aspects, which are:

i. Joint Economic Planning Board (Section 7(4) of the Constitution; and

ii. Joint State and Local Government Accounts (Section 156(6) of the Constitution.

The objective of this indicator is to ascertain whether States have set up these two mechanisms in a manner to ensure synchronization of plan between State and Local governments as well as open, transparent and accountable distribution of funds due to the Local Governments of the state.

The assessment will review the State’s documents and ascertain if the State has a Joint Planning Board with the requisite mandate, responsibilities and members drawn from key State sectors and local governments. The second aspect is to review State’s documents to ascertain whether the Joint Local Government Accounts is functional. This indicator ascertains the existence of the Joint Local Government Accounts only, not the manner of transfer of Local Government funds.

**PFM 6.2**
*Percentage of available Federal Grants such as*

The Federal Government through the mechanism of UBEC and CGS makes available financial grants to State and Local Governments in a clearly designed conditional partnership agreement. The amount
accessed by the state from these grant funds is a reflection of states’ ability to promote fiscal relations with Federal Government as well as its responsiveness to the conditions/criteria of the UBEC and CGS funds. The assessment will calculate the percentage of the UBEC and CGS funds accessed over the maximum amount that was available in the last three years. The amount accessed by the state under UBEC and CGS for each of the three years will be ascertained while the total amount available to the state for each of the three years will be obtained from the Universal Basic Education Commission and the Office of the Senior Special Assistant to the President on Millennium Development Goals.

PFM 6.3
Percentage of LG fund transferred to LGs on transparent and rule-based systems (federation accounts and State IGR)

This indicator flows from indicator 6.1 above and analyses whether local government’s federation accounts receipts and 10% of state IGR are transferred to Local Governments on a transparent and rule-based system.

The key questions that will be answered are:

i. Is 100% of the Local Government share of the federation accounts receipts transferred to Local Governments?

ii. If the answer is no, is there clear, and approved (by both the State House of Assembly and Local Government Legislative Councils – Section 156(8) of the Constitution), criteria for deduction of Local Government share of federation accounts receipts?

iii. Is 10% of state IGR transferred to Local Government on a regular basis?

PFM 6.4
Level of public access to information on distribution and transfer of revenue to LGs and grants from Federal.

This indicator is to ascertain the extent to which information on distribution and transfer of revenue to Local Governments and grants from Federal Government are available to the public.

Note: There is no prescribed method for doing this – it is up to States to decide the best method to make key budget information available to a wider audience.

The assessment will determine how effectively the State has achieved two goals:

i. The information is readily available in an accessible location to members of the public;

ii. The members of the public know and would on their own have
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Debt Management</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **PFM 7.1.1**  
*Extent to which the State has adopted and localized Debt Management Act together with Borrowing Guidelines* |
| Public debt management is a key component of the PFM system, which impacts on the annual budget and fiscal sustainability of the State. An effective public debt management regulatory framework ensures that borrowing is done at least cost and minimum risk, as well as keeping the borrowing within acceptable limits as defined by debt sustainability indicators and the borrowing guidelines.  

The indicator will ascertain whether the State has both regulatory and institutional frameworks that guarantee efficient public debt management. The regulatory framework refers to the existence of debt management legislation; borrowing guidelines and borrowing plan for inclusion in the annual budget.  

Therefore, the assessment will seek to ascertain whether the State has relevant legislation in place for effective and efficient public debt management.  

The goal of public debt management is to ensure that government borrowing needs are funded at least cost and minimum risk. Beyond the existence of sound legislation, there is need to have in place a robust and coherent institutional framework for managing all classes of the State’s debts. The institutional framework relates to the existence of an institutional mechanism for managing both external and domestic debts (contractors debts, commercial loans, bonds, pension liabilities, and bridging finance, etc.). |
| **PFM 7.1.2**  
*Evidence of a coherent framework for managing local and external debts* |
| The indicator will seek to ascertain the existence of robust institutional arrangements for managing all aspects of its public debt, together with maintaining accurate debt stock and debt service obligations database for all categories of debts on a consistent basis. |
**PFM 7.2.1**

**Debt to GDP ratio**

This indicator measures the indebtedness level relative to the State’s economic activity. The debt-to-GDP ratio is an equation with a State’s gross debt in the numerator and its gross domestic product (GDP) in the denominator. It is recognized as the most important indicator to measure the indebtedness degree, stressing the government’s solvency capability. By comparing what a State owes to what it produces, the debt-to-GDP ratio indicates its ability to pay back its debt.

It is also useful to provide its evolution over time so as to gauge whether the debt situation is worsening or improving over time.

Avoiding a ‘deficit bias’ in the budget is very important for the fiscal health of a State. The benefits of short-term profligacy usually accrue to the current government leaving future administrations to repay the debt, which produces a bias in favour of deficits. It can also undermine inter-generational equity in that the concerns of the present could unfairly outweigh those of the future.

**PFM 7.2.2.**

**Percentage of debt financing of annual budgets**

Best practice requires annual budget deficits are kept below 3 per cent.

The indicator will therefore seek to assess the level of annual budget deficits as to whether it falls within or outside the standard of 3% or below defined by international best practice.

**PFM 7.4**

**Level of awareness by stakeholders and Citizens of the State’s level of total indebtedness and fiscal vulnerability risks.**

This indicator will seek evidence as to whether the government provides for the information needs of key stakeholders and the citizenry in terms of publishing the quantum and composition of the state’s debt and borrowing plans, as well as providing information on fiscal vulnerability risks that may be indicated through conduct of Annual Debt Sustainability Analysis (DSAs).

The indicator may also entail ascertaining the extent of involvement of the State Assemblies in approval of new borrowings and having borrowing guidelines approved by the State Assemblies.

These debt assessment indicators should be computed from the State's debt records as well as records of the Debt Management Office of Nigeria that is statutorily responsible for guaranteeing all sub-national debts.
8.4 Human Resource Management

Human Resource Management (HRM) is the organisational function that deals with issues related to people, such as compensation, hiring, performance management, organization development, safety, wellness, benefits, employee motivation, communication, administration, and training. It is also a strategic and comprehensive approach to managing people and the workplace culture and environment. Effective HRM enables employees to contribute effectively and productively to the overall company direction and the accomplishment of the organization’s goals and objectives. In recent times, HRM is moving away from traditional personnel, administration, and transactional roles, which are increasingly outsourced. It is now expected to add value to the strategic utilisation of employees and that employee programmes impact the business in measurable ways. The new role of HRM involves strategic direction and HRM metrics and measurements to demonstrate value. Within the confines of the SPRM, HRM is primarily concerned with the management of civil servants in the state. It has three (3) main components: Civil Service Governance; Delivery and Performance and; Incentives and Accountability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Detailed Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civil Service Governance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRM 1.1</strong></td>
<td>This indicator seeks to assess whether the State has Rules and Regulations that govern its Public Service in the areas of employment, promotion, discipline, posting and overall management. The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999) provides for each State in the Federation a platform for a comprehensive set of Civil Service rules and regulation. This assessment will first determine the existence of a set of State Civil Service Rules and Regulations. Secondly, it will check that the contents of the Civil Service rules are comprehensive, with provisions that promote an open and transparent recruitment processes, facilitate a merit and performance-based promotion process and ensures that other important Human Resource Management issues like diversity (including gender), deployment, discipline and the development of personnel are effectively managed. The document required for this assessment is the State’s most current Civil Service Rules and Regulations. State Government circulars and gazettes will also be examined as they could fill in for gaps in existing Civil Service Rules and Regulations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Summary** | |
| **Civil Service Governance** | This indicator seeks to assess whether the State has Rules and Regulations that govern its Public Service in the areas of employment, promotion, discipline, posting and overall management. The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999) provides for each State in the Federation a platform for a comprehensive set of Civil Service rules and regulation. This assessment will first determine the existence of a set of State Civil Service Rules and Regulations. Secondly, it will check that the contents of the Civil Service rules are comprehensive, with provisions that promote an open and transparent recruitment processes, facilitate a merit and performance-based promotion process and ensures that other important Human Resource Management issues like diversity (including gender), deployment, discipline and the development of personnel are effectively managed. The document required for this assessment is the State’s most current Civil Service Rules and Regulations. State Government circulars and gazettes will also be examined as they could fill in for gaps in existing Civil Service Rules and Regulations. |
**HRM 1.2**

*Extent to which open and transparent processes are applied in recruitment and promotion of personnel.*

The indicator seeks to assess whether open, gender-sensitive and transparent processes are applied in recruitment, posting and promotion of personnel in the state. The open and transparent recruitment processes (i.e. merit principles and gender-sensitivity) that are critical to achieving an efficient state civil service.

The following are some actions that protect merit principles and gender-sensitivity in recruitment:

i. Publicized advertisement of job openings, including through women's networks
ii. Short listing of candidates based on qualification and experience
iii. Attention to gender-inclusiveness in constituting interview panels
iv. Recruitment exams and interviews
v. Consideration of gender and diversity among qualified candidates
vi. Publication of qualified candidates.

The State should be able to provide evidence of publicized advertisements of job openings for its recruitment processes. The State should also be able to provide evidence of gender-sensitive and transparent recruitment examinations and interviews, and evidence of selection of the most qualified candidates for each job. Evidence of publication of qualified candidates in a newspaper or notice board of the Civil Service Commission and concerned MDAs will also be required.

As with recruitment, promotion should also be based on merit and performance and not on years of service or patronage. Evidence should show that promotions are based on pre-set performance indicators and/or performance in promotion exams.

**HRM 1.3**

*Appropriateness of public service workforce to State needs and Recruitment based on need.*

The State’s work force should be distributed according to needs across cadre, grade level and service areas. Employment should not be made based on political or sentimental considerations. In many states, the work force is bloated leading to inefficient allocation of the states' resources. In many such states, most of the workers are in service areas, cadre and grade levels that do not satisfy the need criterion. The resultant effect is huge gaps in most service areas, cadres and grade levels despite the over-sized civil service.

This indicator therefore seeks to determine whether recruitment is based on need and also analyses the current work force to establish the distribution patterns. The first requirement is for states to provide evidence
of a service needs programme/policy assessment informing the recruitment process; and secondly, to supply the current number and distribution of their employees on the basis of the following variables, each disaggregated by sex:

1. Total number of State civil servants.
2. Number of civil servants per grade level.
3. Number of civil servants per cadre.
4. Number of civil servants per MDA; and,
5. Percentage of personnel costs to total expenditure of the state in the last 3 years.

**HRM 1.4**

*Level of capacity development of civil servants disaggregated by sex.*

Dearth of trainings and capacity building programmes in the civil service has been identified as one weakness of the service. Sustainability of gains in civil service governance is dependent on improved competence of civil servants on a continuing basis.

This indicator seeks to ascertain whether the State has a robust training and capacity development programme that can sustain civil service governance in the State. The key parameters for assessing this are:

1. A Systematic Training Needs Analysis;
2. Training and Capacity Development Budget for the last three years (percentage of the total budget earmarked for training and capacity development in the current year’s budget and the two preceding years’ budgets);
3. Training Institutions, Facilities and Curriculum; and
4. Training Reports.

The assessment will evaluate the State against each of these parameters. A state is regarded as having a system that can sustain the civil service governance where there exists a systematic training needs analysis; adequate training and capacity development budget; training institution with appropriate facilities and curriculum; and training reports.

Every parameter is as important as the other. For example, the lack of training needs despite adequate training budget and training institutions indicates that training is unstructured and not need-based which will not guarantee sustainable civil service governance.

Documents required for this assessment are training needs analysis report,
Service Delivery & Performance

HRM 2.1
Extent to which the state has prepared and documented clear guidelines of MDAs’ structures, mandates, functions and accountabilities.

This indicator will seek to assess whether the States’ Ministries, Departments and Agencies have comprehensive and concise structures, mandates, functions and accountabilities. Service delivery and performance of a state government is not dependent on the number of institutions created but on availability of proper structures, mandates, functions and accountabilities for the MDAs.

Clear structures, mandates, functions and accountabilities of all institutions of governments identifies institutions that are not required, eliminates conflict and ensures performance by all institutions. Institutions are guided by their mandate and two or more institutions should not have similar mandate or functions. Some governments create and appoint functionaries for institutions for political ends thereby creating friction and conflict and undermining service delivery and performance.

This assessment should be conducted using any State document stating the existing MDAs, mandates, functions, accountabilities, etc. It may also be necessary to review documents within the institutions (i.e. MDAs) to ascertain whether there are clear structures, mandates, functions, and accountabilities. The assessment will therefore determine the percentage of the state’s institutions with clear:

i. Structures;
ii. Mandates;
iii. Functions; and
iv. Accountabilities.

HRM 2.2
Existence of administrative mechanism to support conduct of State MDAs’ performance Management.

This indicator will seek to ascertain the existence of appropriate administrative mechanisms to facilitate the conduct of performance management of MDAs in the State. The administrative mechanisms that will facilitate the conduct of performance management of MDAs are:

...
i. Applicable Law or Executive Council Mandate for performance management reviews; and
ii. Office charged with the responsibility of conducting performance management reviews.

The administrative mechanisms are two-fold. First, existence of enabling guidelines either in the form of a law or executive council mandate and second, existence of an institution charged with the responsibility of implementing the guidelines. This institution should have appropriate facilities and manpower.

**HRM 2.3**

*Regular performance management system reviews linked to mandates and service standards.*

This indicator will examine the extent to which States efficiently carry out and utilise performance management systems reviews. This will be assessed by the number of performance management reviews, institutional assessments or functional reviews carried out in the state’s MDAs in the current year and the preceding two years.

The sources of information for this review are the performance management reports, institutional assessment reports, and functional review reports. The assessment of this indicator will also ascertain the action taken in respect of findings of the assessments/reviews. However, this aspect will not be executed where there is no evidence of MDAs’ assessments/reviews carried out in the state’s MDAs in the current year and preceding two years.

**HRM 2.4**

*Feedback mechanism to measure service user satisfaction and awareness for redress.*

This indicator assesses mechanisms for users of services to voice their impressions or perceptions on whether their needs or expectations have been met or not, and mechanisms through which the state authorities can programme services to meet the needs of citizens.

The measure looks at a number of tools that States might use to do this:

Feedback mechanisms to measure user satisfaction include surveys, focus groups, a “citizens’ jury”, radio phone-in programmes, and a range of other tools that actively seek service users’ views on services.

i. Avenues for redress where services are poor include a complaints department (which should be accessible and user-friendly), a
complaints hotline (where complaints should be pursued), or regular public meetings at which feedback is assessed and acted on. Charters often indicate facilities available for people to ventilate their complaints. A good complaints policy should also communicate clearly who to complain to and how complaints are addressed.

ii. The State Government’s response to complaints will show how much it cherishes customer feedback. If there is an active policy to follow up complaints, there should be reports on action taken in response to complaints, which should ideally be made public. Evidence of effective follow-up includes internal reports on complaints including how many complaints were received and what response they have received.

A State Government intent on obtaining feedback on the quality of its services could also encourage independent monitoring organisations (e.g. market research organisations or NGOs) to report on its services, and act on these reports.

Some of these are being pursued at Federal level by the SERVICOM initiative, which aims to change the culture of the public services at the Federal level by making them more responsive to users. SERVICOM draws on international best practices in service delivery. Some States have replicated the SERVICOM initiative.

However, not all of this needs to draw on international good practice. If output targets are properly set and published and information collected to demonstrate if these have been met or not, then the public will be able to assess for themselves if the government has performed well. If State Government desires to provide better services, it will welcome and encourage this sort of feedback.

### Incentives and Accountability

HRM 3.1

*Extent to which there are procedures for incentive planning, payments and monitoring.*

This indicator will seek to examine the extent to which procedures exist for incentive planning, payments and the monitoring of these payments.

A state is regarded as having a proper incentive planning, payments and the monitoring of these payments where the following are in place:

i. Salary structure for all categories of staff within the state; and

ii. Harmonized plan for review of salary structure of all categories of staff.
Compensation packages are usually one of the biggest causes of agitation between employees and employers. This is more pronounced with governments. In every state there are different categories of employees operating under different civil service unions. States without proper salary structures for all categories as well as a harmonized plan for the review of salaries are usually susceptible to incessant and uncontrolled agitation for review. This affects service delivery and performance within affected institutions.

The first aspect of this indicator is to ascertain whether there exists a comprehensive salary structure for all categories of staff within the state and secondly whether there is a harmonized plan for review of the salary structure for all categories of staff.

**HRM 3.2.1**

*How salary structure of the state compares with federal and other states.*

The National Economic Council recently approved a minimum wage of N18,000.00 for civil servants. Some States, while adopting this wage threshold, may not apply same structure across the service hierarchy. The aim of this indicator is to ascertain how the State establishes basic salaries for various grade levels compared with what the Federal Government as well as other states pay. Five salary grade points will be used for this. They include:

i. Minimum wage of the State (i.e. Salary Grade Level 01 step 1);
ii. The Basic Salary of Grade level 8 step 4;
iii. The Basic Salary of Grade Level 17 Step 1;
iv. The Basic Salary Grade Level 17 final step; and
v. The basic Salary of State Permanent Secretary.

**HRM 3.2.2**

*Degree of integration and reconciliation between personnel records and the payroll data.*

The wage bill is usually one of the biggest items of government expenditure and is usually susceptible to weak control and corruption. One of the reasons that payroll costs are sometimes escalated is payroll fraud – i.e. payment of salaries to fictitious workers (or ‘ghost workers’), or situations in which regular workers draw more than one salary for the same job.

The payroll is underpinned by the “nominal roll,” which is a list of all staff that should be paid every month and can be verified against the approved establishment list. The link between the payroll and the nominal roll is a key control tool. The ideal practice is that payroll and human resources records are linked by an integrated database covering all staff on the State payroll. The database uses biometric data to identify staff.
This indicator will seek to determine whether:

i. The payroll (typically domiciled in the Office of the Accountant-General of the State) and the human resources records in Civil Service Commission and/or MDAs are directly linked by an integrated database;

ii. The database is reconciled monthly; and

iii. The database uses biometric data to identify staff.

iv.

Where there is no direct link between the payroll and human resource records, the second and third aspects of the indicator will not be answered.

Proper assessment of this indicator will require detailed review of the system and interviewing of key operators of the system.

HRM 3.3

*Internal controls of changes to personnel records and the payroll.*

This indicator follows the principles of indicator 3.2 above. It examines the internal control mechanisms in effecting changes to personnel and payroll records. The ideal situation is that authority to change records and the payroll is restricted and results in an audit trail. The practice is that authority to accept changes is vested on only one officer usually the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Finance or any other senior personnel so designated.

The review will assess the practice in each State against this requirement. However, where there is no direct link between the payroll and human resource records, this indicator will not be assessed.

HRM 3.4

*Existence of payroll audits to identify control weaknesses and/or ghost workers.*

Some States have conducted one-off payroll audits or spot checks. These include ‘pay parades’ where members of staff are required to appear in person to confirm their identity, qualifications, etc., before being paid their salaries. These pay parades may also ascertain if the individual is receiving the appropriate salary, by asking them to show their last promotion letters duly endorsed by the relevant Head of Service.

One-off spot checks are also useful, but they do not prevent ‘ghost workers’ returning to the payroll on a later date. A better approach is to have a strong system of annual payroll audits to identify and control weaknesses and/or ghost workers.

Therefore this indicator seeks to ascertain whether there exists a strong
system of annual payroll audits to identify control weaknesses and/or ghost workers.

8.5 Education

Education is widely recognised as the bedrock of development. Functional and qualitative education is needed to achieve national strategic visions and development priorities, including Nigeria Vision 20:2020 and the Millennium Development Goals. In recent years, Nigeria has expressed a commitment to education, to counter decades of neglect and falling standards, in the belief that overcoming illiteracy and ignorance will form a basis for accelerated national development. State Governments have traditionally played a major role in educating their citizenry. This section assesses the education sector in the state, focusing on four areas:

- Access and equality;
- Teaching and learning environment;
- Sector management and systems; and
- Quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Detailed Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access and Equality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES 1.1</strong></td>
<td>Extent to which the State has adopted and localised laws ensuring access to quality education for all children. This indicator will ascertain whether the state has adopted and localised laws ensuring access to quality education as a right for all children, specifically in reference to the law/policy documents referring to ALL children’s right to quality education and the state’s special education curriculum from the Learning Disabled to the Exceptional Child; timeframe set for the achievements of each of the targets in comparison with targets set in Nigeria Vision 20:2020. The Data Sources are the State’s Annual Comprehensive School data, Special Education Curriculum, and instruction programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ES 1.2 .1</strong></td>
<td>Level of participation of children from disadvantaged groups. The indicator is about participation in education of children belonging to disadvantaged groups such as nomadic and other migrant communities, children with special academic needs and children of low socio-economic status (e.g. almagiris) and girls. This indicator is assessed by computing the total number of children in schools from each of these groups as a percentage of total school age population in these groups. The indicator should be calculated separately for each disadvantaged group and by gender within these groups. Levels of education should also disaggregate the indicator where feasible. For instance computation and/or generation of the percentage of nomadic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
boys and the percentage of nomadic girls currently enrolled across various levels of education. According to NTWG report only 450,000 nomadic children out of estimated school age population of 3.5 million are currently attending schools. In cases where the rates cannot be calculated, absolute number of children in schools among these groups should be provided.

The evidence for this indicator is household surveys such as MICS, CWIQ, NEDS and NLSS; Annual School Census; Special surveys.

**ES 1.3.1**

**Gross and Net enrolment rates and completion rate by gender, level, location and economic status**

This indicator examines gross and net enrolment rates as well as completion rate. Gross enrolment rate relates to enrolment in a specific level of education, regardless of age, expressed as a percentage of total population in the official school age group for that level of education.

Gross enrolment rate is measured by dividing the total enrolment in a given level of education by total population in the school age group for that level of education multiplied by 100. This can be disaggregated by gender, levels of education, location and income groups. For example; According to Nigeria Vision 20:2020, the gross enrolment rate at the secondary level was 31.4 percent in 2005. Gross enrolment rates should be in line with standards set in State policy documents.

Net enrolment rate relates to enrolment of the official age-group for a given level of education expressed as a percentage of the corresponding population.

Net enrolment rates will be measured by dividing the number of pupils enrolled who are of the official age-group for a given level of education by the population for the same age-group and multiplying the result by 100. Again, disaggregate the data by gender, levels of education, location and income groups. to the net enrolment target in Nigeria’s Vision 20:2020, at the primary level should be 100 percent by 2015.

