

BECANS BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT REPORT

Volume 1, Number 32, 2007

OYO STATE

BECANS BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT REPORT

Volume 1, Number 32, 2007

OYO STATE



AFRICAN INSTITUTE FOR APPLIED ECONOMICS

In collaboration with



National Planning Commission



Central Bank of Nigeria

BECANS Business Environment Report

Volume 1, Number 32, 2007

Published by

African Institute for Applied Economics

128 Park Avenue, GRA

P.O. Box 2147 Enugu, Nigeria

Phone: (042) 256644, 300096

Fax: (042) 256035

Email: aiaeinfo@aiae-nigeria.org

www.aiae-nigeria.org

FIRST PUBLISHED, 2007

© **African Institute for Applied Economics**

ISSN 1597-9954

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the copyright owner.

SYNOPSIS

OYO STATE scores 51.00% on the business environment index. Among the four benchmarks, it scores relatively high on infrastructure and low on legal and regulatory services and business support and investment promotion.

The state scores 58.33% on infrastructure and utilities. It performs relatively better on transportation, and lower on water supply.

It scores 45.0% on legal and regulatory services with the score on contract enforcement/commercial dispute resolution as the lowest.

It also scores 45% on business support and investment promotion, with the score on access to finance as the lowest and the score on support for industrial clusters as the highest.

The score on security is 55%. It performs relatively better on major crime incidence and low on minor crime incidence, police coverage and public perception of security.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SYNOPSIS.....	5
TABLE OF CONTENTS	6
List of Tables	7
List of Figures.....	7
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	8
1.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION.....	9
1.1 Geopolitical Profile.....	9
1.2 Economic Potentials	9
1.3 Budget Profile	9
2.0 BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT SCORECARD	10
2.1 Infrastructure and Utilities	11
2.2 Legal and Regulatory Services.....	14
2.3 Business Support and Investment Promotion.....	20
2.4 Security.....	23

List of Tables

Table 1: Budget Profile, 2005.....	9
Table 2: Performance across the Benchmarks	10
Table 3: Scores on Measures under Infrastructure and Utilities.....	11
Table 4: Values on Infrastructure and Utilities Indicators	11
Table 5: Scores on the measures under Legal and Regulatory Services.....	15
Table 6: Values on Legal and Regulatory Indicators.....	15
Table 7: Scores on the Measures under Business Support and Investment Promotion.....	20
Table 8: Performance on the Benchmark Indicators	20
Table 9: Scores on the Measures under Security	23
Table 10: Values on security Indicators	23

List of Figures

Figure 1: Performance on the Benchmarks.....	10
--	----

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACGSF = Agricultural Credit Guarantee Scheme Fund

ADR = Alternative Dispute Resolution

CAC = Corporate Affairs Commission

CAMA= Companies and Allied Matters Act

CBN = Central Bank of Nigeria

C of O = Certificate of Occupancy

FAR= Federal account revenue

IGR = Internally Generated Revenue

LGA = Local Government Area

LUA = Land Use Act

NACRDB = Nigerian Agricultural Cooperative and Rural Development Bank

NBS = National Bureau of Statistics

PHCN= Power Holding Company of Nigeria

PPP = Public-private partnership

SMEs = Small and Medium Enterprises

SMEEIS = Small and Medium Enterprises Equity Investment Scheme

1.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1 Geopolitical Profile

Oyo state is located in the south west of the country and covers a land area of 27,234,097 square kilometers. It lies between latitudes $7^{\circ} 3'$ and $9^{\circ} 12'$ North; and longitudes $2^{\circ} 47'$ and $4^{\circ} 23'$ East. It has a population of 5,591,589 in 2006 with 33 local government areas.

1.2 Economic Potentials

The state is endowed with agricultural and mineral resources. Major agricultural products include: cocoa, tobacco, timber, oil palm, maize, yam, cassava, rice, cowpea, cashew etc.

The agro based industries include: cashew nut and cocoa processing. The state has potential for investment in industries that utilize the following mineral deposits: marble, dolomite, aquamarine, tourmaline, tantalite, coloured granite, feldspar, quartz, bismuth, agate, cassiterite, columbite, talc, kaolin, etc.