The timeframe to be covered in assessing the performance of the indicator should be the year of review and previous two years prior to the review.

The sources of information for this indicator are annual school census and household surveys.
Completion rate relates to the total number of children who complete a given level of education as a percentage of population of children in the official school age for completing the given level of education.

This indicator is measured by dividing the total number of children who are newly enrolled in the final grade of a given level of education by the total population in the official age group for that level of education and multiply by 100. For example, \[ \text{Primary completion rate} = \frac{\text{Total enrolment in grade 6-number of repeaters}}{\text{Total population of 11 years old}} \times 100. \] Disaggregate the data by gender, levels of education, location and income groups. Completion rate should be in line with targets set in State policy documents.

The most recent data available should be used for this assessment (i.e. the data for the year of the review and previous two years prior to the review). The calculation will be done for the current year and two years prior to the review.

Information sources for this assessment are annual school census and household surveys.

**ES 1.3.2.**

*Youth and adult literacy rate by gender, location and economic status.*

The indicator relates to the percentage of population aged 15 years and over who can both read and write a short simple statement.

This indicator is measured by dividing the total number of literates aged 15 years and over by total population of people aged 15 years and above and multiplying by 100. The indicator should be disaggregated by gender, location and income groups. The adult literacy target in Nigeria Vision 20:2020 is more than 75 percent by 2015.

The timeframe to be covered in assessing the performance of the indicator should be the year of review and previous two years prior to the review.

Evidence for this indicator is Household survey such as CWIQ

**ES 1.4.1**

*Infrastructure and staff*

The Indicator relates to educational planning linked to forecasted demand for educational services in the State.
The indicator will be measured by ascertaining whether the State has a short statement mentioning process of determining infrastructural and staffing needs of schools. For instance, the statement should indicate whether there is process in place to predict the population growth of school-age children and demand for public schooling in the State, including those from disadvantaged groups, by levels of education and by LGAs. The statement should also clearly show the projected demand for additional teaching and non-teaching staff, projected demand for infrastructure (i.e. classrooms, toilets etc.) and projected additional funding needs to accommodate these additional children in public schools. It should also mention how and when the demand for infrastructure and staff is measured.

The short statement should cover the projected demand for the next five to ten years.

Evidence of Data Source is administrative records; Projections done using population census and annual school census.

The indicator will be measured by ascertaining whether there is a state policy to support and resource SBMCs as a strategy for promoting access and equity. The policy should clearly show the ways in which the state partners community organisations to reach out to vulnerable groups and encourage attendance and completion.

Sources of information are the MTSS, Annual Education Sector Review and Governor/ Hon. Commissioner policy statements / agendas.

The indicator relates to determining standards for teaching and learning environment for all schools.

The indicator will be measured by ascertaining whether the state has a short statement or policy documents setting standards for teaching and learning environment. For instance, the review will cover policy documents that set standards for the size of classrooms, quality of construction, provision of water and sanitation, provision of furniture for students and teachers, and recreational facilities. Standards for the provision of state infrastructure should be in line with national standards.
Information sources are MTSS (key performance indicators) annual State education sector policy documents and annual education sector review.

**ES 2.2**

*Measures undertaken to ensure compliance with established minimum standards.*

The indicator relates to ensuring compliance with minimum standards set for teaching and learning environment in schools.

The indicator will be measured by ascertaining whether the state has a short statement mentioning measures undertaken by education MDAs for ensuring compliance with established minimum standards. For instance, setting up school-based management committee and training their members in project monitoring; developing instruments for project monitoring and training of officials in project monitoring unit to use them; arrangements to address recommendations in project monitoring reports; monitoring of standards in private schools both registered and un registered; Number of schools inspected; Actions taken in cases of non-compliance.

The information source for this indicator is the Quality assurance reports; Quality project monitoring report.

**ES 2.3.1**

*Percentage of classrooms in need of major repairs.*

The indicator relates to percentage of classrooms at a given level of education that are in need of major repairs.

This indicator is assessed by dividing the total number of classrooms at a given level of education that need major repairs by total number of classrooms at that level and multiplying by 100. The indicator should be disaggregated by level of education, LGA and location.

Timeframe to be covered in assessing the performance of the indicator is the year of review and previous two years prior to the year of review.

Information source: Annual school census.

**ES 2.3.2**

*Pupil per functional toilets.*

The indicator relates to the average number of students per functional toilet at a given level of education.
This will be determined by dividing the total number of students at a given level of education by total number of functional toilets at that level of education and multiplying by 100. The indicator should be disaggregated by level of education, sex-designation (that is, male and female toilets), LGA and location. Averages should be in line with standards set in policy documents.

Timeframe to be covered in assessing the performance of the indicator is the year of review and previous two years prior to the year of review.

Information source: Annual school census.

**ES 2.3.3**
*Pupil per functional classroom.*

This indicator relates to average number of students per functional classroom at a given level of education.

This will be determined by dividing the total number of students at a given level of education by total number of functional classrooms at that level of education and multiplying by 100. The indicator should be disaggregated by level of education, LGA and location. The averages should be in line with standards set in policy documents.

Timeframe to be covered in assessing the performance of the indicator is the year of review and previous two years prior to the year of review.

Information source: Annual school census.

**ES 2.3.4**
*Percentage of schools with potable water.*

The indicator relates to percentage of schools at a given level of education that have access to potable water.

This indicator is assessed by dividing the total number of schools at a given level of education that have access to potable water by total number of schools at that level and multiplying by 100. The indicator should be disaggregated by level of education and LGA.

Timeframe to be covered in assessing the performance of the indicator is the year of review and previous two years prior to the year of review.

Information source: Annual school census.
**ES 2.3.5**

*Proportion of schools with secure environment.*

The indicator relates to percentage of schools at a given level of education that with secure environment.

This indicator is assessed by dividing the total number of schools at a given level of education with secure environment by total number of schools at that level and multiplying by 100. The indicator should be disaggregated by level of education, LGA and location.

Timeframe to be covered in assessing the performance of the indicator is the year of review and previous two years prior to the year of review.

Information source: Annual school census

---

**ES 2.4.1**

*Level of community participation in school management.*

This indicator relates to the participation of members of community (including women and youths) in school management for ensuring compliance with teaching and learning standards in all schools.

There are two aspects of this indicator, which are:

i. To count and verify all schools with functional SBMC as a percentage of total number of schools by level of education and location (rural/urban); and

ii. To count and verify all SBMCs members trained in developing partnership; school development planning; mobilising community to support access; and project monitoring.

For example X percent of primary/junior/senior secondary schools have functioning SBMC; X number of trainers were trained who then trained members of X SBMCs in developing partnership; school development planning; mobilising community to support access; and project monitoring, disaggregated by sex; X number of projects were monitored by these SBMCs; Following actions were taken on the basis of SBMCs monitoring reports; What are the training plans for SBMCs for the following year?

Information source: Annual school census for number of schools with functioning SBMC; Training reports; Inspection reports.
### Sector Management and Systems

**ES 3.1 Teacher performance management and deployment system.**

The indicator relates to performance management and deployment system for enhancing capacity of teaching staff in public schools.

The indicator will be measured by ascertaining whether the state has a short statement or policy document stating teacher performance management and deployment guidelines. For instance, a new board has been established that would be responsible for teacher deployment and performance management; X members (disaggregated by sex) of this new body have been trained; teacher deployment policy has been developed; a teacher performance system has been developed which includes: a professional standards framework, an appropriate salary scale corresponding to each stage of a teacher’s career, a rigorous assessment process including a probationary period and a process for annual increment progression and promotion to higher grades.

Sources of information include Teacher deployment policy; teacher recruitment and promotion policy; short interview.

**ES 3.2.1 Commitment to assessment of teaching competence through measuring pupil-learning achievement.**

The indicator is about measuring learning outcomes of pupils.

Sources of information are State Policy on Teacher Competence; State Measuring Learning Achievement Report (MLA).

**ES 3.2.2 Extent to which appropriate instructional materials and information technology are infused in curriculum and instruction.**

The indicator is about ensuring effective and appropriate use of instructional materials and information technology to facilitate instruction, in line with the global paradigm shift to activity-based learning.

Sources of information are State policy statement on teaching and learning standards; annual school census; training records.

**ES 3.2.3 Arrangements to ensure reliability and relevance of education management information system.**

The indicator relates to ensuring the availability of quality information on the performance of education sector for evidence-based planning.

The indicator will be measured by verifying if the state has an annual school census prepared by the EMIS Unit or Committee; and a
framework and institutional structure to ensure availability of credible and relevant information. For example, central EMIS unit has been established; X staff has been appointed to this unit; Terms of references for these newly appointed staff have been developed; EMIS staff have been trained in data management, analysis etc; EMIS unit has been equipped with computers, printers internet etc; Cost work plan and timetable for this unit has been developed.

Timeframe to be covered in assessing the performance of the indicator is the year of review.

Sources of information are Annual school census; EMIS policy and short interview.

**ES 3.3.1**

*Pupil to teacher ratio.*

The indicator relates to the average number of students per teaching staff at a given level of education.

This is calculated by dividing the total number of students at a given level of education by total number of teachers at that level of education and multiplying by 100. The indicator should be disaggregated by level of education, LGA and location. The averages should be in line with standards set in policy documents for minimum and maximum PTRs.

Timeframe to be covered in assessing the performance of the indicator is year of review and previous two years prior to the year of review.

The evidence for this indicator is Annual school census.

**ES 3.3.2**

*Pupils per qualified teacher ratio.*

The indicator relates to the average number of students per qualified teaching staff at a given level of education.

This is calculated by dividing the total number of students at a given level of education by total number of qualified teachers at that level of education multiplied by 100. The indicator should be disaggregated by level of education, LGA and location. Averages should be in line with standards set in policy documents.

Timeframe to be covered in assessing the performance of the indicator is year of review and previous two years prior to the year of review.

The evidence for this indicator is Annual school census.
ES 3.3.3
*Percentage of teaching staff that received in-service training.*

The indicator relates to proportion of teachers that receive training while in service.

Divide total number of teachers at a given level of education that receive in-service training by total number of teachers at that level of education multiplied by 100. Disaggregate the data by gender, level of education, LGA and location. For example; X percent of teachers at primary level have received in-service training. The percentage should be in line with standards set in State policy documents.

Timeframe to be covered in assessing the performance of the indicator is year of review and previous two years prior to the year of review.

Sources of information are the Training records and payroll records.

ES 3.3.4
*Timely production of annual school census and annual education sector performance review (AESR).*

The indicator relates to the timeliness of annual school census and annual education sector review for evidence-based revision of education plans and MTSS for budget preparation.

The indicator will be measured by ascertaining whether key activities in respect of annual school census are carried out on or before the date the activity is expected to be performed. For example;

i. Annual school census is expected to be performed in November of each year, was the census conducted in November;

ii. The data is expected to be inputted and analysed by March of the next year, was data inputted and analysed by March;

iii. The annual education sector review process is expected to begin in February, did the review process start in February; and

iv. The annual education sector review report is expected to be prepared in May, was the report prepared by May?

Timeframe to be covered in assessing the performance of the indicator is the year of review and two preceding years.

Information Sources: Short interview; ASC report; AESR report.

ES 3.4.1
*Arrangements for ensuring*

The indicator relates to attendance standards for both teaching and non-teaching staff in the education sector.
The indicator will be measured by checking if the state has a short statement issued by the official/department responsible for staffing standards stating the attendance standards for both teaching and non-teaching staff. For example, X members of quality assurance or inspection units have been trained to monitor regularity in staff attendance; a new instrument has been developed to monitor staff attendance; X SBMCs or School support team members have been trained in the use of these instruments. In terms of what inspections were done during the year of review and the findings: X schools were inspected in 2010 to assess level of regularity among teaching and non-teaching staff; X percent teachers were found to be regularly absent; X teachers who were regularly absent have been removed/transferred/warned. State is planning to introduce a programme for linking staff promotion to attendance among other criteria.

Information Sources: Quality assurance reports and inspection records. SBMC reports.

The indicator relates to the institutionalisation of monitoring and evaluation system to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of educational planning and budgeting process. Monitoring of planned activities through budget execution will ensure that set standards of performance are met by all, and that all promotions, retentions and interventions are contingent on levels of performance.

The indicator will be gauged by determining if the State has a short statement outlining steps taken to institutionalize an M&E system. For example, whether the State has developed an M&E policy document to ensure timely conduct of quarterly and annual budget monitoring and annual education sector review and to link MTSS and budget preparation to recommendations in annual education sector review report; a M&E unit has been established in the PRS department of the ministry of education; X staff have been assigned to this unit (disaggregated by sex); X members of this unit have been trained in M&E (disaggregated by sex); Cost M&E work plan and timetable has been developed; Recommendations of the annual education sector review has formed the basis for revision of MTSS.

Information Sources: M&E policy documents; quarterly and annual budget monitoring reports and annual audit report.
**E.S. 4.2.1**

*Establishment of functioning and effective quality assurance*

The indicator relates to quality assurance of the provision of education in the State.

The indicator will be measured by determining if the state has a short statement outlining steps taken to institutionalize an EMIS. For example, whether the State has developed an EMIS policy document to ensure timely conduct of annual school census and to use the funding in education planning and in the annual education sector review report; an EMIS unit has been established in the PRS department of the ministry of education; X staff have been assigned to this unit (disaggregated by sex); X members of this unit have been trained in data management (disaggregated by sex); Costed EMIS work plan and timetable has been developed; annual school census prepared in line with requirements of annual planning & budget timetable.

Information Sources: EMIS & ASC policy documents; Short interview.

---

**Quality**

**E.S. 3.4.3**

*Institutionalisation of State EMIS Committee/ Unit.*

The indicator relates to the institutionalisation of the education management information system to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of educational planning. The EMIS will collect, aggregate and analyse data for educational planning, particularly but not only through the annual school census.

The indicator will be gauged by determining if the state has a short statement outlining steps taken to institutionalize an EMIS. For example, whether the State has developed an EMIS policy document to ensure timely conduct of annual school census and to use the funding in education planning and in the annual education sector review report; an EMIS unit has been established in the PRS department of the ministry of education; X staff have been assigned to this unit (disaggregated by sex); X members of this unit have been trained in data management (disaggregated by sex); Costed EMIS work plan and timetable has been developed; annual school census prepared in line with requirements of annual planning & budget timetable.

Information Sources: EMIS & ASC policy documents; Short interview.

---

**ES 4.1**

*Existence of policies on teaching and learning standards.*

The indicator relates to the learning outcomes and expected standards of achievement in different subjects and at different levels.

The indicator will be measured by reviewing education policy documents to establish if there are provisions for setting teaching and learning standards. The policy should cover expected levels of learning in different subjects at different schooling levels; method of assessment; policy on number of teaching hours to be attained per subject; provision of teaching and learning materials; appointment of head of schools. The review should also consider existing plans for developing or updating policies relating to learning standards at different levels.

Data Source: State policy documents.

---

**ES 4.2.1**

*Establishment of functioning and effective quality assurance*

The Indicator relates to quality assurance of the provision of education in the State.
The indicator will be assessed by checking for a short statement detailing steps to be taken to establish a functional quality assurance unit/department. For example, Quality assurance (QA) unit/department established; Development of QA instrument; X number of officers have been assigned to the unit; X number of QA officers have been trained in QA instruments; level of financial support to the QA unit/department. The review should also consider the existing plans for establishing quality assurance unit/department.

Sources of information: A short interview; Quality assurance instruments and reports.

ES 4.3.1
Percentage of schools inspected using quality assurance instruments.

The indicator relates to the total number of schools at a given level inspected using quality assurance instruments as a percentage of total number of schools at that level.

Divide total number of school at a given level inspected using quality assurance instrument by total number of schools at that level and multiply by 100. The indicator should be disaggregated by location, level of education and type of school. The standards should be as specified in the policy establishing the quality assurance unit/department. In case there is no quality assurance unit/department, inspection reports should be used instead.

Timeframe to be covered in assessing the performance of the indicator is the year of review and the two years prior to the year of review.

Sources of information: Quality assurance report.

ES 4.3.2
Percentage of students who obtained pass certificates in standard examinations.

The indicator relates to the total number of students who obtained pass certificates in standard exams (PSC, JSC and WAEC/NECO) as a percentage of total number of students who took the exams.

Divide total number of students who obtained pass certificate by the number of student who took the exams and multiply by 100. The indicator should be disaggregated by gender, location and type of school (public/private).

Timeframe to be covered in assessing the performance of the indicator is the year of review and the two years prior to the year of review.
Sources of Information: Examination results- PSC, JSC, WAEC/NECO to obtain data relating to the total number of children who took these examinations and total number that obtained pass certificate from administrative records.

ES 4.3.3
*Per pupil teaching cost by level of education.*

The indicator relates to teaching cost to government of sending a child to public school.

Divide total recurrent costs at a given level of education by total number of students enrolled in public schools at that level. It should be disaggregated by LGA and level of education (pre-primary, primary, junior secondary, vocational/technical Education, adult and senior secondary).

Timeframe to be covered in assessing the performance of the indicator is the year of review and the two years prior to the year of review.

Sources of Information: MDA budget records for teacher salary and Annual school census for number of students.

ES 4.4
*Extent to which recommendations from quality assurance and annual education sector performance report continue to inform State education policy.*

The indicator relates to the development of State education policies based on evidence provided in quality assurance report and annual education sector review report.

The indicator will be measured by checking if the education policies were informed by the quality assurance and annual sector review. It should mention the existence of policies developed on the basis of recommendations of these reports. It should also review the annual MTSS to identify whether changes were introduced on the basis of evidence from AESR and QA reports

Time frame to be covered in assessing the performance of the indicator is done annually.

Sources of Information: Quality assurance report; Annual education sector review report; MTSS; State policy documents.

**8.6 Health Sector**

Governments play an important role in health development. The role of government is often to steer the overall health development by designing health policies and programmes, securing essential public
health functions and regulating the delivery of health services. This allows health systems to achieve their
goals of improving access to good healthcare, reducing health inequalities, securing equity in health care
financing and responding to population needs.

In Nigeria, State governments are specifically responsible for secondary hospital care and supporting
LGAs to provide primary health care - state planning, operational support, coordination, monitoring and
training.

This section appraises the health situation in state. Specific indicators are designed for five major areas:

- Existence and implementation of Strategic Health Development Plan;
- Service delivery and performance;
- Immunization, child and maternal maternity;
- Pharmaceutical management programme; and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Detailed Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HS 1.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Existence and implementation of Strategic Health Development Plan.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This indicator examines whether the state has crafted a well cost Strategic Health Development Plan. Ideally, it should mirror the National Strategic Health Development Plan (NSHDP) framework which covers the following eight priority areas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Leadership and governance;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Service delivery;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Health financing;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Human resources for health;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v. Health information system;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi. Community participation and ownership;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vii. Partnerships for health development; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viii. Research for health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The second aspect is concerned with the implementation of the plan. Specifically, it appraises to what extent the institutional framework for delivering healthcare in the state is shaped by the Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sources of Information: State Ministries of Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **HS 1.2**  | **Strategic plans for the Health Sector exist and are institutionalized.** |
| | Linked to H.S. 1.1, this indicator seeks to establish whether the State Health Strategic Plan has been institutionalised. Whether it been adopted by the SHoA? The Reviewers should also establish the extent to which the major actors in the state own the plan. |
| | Sources of Information: State Ministries of Health and SHoA |
**HS 1.3**
*Extent to which Sector targets are being met.*

This indicator assesses the extent to which targets in the plan are being met. It takes the projections in the plan and compares them with actual performance.

Sources of Information: State Strategic Health Development Plan and Ministry of Health.

**HS 1.4**
*Extent to which developments in the health sector are linked to the plan.*

This indicator examines whether developments in the health sector in the state are reflective of the plan. For example, to what extent is the health component of the annual budget shaped by this plan? This should be appraised for the current year as well as the preceding year.

Sources of Information: State Strategic Health Development Plan, Annual Budgets and Ministry of Health.

---

**Service Delivery & Performance**

**HS 2.1.1**
*Institutional arrangements for Primary and secondary Health care and financing of healthcare in the State.*

The Reviewers should examine the institutional arrangements for the delivery of both primary and secondary healthcare in state. What is the extent of collaboration between states and local governments in the delivery of primary healthcare?

**HS 2.2.1**
*Extent of collaboration with the Primary Health care Development Agency.*

In order to sustain Federal assistance to the LGAs, the National Primary Health care Development Agency (NPHCDA) was established following the recommendation of a high level WHO review team in 1992 to support the promotion and implementation of high quality and sustainable primary health care for all through resource mobilization, partnerships, collaboration, development of community based systems and functional infrastructure.

Reviewers should examine to what extent the State is collaborating with the NPHCDA and also report the results of this collaboration.

Sources of Information: Data should be sourced from NPHCDA and the state Ministry of Health.
HS 2.2.2
Number and type of health management and integrated supportive supervision mechanism put in place and implemented.

Policies, guidelines and legislations are meaningless if not implemented and enforced. In addition compliance and enforcement can only be guaranteed through institutionalized structures such as regulatory and enforcement agencies. The indicator thus seeks to not only establish the presence of these structures, but also establish the existence of clearly defined mandates, guidelines and operational framework and plans for these agencies. It also seeks to establish that the regulatory and enforcement agencies actually perform the functions as provided in their mandate, guidelines and operational framework.

The indicator should be measured through physical presence of functional agencies, that are fully staffed, have clearly written mandates that are backed by laws or policies. The activities of these agencies should be presented in the form of documented reports, registers, and other activity documents. There should be in place at least the following key agencies:

i. Private medical practitioners registration board or agency;
ii. Traditional medical practices regulatory agency;
iii. Drugs regulatory and monitoring agency, Public Health agency; and
iv. Industrial health safety regulatory agency and Sanitation agency.

Enquiries should focus on institutions that regulate orthodox and traditional medical practices, drug and medical commodities distribution and consumption and agencies that regulate both domestic and sanitation practices.

Sources of Information: Data sources will include reports of activities of these agencies, physical presence of the agencies, and availability of staff and infrastructure required for effective functioning of the agencies.

HS 2.3.1
Health Sector indicators such as Health spending per capita, number of tertiary, secondary and primary health care facilities by ownership; and bed per population (rural and urban).

Under this heading, reviewers should compute and present the major health indicators for the state such as health spending per capita, number of tertiary, secondary and primary health care facilities by ownership; and bed per population. Separate indicators should also be presented for rural and urban areas.

Sources of Information: Data should be sourced from State Ministry of Health Reports.

HS 2.3.2
Prevalence of Tuberculosis.

This indicator seeks to establish the number of cases of tuberculosis (all forms) in the state at a given point in time. It is sometimes referred to as
"point prevalence". Estimates include cases of TB in people with HIV. Prevalence and mortality are direct indicators of the burden of tuberculosis (TB), indicating the number of people suffering from the disease at a given point in time and the number dying each year.

Further, prevalence and mortality respond quickly to improvements in control, as timely and effective treatment reduce the average duration of the disease (thus decreasing prevalence) and the likelihood of dying from the disease (thus reducing disease-specific mortality).

This indicator should be appraised by establishing prevalence, which can be estimated through population-based surveys. Where survey data are not available, estimates of prevalence are derived from estimates of incidence. The current national benchmark for this indicator is 2.9% with a target of 1% by the year 2012.

Sources of Information: Data should be sourced from Sentinel survey reports, facility surveys, or NARHS reports.

**HS 2.3.3**

**HIV prevalence rate and number of People Living with HIV and AIDS (PLHA) with access to Antiretroviral drugs (ART) and the range of services rendered to them.**

HIV/AIDS is considered not only as the greatest global public health disaster but also as the biggest "development challenge" of the twenty-first century. It affects the most economically productive sector of the population and threatens development.

Reviewers should document the following:

i. HIV prevalence rate in the state;

ii. Number of People Living with HIV and AIDS (PLHA) with access to Antiretroviral drugs (ART) and the range of services rendered to them;

iii. Existence and implementation of Anti-retroviral therapy (ART) in the state;

iv. Provision of prevention of mother-to-child transmission (PMTCT); and

v. State government’s HIV programme.

Sources of Information:: sentinel surveys, National HIV/AIDS Office and State Ministry of Health

**HS 2.3.4**

**Number of reported cases of**

This indicator seeks to measure the level of polio immunization coverage and success or lack of it towards the eradication of the Wild Polio Virus in
new Wild Polio Virus.

This indicator should assess the State and LGAs epidemiology and disease surveillance records to document cases of confirmed and reported Wild Polio Virus (WPV). The current national benchmark is two cases annually and the target is zero WPV cases nationally.

Sources of Information:: Data should be sourced from state epidemiology and disease surveillance records.

**HS 2.4.1**

Proportion of wards with functioning public health facility providing minimum health care package according to quality of care standards; including availability of safe water and sanitation.

This indicator seeks to measure the ability and capacity of the healthcare system to deliver quality services that ensures universal availability and access to essential package of primary healthcare services to all groups.

This indicator should be appraised by conducting a survey and inventory of all PHC facilities using the NPHDCA minimum healthcare package as a checklist. Number of facilities that meet or do not meet the standards should be documented and reported. The annual MDGs/CGS health facilities gap analysis report should also be used to complement the survey report in arriving at conclusions. The benchmark for this indicator is clearly spelt out in the NPHCDA minimum care package and should be made reference to.

Sources of Information:: Data should be sourced from annual facilities survey reports and from the MDGs/CGS gap analysis reports.

**HS 2.4.2**

Number of health facilities and services with client/patient feedback and complaint mechanism and structures existing at all levels of care.

This indicator seeks to uncover the responsiveness of the health system to quality of service, client satisfaction and client grievances.

This indicator should be judged through facility surveys and the evident existence of structures and systems for a two-way client feedback and response. An example of this is the SERVICOM initiative of the FGN.

Sources of Information: Data for this indicator should be sourced from facility survey reports.

**HS 2.4.3**

Coverage of National Health Insurance Scheme or its equivalent in the State.

In May 1999, the government created the National Health Insurance Scheme (NHIS) aimed at providing easy access to healthcare for all Nigerians at affordable cost through various prepayment systems.
In 2004, the Federal Government gave more legislative backing to the scheme following amendments to the original (1999) legislative Act.

The scheme covers government employees, organized private sector and informal sector. It also provides coverage to children under five, permanently disabled persons and prison inmates.

While it is targeted at Federal Civil Servants, some states such as Bauchi and Cross River states have enlisted in it as well as pregnant women and children under the Maternal and Child Health Project (MCHP).

This indicator measures the proportion of civil servants in the state covered by NHIS or the State equivalent. It should be sourced from NHIS.

### Immunization, Child and Maternal Mortality

#### HS 3.1
Framework for immunization, child and maternal mortality in the state.

Reviewers should examine whether the frameworks for immunization, child and maternal mortality exist in the state and the extent to which they comply with the Federal Ministry of Health guidelines.

Sources of Information: State Ministry of Health

#### HS 3.2
Number of wards and LGAs with functional, well equipped and staffed immunizable diseases surveillance system and structures.

This indicator seeks to evaluate the state and status of facilities and improvement in the quality of primary healthcare services that will enable universal availability and access to essential package of primary healthcare services.

The indicator should be tested through health facility survey reports and gap analysis. Evidence: Example is the annual gap analysis of health facilities for the MDGs/CGS. A national benchmark for this indicator is the NPHCDA’s minimum healthcare package.

Sources of Information:: health facilities survey reports and the annual MDGs/CGS gap analysis reports.

#### HS 3.3.1
Proportion of 12-23 months-old children fully immunized.

This indicator seeks to unravel immunization coverage of children less than 2 years with all the NPI recommended antigens for that age group and the status of routine immunization in states and LGA.
This indicator should be judged through evidence from state EPI records and facility service records. All states and LGAs currently have an Expanded Programme on Immunization in place. This programme which coordinates all immunization activities against all immunisable diseases keep records of these activities and share them with the NPHCDA. The service statistics from these records should provide data on this indicator. The current national benchmark is 47% however a target of 95% coverage is set for 2011.

Sources of Information: Data for this indicator should be sourced from the state and EPI service statistics records, NDHS, MICS/ Immunization coverage surveys.

**HS 3.3.2**

*Percentage of children 6-59 months-old receiving Vitamin A supplement.*

Proportion of children aged 6–59 months who received a high-dose vitamin A supplement within the last 6 months. High dose vitamin A, according to the International Vitamin A Consultative Group (IVACG) definition, refers to "doses equal or greater than 25 000 IU".

This indicator should be accessed through household surveys, or through statistical records of MCH programmes and facility records. The current national benchmark for this indicator is 90% with a target of 100% by 2012.

Sources of Information: Data should be collected from states and LGAs EPI, and MCH programmes.

**HS 3.3.3**

*Malaria Incidence among under-five children.*

This indicator seeks to report cases of malaria among children under five and measure level of success or otherwise of malaria prevention programme among children of this age group.

This indicator should be assessed through evidence from facilities MCH services reports, sentinel surveys, MICS and NDHS. The current national benchmark for this indicator is 10% with a target of 5% by the year 2012.

Sources of Information: Data should be obtained from Sentinel survey reports, facility surveys, or NARHS reports.

**HS 3.3.4**

*Total fertility Rate.*

This is an impact level demographic and socio-economic indicator. Total Fertility Rate (TFR) of a population is the average number of children that would be born to a woman over her lifetime if (1) she were to experience
the exact current age-specific fertility rates (ASFRs) through her lifetime, and (2) she were to survive from birth through the end of her reproductive life. It is expressed as children per woman.

Total Fertility Rate is obtained by summing the single-year age-specific rates at a given time. The TFR is a synthetic (based on a hypothetical cohort of women) rate, not based on the fertility of any real group of women, since this would involve waiting until they had completed childbearing. Nor is it based on counting up the total number of children actually born over their lifetime, but instead is based on the age-specific fertility rates of women in their "child-bearing years". The conventional international statistical usage is ages 15–44 or 15-49. The current national benchmark is 5.3%.

Sources of Information: Data should be gathered from population census reports and the NDHS reports.

**HS 3.3.5**

*Number of newly reported wild Polio Virus Cases.*

The indicator for this is the number of newly reported cases of wild poliovirus in the year.

**HS 3.3.6**

*Infant, Child and Maternal mortality ratio*

*Infant mortality* refers to deaths of a child younger than one year old. These deaths are often divided into two groupings; neonatal mortality (deaths of an infant within the first 27 days of life) and post neonatal mortality (deaths of an infant 28-364 days old). Period rates are the number of deaths in a given period per 1000 live births in the same period. Infant mortality is associated with maternal health, quality of and access to medical care, socioeconomic conditions, and public health practice.

*Child mortality* is defined as the number of infants dying before reaching five years of age, per 1,000 live births in a given year. Child mortality is seen as an important barometer of the effect of wider economic and social conditions on child health. It measures an outcome of the development process rather than an input (such as expenditure on health). It is also known to result from a wide variety of factors such as the availability of maternal and child health services (including prenatal care), the level of immunisation, income and food availability in the family, and the availability of safe drinking water and basic sanitation.

*Infant and child mortality* rates often are calculated separately for the neonatal period (from birth to age 28 days) and the post neonatal period.
(from 1 to 11 months of age). Infant mortality rates, which measure the probability of death in the first year of life, are the sum of neonatal and post neonatal mortality rates. The under-5 mortality rate (U5MR) refers to deaths from birth up to a child's fifth birthday. Each rate is calculated as the number of deaths in the specific age group per 1,000 live births. For example, a U5MR of 150 indicates that there are 150 deaths before the fifth birthday for every 1,000 live births, or that 15 percent of children die before age five. The United Nations Population Division produces estimates of infant and child mortality rates for every country regularly. The current national benchmark is 60/1000 LBs with a target of 45/1000 LBs by 2013.

Complications during pregnancy and childbirth are a leading cause of death and disability among women of reproductive age in developing countries. The maternal mortality ratio, which is an MDG indicator, represents the risk associated with each pregnancy, i.e. the obstetric risk. Maternal death is the death of a woman while pregnant or within 42 days of termination of pregnancy, irrespective of the duration and site of the pregnancy, from any cause related to or aggravated by the pregnancy or its management but not from accidental or incidental causes.

To facilitate the identification of maternal deaths in circumstances in which attribution of cause of death is inadequate, a new category has been introduced: Pregnancy-related death is defined as the death of a woman while pregnant or within 42 days of termination of pregnancy, irrespective of the cause of death.

Live birth refers to the complete expulsion or extraction from its mother of a product of conception, irrespective of the duration of the pregnancy, which, after such separation, breathes or shows any other evidence of life - e.g. beating of the heart, pulsation of the umbilical cord or definite movement of voluntary muscles - whether or not the umbilical cord has been cut or the placenta is attached. Each product of such a birth is considered live born.

Measuring maternal mortality accurately is difficult except where comprehensive registration of deaths and of causes of death exists. Elsewhere, census, surveys or models have to be used to estimate levels of maternal mortality. Reproductive-age mortality studies (RAMOS) use triangulation of different sources of data on deaths of women of reproductive age coupled with record review and/or verbal autopsy to identify maternal deaths. Based on multiple sources of information, RAMOS is considered the best way to estimate levels of maternal mortality. Estimates derived from household surveys are subject to wide confidence intervals and long period rates (often for 10 year periods). Global and
Regional estimates of maternal mortality are developed every five years, using a regression model.

Current national Benchmark is 409/10,000 LBs with a target of 136/10,000 LBs by 2012.

Sources of Information: Vital registration, health service records, household surveys, census.

**HS 3.3.7**

*Contraceptive prevalence rate.*

Contraceptive prevalence rate is an indicator of health, population, development and women's empowerment. It also serves as a proxy measure of access to reproductive health services that are essential for meeting many of the Millennium Development Goals, especially those related to child mortality, maternal health, HIV/AIDS, and gender equality. This indicator seeks to measure the proportion of women aged 15-49 years, married or in-union, who are currently using, or whose sexual partner is using, at least one method of contraception, regardless of the method used. Contraceptive methods: Include modern and traditional methods. Modern methods include female and male sterilization, oral hormonal pills, the intrauterine device (IUD), the male condom, injectables, the implant (including Norplant), vaginal barrier methods, the female condom and emergency contraception. Traditional methods of contraception include the rhythm (periodic abstinence), withdrawal, lactation amenorrhea method (LAM) and folk methods.

Contraceptive prevalence = (Women of reproductive age [15-49] who are married or in union and who are currently using any method of contraception / Total number of women of reproductive age [15-49] who are married or in union) x 100. The method of estimation is empirical data only. Disaggregation is by age (adolescence), marital status, method of contraception, location (urban/rural, major regions/provinces), and socioeconomic characteristics (e.g. level of education, wealth quintile). Current national benchmark is 9.7% with a target of 26% by the year 2012.

Sources of Information: Household surveys, such as Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), Multiple Indicators Cluster Surveys (MICS), and contraceptive-prevalence surveys. Estimates can also be made from health-services statistics using census projections as a denominator. Such estimates, however, are often expressed in terms of couple years of protection and may not always be complete.
**HS 3.3.8**  
*Percentage of pregnant women with 4 ANC visits performed according to national standards.*

This indicator seeks to establish the percentage of women aged 15-49 with a live birth in a given time period that received antenatal care four or more times. It seeks to confirm not only action towards reducing maternal mortality but also ANC service uptake. Antenatal care coverage is an indicator of access and use of health care during pregnancy. The antenatal period presents opportunities for reaching pregnant women with interventions that may be vital to their health and wellbeing and that of their infants. Receiving antenatal care at least four times, as recommended by WHO, increases the likelihood of receiving effective maternal health interventions during antenatal visits. This is an MDG indicator.

This indicator should be measured through household surveys and summary statistics of service providing facilities. The national benchmark for this indicator is 44.8% with a set target of 70% by the year 2012.

Sources of Information: Data should be collected from survey reports, states and LGAs MCH programmes and NDHS.

---

**Staffing**

**HS 4.1**  
*Framework for staffing and capacity development of health personnel in the state.*

Human resource is the key ingredient to functioning health systems. Under this indicator, Reviewers should examine the existence and efficiency of the framework for staffing, retention and capacity development of health personnel in the state.

Specifically, what types of contracts are issued to health professionals, how their salaries compare with their federal counterparts and presence of other incentives.

Sources of Information: Ministry of Health and personnel records

**HS 4.2**  
*Proportion of health professionals per population (physician, nurses and health workers per population (rural/urban)).*

This indicator seeks to estimate the number of healthcare professionals available to provide services to the population. It is calculated as the number of professional available per 10,000 of the population. The number of professionals and population should be disaggregated by sex.

The indicator should be measured using the LGA or state population estimate at time of assessment and the total number of health professionals providing services at facilities. There is currently no national benchmark for this indicator in the absence of a national baseline. However, the NSHDP sets a target of 20: 10,000 by 2015.
HS 4.3
Number and types of plans and programmes for strengthening and motivating the human resource capacities in the health sector implemented.

This indicator plans to determine level of investment in Human Resources for Health (HRH) especially in the area of capacity building to enable delivery of up-to-date quality health care services. It also seeks to appraise the level of motivation and incentives for retaining and engaging personnel.

This indicator should be determined from records of attendance of personnel in-service academic and professional courses that are paid for by employer, records of seminars and capacity building trainings conducted by employer and record of regular personnel promotion and salary upgrades. Sex and cadre should disaggregate these. Example here is quarterly seminars, annual capacity building training, periodic in-service courses and promotion every 3 to 4 years. It also includes prompt payment of salaries, leave grants, call duty and agency allowances and regular reviews of salaries and emoluments.

Sources of Information: include records from personnel departments, DPRS and other relevant MDAs.

HS 4.4
Quantity and quality of schools for training health professionals in the state.

This indicator relates to the number and quality of schools for training health professionals in the state. It includes medical colleges and nursing institutions among others.

Reviewers should not be limited to formal institutions but also “community health workers” (CHW), a variety of community health aides selected, trained and working in the communities from which they originate.

Sources of Information: include records from the Ministry of Health as well as physical visits to some of these institutions to ascertain the quality of personnel and infrastructure.

Pharmaceutical Management Programme

HS 5.1
Existence of Drug Revolving Fund modelled after Public-Private partnership.

The Drug Revolving Fund Scheme is a very effective strategy for ensuring uninterrupted drug supply in the health care delivery system.

This indicator intends to ascertain if a Drug Revolving Fund Scheme, modelled after public-private partnership for its sustainability exist in the state. If it does, its efficiency should be assessed from evidence of its
existence at facility, Ward, LGA and state levels of a logistics framework, qualified logistics and pharmaceutical personnel, and drugs storage and distribution facilities and infrastructure. Examples of national benchmarks include existence of well-equipped drugs storage facilities with cold chain equipment, well-trained personnel, distribution vehicles, and reduced stock-out in facilities.

Sources of Information: Should include, inspection reports, inventories, and drugs and commodities utilization reports.

**HS 5.2**

*Number of Health facilities experiencing stock-outs of drugs within the last one year.*

This indicator seeks to evaluate level of availability of essential drugs in all health facilities required for the provision of quality services as recommended in NPHCDA minimum package of care.

This indicator should be measured through facility health commodities inventory, utilization and procurement records.

The national benchmark for this indicator is 80% with a target of 40% by the year 2012.

Sources of Information: Sentinel survey reports, facility surveys, and DRF reports.

**HS 5.3**

*Efficiency of the procedures including the service delivery points.*

Efficiency of the procedures depends on a myriad of factors including:

i. Establishment of a DRF committee in every health institution for an effective and transparent fund management;

ii. Provision of adequate capital for the procurement of required drugs;

iii. Maintenance of a separate account for the DRF scheme, which shall be used exclusively for drug purchase;

iv. Ensuring strict accountability for the drugs provided in the system by supplying them on a “cash-and-carry” basis;

v. Empowering head of pharmacy department of health institution as the custodian of drugs to the institution and making him a required signatory to the DRF account; and

vi. Provision of appropriate training for the DRF personnel.

The Reviewers should establish the extent to which the above conditions are satisfied.

Sources of Information: Sentinel survey reports, facility surveys, and DRF reports.
HS 5.4
Options for recapitalizing the DRF including public-private partnership schemes.

Assessors should indicate the viability of options for recapitalizing the DRF and the extent to which it incorporate public-private partnership schemes, which would ensure its viability.

Health Information and Management System, Communication and Advocacy

HS 6.1
Existence of fully established HMS in the state.

This indicator seeks to ascertain the existence of a fully established HMS system in the State and the extent to which it is aligned to the National HMS.

The Reviewers should also establish the extent to which it is functional if it exists.

Data Source: State Ministries of Health

HS 6.2.1
Proportion of state annual health budget earmarked and utilized for health research, generation of evidence, and research capacity strengthening.

This indicator pursues the level of compliance with National Health Financing Policy and recommendations. It seeks to establish the proportion of the State’s or LGA’s total health budget that is dedicated to health research and evaluation to create knowledge base to inform health policy and programming.

This indicator should be assessed using reports of the state’s health ministry sectoral/department annual budget allocation and utilization reports. The national target of this indicator is not fixed but is a progressive target taking into cognisance current trends. The current benchmark is 2% of total health budget.

Sources of Information: DPRS reports.

H.S. 6.3.1
Number of health programmes and intervention plans and strategies for improved coverage and high quality impact developed based on information generated from routine HMIS data.

Evidence based planning is universally recognized as the best means of achieving high impact interventions and better health outcomes in a way that is efficient and effective. It also reduces wastages, leakages and duplication in addition to being able to meet the expectations of genuine needs. This indicator will measure the use of (sex, age and location) disaggregated data, especially routine HMIS data, for planning interventions. It will also establish evidence of data use in policy formulation, strategy development and programme activities design and implementation.
The indicator should be assessed by evidence of a data analysis and utilization system, structure and mechanism at LGA and state levels. It should also be verified by the availability of cost plans that derives from routine HMIS data and by reports of implementation of the plans. A good example is the use of data from an LGA that shows an increase in waterborne diseases to plan and implement intervention aimed at improving quality of water supply and treatment of waterborne diseases in the LGA. Examples here include monthly, quarterly and annual data review meetings, strategic planning process and periodic facility and household surveys. These activities should normally be followed by cost plans of action and operational plan development.

Sources of Information:: Periodic data review reports, strategic plans, operational plans and implementation reports.

**HS 6.4**

*Extent of collaboration with communities (active participation of women groups, traditional rulers, opinion leaders, CBOs, NGO and CSOs).*

This indicator seeks to establish the level of community participation and involvement in health development and to ascertain the existence of a formal framework and policy for this participation and involvement.

This indicator should be gauged through evidence of existence of a formal framework and policy for community participation (including women and youth groups), existence of community health advisory committees at all levels and evidence of community input in health planning and programme implementation. An example is the establishment of a village or ward health community comprising of community leaders and CSOs that is supported and strengthened to set community health priorities, suggest best strategies for intervention and advise the authorities for action. The national benchmark for this indicator is the existence of community health committees in at least 60% of all communities in the state. This should be demonstrated by providing evidence of their existence, structures, their gender and social inclusiveness, line of communication and interface with the relevant health MDAs.

Sources of Information:: health MDAs, LGA community development departments, community leaders and CSOs. The data should include list of committees, identity of leaders of committees, documentary evidence of their activities and presence of a coordinating liaison at the MDAs.
8.7 Environment Sector

In 1992, World Leaders adopted the principles of the Rio Declaration and Agenda 21 as the route to sustainable development in the 21st century. It is now increasingly recognised that environmental concerns are closely linked to the way development theory and practice are conceived and applied. In this context, the concept of Sustainable Development (SD) has rapidly emerged as an envisioning strategy to save the earth for future generations. Moreover, climate change has recently emerged as a major global environmental threat confronting humanity.

Meeting the challenges of environmental degradation thus requires re-examining the ways in which trade, industry, development and other economic policies are pursued and to what extent they are mindful of the environment.

Indicators are developed for six major areas:

- Waste Management;
- Biodiversity Management;
- Data Management;
- Pollution; and
- Environmental Governance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Detailed Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EnvS 1.1.1</strong></td>
<td>This indicator examines the existence of policies, strategies and plans for managing solid waste in the States, which are at the same time in line with federal government equivalents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existence of waste management policies, strategies and plans that align with Federal equivalents.</strong></td>
<td>In evaluating this indicator, questions to address include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Does the PSP consider and adopt appropriate mechanisms that facilitate effective and efficient waste management in the state; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Does this reflect, among others, the following elements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Analysis and evaluation of the current state, trends projections of solid waste management at the State level;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Identification of critical solid waste facilities which need closer monitoring and/or regulation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Characteristics and conditions of collection, storage, processing, disposal, operating methods, techniques and practices, location of facilities where such operating methods, techniques and practices are conducted, taking into account the nature of the waste; and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) The profile of the sources, including industrial, commercial, domestic and other sources.