The state has infrastructure as incentives to attract investor in the area of commerce, industry and tourism. A number of international and national research institutions are located within the state, including IITA, CRIIN, More plantain, NISER, etc.

1.3 Budget Profile

Internally generated revenue accounted for 22.77% of the total budgeted revenue in 2005. Health capital budget and education capital budget were ₦242.93 and ₦605.64 per capita respectively as shown in table 1.

Table 1: Budget Profile, 2005

Budget Indicator	Amount (₦'m)	Amount per capita
Federation Account Revenue (FAR)	24,766.09	5,655.70
Internally Generated Revenue (IGR)	7,300.00	1,305.90
Total Budget	39,944.41	7,145.69
Capital Budget on Health	1,358.00	242.93
Capital Budget on Education	3,385.50	605.64

2.0 BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT SCORECARD

The state scores 51.00% on the business environment index. The performance of the state across the benchmarks is as follows.

Table 2: Performance across the Benchmarks

Benchmarks and measures	Actual Score	Maximum score	Percentage score
Infrastructure and utilities	17.50	30.0	58.33
Legal and regulatory services	13.50	30.0	45.00
Business support and investment promotion	9.00	20.0	45.00
Security	11.00	20.0	55.00
Total	51.00	100.0	XXXXXXX




Figure 1: Performance on the Benchmarks

2.1 Infrastructure and Utilities

The state scores 58.33% on infrastructure and utilities.

2.1.1 Performance on the measures:

The performance on the infrastructure and utilities benchmark measures is given in table 3.

Table 3: Scores on Measures under Infrastructure and Utilities

Measure	Actual Score	Maximum Score	Percentage score
Energy (F1)	4.5	8.0	56.25
Water supply (F2)	2.0	5.0	40.00
Access to information (F3)	3.4	5.0	68.00
Transportation (F4)	4.0	5.0	80.00
Social infrastructure (F5)	3.6	7.0	51.40
Total	17.50	30.0	XXXXXXX

2.1.2 Performance on the Indicators

The performance of the state on infrastructure and utilities benchmark indicators is summarized in table 4.

Table 4: Values on Infrastructure and Utilities Indicators

Code	Indicators	Actual score	Maximum score
F1:	Energy		
F1.1	Annual per capita electricity supply (kilowatts per capita)	0.5	2.0
F1.2	Average hours of public electricity supply per 24 hour day	0.5	2.0
F1.3	Difference between actual and officially regulated price of petroleum products in the last quarter of 2006	1.5	2.0
F1.4	Evidence of availability of petroleum products in the last quarter of 2006	2.0	2.0
	Sub total (F1)	4.5	8.0
F2	Water supply		
F2.1	Evidence of public water supply	1.0	2.0
F2.2	Average price of 20 liters of water	1.0	2.0
F2.3	Proportion of firms' total water requirement obtained from private water supply	0.0	1.0
	Sub total (F2)	2	5.0

F3	Access to information		
F3.1	Number of post offices per 100,000 of the population	0.0	1.0
F3.2	Tele-density of fixed lines	0.5	0.5
F3.3	Incidence of mobile phone ownership	0.2	0.5
F3.4	Availability of TV stations	1.0	1.0
F3.5	Availability of radio stations	0.7	1.0
F3.6	Availability of a functional website	1.0	1.0
	Sub total (F3)	3.4	5.0
F4	Transportation		
F4.1	Average cost of per kilometer of intra-state road transportation in the last quarter of 2006	2.0	3.0
F4.2	Availability of airport in the state	2.0	2.0
	Sub total (F4)	4.0	5.0
F5	Social infrastructure		
F5.1	Primary school enrolment rate	0.75	1.0
F5.2	Pupil-teacher ratio	1.0	1.0
F5.3	Capital budget to education as % of total capital budget	1.0	1.5
F5.4	Capital budget to health as % of total capital budget	0.5	1.5
F5.5	Private sector rating of waste management	0.0	0.5
F5.6	Frequency of waste disposal	0.25	1.0
F5.7	Average monthly waste disposal levy	0.1	0.5
	Sub total (F5)	3.6	7.0
	Total	17.50	30.0

F1. Energy

F1.1 Annual per capita electricity supply: With an estimated annual power supply of 85,822.06kw in 2005 and a population of 5591589 persons, the per capita power supply is 0.02Kw and the state scores 0.5 out of 2.0.