To confirm the status of this indicator, Reviewers should ask whether the State has adopted a systematic, comprehensive and sound solid waste management plan.

Sources of Information:: Ministry of Environment, annual environmental reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics.

**EnvS 1.1.2**  
*Existence of Policy encouraging waste-to-wealth programme.*

With increasing population and per capita income, the quantum of waste generated will only increase in the near future. It is thus imperative that environment friendly waste-to-wealth programmes are designed and adopted for processing waste before disposal and generating value. Thus this indicator examines the extent to which formulated policy encourages commercial and industrial establishments to embrace waste-to-wealth activities and programmes.

**Measurement:**

To measure this indicator, ask:

i. Does the formulated policy cover public-private partnerships models in waste management?

ii. Does the policy lay down proper guidelines and directions to encouraging waste-to-wealth activities and programmes?

iii. Does it encourage commercial and industrial establishments through appropriate incentives other than tax incentives?

Establish if the policy is capable of encouraging:

i. Initiation of participation and investment in integrated ecological solid waste management projects;

ii. Manufacturing of environmental-friendly products, introduction, development and adoption of innovative processes that recycle and re-use materials, conserve raw materials and energy, reduce waste and prevent pollution;

iii. Undertaking community activities to promote and propagate effective solid waste management practices;

iv. The composting\* of agricultural waste, and other compostable materials including, but not limited to garden waste;
v. The initiation of study on the alternative usage of non-recyclable and non-reusable materials;

vi. Identification and documentation of all markets for recyclables, including possible markets for recyclables not handled by existing recyclers, the strengths and weaknesses of those markets; the general demand for recyclables; general and probable future market conditions and the benefits of cooperative marketing associations; and

vii. Reducing waste to landfill, increasing recycling through the following:

   a) Increase the percentage of municipal waste recycled**;

   and

   b) Reduce the percentage of municipal waste land filled.

*Percentage of waste composted - Quantity of waste composted/total waste quantity x 100

** Percentage of waste recycled - Quantity of waste recycled (by formal and informal sector)/total waste quantity x 100

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, annual environmental reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics.

EnvS 1.2.1
State institutional framework for waste management and its alignment with relevant federal institutions

This refers to arrangements designed by the State to ensure the efficient and effective waste management in line with good solid waste management plans and prescribed policies/laws.

Measure:

i. Is there a functional organizational and management structure?

ii. Are there adequate (quality & quantity) staff, equipment and facilities to ensure smooth operation of the institution?

iii. Is there a budgetary provision annually for solid waste management service in total state budget?

iv. Does the framework contain the following arrangement:

   a) Adoption of a programme that provide technical and other capability building assistance and support to the development and implementation of source reduction programmes?

   b) Development and implementation of programme to assist in the identification of markets for materials that are diverted from disposal facilities through re-use, recycling, and composting and other environment-friendly methods?

   c) Mechanism for consultation with stakeholders (including women, youths and vulnerable groups)?
d) Mechanism for the imposition of sanctions for violations?

What is the expenditure on solid waste management of the state?

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, annual environmental reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics

EnvS 1.3.1 Availability of final waste disposal sites.

This indicator examines the provision of sites by the State for final waste disposal. It is measured as total waste quantity generated/total population served by waste disposal sites, or alternatively, as per capita waste generation - Total waste quantity/total population served.

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, annual environmental reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics.

EnvS 1.3.2 Frequency of waste evacuation.

This refers to the frequency or rate of solid waste removal from the streets/"convenience centre" which accepts solid waste from the general public, for the purpose of transfer, processing, storing or disposing of the solid waste in a solid waste facility by the State or designated body. It does not include an individual transporting solid waste generated on or from his residential premises for the purpose of disposing of it in a solid waste facility.

Measure:

i. The type and number of pathways available, including nodes such as transfer stations and marshalling yards;

ii. Estimates of the amount and type of municipal solid waste flowing along each pathway;

iii. The persons responsible for funding, operating and maintaining the collection systems for each pathway;

iv. The geographic area and population served by communal systems;

v. The potential for and constraints to expansion of communal systems;

vi. Problems with and impacts of various collection methods and pathways; and

vii. The total collection system costs, in aggregate and for each pathway.

For example:

Measure performance with per capita waste generation - Total waste quantity/total population served in relation to turn-around evacuation of waste generated and
establishment of solid waste sanitary landfills.

This refers to the establishment of a comprehensive integrated solid waste management (SWM) programme with sanitary landfills (engineered and managed professionally) for ultimate waste disposal.

In measuring this indicator, ascertain how many sanitary landfill sites exist in the state. Whether the components of a sanitary landfill infrastructure include the following elements:

i. Recycling of secondary materials, including collection, and intermediate processing facility, marketing;

ii. Household hazardous waste disposal centre yard waste collection and composting;

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, annual environmental reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics.

**EnvS 1.3.3**

*Numbers of illegal refuse disposal sites and black spots.*

This refers to the number of illegal refuse disposal sites and black spots closed out or shut down by the State.

Reviewers should ask:

i. Has the State been able to identify and take inventory of all the illegal refuse disposal sites and black spots in the State?

ii. How many of these have been shut down?

Measure percentage of illegal refuse disposal sites and black spots closed in relation to the total spots identified in the State.

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, annual environmental reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics.

**EnvS 1.4.1**

*Establishment of solid waste sanitary landfills.*

This refers to the establishment of a comprehensive integrated solid waste management (SWM) programme with sanitary landfills (engineered and managed professionally) for ultimate waste disposal.

In measuring this indicator, ascertain how many sanitary landfill sites exist in the state. Whether the components of a sanitary landfill infrastructure include the following elements:

i. Recycling of secondary materials, including collection, and intermediate processing facility, marketing;

ii. Household hazardous waste disposal centre yard waste collection and composting;
iii. Convenience centre (transfer station); and
iv. Automated residential collection.

Percentage of waste disposed of in sanitary landfills = Quantity of waste disposed of in sanitary landfills (engineered and managed professionally)/total waste quantity \times 100.

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, annual environmental reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics.

**EnvS 1.4.2**

*Existence and extent of State maintenance and improvement of waste management.*

Solid waste in most cities of the federation is seen as a major problem that has reached proportions requiring drastic measures in the short term but also on a very long-term. Thus this indicator examines the provision made by the state to ensure both short and long-term maintenance and improvement of waste management as well as integration of the various solid waste management programmes and strategies.

It seeks to establish whether solid waste management (SWM) activities are integrated within the larger process of urban environmental management and the extent to which the State has adopted a broad approach that covers the social, economic, technology, political and administrative dimensions in the management of solid waste. For example, the social dimension of Solid Waste Management (SWM) involves waste minimization; the economic dimension of SWM involves waste recycling; the technology dimension of SWM involves waste disposal; and the political and administrative dimensions cut across all the three issues of minimization, recycling and disposal.

The matrix that links the dimensions of decision-making (social, technological, economic, political and administrative) with the levels of decision-making (household, neighbourhood, city, and nation) - helps in categorizing the decisions, action and related activities undertaken. The Matrix is shown below:
### The Solid Waste Management Matrix

For example:

1. Are there provisions for monitoring the implementation of the Solid Waste Management Plan through the various political subdivisions and in cooperation with the private sector and the NGOs?
2. Has the state adopted specific revenue-generating measure to promote the viability of its Solid Waste Management Plan?
3. Are the necessary logistical and operational support provided to the component in cities and municipalities?
4. Is there a review every two (2) years or as the need arises on the State’s Solid Waste Management Plan for purposes of ensuring its sustainability, viability, effectiveness and relevance in relation to local and international developments in the field of solid waste management?
5. Reviewers should observe three key trends with respect to solid waste - increase in the volume of waste generated, especially by urban residents; change in the quality or make-up of waste generated; and the disposal method of waste collected, by land-fill, incineration etc.

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, annual environmental reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics.
Biodiversity Management

EnvS 2.1

Existence of Updated laws on biodiversity, Status of biodiversity management policies, strategies and plans that align with Federal equivalents.

This indicator examines the availability of policies, laws, strategies and plans relating to issues of biodiversity reviewed and updated in the light of currency of information of the State which align with that of the Federal government.

Reviewers should carry out a survey of existing policies/laws operational in the State to ascertain their biodiversity relatedness. Find out if the laws are relatively new or have undergone significant changes. Ascertain the number of EIAs carried out before development projects are allowed and how consideration is given to the aspect of biodiversity, especially in the legal framework discussion. What is the State government’s plan and strategies on biodiversity management?

Reviewers should measure how the existing policies/guidelines of the State on Biodiversity affects:

i. Conservation Risk Index.
ii. Effective Conservation.
iii. Critical Habitat Protection.
iv. Marine Protected Areas.
v. Growing Stock.

Assess improved management of natural resources based on relevant OECD, MDGs and Vision 20:2020 indicators. Ask further to what extent do the state policies tie in with:

i. National Agenda 21:
ii. National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan;
iii. National Water Resources Master Plan (1995 -2020);
v. National Conservation strategy;
vi. National Agricultural Policy;
viii. National Forestry Policy and Action Plan;
x. National Policy on the Environment; and

Reviewers should reach out to converse with NGOs, and/or Commissioners for Environment/Agriculture.

Sources of Information: State of the Environment Report, Ministry of Environment, conservation department and ministry of agriculture.
EnvS 2.2.
Inventory of state biodiversity resources, Institutional framework for biodiversity management and its alignment with relevant Federal institutions.

This indicator examines the documentation of available list of life forms in the State - fauna and flora composition in the environment. The institutional framework for the management of biodiversity is the laid down formal arrangement by the State Government to oversee the issues of biodiversity, with proper linkage with Federal Institutions engaged in related activities.

Measurement:

Through Species - Area protection, measure the number of

i. Protected areas; and

ii. Threatened species (Red List species)

iii. To assess representation, the total area of that habitat type may be divided by the actually protected area of a certain habitat type.

iv. Use the Federal Ministry of Environment Guidance on Biodiversity Management and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan to assess how environmental protection needs of the State are aligned with Federal requirements.

v. Check if the institutions with responsibilities for biodiversity management are appropriately resourced with policies and procedures and have monitoring and evaluation capacity.

vi. Assess effectiveness and efficiency based on various compliances: expected institutional capacity and budget and various Federal standards and benchmarks to be found in relevant conventions and treaties.


Reviewers should also reach out to NGO’s for nature conservation and Historic data on the presence and abundance of species – for the construction of reference values – require archive studies, on e.g. trade data in hides, feathers and tusks; hunting data.

Sources of Information:: State of the Environment report, ministry of Environment, conservation department and ministry of agriculture.

EnvS 2.3.1
Existence of conservation facilities (e.g. zoo, parks, botanical gardens).

This indicator refers to a protected area. The definition adopted is derived from that of the workshop on Categories held at the Fourth World Congress on National Parks and Protected Areas: An area of land and/or sea especially dedicated to the protection and maintenance of biological diversity, and of natural and associated cultural resources, and managed through legal or other effective means.

Measurement:
Performance of this indicator will be measured by the existence and functioning of protected areas.

**EnvS 2.3.2**

**Number of wildlife parks.**

The precise purposes for which protected areas are managed differ greatly. Thus to ascertain what may or may not be sufficient performance of this indicator, determine if the existing park is functioning well in regard to any of the following main purposes of management:

i. Scientific research;
ii. Wilderness protection;
iii. Preservation of species and genetic diversity;
iv. Maintenance of environmental services;
v. Protection of specific natural and cultural features;
vi. Tourism and recreation;
ix. Sustainable use of resources from natural ecosystems; and
ix. Maintenance of cultural and traditional attributes.

Reviewers should also reach out to NGO’s for nature conservation and historic data on the presence and abundance of species – for the construction of reference values – required archive studies, on e.g. trade data in hides, feathers and tusks; hunting data.

**Sources of Information:** State of the Environment Report, Ministry of Environment, conservation department and ministry of agriculture.

**EnvS 2.3.3**

**Comprehensive Biodiversity report.**

This indicator refers to the existence of documented evidence that provides information about environmental and heritage conditions, trends and pressures for the State.

**Measurement:**

Examine printed materials/reports on the state of biodiversity in the State.

i. Is the Report Comprehensive such as including ecological communities?
ii. Has it provided information about changes in important processes at the appropriate temporal and spatial scale?
iii. Does it contain reliable data that is available and relatively straightforward?
iv. Do policy-makers and other members of the general public easily understand the report?

For example:

a) Has it attracted or can the report attract strong interest from a wide range of groups and individuals with an interest in environmental information, including the general public, all levels of government, MDAs, non-government organisations, the scientific community, international bodies such as OECD, UNEP and CSD, industry groups, and educational institutions?

b) Does the report align with Federal Ministry of Environment Guidance on Biodiversity Management and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan?

c) Does it contain threatened species (plants and animals) ranked as critically endangered (CR), endangered (EN) or vulnerable (VU), using criteria set out by the World Conservation Union (formerly known as the IUCN)?

Reviewers should reach out to conservation NGOs, Commissioners for Environment/Agriculture.

Sources of Information: State of the Environment Report, Ministry of Environment, conservation department and ministry of agriculture.
**EnvS 2.3.4**  
*Percentage of hectares of natural forest improved or retained.*

The various mechanisms designed by the State, to ensure forest cover over a given hectares of land which need to be improved or retained.

Measurement:
In measuring this indicator, ask;

i. What is the total forest cover in the State?

ii. What percentage is to be improved or retained?

The Reviewers should determine if the National Forestry Policy and Action Plan targets of achieving 25% forest cover in Nigeria and sustainable utilization of forest products is replicated in the State.

Sources of Information:: State of the Environment report, ministry of Environment, conservation department and ministry of agriculture. In case of absence of data, carry out a rapid assessment of the level of compliance amongst organizations.

**EnvS 2.4.1**  
*Increase in capacity building/ equipment, and increase of prosecuted polluters/year.*

This indicator measures the provision made through empowerment via training of MDAs personnel and/or provision of equipment that enable them to carry out the function of protecting the environment, reduction of risk to human health and the ecosystem and/or conservation of natural resources.

Measurement:

i. Measure if;
   a) training or equipment provided is targeted to particular environmental (biodiversity) problem and has met that need;
   b) Implementation of activities as defined by the annual plan is meticulously followed;
   c) Implementation of annual inspection plans is undertaken.

ii. Measure and assess performance Compliance via fines collected, amount; damage compensation collected, amount.

iii. Are there:
   a) Deterrent effect of fines?
   b) Fines imposed, and how many?
   c) Fines imposed, and by what amount?
   d) Damage compensation imposed, and what amount?
e) Number of cases transmitted to court?
  f) Number of cases audited in courts?

The Reviewers should use the following performance-based questions in OECA guidebook, “Using Performance Measurement Data as a Management Tool” which relates to enforcement and compliance assurance programme:

i. Are we contributing to the goal of protecting human health and the environment through our actions and strategies?
ii. Are we changing the behaviour of the regulated community in ways that lead to improved environmental performance?
iii. Are we achieving appropriate levels of compliance in key populations?
iv. Are we achieving the appropriate levels of enforcement activity in the regulated community?
v. Are we providing appropriate assistance to our state to support them in contributing to improving environmental performance?

Alternatively, carry out a rapid assessment of the level of compliance amongst organizations.

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, annual environmental reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics.

EnvS 2.4.2
Increase in forest cover; Percentage hectares of degraded land restored; and Percentage of invasive species removed.

Definition: This relates to the performance of the States with regard to ensuring that the forest cover in the state is maintained and not degraded and that foreign or invasive species have not taken over.

Measurement:

Reviewers should find out:

i. Does the state have a benchmark of percentage reservation or conservation?
ii. Is this percentage benchmark respected?
   - Where there is a percentage of formal reservation/conservation policy, what progress is being made towards the establishment of a comprehensive, adequate and representative system of protected areas?
iii. What is the extent of native vegetation remaining in relation to invasive species?
   - The amount of native remaining vegetation is generally correlated with the amount of stress that those ecosystems are under...
iv. What is the extent of fragmentation (or connectedness) of the landscape to the area of vegetation cover?
   - When small remnants of native vegetation remain but are not connected to other similar areas, they become islands of vegetation in a sea of agricultural land or urban development, and the genetic diversity and ecosystem resilience declines.

v. Does the benchmark tally with meeting National Forestry Policy and Action Plan targets of achieving 25% forest cover in Nigeria?
   - Existing Status of biodiversity and information generated from field survey will be used as benchmark for subsequent years.

Sources of Information: Ministries of Environment and Agriculture.

EnvS 2.4.3 Maintenance and improvement extent of biodiversity management.

This indicator is designed to ensure factual information on the dynamics of biodiversity in the State at any time.

Measurement:
Measure the number of activities/programmes that are in place to know and manage:

i. Number of populations of threatened species in decline;
ii. Extent of alien plant invasion reduced significantly (number of hectares infested);
iii. Percentage of mammals threatened;
iv. Percentage of breeding birds threatened.

Since relevant human impact on biodiversity operates differently at different spatial scales, give consideration to at least three different indicators to observe changes over time in:

i. Local ('within-habitat'),
ii. Landscape ('habitat-mosaic'), and
iii. Macro-scale ('regional') diversity.

To keep things as simple as possible, use species richness as an indicator for all three levels of diversity, each indicator based on a number of taxonomic groups that could be selected mainly on the basis of costs and availability of appropriate methods.

However, monitoring a complex issue like biodiversity in order to give relevant and accurate messages to the general public and politicians within a politically relevant...
Existence of state policy on Data Management (DM).

The Rio Conference on Environment and Development in 1992, and other similar environmental milestone activities and happenings recognized the need for better and more knowledge and information about environmental conditions, trends, and impacts. To achieve this, it is necessary to collect new and better data; acknowledge new thinking and research.

Measurement:
The Reviewers should give answers to the following questions in measuring this indicator:

i. Is there a deliberate State policy directed at ensuring the gathering of environmental data?

ii. Is there a State support for research and development (R&D) in the area of environmental management?

iii. Are there State policies that encourage environmental data bank and dissemination of the collected pull of knowledge to the public?

iv. Are environmental issues high on the list of priorities for governments?

The Reviewers should find out:
What issues constrain the development of new and useful environmental data in the State? In its Global Environment Outlook 2000 report (UNEP 1999), UNEP (the United Nations Environment Programme) discusses two types of constraints - institutional and technical:

i. The institutional constraints:
   a) General institutional constraints - limitations in resources, personnel and equipment;
   b) Data reporting units - difficulties with the aggregation and comparison of data sets;
   c) Data management - lack of central compiling systems; and
   d) Relevance - lack of relevance of certain issues for some countries result in incomplete global data sets.

ii. Technical constraints:
   a) Coverage of monitoring networks - lack of monitoring networks results in gaps in data time series;
b) Different reporting periods - difficult to compare locations’ collected time series;

c) Gap filling - using various estimates, instead of real data, can lead to misinterpretation;

d) Conceptual and technical difficulties of measurement—certain aspects of sustainable development are difficult to monitor over large geographic areas or to determine the cause and effect relationship; and

e) Differences in measurement method—data that are incompatible risk ending up in the same aggregated data set without detailed analysis of data collection and measurement methods\(^1\).

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, and other relevant MDAs as well as Civil society organizations.

---

**EnvS 3.2**

**Existence of baseline data on different components of the environment.**

Baseline enables the identification of what kind of impact an activity is having or has had or what kind of environmental changes (positive or negative) are occurring in an area due as a result of an initiative. This implies the availability of information on the main areas of environmental concerns which could be broadly grouped into: Climate change, Terrestrial Biodiversity, Atmosphere, Land, Water, Human settlements, Coastal and wetland zones, and Waste before the initiatives are taken.

**Measurement:**

The Reviewers should find out if there is documented evidence with regard to the prevailing situation of each area of concerns in the state.

The line of enquiry should be directed at all components of the environment such as:

i. Climate change - What are the efforts of the state in creating awareness about climate change issues? Is the state interested in developing carbon footprint? What incentives are provided for greenhouse gas emissions reduction to investors? What are the improvement policies on efficient and effective means of transportation? Are adaptation and mitigation measures considered in policy circles?, etc.

ii. Terrestrial Biodiversity – Does the state have a data base of threatened species of plants and animals? Are there tree tagging in cities?

iii. Atmosphere - Are pollution, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions data readily available?

iv. Land - Does the State have land use, forest area, built-up areas, human settlements properly documented?
v. Water - How are the issues of freshwater resources, water abstraction, precipitation, water consumption, water quality of rivers, reservoirs taken?

vi. Human settlements - Are there proper considerations of settlements growth and change, population density, infrastructure, health and welfare conditions, housing stock, infrastructure in government development plans and actions?

vii. Rivers, Wetland and Coastal zones (fish stocks, biodiversity, sea water quality)

viii. Waste (industrial wastes, health waste, waste generation rate, waste oil, sanitation and sewage, wastewater treatment. Are they on the front burner in government actions?)

However, some work may readily not be in the public domain but relevant to the States so it will be useful to also check with federal ministry of environment, research institutions, NGOs, etc.

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, Pollution control departments.

**EnvS 3.3.1**

*Number of environmental studies carried out.*

Environmental Studies emphasizes the relationship between humans and the environment. Through such studies the quality of the Earth's environment and the sustainable use of its natural resources, are enhanced since this allows the addressing of any fundamental problems.

Measurement:

What are the published and unpublished environmental studies/reports that detail some or all aspects of the status of the environment in the state?

i. Is there a Status report on the environment of the State?

ii. Are Environmental Impact Assessments, Environmental Audit Report, etc. carried out even for state government-sponsored projects?

iii. Count the number of EIA studies submitted to the Ministry of Environment.

iv. How many of these EIA studies have been reviewed by independent experts for quality?

In the absence of data, gauge performance by discussing with other relevant stakeholders such as NGOs/CBOs in the field of environmental management, academics.

Sources of Information:: Ministry of Environment, office of statistics, NGOs, etc.
The lack of data in general and reliable data especially, is a common problem in the indicator world. This is true for many indicators at the analytical level. Yet, to better integrate environmental considerations in policy decision, governments need sufficient information on which to predicate their decisions. Thus credible and up-to-date environmental information must be ensured in order not to undermine effective environmental management.

Measurement:

i. What are the processes in place to develop new and useful environmental data?

ii. Does State have opportunities (such as laboratory) where analytical methods are employed to provide high-quality data for environmentally relevant concentration on issues of concern?

iii. Are field-based research carried out with rigorous tests as well as investigation of emerging environmental quality issues?

iv. Could the data be proven and used by the scientific community in general?

To benchmark the indicators’ performance on prevailing international standards, ask:

Are there records of Environmental Occurrences such as are based on

i. Actual field data?

ii. Potential environmental occurrence based on chemical property information?

iii. Forensic evidence from analysis of environmental samples?

In the absence of data, gauge performance by discussing with other relevant stakeholders such as NGOs/CBOs in the field of environmental management, academics.

**EnvS 3.4.1**

**Research and Development Units;**

Definition: To provide reliable scientific information essential for the evaluation of the potential significance of emerging environmental-quality issues as well as identification of additional science needs required to design effective management strategies.

**EnvS 3.4.2 Budgetary provision of effective equipment, funding, capacity building and manpower for data collection.**

Measurement:

Amount of fund provided for research and development for environmental studies in relation to other sectors, institutional strengthening of R & D departments of the various environmental regulatory agencies in the States.
Environmental R & D % = \frac{\text{Amount allocated to Environmental R & D}}{\text{Total State Budget allocated to R & D}} \times 100

Sources of Information:: Ministries of Environment.

Pollution

EnvS 4.1.1
Existence of Management policies, strategies and plans that align with Federal equivalents and best practice.

This indicator refers to the level of actions taken by the State to implement resolution jointly agreed by the state with other States in the Federation.

Measurement:
Use the Vision 2020 requirements to judge extent to which Federal environmental protection needs inform State Resource Management of the Environment.

Has the State proved through its various instruments that all its actions are comparable and aligned with Federal actions? In case of absence of data, carry out a rapid assessment of the level of compliance amongst the states.

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, annual environmental reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics.

EnvS 4.1.2
Extent of institutional framework and enforcement mechanism.

This refers to arrangements made to ensure that pollution prevention and management policies and guidelines are implemented effectively and efficiently and complied with by all sectors of the economy.

Measurement:
Examine if the operation of environmental agency/ministry is sophisticated. Do they possess limited capabilities, severe resource shortages, and perhaps struggling for viability?

Use the guidance set in Vision 20:2020 on compliance, monitoring and enforcement of appropriate standards towards creating changes in attitudes.

In addition, indicate if the agency/ministry effectively coordinates the implementation of environmental programmes for the control of environmental degradation, pollution and the sustainable use and conservation of natural resources.
In the absence of data, carry out a rapid assessment of the level of compliance by the state.

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, annual environmental reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics.

**EnVS 4.2.1**

*Encouragement of non-pollution sources of energy*

This refers to the enabling environment created by the state to ensure that there is no pollution or that the pollution emitting sources such as energy are discouraged through deliberate policies and prevention of market mechanism that do not allow pollution generating facilities or pieces of equipment.

Measurement:
Assess the climate the government has created to enable the use of non-pollution sources of energy.

i. Assess Government provision of electricity/power as against individual/corporate provision of self-generated electricity via generators.

ii. Assess Government policies for encouraging renewable energy technologies in the state.

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, annual environmental reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics.

**EnvS 4.3.1**

*Low level of untreated industrial effluents.*

This refers to the absence or near absence of releasing of industrial wastewater into the environment whose characteristics after analyses falls outside or is at variance with permissible levels set by the designated authority.

Examine and measure:

i. Quality of pollution data generated, stored and retrievable

ii. Number of industries complying with pollution control standards


Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, Annual Environmental Reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics.
EnvS 4.3.2

Availability of data and monitoring mechanism.

This refers to data developed over time through the monitoring mechanism of the state.

Measurement:
Examine and measure data availability on (a) pollutants, and (b) monitoring techniques and technologies. Specifically, how reliable are data on the following:

i. Emissions per capita;
ii. Emissions per electricity generated; and
iii. Industrial carbon intensity.

Assess improved management of natural resources based on relevant OECD, MDG and Vision 20:2020 Indicators.

Sources of Information:: Ministry of Environment, annual environmental reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics.

EnVS 4.3.3

Number of companies with Environmental Audit Report (EAR) processed.

Environmental Audit Report (EAR) is an environmental management regulatory tool for ascertaining if management and other processes put in place to deal with environmental issues by an organization are working effectively to achieve a benign environment.

Measurement:
This indicator assesses the level of compliance by various organizations in the state.

What percentage of facilities carried out EAR in the past three years in relation to the total number of industrial facilities that exist in the state?

The Federal Ministry of Environment requires that operators in technical industry conduct an audit once in three years.

Also the Reviewer can undertake a rapid assessment of the level of compliance amongst organizations. In case of absence of data at the state level, gauge compliance from industries self-reporting, submission of EAR to the Federal Ministry of Environment. State Ministry of Justice to ascertain number of violations, cases transmitted to court, fines collected, etc.

Sources of Information:: Ministry of Environment, annual environmental reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics
A number of organizations in the various states do not operate best available technologies that are pollution-free or at its barest minimum. Thus, this indicator evaluates the number of abatement measures served to organizations to ameliorate environmental degradation arising from their activities.

Measurement:
Determine number of inspections made to facilities as well as enforcement actions applied that resulted in improved facilities practices.

(i) Non-compliance indicators
   a) Number of revealed violations
   b) Number of violations leading to damage
(ii) Enforcement response indicators
   a) Deterrent effect of fines
   b) Fines imposed, number of fines imposed, amount
   c) Damage compensation imposed, amount
   d) Number of cases transmitted to court
   e) Number of cases audited in courts
(iii) Compliance reaction indicators
   a) Fines collected, amount
   b) Damage compensation collected, amount

Also may undertake a rapid assessment of the level of compliance amongst organizations.

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, annual environmental reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics.

This is the number used to characterize the lowering of the quality of the air in the State as against the hitherto existing level. The AQI can worsen (go up) due to lack of dilution of air emissions by fresh air. Stagnant air, often caused by an anticyclone or temperature inversion, or other lack of winds lets air pollution remain in a local area. **Air Quality Index (AQI)** (also known as **Air Pollution Index (API)** or **Pollutant Standard Index (PSI)**) is a number used to characterize the quality of the air at a given location. As the AQI increases, an increasingly large percentage of the population is likely to experience increasingly severe adverse health effects.[1]

Measurement:
Monitor Air (indoor and outdoor) pollution- ground-level ozone, particulates, sulphur dioxide, carbon monoxide and nitrogen dioxide and calculate air quality indices for
these pollutants. Air quality index values are divided into ranges, and each range is assigned a descriptor and a colour code with standardized public health advisories associated with each AQI range.

Use WHO’s Disability Adjusted Life Year (DALY) to measure the sum of the number of years lost due to premature mortality caused by environmentally-influenced disease and the years of healthy life lost due to disability caused by such disease.

Benchmark on datasets maintained by the World Health Organization (WHO) to capture the health burden of environmental degradation. The Reviewers could use the following example of API and Health Implications (Daily Targets).[2]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>API</th>
<th>Air Pollution Level</th>
<th>Health Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 50</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>No health implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 -100</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>No health implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-150</td>
<td>Slightly Polluted</td>
<td>Slight irritations may occur; individual with breathing or heart problems should reduce outdoor exercise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-200</td>
<td>Lightly Polluted</td>
<td>Slight irritations may occur; individuals with breathing or heart problems should reduce outdoor exercise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-250</td>
<td>Moderately Polluted</td>
<td>Healthy people will be noticeably affected. People with breathing or heart problems will experience reduced endurance in activities. These individuals and elders should remain indoors and restrict activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-300</td>
<td>Heavily Polluted</td>
<td>Healthy people will be noticeably affected. People with breathing or heart problems will experience reduced endurance in activities. These individuals and elders should remain indoors and restrict activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300+</td>
<td>Severely Polluted</td>
<td>Healthy people will experience reduced endurance in activities. There may be strong irritations and symptoms and may trigger other illnesses. Elders and the sick should remain indoors and avoid exercise. Healthy individuals should avoid outdoor activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the absence of data, the Reviewers should advise the State to monitor ground-level ozone, particulates, sulphur dioxide, carbon monoxide and nitrogen dioxide for 24 hours and 72 hours for a month and calculate air quality indices for these pollutants.
**EnvS 4.4**  
*Percentage Level of compliance by all sectors with pollution free policies and guidelines.*

This indicator gauges the level of conformity by all persons and industries to environmental guidelines and procedures articulated by the State to ensure a pollution-free environment.

**Measurement:**

i. Number of inspections and investigations conducted;  
ii. Number of civil and criminal enforcement actions;  
iii. Number of facilities reached through compliance assistance efforts;

The Reviewers should use the following performance – based questions in OECD guidebook, “Using Performance Measurement Data as a Management Tool” which relates to enforcement and compliance assurance programme:

i. Are we contributing to the goal of protecting human health and the environment through our actions and strategies?  
ii. Are we changing the behaviour of the regulated community in ways that lead to improved environmental performance?  
iii. Are we achieving appropriate levels of compliance in key populations?  
iv. Are we achieving the appropriate levels of enforcement activity in the regulated community?  
v. Are we providing appropriate assistance to our state to support them in improving environmental performance?

Also may carry out a rapid assessment of the level of compliance amongst organizations.

**Sources of Information:** Ministries of Environment/SEPA, Research Institutes, Universities and Ministry of Health/Public Health Departments.

**Environmental Governance**

**EnvS 5.1**  
*Environmental policies and presence of environmental laws and enforcement.*

This indicator scrutinises organizations, policy instruments, financing mechanisms, rules, procedures and norms that regulate the processes of environmental protection in the State.

**Sources of Information:** Ministry of Environment, annual environmental reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics.
Measurement:
Assessing the performance of any environmental governance system is complex, given the complicated nature of the subject. The following questions would assist to apprehend some key principles of environmental governance:

Reviewers should examine if there is a “system of values, policies and institutions by which the State manages her affairs through interactions within and among the state, civil society and private sector.

Does the system facilitate the making and implementing of decisions by the state, that are people-environment oriented – achieving mutual understanding, agreements and action at every level of human enterprise: household, village, municipality, nation, region or globe?

For example:

i. Are there innovation and effective management and delivery models that inform policy and legislative development and improved local level environmental planning?

ii. Does decision making involve the principles of inclusivity, representation, accountability, efficiency, effectiveness, as well as social equity and justice with regard to environmental issues?

iii. Are best-practice guidelines for delivery of environmental services available in the State?

iv. Does the environmental policy of the state tie in very well with the national Policy on Environment?

v. Statistics could be generated from the involvement of the corporate organizations in Environmental governance (Box 1)

Box 1: Environmental governance in the corporate sector – key statistics and activities

ISO 14001

(i) ISO 14001 is the standard set by the International Standards Organization, which specifies the requirements for environmental management systems (EMS). EMS can be integrated, with other management requirements, to assist organizations to achieve environmental and economic goals. The overall aim of ISO 14001 is to support environmental protection and prevention of pollution in balance with socio-economic needs.

(ii) Ascertain how many organizations are accredited for EMSs
International sustainability indices

1. **Dow Jones Sustainability Index**
   (i) The Dow Jones Sustainability Indexes (DJSI), launched in 1999, is the first global index tracking the financial performance of the leading sustainability-driven companies worldwide.

2. **FTSE4Good**
   (i) The FTSE4Good Index Series encompasses four tradable and four benchmark indices, representing Global, European, US and UK markets.
   (ii) *How many organizations are listed on International sustainability indices*

Cleaner production mechanisms

*How many organizations have adopted cleaner technology?*

**Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative**

“The Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative” aims to increase transparency in transactions between governments and companies within extractive industries (mining, oil and gas).

*How many companies are on the list and participating in the initiative?*

**Global Reporting Initiative**

The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) is a multi-stakeholder process and independent institution whose mission is to develop and disseminate globally applicable Sustainability Reporting Guidelines. These are for voluntary use by organizations for reporting on the economic, environmental, and social dimensions of their activities, products, and services. The uptake and use of the guidelines improve the quality of sustainability reporting.

*How many companies are registered with the GRI secretariat as users of the guidelines?*

**Support of Climate Change issues and initiatives.**

How many organizations have taken on climate change initiatives, carried out carbon inventory, developed carbon footprint, etc?

---

**EnVS 5.2.1**

*Coordinated approach to environmental management.*

This relates to the combined efforts of related MDAs, especially other relevant stakeholders for addressing environmental issues in the State.

Measurement:

Ascertain whether there is a Ministry/EPA that coordinates environmental issues in the state.

i. What is the role of the Coordinating office?

ii. Are other stakeholders aware of its functions?

Sources of Information: Ministries of Environment/EPA.
This refers to documentation annually of environmental management affairs of the State.

Measurement:

i. Examine if there are published annual reports on the State of the environment.
ii. Are environmental issues high on the list of priorities for governments?
iii. Any State of the Environment Report?

Sources of Information: State MDA policy statements.

This indicator refers to the level of actions taken by the State to implement resolution jointly agreed with other States in the Federation.

Measurement:
Reviewers should identify all environmental programmes executed in the State and relate them to the Resolutions of the National Council on Environment.

How many of the environmental programmes/activities carried out by the State are taken from the resolutions made by NCE?

What proportion of the NCE resolutions have been executed by the State?

In the absence of data, carry out a rapid assessment of the level of compliance amongst organizations.

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, annual environmental reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics.

Environmental enforcement is no respecter of anyone violating the tenets of good environmental behaviour. To this end, this indicator examines the absence or presence of government interference in the prosecution of environmental offenders.

Measurement:
Obtain a picture of the enforcement system’s effectiveness as a whole. Measure total number of offenders of environmental laws/guidelines in comparison to actual prosecution?

Total the number of public complaints received, various legal actions taken and
number of site visits undertaken within a particular time frame. Ask why some were prosecuted and others not?

In the absence of data, carry out a rapid assessment of the level of compliance amongst organizations.

Sources of Information:: Ministry of Environment, annual environmental reports, Waste Management Board, Bureau of Statistics.

Soil Erosion Management

EnvS 6.1.1
Existence of soil erosion management policies, strategies and plans, which align with Federal equivalents.

This indicator examines policy strategies and plans encouraging soil erosion management in the State and which are also in accordance with the federal government equivalents.

In evaluating this indicator, questions to ask include:

i. Does the policy cover the State-Federal partnership in combating soil erosion (accelerated gully)?

ii. Does the policy lay down proper guidelines and directions to encourage strip cropping on hill slope, planting of vetiver grass as well as afforestation/reforestation of hilly terrain susceptible to soil erosion?

iii. Does the policy encourage Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), Corporate organizations and individuals to be involved in the campaign against the misuse of land/soil, over cultivation and exposures of hilly terrain?

iv. Does the policy encourage community participation in the campaign against soil erosion?

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, Annual Research Report from institutions in the State.

EnvS 6.1.2
Existence of Policy encouraging rehabilitation of erosion sites.

This refers to the policy formulated by the State to rehabilitate erosion sites.

Reviewers should ask the following questions:

i. Does the existing policy at the State align with that of the Federal Government?

ii. Is there any budgetary provision on annual basis for rehabilitation of erosion sites?

iii. How many erosion sites have been successfully rehabilitated?

iv. How many erosion sites have not been rehabilitated?

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, Annual Report from Institutions at the State.
Existing Institutional framework for soil erosion management and its alignment with relevant Federal Institutions.

This refers to arrangement designed by the State to ensure efficient soil erosion management through adoption of soil erosion control strategies/measures, which are in accordance with the prescribed environmental policy/laws.

Measure:

i. Is there a functional organizational and management structure for soil erosion control in the state?

ii. Are there adequate staffs in terms of quality and quantity, which will ensure smooth operation of institutions saddled with the responsibility of monitoring soil erosion in the State?

iii. Is there a budgetary provision on annual basis for effective monitoring of soil erosion control measures put in place by the State?

iv. Does the framework contain the following arrangement:
   a. Adoption of conservation measure or programme which provide technical and other capacity building assistance and support for rehabilitation or recovery of badly eroded area in the State.
   b. Development and implementation of programme to assist in the identification of erosion sites especially accelerated gully sites.
   c. Mechanism for consultation/dialogue with other stakeholders apart from government (i.e. the general public and NGOs).
   d. What is actually spent on soil erosion management in the State?

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, Budget Unit of Ministry of Finance, Annual project Report.

The Availability of erosion rehabilitation sites by the state.

This is a measure of State performance in respect of erosion control and mitigation programme adopted by the State. This is measured by simply counting the number of soil erosion sites that have been healed or rehabilitated completely and those that are near completion over those that have not been rehabilitated at all in the State.

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, Annual Environmental Reports, and Research Institutions.

Frequency of monitoring development at erosion sites.

This refers to the frequency or how often are the erosion sites visited and monitored on annual basis. This is just to monitor or assess how erosion control measures are effective in mitigating accelerated gully erosion.
In evaluating this indicator, questions to ask include:

i. Does the designated body provide appropriate measures/strategies? Is the strategy or measure adopted yielding fruitful results?

ii. Is the farmer, adopting strip cultivation/cropping in the hilly terrain, able to minimize soil erosion?

Measure:

i. The number of erosion sites available.

ii. Estimate of sediment loss from such identified erosion sites.

iii. Persons/NGOs apart from government responsible for funding, operating and monitoring of the erosion site rehabilitation process.

iv. Problems associated with the adoption of measure for mitigating accelerated erosion.

v. Total cost of the healing process or rehabilitation of the accelerated gully sites.

vi. Cost of preventing the marginal land (hill slope) from being affected by soil erosion.

For example:

Measure performance with respect to soil erosion affected areas (accelerated gully sites) in term of number of erosion sites healed over the number of unhealed or un-remediated sites and relate it to the following:

i. Population/community affected and provided with tree-seedlings and vetiver grass for mitigating soil erosion.

ii. Densely populated areas provided with conveyance channels for routing runoff into stream channel or valley.

iii. Length or erosion channel channelized by the community/NGOs/government.

iv. 

Sources of Information: Ministry of Environment, Annual Research Reports from Institutions, and Bureau of Statistics.

EnvS 6.3.3

Number of Identified erosion sites and badland topography in the State.

This refers to the number of unidentified erosion sites and abandoned land (i.e. badland topography) shutdown or banned by the State for rehabilitation process.

The reviewers should ask the following:

i. Has the State been able to identify and take inventory of all erosion sites and badland topography (i.e. area that has been badly devastated by gully erosion) in the State?

ii. How many of these sites have been closed down or banned for agricultural or any other development purpose?

Measure percentage of erosion sites and badland areas identified by the State to the total erosion sites identified in the State through research inventory conducted by institutions.

Sources of Information: The Ministry of Environment, Annual Environmental Reports compiled by Research Institutions or organization, Bureau of Statistics.
This refers to the creation of Commission/Authority for Soil Erosion Control/Management programme in the Ministry of Environment specifically for developing; adopting appropriate measures for mitigating accelerated soil erosion.

In measuring this indicator, ascertain/identify how many erosion site exist in the State where both engineering and soil conservation/management measures are being implemented. These include:

i. Level of awareness of the populace (affected population) on the best agricultural system/technique against soil erosion.
ii. Engineering control measures e.g. the quality of the channelization work to rehabilitate gully sites.
iii. Generating Spatial Support System for monitoring erosion sites.

Sources of Information: The Ministry of Environment, Annual Environmental Reports by Research Institutions, Soil Erosion control board/Commission, Published books.

8.8 Agriculture Sector

Agriculture is the mainstay of most States’ economy in Nigeria and provides livelihood for majority of the population. Despite the existence of high potentials for market-oriented agricultural production, farming activities in States is mainly for subsistence. Many States also engage in rearing of livestock, such as cattle, goats, sheep etc. Though opportunities do exist for plant and animal production and management, there are many variables that determine the volume and quality of yield and the resulting return on investment.

This assessment therefore intends to look beyond the normal focus of input and output relationship, and probe into the provision and management of other factors that affects the input and output variables. In this regard, 6 key areas will form the focus of this assessment as follows;

- Food and Agricultural Raw Material Supply;
- Agricultural Research and Extension System;
- Land Management and Tenure Systems;
- Rural Infrastructure and Market access;
- Water and Irrigation Supply and Control; and
- Credit Supply and Insurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Detailed Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food and Agricultural Raw Material Supply</strong></td>
<td>This indicator seeks to ascertain whether the State Government has a policy for stimulating and increasing food and agricultural raw materials supply. This may be in form of a separate document or a component of the State Medium-Term Agriculture Sector Strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is to ascertain access of livestock / fishery farms to veterinary services. The indicator of the relative access to these facilities is the Animal Scientist/Veterinary Doctor-Livestock farmer ratio.

It is measured by first identifying and recording the type of livestock and fisheries health facilities available in the state and secondly, noting/indicating the type and number of those facilities that are effective (i.e. currently in constant use). It may also be measured by the ratio of the number of Frontline animal scientist/Veterinary Officer/fisheries officers to Livestock/fishery farm ratio. For example: 200 clinics to 5000 Farms give a ratio of one veterinary clinic to 25 livestock farms.

Ratio of livestock production facilities (abattoirs, farms, feed mills etc.) to the number of trained livestock scientist managing livestock farms and production centres. This can be weighed against the National Average and any State that has a ratio above the national average could be regarded as making appreciable progress. Information generated from field survey could also be used as benchmark for subsequent years. The measurement and records should be annually.

Information on number of livestock production facilities/veterinary clinics, personnel can be obtained from report on survey of veterinary/fisheries facilities from the State Ministries of Agriculture. Similarly, number of registered livestock/fishery farms could be obtained from the Livestock Department of the Ministries, ADPs and registered Farmers Associations.

Meteorological services are within the national mandate of the Nigerian Institute of Meteorology, Oshodi and they have their facilities (synoptic weather Stations) installed at different levels across the country. Consequently, accessing the existence and extent of effectiveness might be with respect to available staff on ground and type of information obtained by the staff for local and national use and if regularly generated.

However, since data collection is done in collaboration with the personnel of the State ADP and Ministries of Agriculture, relative existence of facility can be measured by the number of meteorological staff in the public sector of the State per synoptic stations (i.e. number of synoptic stations in each zone divided by
AS 1.3.1
Percentage change in the quality and quantity of farm inputs (e.g. fertilizer, seed, livestock/fisheries production inputs etc.) delivered to farmers by government and/or private companies.