F1.2 Average hours of public electricity supply per 24 hour day: Evidence shows public power supplies only 2-7 hours of electricity out of 24 hours in a day. The state scores 0.5 out of 2.0.

F1.3 Difference between Actual Price and officially regulated price of petroleum products the last quarter of 2006: There is 1 to 10% price difference between the official prices of petrol, kerosene and diesel, and what the people pay. The state scores 1.5 out of 2.0.

F1.4 Evidence of availability of petroleum products in the state in the last quarter of 2006: The survey shows that petrol, kerosene and diesel are available all the time. The state scores the maximum point of 2.0.

F2 Water

F2.1 Daily per capita litres of water supply: There is approximately 7.54 litres daily per capita public water supply. The state scores 1.0 out of 3.0.

F2.2 Average Price of 20 litres of private water supply: The average price of 20 litres of water from private supply is ₦10.00. The state scores 1.0 out of 2.0.

F2.3 Proportion of Firm's daily water requirement obtained from private supply:

Business firms obtain 60 to 70% of their daily water supply from the private sector. The state scores zero out of 1.0.

F3. Communication

F3.1 Number of post offices per 100,000 of the population: There are 32 post offices. This represents 0.57 post offices per 100,000 persons. The state scores zero out of 1.0.

F3.2 Teledensity of fixed lines: There are 255,600 fixed telephone lines. With the population figure of 5591598 persons this gives 45.71 lines per 1000 persons. The state scores the maximum point of 0.5.

F3.3 Incidence of mobile phone ownership: The incidence of mobile phone ownership is 42.9%. The state scores the maximum point of 0.2.

F3.4 Availability of local television stations: There are federal, state and private television stations. The state gets the maximum score of 1.0.

F3.5 Availability of local radio stations: There are federal and state radio stations. The state scores 0.7 out of 1.0.

F3.6 Availability of functional website: There is a functional and regularly updated website (www.oyostate.gov.ng). The state scores the maximum point of 1.0.

F4 Transportation

F4.1 Average cost per kilometer of intra state road transportation in the last quarter of 2006: Intra state road travels cost between ₦6.00 and ₦10.00 per kilometer. The state scores 2.0 out of 3.0.

F4.2 Availability of Airport: There is one airport located in the capital city, Ibadan, giving the state the full score of 2.0.

F.5 Social infrastructure

F5.1 Primary school enrolment rate: The net primary school enrolment rate for 2006 is 78%. The state scores 0.75 out of 1.0.

F5.2 Pupil teacher Ratio: The pupil teacher ratio for primary schools is 27:1 and the state gets the maximum score of 1.0.

F5.3 Capital budget for education as % of total capital budget in 2005: The total capital budget for education in 2005 was 17.21% of the total capital budget, giving the state 1.0 out of 1.5.

F5.4 Capital budget for health as % of total capital budget in 2005: The total capital budget for health in 2005 was 6.9% of the total capital budget, giving the state 0.5 out of 1.5

F5.5 Private Sector rating of waste management: The survey shows that waste management is rated as poor, giving the state 0.0 out of 0.5.

F5.6 Frequency of waste disposal in the state: Waste disposal is carried out monthly, giving the state a score of 0.25 out of 1.0.

F5.7 Average monthly waste disposal levy: Average monthly waste disposal levy is between ₦501.00 and ₦1000.00. The state scores 0.1 out of 0.5.

2.2 Legal and Regulatory Services

The state scored 45.00% on the benchmark.

2.2.1 Performance on the Measures:

The state's performance on the measures is shown in table 5.

Table 5: Scores on the measures under Legal and Regulatory Services

Code	Measure	Actual score	Maximum score	Percentage Score
R1	Business registration	2.0	4.0	50.00
R2	Tax administration	5.0	10.0	50.00
R3	Commercial dispute resolution	1.5	6.0	25.00
R4	Land registration and property rights	5.00	10.0	50.00
	Total	13.50	30.0	XXXXXXX

2.2.2 Performance on the Indicators

The performance of the state in legal and regulatory services indicators is given in table 6.