This indicator measures effectiveness of implementation of the budget. The quality of inputs and access of farmers are crucial to the end result of increased productivity. Level of performance can be measured as percentage growth in quantities of input supplied through government and accredited input supply agencies for purchasing inputs like fertilizers, agrochemicals and improved seeds/seedlings.

\[
\text{Change in Quantity (\%) } = \frac{\text{Quantity in current year} - \text{Quantity in previous year}}{\text{Quantity in previous year}} \times 100
\]

Information generated from field survey will be used as benchmark for subsequent years. The measurement should be done annually. The information should be obtained from the Staff list of the State ADPs or Ministries of Agriculture.

AS 1.3.2.
Annual count of private organizations/companies involved in the farm inputs (e.g. fertilizer, seed etc.) market and number/volume marketed.

This indicator measures progress in public-private partnership in the provision of enabling environment for a private sector-led agricultural and economic growth.

The measurement should be the verifiable physical count of number of organizations involved in the various activities with categorization by NGOs, commercial enterprises compared with the preceding year:

\[
\text{Change in Private Participation } = \left[ \frac{\text{No. of Org in Current yr} - \text{No.in Preceding yr}}{\text{Number in preceding year}} \right] \times 100
\]

This could be done by categories to identify area of positive growth. Growth should be expressed as a percentage of change in the number of each category of organization and investments annually. Information generated from field survey will be used as benchmark for subsequent years.

The needed data/information on this indicator could be collected from Federal and State Ministries of Agriculture, Commerce and cooperatives, State ADPs, number of desk personnel for weather stations).
Input Supply Agencies, NGOs and accredited private input agencies/organizations, and NGOs involved with input delivery services.

**AS 1.3.3**

*Annual count of Public-Private Partnership and government investment directed at financing and maintaining inputs and their supply (e.g. tractors).*

This indicator shows the dynamics of the States’ land use pattern. It indicates the potential of agriculture growth through expansion in land area and the implication of population growth on land resources management and conservation. It is measured by the percentage change in total arable land area under cultivation, land area under forest reserves. Change in number of fishery and livestock farms and production capacity. The index is generated as given by:

\[
\text{Change in Area cultivated (\%) } = \frac{\text{Area in current year} - \text{Area in preceding year}}{\text{Area in preceding year}} \times 100
\]

Physical count of livestock and fishery resources is used for livestock and fishery resources respectively. Information generated from field survey will be used as benchmark for subsequent years. This can be measured annually.

The required information can be gathered from farm survey reports of State Ministries of Agriculture, ADP, State Departments of Forestry, Livestock and fishery. It may however be difficult to get data on total arable land area at the farm level but average farm size for arable crops could be used as proxy for land area extrapolated over the estimated population of farming households obtainable from the village listing reports of State ADPs.

**AS 1.4.1**

*Percentage Growth in Agricultural Production.*

This indicator measures progress in the overall policy emphasis of making agriculture the cornerstone of pro-poor growth and diversification of the revenue base of developing countries. It will be measured by comparing the output of a commodity at the present period with a base year as follows:

\[
\text{Output Change (\%) } = \frac{\text{Output in current year} - \text{Output in previous year}}{\text{Output in previous year}} \times 100
\]

The NEPAD/CAADP initiative stipulated a minimum benchmark annual growth of 6% as measure of progress in attainment of MDG. State’s performance can be assessed based on this benchmark. Measurement should be done annually.

Information on output of most crops at the State level is obtainable from the National Food Reserves Agency (formally Project Coordinating Unit PCU) which collates state level data provided by the ADP offices in each state.
The indicator measurement should focus on the number of FGN/state government collaborative projects or FGN agricultural programmes and projects in states.

This indicator measures the progress made as regards markets access and shift towards market-oriented production at the farm level for sustainable growth.

Information generated from field survey will be gender disaggregated and used as benchmark for subsequent years and subsequently assessed annually.

The nature of the data means that it can only be obtained at field level through farm survey. However, ADPs have collection of farm level data and farm budget as important components of the schedule of duties of their Project Monitoring and Evaluation Departments. In the absence of this data, farm survey can be carried out basically to collect information on percentage of the total output of commodities that is consumed by farming households, given out as gift and sold for income across different commodities. As much as possible, all information should be gender disaggregated. The results of the survey can then be compared across commodities in the States.

This indicator measures the progress made as regards markets access and shift towards export market-oriented production at the farm level for sustainable growth.

This will focus on the institutional mechanism put by states for the promotion and regulation of agricultural export commodities such as Agricultural Trade and Markets Units responsible for international trade facilitations, regulates on barriers such as sanitary and phytosanitary standards (SPS) and food safety measures that will make states produce competitive and acceptable in international markets.
Agricultural Research and Extension Systems

**AS 2.1**
Existence of programmes at State level aimed at ensuring dissemination of appropriate new technology.

This indicator shows the extent to which the State participates in programmes targeted at improving productivity through dissemination of appropriate technologies. Such programmes include those in the National REFILS (Rural-Extension-Farmers-Input-Linkage-System) structure like the ADP systems and the specialized programmes like FADAMA, National Programme of Food Security.

i. The number of programmes targeted at technology dissemination can gauge this indicator and rural empowerment (e.g. REFILS, FADAMA, National Programme on Food Security, Presidential Initiative on Rice Production, etc.) participated in by the States.

ii. Percentage of the required counterpart funding released by the States measured as:

\[
\text{Counterpart Funding (\%)} = \frac{\text{Amount Released}}{\text{Required Funding}} \times 100
\]

The benchmark performance is at least 75% of the scheduled activities and the assessment can be done annually. The required data for the assessment could be obtained from the State ADPs and Ministry of Agriculture.

**AS 2.1.2**
Existing programmes at state level aimed at engaging local research centres in the development and dissemination of appropriate new technology.

This indicator shows the extent to which the State supports its internal research centres (universities, colleges of agriculture etc.) in improving productivity in agriculture through development and dissemination of appropriate and adaptable technologies.

**AS 2.2**
Annual count of new varieties (by commodities) and technologies made available for transfer.

This indicator relates to the performance of States as evidenced by the ADPs and Research system’s response to the technology needs of farmers. The research Institutes generate technologies, which are accessed by the ADPs for transfer to farmers.

The indicator can be assessed by the Verifiable Physical count of number of
technologies transferred by ADP by type and commodity groups/enterprises (e.g. production, processing or post-harvest, and livestock). The information generated from field survey will be used as benchmark for subsequent years and the assessment should be done annually. The required information for the assessment can be obtained from ADP in each State.

**AS 2.3 Ratio of farmers to extension agents.**

This indicator seeks to evaluate the availability of human resources for effective extension service delivery. They also reflect the potential for replacing disengaged/retiring officers through new recruitment.

The measurement of the effectiveness through Extension agent-Farmer ratio however forms the baseline for this indicator as it compares the number of frontline extension staff with population of farming household in each of State.

**Ratio of Farmers to Extension Agent:**

\[
\text{Ratio} = \frac{\text{Number of Farming Households}}{\text{Number of Extension Agents}}
\]

The performance benchmark can be adapted from practice in other Countries such as; Extension Agent: 1:1000 Farming households for South Africa; East Africa 1:1,500; India 1:2,000; Or information may be generated from field survey and used as a benchmark for subsequent years. The assessment could be done annually and the required data could be sourced from REFILS report of the State ADPs.

**AS 2.4 Proportion of farmers getting information from extension services and frequency of information supply measured as a percentage of the baseline.**

It measures the relative access of women and men farmers to extension services. This can be measured by the number of male and female farmers having contact and the number of contacts they have in a year.

\[
\text{Extension Contact (\%) } = \frac{\text{Number of Farmers having contact}}{\text{Total Number of Farmers}} \times 100
\]

Frequency = Number of contacts per year. Annual assessment is desirable.

Information generated from field survey should be disaggregated by gender and used as a benchmark for subsequent years. In order to ensure reliability, the data should be generated through fresh farm survey. Getting the data through the ADPs is tantamount to asking them to assess themselves and some level of bias may be introduced. The data could be collected alongside the adoption study.
Land Management and Tenure Systems

This area of assessment seeks to find out the extent of efforts undertaken by the State to ensure access to land, especially for women and marginalised groups, and conservation of land for good agricultural practices.

**AS 3.1**
*Framework that is gender and socially inclusive to promote land management and tenure systems for agricultural purpose.*

This indicator seeks to establish if there is a policy on land use and acquisition for agricultural purposes and farm settlement scheme and how gender and socially inclusive the policy is. This could be obtained from agricultural land development documents of Ministries of Agriculture or Agricultural Agencies including ADPs, etc.

**AS 3.2**
*Measures undertaken by the State to ensure access to land and conserve land for good agricultural practices, including for women and marginalised groups.*

This indicator seeks to determine the number of Farm Settlement schemes established or renovated. Non-functional farm settlement scheme does not qualify.

Information on number of farm settlements and the area of each farm settlement should be available in the Ministry of Agriculture or Agriculture Development Agency.

**AS 3.3**
*Proportion of land area with Sustainable Land Management (SLM) practices measured as a percentage of the baseline.*

This indicator seeks to determine the adoption of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) technologies in crop production. This can however be measured in relation to the number of men and women farmers adopting the technology or the land area that is engaged under the technology. It reflects the popularity of the technologies among women and men farmers as an indirect measure of the consciousness of farmers on the need to conserve and/or maintain soil quality.

The indicator is measured as an adoption index:

\[
\text{Ag (c) 1.4.3 SLM - Adoption(\%)} = \frac{\text{Land Area under SLM Technologies}}{\text{Total Land Area Cultivated}} \times 100
\]

Information generated from field survey should be disaggregated by gender and used as benchmark for subsequent years and the assessment could subsequently be done annually.
Adoption level of technologies relevant to sustainable land management are expected to be determined routinely by the ADPs in the absence of which the adoption status can be determined through a fresh field survey (Adoption study).

**AS 3.3.2**

*Proportion of land area demarcated/gazetted as grazing reserves/stock routes*

This indicator seeks to determine the proportion of land area demarcated/gazetted as grazing reserves/stock routes.

**AS 3.4**

*Annual count of training mounted for extension agents in SLM techniques.*

This indicator assesses the extent of human capacity building among frontline extension agents who are directly responsible for the transfer of sustainable land management techniques to farmers. This is usually conducted through training workshops organized for relevant research institutes to subject matter specialists who are then expected to train frontline extension agents using the Train-the-Trainer approach.

Measurement of this indicator is by count of number of training workshops organized annually for extension agents through training workshops and fortnight training (FNT) programmes with sustainable land management components.

Information generated from field survey should be disaggregated by gender and used as benchmark for subsequent years.

**Sources of Information::** Records of ADPs on Training workshops, MTRM and FNT topics focused on sustainable land management.

---

**Market Access**

This area of assessment seeks to determine existence and suitability of framework that provides market access.

**AS 4.1**

*Framework that ensures access to market.*

This indicator seeks to establish whether the state is implementing programme to ensure that women and men farmers have access to markets. The assessment is restricted to five areas:

i. Provision of rural all season access roads to all parts of the state;

ii. Rural markets close to farmers;
iii. Processing Facilities;
iv. Provision of government storage facilities; and
v. Buying up excess products from farmers to avoid wastages

The Reviewers will verify whether the state has programme for each of the above-mentioned areas, which facilitates access to markets.

**AS 4.2**

*Status of State rural infrastructures in ensuring market access.*

This indicators measures efforts by States to encourage value addition and access to market for enhanced income among women and men farmers. This indicator could be measured as the percentage of men and women farmers that have access to public or private input and output centres or storage and processing facilities.

\[
\text{Access Change (\%)} = \frac{\text{No. with Access in current year} - \text{No. with Access in previous year}}{\text{No. with Access in previous year}} \times 100
\]

A positive value indicates improving access. Data for this indicator could be sourced from annual report of service centres. In the absence of this data, a new farm survey can be carried out to generate the information. The information should be gender-disaggregated and will be used as benchmark for subsequent years. The assessment should be done annually.

**AS 4.3 Proportion of certified service providers and price information systems measured as % of the baseline.**

The indicator seeks to examine the institutional framework for the generation and dissemination of market information to women and men farmers.

The measurement is the change in the number of registered service providers in a period expressed as a percentage of the number of such providers in the preceding year.

\[
\text{Service Providers (\%)} = \frac{\text{Current year Service Provider} - \text{Previous year Service Provider}}{\text{Previous year Service Provider}} \times 100
\]

Information generated from field survey will be used as benchmark for subsequent years and the assessment should be done annually.

Information could be sourced from ADPs, National Agricultural Research Extension and Liaison Services (NAERLS) and National Food Reserve Agency (NFRA) at Zonal and State Level.
AS 4.4.  
Proportion of men and women small-scale producers and farmers’ association linked to value chains and marketing companies/organizations.

This indicator assesses progress made by States in market linkage and value addition opportunities for agricultural commodities. The progress is measured by expressing the change in number of men and women farmers or small scale producers linked to value chains and marketing companies as a percentage of the number of farmers who enjoyed the linkage in the preceding year.

$$\text{Linkage Change (\%) = } \frac{\text{No linked in current year } - \text{No linked in prev year}}{\text{Number linked in previous year}} \times 100$$

Data on the number of farmers, farmers association or processors that have benefited from such efforts could be obtained from the ADPs, State Ministry of Commerce and Industries, processors associations and non governmental marketing companies of agricultural commodities. The assessment should be done annually and the baseline information should be generated from field survey for subsequent years. Information from the survey should be disaggregated by gender and location.

Water and irrigation supply and control

This area of assessment seeks to determine the status of water and irrigation supply system in the State.

AS 5.1  
Framework for water irrigation supply and control.

This indicator seeks to ascertain whether the state has policy on water irrigation supply and control. The policy may be in a separate section of the state Agriculture policy document or may be in a separate document.

The policy should be comprehensive and comparable to Federal Government Water Irrigation supply and control policy.

AS 5.2.  
Existence of institutional structure to manage and control water irrigation supply systems in the state.

Water irrigation supply and control is a specialist area of Agriculture and requires professionally staffed institution to manage the process. This indicator seeks to confirm if the state has a department, agency or programme whose mandate is to oversee water irrigation supply and control.

The second aspect is whether the department, agency of programme has qualified competent staff, requisite facilities and equipment and adequate funding.
AS 5.3.
Volume and value of irrigated water capacity developed or rehabilitated.

This indicator aims to assess the volume of investment in construction of irrigation facility and the potential addition to the capacity of irrigation facility in terms of volume and value of water. The measurement is expressed as Total water volume capacity of irrigation facility added expressed as percentage of the existing capacity in the previous year.

\[
\text{Change in Irrigable land (\%) = } \frac{(\text{Water Capacity in current Year} - \text{Water capacity in Previous year})}{\text{Water Capacity in previous year}} \times 100
\]

Positive values mean progress. This indicator should be measured annually. Data for assessment could be sourced from the reports of Ministry of Water Resources and River Basin Development Authorities. The baseline information could be generated from the field survey/state reports and will be used as baseline for subsequent years.

AS 5.4
Proportional increase in yield of crop/fish and farm income measured as a percentage of the baseline.

This indicator seeks to assess the proportional change in yield and income. It is measured as a percentage of the yield of non-irrigated crops. Consequently, the proportional production increase can be calculated as the gap between irrigated and non-irrigated crop divided by the national yield of the crop and should subsequently be assessed annually:

\[
\text{Proportional Production Increase (\%) = } \frac{\text{Yield of Irrigated crop} - \text{Yield of Non-Irrigated crop}}{\text{National Yield of crop}} \times 100
\]

Information on crop yield could be obtained from survey of irrigated farming and national yield figures as contained in the reports and Abstract of Statistics of River Basin Authorities, National Bureau of Statistics and Central Bank. The first year information/data will be used as the baseline for subsequent years.

Credit supply and insurance

This assessment aims to appraise the framework put in place to ensure credit supply and insurance to farmers in the state. It provides information on machinery of government targeted at credit delivery and other financial support to farmers (e.g. credit agencies and schemes).

AS 6.1
Framework for credit supply and insurance

This indicator intends to ascertain whether the state has policy and/or operational framework for providing financial support to men and women farmers for agricultural development.
AS 6.2
Number Of financial institutions (Savings/Credit/Insurance) and products offered in rural areas.

The indicators show the distribution and consequently the relative access of rural communities to financial institutions’ products and services. This assessment will count the number of financial institutions (savings/credit/insurance) operating in the rural areas of the state.

The second aspect is to count the number of financial products offered by the financial institutions in those rural areas.

AS 6.3
Annual count of financial institutions (insurance/savings/loan) and products offered in rural area.

This indicator shows the distribution and consequently the relative access of rural communities to financial institutions, products and services. The measurement is an expression of number of financial institutions in rural communities by category as a percentage of total number of such institutions. Expressing the change in number of financial institutions in rural communities as percentage of the number in the preceding period can also indicate the progress made in provision of the services in rural communities. Positive value indicates progress; and it should be assessed annually.

\[
\text{Rural Financial Institutions(\%) = \frac{Number \ in \ Previous \ year}{Number \ in \ previous \ year} \times 100}
\]

Information for assessing this indicator could be generated from the reports of State Ministries of commerce and industry. Information generated from field survey/state reports will be used as benchmark for subsequent years.

AS 6.4
Proportion of farmers with access to credit and insurance measured as a % of the baseline.

The indicator seeks to evaluate the relative access of members of rural communities to credit and insurance policies. The relative access to credit or insurance scheme is measured by expressing number of farmers with access as a percentage of total number of women and men farmers for each category of facility and could subsequently be assessed annually.

\[
\text{Access to credit(\%) = \frac{Number \ of \ farmers \ with \ Access \ to \ credit}{Total \ number \ of \ Farmers} \times 100}
\]

Data for this assessment could be sourced from the record of financial institutions and reports of State ADPs. The information generated from field survey/state reports will be disaggregated by gender and location used as benchmark for subsequent years.
8.9 Infrastructure Sector

The term “infrastructure” typically connotes public facilities such as roads, railway lines, electric lines, air/sea and river ports, telecommunications, geodetic control framework and similar physical structures or networks in which government has played either a major role or supported their construction. The term also connotes the systems associated with these facilities including energy sources, vehicles and traffic control and the operational environment within which these systems function. Increasingly, its meaning has been shifting from one focusing on physical fixed assets such as roads, airports, sea ports, telecommunications systems, water distribution systems and sanitation (what might be called ‘public utilities’). It now often embodies notions of softer types of infrastructure such as information systems and knowledge bases.

The assessment in this sector focuses on four (4) broad areas. These are:

- Basis for undertaking Infrastructural Investments;
- Level of Public Access to Infrastructure; and
- Sustainability and Maintenance of Infrastructural Investments;
- The state of IT infrastructure in the state including the deployment of internet for communication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Detailed Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IS 1.1</strong></td>
<td>This indicator seeks to ascertain if the state has laws, regulations and policies to regulate investments in infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which the state has laws, regulations and policies to regulate investments in infrastructure, including private and public/private partnerships.</td>
<td>These will be in respect of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. State Water Policy or Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. State Power Policy or Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. State Transportation infrastructure Policy or Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This assessment will first verify the existence of the policy or law. Secondly, it will check whether there are provisions detailing basis and requirements for undertaking infrastructural investments by the government in the sector. The second consideration is whether the policy or law stipulated requirements for infrastructural investments by private sector participants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IS 1.2**
Evidence that locations for Good practice demands that infrastructural investments (i.e. roads, water, power, schools and health facilities) should be physically located in areas of
The growth of Nigeria’s democracy requires that key stakeholders including beneficiaries be afforded the opportunity to contribute to identification/selection and implementation of infrastructural investments. This indicator seeks to unravel involvement of stakeholders including women and youth groups in identification/selection of infrastructural investments. Specifically, to consider if the following key stakeholders were consulted:

i. The State House of Assembly;
ii. The State Executive Council;
iii. Women and Youth groups;
iv. Traditional and religious groups;
v. Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), the private sector, etc.; and
vi. The wider public (through forums in senatorial districts, local governments, etc.).
States should provide evidence of whether consultation took place and what effect the consultation had on the process. The assessment may also seek opinions from outside government on how effectively the government consulted stakeholders.

**IS 1.4**

_Evidence that community concerns were addressed before, during and after project implementation._

This indicator seeks to ascertain if community concerns were addressed in infrastructural investments. Community concerns are addressed through Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) hearings.

The indicator calculates the total number of projects in excess of N20 million in each of the following sectors:

i. Roads;

ii. Water; and

iii. Power.

Thereafter calculate the proportion/percentage of the projects that have comprehensive EIA reports.

The assessment will cover the current year’s projects and the two preceding year’s projects.

---

**Level of Public Access to Infrastructure (i.e. Roads, Water and Power)**

**IS 2.2.1**

_Good Paved Asphalt Road link from state capital to all local governments’ headquarters._

Provision of paved roads is the responsibility of Federal, State and Local Governments. This indicator will primarily be restricted to good asphalt road link from state capital to all Local Government headquarters irrespective of whether it is the responsibility of State or Federal Government to provide and maintain all or some of the Local Governments' headquarters link roads.

The indicator will ascertain the percentage of the Local Governments' headquarters in the State with a good paved asphalt road link to the state capital. For example, in a state with 20 local governments and 16 Local Governments’ headquarters are linked to the state capital with paved asphalt road, it therefore means that 80% of the local governments headquarters are linked to the state capital with good paved asphalt road.

Reviewers should confirm the state of the paved road as paved roads in a state in a condition of disrepair will not be included in the analysis.
IS 2.2.2
Daily per capita litres of water supply.

Recent study revealed that less than 30% of Nigerians have access to safe drinking water, and consume only 40 litres of water per day per capita. WHO recommended standard are 130 litres and 70 litres per day per capita for urban and rural dwellers, respectively.

This indicator uses the daily per capita water supply to measure public access to water in the state. Per capita water supply per day is the total public water supply per day divided by the population.

IS 2.2.3
Connectivity to power (National Grid and Rural Electrification).

This indicator plans to use the percentage of Local Governments’ headquarters and electoral wards connected to the National Grid and rural electrification to measure access to power.

For example, in a state that has 20 Local Governments, if 16 local government headquarters are connected to National Grid and rural electrification, that is 80% compliance. In the case of electoral ward, what is required is for any part of the electoral ward (not the entire ward) to be connected.

IS 2.2.4
Telecommunications coverage in the state.

The indicator will ascertain the proportion of the state that has GSM coverage.