Table 6: Values on Legal and Regulatory Indicators

Code	Indicator	Actual score	Maximum score
R1	Business registration		
R1.1	Cessation of registration of business names at the State Ministry of Commerce since the Companies and Allied Matters Act (CAMA) and setting up of CAC	0.5	1.0
R1.2	Evidence that improperly registered business names are not given recognition.	0.25	0.5
R1.3	Evidence of existence of a task force against the display of unregistered names by firms	0.0	0.5
R1.4	Existence of an office of the Corporate Affairs Commissions.	0.5	0.5
R1.5	Evidence of publication of the activities of CAC branch :	0.25	0.25
R1.6	Evidence that the CAC office branch has a service charter	0.0	0.25
R1.7	Availability of accessible on-line service at the CAC branch office	0.5	0.5
R1.8	Duration for obtaining certificates of registration for business names after filing all papers	0.0	0.5
	Sub total (R1)	2.0	4.0
R2	Tax administration		
R2.1	Evidence of database of taxable persons.	1.0	1.5
R2.2	Evidence of publication of the tax notices and sending of tax assessment notices to registered tax payers in the last three years	0.75	1.0

R2.3	Evidence of a mechanism for validation of tax paid to other tiers of government and other states in the federation	0.0	1.0
R2.4	Evidence of a Tax Appeal Tribunal/Revenue Courts	0.5	1.5
R2.5	Evidence of one-stop shop for tax payment to state and local government	0.0	1.0
R2.6	Number of taxes paid by manufacturing firms.	0.75	1.0
R2.7	Amount paid as business premises levy per annum	1.0	1.0
R2.8	Number of days between receipt of demand notice and enforcement of penalties	0.5	1.0
R2.9	Penalty for on payment of bus premises (amount paid as business premises levy per annum)	0.5	1.0
	Sub total (R2)	5.0	10.0
R3	Commercial dispute resolution		
R3.1	Establishment of information systems on caseload and judicial statistics	0.0	2.0
R3.2	Average time (in weeks) between filing a business dispute in court and obtaining judgment	0.0	2.0
R3.3	Evidence on availability/establishment of formal alternative dispute resolution	1.5	2.0
	Sub total (R3)	1.5	6.0
R4	Land registration and property rights		
R4.1	Availability and usability of a cadastral map of the state	0.0	1.0
R4.2	Evidence that the state has enacted a land tenure law to effectuate the Land Use Act	0.0	1.0
R4.3	Official cost (charge) of obtaining governor's consent relative to the price of land in the highest profile business area	0.5	1.0
R4.4	Time taken to obtain C of O (between submission of application forms and eventual granting of consent)	1.0	1.0
R4.5	Computerization of land transactions	0.75	1.0
R4.6	Time taken to search the registry for confirmation of validity of title in the case of transfer of rights of ownership	0.50	1.0
R4.7	Time taken for obtaining the governor's consent for transfer of rights of ownership of land	0.50	1.0
R4.8	Evidence of active support for and promotion of equipment leasing	1.0	1.0
R4.9	Evidence of laws that require mandatory subscription to insurance and mortgage contributions	0.0	1.0
R4.10	Evidence of effective protection of private property rights	0.0	1.0
	Sub total (R4)	5.00	10.0
	Total	13.50	30.0

R1 Business Registration

R1.1 Cessation of registration of business names since the setting up of CAC. There is evidence that the state has ceased to register business names, but there is no evidence to show that records of earlier registration by the state have been transferred to corporate affairs commission. The state scores 0.5 out of 1.0.

R1.2 Evidence that improperly registered business names are not given recognition: There is evidence that the state business premises registry recognizes only business names that are registered with CAC, but there is no evidence to show that the state board of internal revenue accepts only properly registered business names as tax payers. The state scores 0.25 out of 0.5.

R1.3 Existence of a taskforce or regulatory action against the display of unregistered business names: There is no task force against the display of unregistered business names. The state scores zero out of 0.5.

R1.4 Existence of CAC office in the state: There is a functional CAC office in the state, with a prescribed register. The branch office is manned by a Deputy Registrar. The state scores the maximum point of 0.5.

R1.5 Evidence of publication activities of CAC branch: Evidence shows CAC publications including booklets and flyers of CAC activities. The state scores the maximum point of 0.25.

R1.6 Evidence that the CAC branch has a service charter: There is no evidence of a service charter for the CAC branch office and their operations. The state scores zero out of 0.25.

R1.7 Availability of accessible on-line real time services: Available evidence shows that there is On- line-real time services in the CAC branch office. The state scores the maximum point of 0.5.

R1.8 Duration for obtaining certificate of registration after filling all forms: There is evidence that it takes two to three weeks to obtain certificate of registration after completing the necessary forms. The state scores 0 out of 0.5.

R2 Tax administration

R2.1 Evidence of database of taxable persons: There is evidence of manually compiled lists of taxable persons and companies. The state scores 1.0 out of 1.5.

R2.2 Evidence of publication of tax notices and sending tax assessment notices: Tax notices are sent to individuals and companies. But there is no evidence of press release of these notices. The state scores 0.75 out of 1.0.

R2.3 Evidence of mechanism for validation of tax paid to other tiers of government: There is no mechanism for validation of tax paid to other tiers of government. The state scores zero out of 1.0.

R2.4 Evidence of a tax appeal tribunal/Revenue court: There is a tax appeal tribunal. But there is no information on the last date the court held its session. The state scores 0.5 out of 1.5.

R2.5 Evidence of one stop shop for tax payment to state and LGA: There is no one- stop-shop for tax payment. The state scores zero out of 1.0.

R2.6 Number of taxes paid by manufacturing firms: Manufacturing firms pay 11 different taxes and the state scores 0.75 out of 1.0.

R2.7 Amount paid as business premises levy in the state capital per annum: Business firms in the state pay less than ₦5000.00 per annum as business premises levy. The state gets the full score of 1.0.

R2.8 Number of days between the receipt of demand notice and enforcement of penalties for non payment of business premises levy: It takes between 30 and 90 days after receipt of demand notice, to enforce the penalty for non payment of business premises levy. The state scores 0.5 out of 1.0.

R2.9 Penalty for non payment of business premises levy is enforced by: -The penalty is enforced by government officials and the state scores the maximum point of 1.0.

R3 Commercial dispute resolution

R3.1 Establishment of information system on caseload and judicial statistics: There is no evidence of establishment of information on case load of judges and judicial statistics. The state scores zero out of 2.0.

R3.2 Estimate in weeks of the time lag between filing a business dispute and obtaining judgment: It takes more than 52 weeks to obtain judgment after filing a business dispute. The state scores zero out of 2.0.

R3.3 Evidence of availability/establishment of alternative dispute resolution mechanism: There is evidence of establishment of an alternative dispute resolution mechanism called the “Oyo state Mediation Centre”. But, there is no evidence of endorsement of the decision of this centre by the state high court. The state scores 1.5 out of 2.0.

R4 Land registration and property rights

R4.1 Availability of cadastral map of the state: The state has no cadastral map of the state and scores zero out of 1.0.

R4.2: Evidence that the state has enacted a land law to complement the land use act: There is no evidence of state land tenure law enacted to complement the land use act. The state scores zero out of 1.0.

R4.3 Official cost/charge of obtaining governor’s consent relative to the price of land in the highest profile business areas: The official cost of obtaining the governor’s consent 10% of the value of land in the highest profile business areas. The state scores 0.5 out of 1.0.

R4.4 Time taken to obtain C of O between (submission of application and eventual granting of consent): It takes less than six months to obtain C of O after submission of application form and granting of consent. The state scores the maximum point of 1.0.

R4.5 Computerization of land transactions: Available evidence shows that land transactions are computerized. But there is no evidence of on-line land transactions. The state scores 0.75 out of .0.

R4.6 Time taken to search the registry for confirmation of validity: On the average, it takes one to two months to search the registry for confirmation of validity of rights. The state scores 0.5 out of 1.0.

R4.7 Time taken to obtain governor’s consent for transfer of right of ownership of land: It bakes between one and two months to obtain governor’s consent for transfer of right of ownership of land. The state scores 0.5 out of 1.0.

R4.8 Evidence of active support for equipment leasing: There is evidence of active support for equipment leasing. The state scores the maximum point of 1.0.

R4.9 Evidence of law that requires mandatory subscription to insurance and mortgage contributors: There is no evidence of law that requires mandatory subscription to insurance. The state scores zero out of 1.0.