Sustainability and Maintenance

IS 3.1
Extent to which the state has laws, regulations and policies to ensure/guarantee sustainability and maintenance of investments in infrastructure.

This indicator seeks to ascertain if the state has laws, regulations and policies to ensure/guarantee sustainability and maintenance of investments in infrastructure.

These will be in respect of the following (same as in 1.1 above).

i. State Water Policy or Law;
ii. State Power Policy or Law; and
iii. State transportation infrastructure policy of law.

This assessment will check whether there are provisions detailing process roles, responsibilities and funding mechanism for sustainability and maintenance of infrastructural investments by the state government, local government, community members, user groups, etc.
IS 3.2
Existence of institutions and organisations responsible for sustainability and maintenance of investments in infrastructure.

This indicator tries to ascertain whether the state has specific organisation, department or agency responsible for maintenance and sustainability of roads, water and power projects.

Existence of an organisation, department or agency is not sufficient; the assessment will review whether the organisation, department or agency has required professionals and motivated manpower to perform their functions.

IS 3.3
Percentage of state budget earmarked for sustainability and maintenance of investments in infrastructure.

Good policy and institutional arrangement without adequate funding will not ensure/guarantee sustainability and maintenance of roads, water facilities, power installations, schools and health facilities. An important requirement is availability of funds.

This indicator identifies the percentage of the state budget allocated for sustainability and maintenance of roads, water facilities, power installations, schools and health facilities. The essence is to determine whether sustainability and maintenance of projects are funded by the state.

The assessment will calculate the percentage of total budget allocation for sustainability and maintenance of road, water, power, education and health projects. That is the percentage of the total state budget.

The assessment will cover the current year’s budget and the two preceding years’ budgets. The indicator looks at the budget only, not actual fund releases.

IS 3.4 Existence of cost recovery mechanism.

This indicator tries to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of the revenue collection mechanism as well as its viability and sustainability in contributing to maintenance of the projects.

The assessment will calculate the total user charges generated from water projects in the two preceding financial years. This indicator is restricted to water.
Information and Communication Technology (ICT) is integral to human society, affecting all facets of modern life. They enhance productivity while being key drivers of economic growth, job creation, and new business creation, which if properly harnessed could lead to an increased tax base.

States thus need to harness the potential of ICT for economic growth and poverty reduction as increased use of ICT is critical in efforts to eradicate poverty, enhance human development, and achieve the U.N. Millennium Development Goals.

This indicator seeks to examine whether the State has an ICT policy which is an official statement stating the objectives, goals, principles, and strategies intended to guide and regulate the development, operation and application of ICT in the State. The examiner should also find out to what extent the policy is being implemented if it exists. It may be recalled that Nigeria recently launched an ICT policy in 2012.

Sources of Information: Ministry of Information and Governor’s Office.

**IS 4.2.1**

*Level of deployment of ICT in the State (Internet, cyberspace and the worldwide website (WWW)).*

The Internet has become an important facet of e-governance. All State Governments currently have websites, albeit at varying degrees of functionality. This indicator intends to measure the extent to which ICT is deployed and functional in the state. A rough indicator is the State’s website.

**IS 4.2.2**

*The capacity of IT staff around the Chief Executive.*

IT, no doubt, plays a major role in communication in this information age. The Chief Executive is expected to be internet literate with a functional official e-mail address. This indicator will examine the capacity of the IT Staff around the Chief Executive. It should be sourced from the Government House.

**IS 4.2.3**

*Existence of an interactive state website.*

While many states now have websites, many of them are redundant and hardly updated. This indicator will evaluate how interactive a State’s website is.
IS 4.2.4
The contents and functionality of the state website; is there sufficient depth and breadth of content offerings?

Linked to IS 4.3.2 above, the indicators here evaluate the functionality and adequacy of the content of the website.

i. How informative is the homepage?
ii. Is global navigation consistent from page to page?
iii. Is the site organisation intuitive and easy to understand?
iv. Overall, do pages load quickly and are graphic applications like search and multimedia presentation optimized for easy web viewing?
v. On content, does the site present adequate and relevant information on the state such as profile of members of the Executive, state medium-term plan, current and last year’s budget?
vi. Is it updated regularly?

This should be sourced from the State’s website.

IS 4.3
The governance structure and backend architecture for managing the State’s website.

The functionality of the website depends on the backend architecture i.e. the database used to organize information and the content management system used, as well as the adequacy of resources and manpower dedicated to it.

Relevant information should be sourced from the IT Section in the State.

8.10 Citizen Participation, Social Inclusion and Protection

Around the world, a growing crisis of legitimacy characterises the relationship between citizens and the institutions in state and society that affect their lives. The disconnection between public authorities and citizens is mounting and with it the consequential failure of public policies to respond to and reflect the common welfare of citizens or to address their needs and wants.

The Citizen Participation, Social Inclusion and Protection (CPSIP) theme of the SPRM thus provides the overarching substantive and process nexus connecting the various thematic areas of the SPRM. It provides the theoretical base for democratic governance and the standards by which to access the policy thrust in various policy areas, and for the determination of not only the extent to which governance is owned by the citizens of the state but also the confidence they have in those who have been entrusted with governing them, through democratic elections.

The term “social exclusion” refers to deficits in the multidimensional relations between the individual, on the one hand, and state and society on the other hand: a material dimension (resources), a political dimension (rights) and a cultural dimension (self-realization). It describes a process by which certain groups are systematically
disadvantaged, discriminated against and denied their entitlements as citizens by the state and society on the basis of their gender, ethnicity, race, religion, sexual orientation, caste, descent, age, disability, HIV status, migrant status or where they live. Social inclusion is a strategy to combat social exclusion.

Social inclusion and protection are about providing equal opportunities for men and women, boys and girls, for redressing the historic disadvantages of vulnerable and marginalized groups as citizens. In addition to the special case of promoting, protecting and enforcing the rights of vulnerable and marginalized groups, the state and society should respect, promote and protect the human rights of citizens. Underpinning this approach are three perspectives to rights: inclusive rights for all people, the right to participation, and the 'obligations to protect and promote the realisation' of rights by states and other duty bearers: a concept which links to that of accountability. All of this touches as well on access to justice and a cultural, economic, political and social environment that provides on a sustainable basis for the enjoyment of the rights.

This is a fundamental tenet of liberal democracy, which is enshrined in the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. Chapter II in particular stipulates that "Sovereignty belongs to the people of Nigeria from whom government through [the] Constitution derives all its powers and authority." This is the basis for constitutional or limited government in Nigeria and the consequential constitutional provisions for the rule of law, separation of powers, the fundamental objectives and directive principles of state policy, fundamental rights, citizenship, and for competitive party and electoral politics. While public authorities are enjoined to promote and protect constitutional government and the rights conferred on the citizens, it is also the obligation or duty of non-state actors to defend, respect and protect the rights and stand as sentinel for limited government. The expression of the sovereignty of the people of Nigeria finds its outlet in their participation in the election of their governments and legislatures at the federal, state and local government levels. Periodic competitive elections provide the opportunity and mechanism for the renewal or withdrawal of the mandate of the government and legislators. Citizens and the state fulfill their respective obligations to each other through the relationships of engagement, inclusion and participation in the governance process and their mutual obligation to protect constitutional government in the country.

This thematic area is thus concerned with various dimensions of citizen participation, social inclusion and the protection of the sovereignty of the Nigerian people], in a rights-based and citizenship-centred mould. This note explains the indicators for measuring the various dimensions and perspectives of citizen participation, social inclusion and protection included in the SPRM assessment framework. Five such dimensions are included in the SPRM framework for assessment because of their salience for meeting the constitutional obligations of state and non-state stakeholders under the 1999 constitution and international and regional conventions, standards and codes.

The five dimensions are as follows:

- Promoting Competitive & Electoral Politics;
- Promoting Civil & Political Rights;
- Promoting and Protecting Rights of Women;
- Promoting and Protecting the Rights of Youths and Children; and
- Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Vulnerable Groups, particularly the Physically and Visually Challenged

The following are more detailed explanations of indicators under those elements:
| Indicator                                      | Detailed Explanation                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-----------------------------------------------|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| **Promoting Competitive & Electoral Politics** |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| **CP 1.1.1**                                  | **Existence of mechanisms and institutions in the state to protect the right of citizens and political parties to free and fair elections on a periodic basis under the country’s constitution and relevant electoral laws.** This indicator seeks to find out whether the government provides an environment that is conducive to the conduct of free, fair and credible elections in the state.                                                                 |
| **CP 1.1.2**                                  | **Compliance with and efficacy of regulations governing political parties’ activities, such as intra-party democracy, political financing, political campaigns and resource allocation.** This indicator seeks to find out whether party political activities in the state comply with the provisions of the 1999 Nigerian Constitution and the relevant federal and state electoral laws, and domesticated international standards, codes and conventions on free and fair elections. |
| **CP 1.1.3**                                  | **Neutrality of the state public service (MDAs) in the electoral process.** This indicator seeks to find out whether state governments abuse the power of incumbency for undue electoral advantage, and whether the electoral management body is under the control of the state government.                                                        |
| **CP 1.2.1**                                  | **Extent to which the State has domesticated International Conventions, Codes and Standards on elections** This indicator places focus on whether the State has passed legislation to give effect to international conventions and codes, intended to ensure the integrity of elections and electoral administration in African countries. These international and regional conventions, etc., are part of an emerging international and regional consensus on the minimal conditions and requirements for ensuring electoral integrity and credible elections in Africa and in the world generally. The African regional ones include: (i) The African Charter for Popular Participation in Development and Transformation; (ii) The O.A.U. Declaration on Principles Governing Democratic Elections in Africa; (iii) The African Peer Review Mechanism: Base Document and Memorandum of |
Understanding; and (iv) The A.U. African Charter on Democracy, Elections and Governance.

In this respect, you should determine, which of these conventions/codes (a) have been domesticated by the federal government; (b) are yet to be domesticated and why. Of the domesticated ones at the federal level, indicate which ones have (a) been domesticated by the State Government; and (b) have not been domesticated by the State Government, and state the reasons why they have not been domesticated.

**CP1.2.2**

*The ability of all political parties to engage in a participatory and inclusive way in the electoral process.*

The indicator seeks to find out whether there is a general level playing ground for all parties to compete fairly in the electoral process in the state.

**CP1.2.3**

*Assessment of the independence and role of the electoral body in the electoral process and its ability to conduct free and fair elections in the state.*

The independence of the State Independence Electoral Commission (SIEC), especially how it is constituted, disabled (its members removed), and empowered financially, is part of the emerging international and regional consensus on elections in Africa. It is critical to electoral integrity, defined as a set of standards based on democratic principles, measures and mechanisms for protecting free and fair elections, in this case to local government elections in the state.

Assessors should, therefore, indicate and turn the searchlight on the process by which members of SIEC in the state were nominated and appointed, and the extent to which the process not only conforms to the provisions of Nigeria’s 1999 Constitution (as amended) but also insulates them from partisan control or unnecessary interference in their work. For example, are members of the SIEC members of political parties? Does the membership reflect the “federal character” of the state, including reflecting the interest of women and other marginalized groups, such as youths and vulnerable groups?

The independence and role of the SIEC is also affected by (a) budgetary provisions appropriated and timely release to it, including its ability to undertake procurements, without undue encumbrances by the executive branch; and (b) the logistics (office accommodation, vehicles, ICT, etc.) available to it, so that it is able to conduct free and fair elections to local government councils in the state. Your assessment under this section should, therefore, focus on this critical aspect of the independence of SIEC.

Reviewers should also focus on the extent to which the SIEC engages non-
state actors in its work, the extent to which it conducts voter education, and with how much success. In this respect, indicate whether the general public has confidence in the SIEC.

This indicator seeks to find out whether aggrieved candidates and political parties have the opportunity to seek redress with the electoral management body and in the law courts over disputed elections.

Sources of Information:: The 1999 Nigerian Constitution; Federal and state electoral laws; Political Party Constitution; Laws establishing electoral management bodies.

Promoting & Protecting Civil & Political Rights

CP 2.1.1
Institutional framework for managing diversity and for promoting and protecting civil and political rights in the state

This indicator seeks to find out whether there are laws and institutions in place to promote, protect and enforce the human rights of the citizens of the State and of other Nigerians in the State.

CP 2.1.2
Institutional framework in place in the state for ensuring that prosecutors, especially the Police and Director of Public Prosecutions are insulated from partisan political control and influence in practice.

This indicator focuses attention on the fair dispensation of justice, without fear or favour by the Police and the Office of the Director of Public Prosecution in a non-partisan manner.

CP 2.1.3
Institutional framework to promote, encourage and protect civil society organizations, community-based and faith-based organizations in their civil and political rights and other democracy-promoting activities in the state.

This indicator focuses on the complementary and reinforcing role of non-state actors, such as civil society organizations in the promotion, protection and enforcement of the human rights of citizens.

Sources of Information: The 1999 Nigerian Constitution; Legislation by the State House of Assembly; MDAs working in the human rights field.
CP 2.1.4
Legal Framework in place for managing police-community relationships and Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanisms in the State

This indicator should be assessed by basically asking the question:
Is there a legal framework for managing police-community relationship and Alternative Dispute Resolutions mechanisms in the state? To answer these questions, reference should be made to the following:

i. Whether there is any constitution or official policy document sanctioning and regulating the establishment and conduct of Police-Community Relations Committee. The existence of such a document provides an institutional basis for the operations of Police Community Relations Committees.

ii. Whether there is any constitution or official policy document sanctioning and regulating the establishment of Alternative Dispute Resolution in the state. The existence of such a document provides an institutional basis for the establishment and operation of ADR mechanisms and facilities in the state.

CP 2.2.1
Platforms and mechanisms exist for easy and ready access to courts and other adjudication mechanisms to the citizens, and especially to the poor, women, children and other vulnerable groups of citizens.

This indicator turns the searchlight on access to justice questions especially by the poor, women, children and other vulnerable groups in the state.

Sources of Information: The 1999 Nigerian Constitution; Legislation by the State House of Assembly; MDAs working in the human rights field.

CP 2.2.2
Mechanisms exist for ensuring safety of citizens and their properties are ensured at the state level.

The Police Forces is assigned the primary duty of law enforcement and maintenance of order. These indicators would thus ascertain:

i. How many NPF stations are there in the State? Are there enough NPF stations? This can be ascertained by reference to the national average distribution of police stations per population. NPF records will provide data to determine the distribution of Police Stations and the number of police officers in the State. Also, the adequacy and gender-sensitivity or otherwise of police stations and police officers can be verified through stakeholder workshops and a household survey; and

ii. What is the number and distribution of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) facilities? Besides the ADR facilities set up by the state, the non-state facilities such traditional and faith-based alternative dispute resolutions in place should be taken into account.

Sources of Information: Nigeria Police Force Annual Reports.
Security is extremely important. It affects practically everything in the state from lives and property to livelihoods and businesses. This indicator on crime incidence rate in the State vis-a-vis national crime incidence rate is to assess how well the state is doing in fighting crime. It can be measured by comparison with the levels of crime in neighbouring States and the national average. The rate of crime should be disaggregated as much as possible and cascaded down to Local Governments to show where the State is more vulnerable to criminal activities.

The indicators that will be used to proxy the crime incidence rate in a state are:

i. Crime statistics in the past one year
ii. Number of kidnappings in the state
iii. Number of ethnic and religious disturbances in the state.

Sources of Information: Nigeria Police Force Annual Reports.

This performance criterion should be assessed against the background that the Nigeria Police Force has adopted Community Policing as a strategy. Under this Policy, Police Community Relations have been established nationwide and various degrees of community participation are being promoted.

Likely questions to ask here is:

i. How many Police-Community Relations Committees exist in the state?

ii. What is the number and distribution of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) facilities in the state? Besides the ADR facilities set up by the state, the non-state facilities such as traditional and faith based alternative dispute resolutions in place should be taken into account

Sources of Information: Nigeria Police Force Annual Reports

To assess the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of justice, law and order policies, the benefits accruing from them are measured. These include:

i. The number and variety of crimes detected or aborted through the efforts of the Police-Community Relations Committees. The purpose of the involvement of the community in policing is to help the police avert, detect and deter crime. The effectiveness
of the police-Community Relations Committees should primarily reflect on reduced crime levels, so the impact of the existence of the Committees is to be assessed by comparing crime levels over time, that is, quarterly or annually; and

ii. Cases settled through ADR. The number of cases settled through ADR by type of ADR should be compared to the number of cases processed through the Customary/Alkali, Magistrates, and High Courts. This will show what is happening to dispute resolution and where intervention is required to ensure efficacy of the judicial system.

Sources of Information: Nigeria Police Force Annual Reports.

This indicator measures the percentage increase in cases handled at ADR facilities. This measure is a test of acceptability and demand. If more people turn to ADR facilities, it reflects greater accessibility and affordability (which are the reasons for promoting them). Increases in cases handled by ADR facilities are indicative of their sustainability.

Sources of Information: Nigeria Police Force Annual Reports

Security (Police) is primarily a Federal responsibility. However, each Governor is regarded as the chief security officer of the state. States therefore often make budgetary provisions to security agents working in the state while rendering other support. The State budget support to the police is a good measure of how seriously the state takes its function of guaranteeing security of lives and property, and invariably ensuring sustainability of businesses in the state.

These indicators can be obtained from the State Police Headquarters as well as the Governor’s Office.

This indicator seeks to examine whether the State has passed the Affirmation Action Bill. It should be sourced from either the ShoA or the Ministry of Women Affairs if it exists in the State.
This indicator seeks to ascertain whether there is institutional framework for implementing affirmative action in the State, especially in appointive and elective positions.

Good practice demands the existence of a document stating the strategy to be adopted by state agencies in promoting affirmative action and combating domestic violence. The document should be evaluated for its relevance and the robustness of the strategies where it exists.

This indicator here seeks to ascertain whether the state has domesticated relevant laws or policies to promote women’s full and equal participation in development and to end discrimination and violence against women. Good practice demands gender balance in all decision-making positions and minimally, 35 per cent representation of either gender (women or men). With regard to violence against women, good practice is zero tolerance at both domestic and public levels.

The availability of gender disaggregated data and information for analysis and monitoring is an indicator of the quality of planning. It is also a starting point for measuring progress in gender equality and social inclusion.
Several important international gender equality indexes have been developed. These include: the Gender Inequality Index of the UNDP, the Gender Gap Index of the World Economic Forum, the Gender Equity Index of Social Watch and the European Union Gender Equality Index (EUGE-Index). A comparison of these indexes shows that there appear to be some unanimity on the methodological and conceptual level as well as the results.

The five dimension indicators for Gender Gap Index (GGI) include the following:

i. Economic participation: Gender balance in the workforce, male and female unemployment levels, and remuneration for equal work;

ii. Economic opportunity: duration of maternity leave, proportion of men and women in managerial positions, availability of government-provided childcare (Crèche), wage inequalities between men and women;

iii. Political empowerment: Proportion of women to men in State House of Assembly, Commissioners, Special Advisers/Assistants, Permanent Secretaries, High Court Judges and Magistrates;

iv. Educational attainment: literacy rates, enrolment rates for primary, secondary and tertiary education, average years of schooling all disaggregated by sex; and

v. Health and wellbeing: Prevalence of adolescent pregnancy, percentage of births attended by skilled health staff, and maternal and infant mortality rates.

Sources of Information: SHoA Records, State Ministry of Women Affairs, State Ministry of Health and State Statistical Office.

This indicator seeks to measure the prevalence of violence against women (VAW) in the State. It should be reported simply as the number of reported cases of VAW in the State. It is important to note that reported cases of domestic violence against women represent only a very small part of the problem when compared with prevalence data. The reviewer(s) should further understand why victims of domestic violence do not often report or seek help during deliberations in the State.

Sources of Information: Police and Court Records.
CP 3.2.5.
Proportion of reported cases of violence against women that are prosecuted.

The evaluators should also establish the proportion of reported cases of VAW that are prosecuted and presented over a period of years (2-3 years) to ascertain what has changed.

Sources of Information: Police and Court Records.

---

Promoting & Protecting the Rights of Youths and Children

CP 4.1.1
Child rights act and African youth charter enacted into law in the state, in line with such international and regional codes and standards as the convention on the rights of the child; captional Convention on the Rights of the child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography.

The rights of children and the youth are often neglected to the detriment of their development. To call attention to and redress the harmful effects of neglect or abuse of the rights of children, the UN and other international organizations have adopted conventions to promote and protect their rights.

CP 4.1.2
Measures and policies (institutional framework) put in place for promoting and protecting the rights of the Child, especially (i) from child abuse, such as: harmful cultural and social practices affecting the girl-child, prostitution, child trafficking, child labour; and (ii) through provision for child health care and child welfare, child education, custody and guardianship.

The performance criterion for assessing Child Rights is:

i. Adoption and domestication of international conventions and national standards on the rights of children.

It is important to be conscious of the fact that there are international and national instruments on the rights of the child that are applicable to the States because of the country’s membership of certain international organizations that adopted them. Key among these is UN Convention on the Rights of the Child adopted in 1989; African Union Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (CRCW) adopted by OAU Assembly of Heads of States in 1990. The National Assembly also passed the Nigeria Child Rights Act 2003 to domesticate the rights of the child as passed by these international bodies.

State Performance, therefore, is to be assessed through two criteria as follows:

i. Child Rights Act passed by State House of Assembly. The National Assembly passed the Child Rights Act in 2003. Therefore, it will be an indication of a State’s desire to promote and protect child rights to have passed the Child Rights Act.
ii. School age children in school. The passage of the Child Rights Act should be followed by enforcement otherwise, it is hollow symbolism. One mark of effectiveness of the implementation of the Child Rights Act is enforcement of the rights of the child to education. For the SPRM, this indicator will be measured under education to avoid duplication. Similarly, there are indicators under the health sector to measure the enforcement of children’s right to health.

The performance criterion for assessing the rights of the Youth is:

i. Adoption and domestication of international conventions and national standards on the rights of Youth, such as the African Youth Charter, Convention for the Suspension of Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of Prostitutes and Others, and the African Charter on Human and Peoples Rights.

State Performance, therefore, is to be assessed through two criteria as follows:

i. Youth Rights Act passed by State House of Assembly. It is an indication of a State’s desire to promote and protect Youth Rights if it has passed the Youth Rights Act.

ii. The passage of the Youth Rights Act should be followed by enforcement otherwise, it would be insignificant and of no effect. The level of youth unemployment in the state and the extent of their inclusion and participation in the governmental processes and the provision of educational facilities for training and rehabilitating them can measure the effectiveness of the implementation of the Youth Rights, where necessary. For the SPRM, this indicator will be measured under education to avoid duplication.
CP 4.2.1
Extent to which the state has adopted and localised international conventions and national Acts on the rights of children

The international and regional community has shown increasing interest in promoting and protecting the rights of the child, as part of the emerging international law and international humanitarian law regime. This requires you to indicate which of the domesticated international conventions and national legislation on the rights of children have been passed into law in the state. Regarding those, which have not been passed into law, find out the reasons why they have not been domesticated in the state.

CP 4.2.2
Extent to which the state has adopted and domesticated, as applicable international and regional codes and standards on the rights of the youth.

The international and regional community has shown increasing interest in promoting and protecting the rights of the youth, as part of the emerging international law and international humanitarian law regime. This requires the State to indicate which of the domesticated international and regional conventions and national legislation on the rights of the youth have been passed into law in the State, and which have not been domesticated. Regarding those, which have not been passed into law, the State should find out the reasons why they have not been domesticated.

CP 4.2.3
Other legislative policy and institutional framework and mechanisms in place to promote the rights of children and to implement issues highlighted in the various international and regional codes and standards.

Beyond the domestication of international and regional conventions/codes, and national legislation on the rights of the child, evaluators should turn the searchlight on the policy framework for promoting and protecting them in the state. This is important if domestication is not to become a meaningless measure, devoid of concrete policy programmes and action. Discuss such programmes and indicate the effectiveness of the policy framework for pursuing them. For example, is the policy framework inclusive and participatory? Is it top-down or bottom-up? What mechanisms are in place to monitor and evaluate them?

CP 4.2.4
Other legislative policy and institutional framework and mechanisms in place to promote the rights of youths and to implement issues highlighted in the various international and regional codes and standards.

Beyond the domestication of international and regional conventions/codes, and national legislation on the rights of youths, you should turn the searchlight on the policy framework for promoting and protecting them in the state. This is important if domestication is not to become a meaningless measure, devoid of concrete policy programmes and action. Discuss such programmes and indicate the effectiveness of the policy framework for pursuing them. For example, is the policy framework inclusive and participatory? Is it top-down or bottom-up? What mechanisms are in place to monitor and evaluate them?

CP 4.3.1
Existence of institutions and...
mechanisms to promote and protect the rights of the Child.

number of school age children who are not enrolled in schools and is therefore linked to the education sector indicator:

i. Percentage of school age children in school. The number of school age children in school should be calculated as a percentage of the State’s school age population as provided by the National Bureau of Statistics’ most recent Abstract of Statistics or National Populations Commission report.

Sources of Information: National Bureau of Statistics.

CP. 4.3.2
Existence of institutions and mechanisms to promote and protect the rights of the Youth.

This indicator is to assess the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of legislation and policy measures for the promotion and protection of the Rights of the Youths in the state. The measurement will show the per cent of youth unemployment relative to the total unemployment rate in the state, indicating areas where youths tend to be employed or /unemployed and disaggregating the youth unemployment/employment rate in the state into rural and urban. It will also show what vocational training, rehabilitation and credit facilities are available to enhance the skills and opportunities available to make the youths gainfully employed.

Sources of Information: National Bureau of Statistics.

CP 4.3.3
Assessment of effectiveness of the measures and policies to promote and protect the rights of the child and of those designed to sustain and monitor and evaluate the implementation of the measures and policies, such as training, education.

As indicated for CP 4.2.3 above, beyond the domestication of international and regional conventions/codes, and national legislation on the rights of the child, you should turn the searchlight on the policy framework for promoting and protecting them in the state. This is important if domestication is not to become a meaningless measure, devoid of concrete policy programmes and action. Discuss such programmes and indicate the effectiveness of the policy framework for pursuing them. For example, is the policy framework inclusive and participatory? Is it top-down or bottom-up? What mechanisms are in place to monitor and evaluate them?

CP 4.3.4
Assessment of effectiveness of the measures and policies to promote and protect the rights of the Youth, especially Youth employment, and of those

This requires you to indicate the measures and policies adopted and being implemented in the state to promote and protect the rights of the Youth, with particular focus on youth employment, training, and vocational education. How inclusive and participatory are the programmes? As with the policy framework for promoting and protecting the rights of the child, is it top-down or bottom-up? What mechanisms are in place to monitor and evaluate
designed to sustain and monitor and evaluate the implementation.

CP 4.3.5
Outline the Youth unemployment rate in the state and disaggregate it (i) as a per cent of the national unemployment rate; and (ii) into comparative figure of urban and rural unemployment rate, i.e. what per cent of the youth unemployment rate is urban, and what per cent rural.

This will enable you assess the success of the youth policy in the state. You should be able, through desk research, to find independent sources to confirm official figures for youth unemployment in the state, such as those provided by the UNDP, World Bank, Nigerian Institute for Social and Economic Research (NISER), among others. It is not enough to find out the youth unemployment rate in the state. Show how much of it is urban and how much rural. Find out, also, how the youth unemployment rate in the state compares with the (a) national rate; and (b) the zonal rate.

CP 4.3.6
Itemise and explain the challenges, including shortfalls and capacity deficits, faced in promoting and protecting the rights of the Child in the state and indicate steps taken to address them by state and non-state stakeholders in the state.

This requires focus on cultural, political, social-psychological and structural (economic) factors and forces that promote or hinder the enjoyment and protection of child rights in the state. How strong are these factors and forces, and what action is being taking by various stakeholders in state and society to advance or mitigate them?

CP 4.3.7
Itemise and explain the challenges, including shortfalls and capacity deficits, faced in promoting and protecting the rights of the Youth in the state and indicate steps taken to address them by state and non-state stakeholders in the state.

As indicated under CP 4.3.6 above this requires that you focus on cultural, political, social-psychological and structural (economic) factors and forces that promote or hinder the enjoyment and protection of youth rights in the state. How strong are these factors and forces, and what action is being taking by various stakeholders in state and society to advance or mitigate them?
CP 4.4.1
State budget support to MDAs, CSOs, including community-based and faith-based organizations, working to promote and protect the rights of the Child in the state.

The extent to which there are budgetary provisions for pursuing and implementing programmes for the promotion and protection of child rights is an indication of the commitment of the state government to securing that end. You can get an indication of such a commitment by looking at appropriations for programmes for promoting child rights in the state over, say, the past four years—do you notice an increase or decrease? How much of appropriations is actually released and spent in each of the, say, four years? What explains the pattern? How much of the budget in each year goes to non-state actors promoting child rights in the state.

CP 4.4.2
State budget support to MDAs, CSOs, including community-based and faith-based organizations, working to promote and protect the rights of the Youth in the state.

As indicated under CP 4.4.1 above, the extent to which there are budgetary provisions for pursuing and implementing programmes for the promotion and protection of youth rights is an indication of the commitment of the state government to securing that end. You can get an indication of such a commitment by looking at appropriations for programmes for promoting youth rights in the state over, say, the past four years—do you notice an increase or decrease? How much of the appropriations is actually released and spent in each of the, say, four years? What explains the pattern? How much of the budget in each year goes to non-state actors promoting child rights in the state.

Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Vulnerable Groups, particularly the Physically and Visually Impaired

CP 5.1.1
Existence of laws on disability rights in the State.

These two indicators [CP 5.1.1 and 5.1.2] assess State Government Performance on the following criteria:

i. Institutional framework in place for protecting and promoting the interests of people living with disability. The key question is: Is there a law or regulation or policy on the promotion and protection of the rights of people living with disability?

ii. Affirmative action to employ or provide income-generating self-employment to people living with disability. Has the State articulated any policy to employ and or provide income-generating self-employment to people living with disability?

Measures and institutional framework to rehabilitate, train, and reintegrate vulnerable groups, particularly the physically challenged and the visually impaired into society.

The international and regional community has shown increasing interest in promoting and protecting the rights of vulnerable groups in society, as part of the emerging international law and international humanitarian law regime. This requires the authorities to indicate the measures and policies adopted and being implemented in the State to promote and protect the rights of the vulnerable groups in the state, with particular focus on the employment, training and vocational education of vulnerable groups. How inclusive and participatory are the programmes? As with the policy framework for promoting and protecting the rights of the child and of the youth, is it top-down or bottom-up? What mechanisms are in place to monitor and evaluate the policy framework and the programmes.

People living with disability constitute a significant proportion of the population and yet their special needs are often not appreciated or addressed. In recent times, attempts have been made to define the special needs or rights of people living with disability as a way of ensuring that they are promoted and protected. For example, the UN in 2006 adopted the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), Nigeria’s National Assembly passed the National Disability Act June 2010, which is awaiting Presidential assent.

This requires that evaluators discuss the extent to which the state government has domesticated the relevant international conventions, codes and standards on promoting and protecting the rights of the physically challenged in the state. Which of the conventions etc. have been domesticated, and which have not been domesticated, and for. This will require that you outline the conventions etc., which have been domesticated, and those not domesticated at the federal level.

These two indicators measure the level of state performance in promoting the rights of the physically challenged.

i. Number of persons with disability employed in MDAs is a good test of the relevance and impact of a policy promoting disability rights by measuring benefits. A simple assessment is to calculate how many have been employed by the State Government and juxtapose that against the percentage of the population in the state who are disabled.

Training, education, rehabilitation and other empowerment programmes for people living with disability is another measure. The evaluation is to enumerate and describe the training, education and rehabilitation
programmes and other empowerment schemes provided by the State Government to assist people living with disability.

This indicator cross-cuts with infrastructure and will need to be cross-referenced with that sector and measured over a review period of time to check progress.

As indicated for CP 4.2.3, CP 4.3.3 and CP 4.3.4 above, beyond the domestication of international and regional conventions/codes and national legislation on the rights of vulnerable groups in the state, the reviewers are expected to describe and assess the adequacy and effectiveness of the policy framework of legislation and programmes for promoting and protecting the rights of vulnerable groups in the state. This is important if domestication is not to become a meaningless measure, devoid of concrete policy programmes and action. Reviewers must provide detailed but critical information about the legislative and policy framework, assessing it in terms of concrete measures implemented and with how much effect and success in mainstreaming the promotion and protection of the rights of vulnerable groups in the governance process in the state. To cite some examples: (i) is the general public policy process inclusive and participatory, in the sense of seeking the input of vulnerable groups into the formulation of, and implementation of public policies, including but not limited to the promotion and protection of their rights and interests? (ii)Is there affirmative type-public policy targeted at enhancing the recruitment and promotion of vulnerable groups in the state’s public service, including the civil service? (iii) Are public buildings fitted with fixtures making them readily accessible to vulnerable groups, such as the physically challenged and visually challenged? (iv) Are there rehabilitation centres and training programmes to enhance the employment opportunities and skills of vulnerable groups in the state—if so how many and how adequate are they? Finally, describe and assess the mechanisms in place to monitor and evaluate the implementation of programmes and other measures to promote and protect the rights of vulnerable groups in the state?

As under CP 4.4.1 and CP 4.4.2 above, the extent to which there are budgetary provisions for pursuing and implementing programmes to promote and protect the rights of vulnerable groups is an indication of the commitment of the state government to securing that end. Reviewers can get an indication of such a commitment by looking at appropriations for programmes for promoting rights of the vulnerable in the state over, say, the...
rights of vulnerable groups in the state.

past four years - is an increase or decrease noticed? How much of appropriations is actual released and spent in each of the, say, four years? What explains the pattern? How much of the budget in each year goes to non-state actors promoting rights of vulnerable groups in the state?
9.1 Report Format
As explained in section 3.5, the three main outputs of the State Peer Review are:

1. State Self-Assessment Report (SSAR);
2. State Peer Review Report (SPRR); and
3. State Programme of Action (SPoA).

The SSAR and SPRR are not to report on the State, or its Government, but are to document findings on the indicators and thematic areas (sectors). The findings on each indicator and thematic area (sector) should spell out clearly the achievements, best practices and challenges. The State Programme of Action (SPoA) documents the remedies and/or proposals to address the shortcomings identified in the thematic areas (sectors). The SPoA would be incorporated as a section in both the SSAR and SPRR. The Guidelines for its Preparation are presented in Appendix 2.

9.2 Report Structure
The SPRR is equivalent to an SSAR validated by the Technical Review Panel as explained in section 3.5 above. Therefore the SSAR and SPRR structure is essentially the same. The report structure is as follows:

- Acronyms
- Acknowledgements
- Summary of Assessment (SSAR) or Report (SPRR)
  1. Introduction
  2. State Background Information/Historical Context
  3. Methodology/Approach
  4. Findings
     a. Policy and Strategy/Monitoring and Evaluation
     b. Economic Development
     c. Public Financial Management
d. Human Resource Management  
e. Health Sector  
f. Education Sector  
g. Agriculture Sector  
h. Environment Sector  
i. Infrastructure Sector  
j. Citizen Participation, Social Inclusion and Protection

5. State Programme of Action (SPoA)  
   • Annexes

Acronyms
All acronyms and/or abbreviations should be listed here.

Acknowledgements
A short statement of appreciation for cooperation and assistance received during the assignment from staff of the host government and other stakeholders. This requires some judgment, and if names are mentioned there should be no omissions.

Executive Summary
A short summary of the report should be provided here. This should include a summary of achievements, best practices and challenges for each thematic area (sector). There are ten areas of assessment (i.e. Policy and Strategy/Monitoring and Evaluation; Economic Development; Public Financial Management; Human Resource Management; Health; Education; Agriculture; Environment; Infrastructure and Citizen Participation, Social Inclusion and Protection).

Introduction
Provide the context, state's involvement in the SPRM process of SPRM and the methodology for coming up with the report.

State background Information
Provide background information on the state. In particular, the section should set out the following:
   • Historical context
   • Location, population and governance structure.
   • Ruling party, Key functionaries of the state including; the Executive, Legislature and Judiciary disaggregated by gender.
   • Key economic activities and performance.

Findings
This section details the assessment of all the indicators under Policy and Strategy; Economic Development; Public Financial Management; Human Resource Management; Health; Education; Agriculture; Environment; and Infrastructure. The report should describe in detail what evidence was seen on each indicator as well as the basis for the conclusion reached. The narrative should highlight
achievements, best practices, challenges and recommendations.
Findings need not be lengthy but should contain sufficient information for the Technical Review Panel to ascertain the facts behind the conclusions reached by the state.

**State Programme of Action**
This section details remedies proposed by states to overcome the shortcomings identified in the findings. The programme of action will be structured in line with the sub-sections of the findings.

**Annexes**
The Annex should contain the following information
1. List of persons who prepared the SSAR
2. List of State officials/individuals who provided data and documentation for the assessment.
3. List of important documents and written evidence that aided the Reviewers in reaching their conclusion
4. List of Technical Review Panel members (include only in the SPRR)

### 9.3 Page Numbering
All pages should be numbered (page numbers in the top or bottom right hand corner). Reports should not contain colours (black and white only), photographs or elaborate graphics. The report should avoid excessive use of bold text, italics or underlining.
10.1 GUIDELINES FOR PRESENTING THE STATE PROGRAMME OF ACTION (SPOA)

Introduction

The State Programme of Action (SPOA) is a major component of the peer review process to be delivered by the state undergoing review. Being an instrument developed as part of the SSAR to address the challenges identified during the exercise, it demonstrates the value-addition elements of the exercise.

The primary purpose of the State Programme of Action is:

“To guide and mobilise the State's efforts in implementing the necessary changes to improve its development performance. In addition, the SPOA is the key input delivered by the State into the peer review, and it, therefore, serves to present and clarify the State's priorities as well as to explicitly explain the responsibilities of the main stakeholders in implementing the Programme”.

Inter alia, the SPOA is expected to present the following:

- Clear, time-bound commitments on the State's development priorities over the next three years, including identification of key stakeholders for implementation, and the estimated budgetary implications and allocations;
- Outline the feedback mechanism established to keep stakeholders involved in the process, including efforts to disseminate information in an easily accessible and understandable manner;
- Description of the capacity building and resource mobilization requirements for undertaking the State Programme of Action; and,
- Outline the implementation, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms for the Programme of Action.

The SPOA should therefore be developed on the basis of the state self-assessment. It is expected to emanate largely from the recommendations of both the SSAR and SPRR. While it should not be overly technocratic, it should be credible and scientific while remaining simple. The SPOA should thus be presented in two parts - a narrative and a log frame.
Part A: Main Report

The details of the reporting format and its terminology are described as follows.

**Summary**

This section provides a brief summary of the SPoA for easy comprehension by policy makers.

**Methodology**

Describe the methodology employed for the report, its linkages with the SSAR and the role of key stakeholders? For example, how was the costing done? Was it approved by the State Executive Council and House of Assembly?

**Description, objectives, main activities/initiative or programme**

For each of the core sectors and crosscutting issues, provide a brief description of the main activities, initiative or programme to be undertaken, together with the aim(s) or objective(s) of the initiative and specific timeframe.

**Other issues**

(a) **Mobilization and Utilization of Resources**: What is the total budgetary outlay for the SPoA and how would it be funded?

(b) **Capacity Building Requirements**: What capacity is required to successfully implement the SPoA?

(c) **On-going initiatives**: Are there any on-going initiatives by the State that will complement the SPoA? Do they have synergies with the SPoA and how will they be monitored?

(d) **The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework**: What is the framework for monitoring and implementation of the SPoA, in the understanding that the day-to-day monitoring and associated evaluation system will be designed by all States, in accordance with their peculiarities and specificities? (It is hoped that at a later stage, a more integrated approach to monitoring and evaluation will be developed in collaboration with the Ministry of Planning).

However, in preparation for monitoring and evaluation at the SPoA formulation stage, there is need to undertake the following activities:

- Construct gender-disaggregated baseline data describing the problems to be addressed;
- Clarify SPoA objectives;
- Set specific performance indicators and targets or milestone events in accordance with the objectives;
- Establish consensus among stakeholders on the specific indicators to be used for monitoring and evaluation purposes;
- Define the types and sources of data needed and the methods of data collection and analysis required based on the indicators;
- Reach agreement on how the information generated will be used;
- Specify the format, frequency and distribution of reports;
- Establish the monitoring and reporting schedule;
- Assign responsibilities for monitoring, reporting and evaluation; and
- Provide adequate budget for monitoring and evaluation.

To support the monitoring process, an effective tracking system must be established that builds on management information systems within the State.

10.2 The Logframe

A more detailed description of the initiatives on the SPoA is expected to be reported in the format of the ACTION MATRIX provided below. It is structured around thematic focus of the SPRM as well as overarching or crosscutting issues. The format seeks information on objectives, main activities, results and achievements recorded, major challenges and lessons learnt in implementing the initiative or programme and lastly, the steps ahead.
### PART B: LOGFRAME FOR THE SPOA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>REQUIRED ACTION</th>
<th>INPUT INDICATORS</th>
<th>OUTCOME INDICATORS</th>
<th>MEANS OF VERIFICATION</th>
<th>ONGOING INITIATIVES INCLUDING DONOR ACTIVITIES SUCH AS SGA, SEAT AND SAVI (THESE ARE NOT TO BE COSTED)</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION PERIOD</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION AGENCY</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST IN NAIRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BASELINE</td>
<td>2012-2014</td>
<td>2011-2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. POLICY AND STRATEGY AND M&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PUBLIC FINANCE MANAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EDUCATION SECTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. AGRICULTURE SECTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ENVIRONMENT SECTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. INFRASTRUCTURE SECTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION, SOCIAL INCLUSION AND PROTECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. CROSSCUTTING ISSUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.3 The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

In order to address the problem of poverty and promote sustainable development, the United Nations Millennium Declaration was adopted in September 2000 at the largest ever gathering of heads of States committing countries both rich and poor to do all they can to eradicate poverty, promote human dignity and equality and achieve peace, democracy and environmental stability.

The eight main goals to be achieved in 2015, using 1990 as baseline, are:

1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger: 2015 target - Halve proportion of people living on less than $1 a day, and those suffering from hunger;
2. Achieve Universal Basic Education: 2015 target - Achieve universal primary completion
4. Reduce Child Mortality: 2015 target - Reduce by two thirds the child mortality rate
5. Improve maternal health: 2015 target - Reduce by three quarters the proportion of women dying in childbirth
6. Combat AIDS, Malaria and Other Diseases: 2015 target - Halt and begin to reverse the incidence of HIV-AIDS, malaria and other major diseases
7. Ensure environmental sustainability: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources; 2015 target to reduce by half the proportion of people without access to clean drinking water and basic sanitation; By 2020 achieve a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers
8. Develop a Global Partnership for Development: There are no measurable indicators, but goal 8 commits north and south to working together to achieve an open, rule-based trading and financial system, more generous aid to countries committed to poverty reduction, and relief for the debt problems of developing countries. It draws attention to the problems of the least developed countries and of landlocked countries and small island developing states, which have greater difficulty competing in the global economy.


The vision reflects the intent of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to become one of the top twenty economies in the world by the year 2020, with a minimum GDP of $900 billion and a per capita income of no less $4000 per annum. The vision is that by 2020, Nigeria will have a large, strong, diversified, sustainable and competitive economy that effectively harnesses the talents and energies of its people and responsibly exploits its natural endowments to guarantee a high standard of living and quality of life to its citizens.

The aspirations of the vision are defined across four dimensions:

1. Social dimension: A peaceful, equitable, harmonious and just society where every citizen has a strong sense of national identity and belonging; a healthy and economically productive population and a modern and vibrant educational system. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)
2. Economic dimension: A globally competitive economy that is resilient and diversified; and an industrialised economy.


4. Environment dimension: A level of environmental consciousness that enables and supports sustainable management of the nation's God-given natural endowments to ensure their preservation for the benefit of present and future generations.

The economic transformation strategy for Vision 2020 is anchored upon three overarching thrusts:

1. Creating the platform for success by urgently and immediately addressing the most debilitating constraints to Nigeria's growth and competitiveness;

2. Forging ahead with diligence and focus in developing the fabric of the envisioned economy by:
   a. Aggressively pursuing a structural transformation from a mono-product economy to a diversified, industrial economy;
   b. Investing to transform the Nigerian people into catalysts for growth and national renewal, and a lasting source of comparative advantage; and
c. Investing to create an environment that enables the co-existence of growth and development on an enduring and sustainable basis.

3. Developing and deepening the capability of government to consistently translate national strategic intent into action and results by instituting evidence-based decision making in Nigeria's public policy.
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