R410 Evidence of effective protection of private property rights: There is no evidence of a state law or policy on effective protection of private property rights. The state scores zero out of 1.0

2.3 Business Support and Investment Promotion

The state scores 45% on the benchmark.

2.3.1 Performance on the Measures

The state's performance on the measures is shown in table 7.

Table 7: Scores on the Measures under Business Support and Investment Promotion

Code	Measure	Actual Score	Maximum Score	Percentage Score
B1	Entrepreneurship promotion	1.5	3.0	50
B2	Access to finance	3.1	8.0	38.75
B3	Investment promotion services	2.0	5.0	40
B4	Support for industrial clusters/layouts/parks	1.4	2.0	70
B5	Public private Partnership	1.0	2.0	50
	Total	9.0	20.0	XXXXXXX

2.3.2 Performance on the Indicators

The performance of the state in business support and investment promotion benchmark indicators is shown in table 8.

Table 8: Performance on the Benchmark Indicators

Code	Indicator	Actual score	Maximum score
B1	Entrepreneurship promotion		
B1.1	Existence of specific policies and/or institutions to promote entrepreneurship (business start-up and business growth) in the state	1.5	3.0
	Sub total (B1)	1.5	3.0
B2	Access to finance		
B2.1	Number of companies that have benefited from SMEEIS in 2005 relative to national average	0.8	1.5
B2.2	Relative number of bank branches as at May 2006	0.8	1.5

B2.3	Volume of NACRDB loans disbursed to agro-businesses as percent of agriculture capital budget in 2005.	0.0	1.5
B2.4	Volume of ACGSF loans disbursed to agro-businesses as percent of agriculture capital budget in 2005	0.0	1.5
B2.5	Repayment rate of ACGSF loans for the period, 2002-2005	1.5	2.0
	Sub total (B2)	3.1	8.0
B3	Investment promotion services		
B3.1	Existence of special programmes/incentives that promote technology innovations	1.0	2.0
B3.2	Evidence of special incentives to promote linkages between large firms and SMEs	0.0	1.0
B3.3	Availability of published and up-to-date investment or business information guide	0.0	1.0
B3.4	Existence of up to date directory of business firms	1.0	1.0
	Sub-total (B3)	2.0	5.0
B4	Support for industrial cluster		
B4.1	Presence of an industrial cluster/layout/ park	1.0	1.0
B4.2	Government's infrastructure programmes to support the cluster	0.4	1.0
	Sub total (B4)	1.4	2.0
B5	Public private partnership		
B5.1	Public private partnership in security, infrastructure and utilities, credit provision, training and mentoring	1.0	2.0
	Sub total (B5)	1.0	2.0
	Total	9.0	20.0

B.1 Entrepreneurship promotion

B1.1 Existence of specific policies and/or institutions to promote entrepreneurship: The state scores 1.5 out of 3.0.

B.2 Access to finance and credit

B2.1 Number of companies in the state that have benefited from SMEEIS: About 87.26% of companies have had access to SMEEIS facilities relative to the national average. The state scores 0.8 points out of 1.5.

B2.2 Relative number of bank branches in the state as at May 2006: As at May 2006, there were 130 bank branches in the state, representing 148% of the national average. The state scores 0.8 out of 1.5.

B2.3 NACRDB loan as a percentage of state Agric budgets in 2005. The amount of NARCDB loan to the state was 9.17% of the state's capital budget for agriculture in 2005. The state scores zero out of 1.5.

.B2.4 Volume of ACGSF loan disbursed to Agribusinesses as a percentage of the state's capital budget on Agriculture in 2005: The volume of ACGSF loan disbursed to Agribusinesses in 2005 was 5.89% of the state's capital budget for Agriculture. The state scores 0.0 out of the 1.5.

B2.5 Percent Repayment of ACGSF loan in the state (2002-2005): Repayment rate of ACGSF loan between 2002 and 2005 was 65.17%. The state scores 1.5 out of 2.0.

B3 Investment Promotion Services (BDS)

B3.1 Existence of special programme/incentives that promote technology innovation: There is a technology acquisition centre and evidences of infrastructure provisioning especially at the industrial sites to promote technology innovation. The state scores 1.0 out of the 2.0.

B3.2 Evidence of special incentives to promote linkages between large firms and small and medium enterprises: There were no evidences of incentives to promote linkages of small/medium and large firms. The state scores zero out of 1.0.

B3.3 Availability of published and up to date investment or business information guide: There was no evidence of published investment guide. The state scores zero out of 1.0.

B3.4 Existence of published and up to date directory of business firms: There was evidence of published and up to date directory of business firms. The state gets the maximum score of 1.0.

B4 Support for industrial clusters/layouts/parks

B4.1 Is there an industrial cluster/layout/park in the state: There are two industrial estates located within Ibadan, the state capital. The state scores the maximum point of 1.0.

B4.2 Government infrastructure programme to support cluster/layout/park: There are evidences of construction of roads and supply of electricity at the industrial estates/parks. The state scores 0.4 out of 1.0.

B4 Public/Private Partnerships

B4.3 Public private partnership in security, infrastructure and utilities, credit and mentorship: There are evidences of public-private collaborations in the provision facilities especially infrastructure and security. The state scores 1.0 out of 2.0.

2.4 Security

The state scored a total of 55% on the benchmark.

2.4.1 Performance on the Measures

The state's performance on the security benchmark measures is shown in table 9.

Table 9: Scores on the Measures under Security

Code	Measure	Actual Score	Maximum Score	Percentage
S1	Major crimes	7.0	12.0	58.3
S2	Minor crimes	1.5	3.0	50
S3	Police resources	1.0	2.0	50
S4	Perceptions of security	1.5	3.0	50
	Total	11.0	20.0	XXXXXXXXXX

2.4.2. Performance on the Indicators

The performance of the state in security benchmark is given in table 10.

Table 10: Values on security Indicators

Code	Indicator	Actual score	Maximum score
S1	Major crimes		
S1.1	Number of reported armed robber cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons	1.0	2.0
S1.2	Number of reported murder cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons	2.0	2.0
S1.3	Number of reported rape cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons	2.0	2.0
S1.4	Number of assault cases reported/recorded	0.0	2.0
S1.5	Number of reported burglary and theft cases (including motor vehicle snatching) in 2005 per 100,000 persons	0.0	2.0

S1.6	Number of reported arson/vandalism cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons	2.0	2.0
	Sub total (S1)	7.0	12.0
S2	Minor crimes		
S2.1	Number of reported fraud (including forgery and counterfeiting and extortion) cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons	1.5	3.0
	Sub total (S2)	1.5	3.0
S3	Police coverage		
S3.1	Police : population ratio	1.0	2.0
	Sub total (S3)	1.0	2.0
S4	Perceptions on security		
S4.1	Assessment of the conduciveness of security to business	0.75	1.5
S4.2	Rating of police performance	0.75	1.5
	Sub total (S4)	1.5	3.0
	Total	15.0	20.0

S1. Major crimes

S1.1 Number of reported armed robbery cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons: There are 172 reported armed robbery cases in 2005, giving 3.08 cases per 100,000 persons. The state scores 1.0 out of the maximum point of 2.0.

S1.2 Number of reported murder cases in 2005: There are 89 reported murder cases in 2005. The number of cases per 100,000 persons is 1.59. The state scores the maximum point of 2.0.

S1.3 Number of reported rape cases in 2005: There are 85 reported rape cases in Oyo state. The number of cases per 100,000 persons is 1.52. The state scores the maximum point of 2.0

S1.4 number of reported assault cases in 2005: There are 992 reported cases of assault in 2005. This gives 17.74 cases per 100,000 persons. The state scores zero out of 2.0

S1.5 Number of reported burglary and theft cases (including motor vehicle snatching) in 2005: There are 1042 reported burglary and theft cases in 2005, giving 25.07 cases per 100,000 persons. The state scores zero out of 2.0.

S1.6 Number of reported arson/vandalism cases in 2005: There are four reported arson cases in 2005. This gives 0.07 cases per 100, 000 persons. The state gets the maximum score of 2.0.

S2 Minor crimes**S.2.1 Number of reported fraud cases (including forgery, counterfeiting, and extortion)**

reported in 2005: There were 523 reported fraud cases in 2005. The number of cases per 100,000 persons is 9.26. The state scores 1.5 out of 3.0.

S3 Police coverage

S3.1 Police: population ratio in 205 per 1,000 persons: There were 8,351 combatant policemen in 2005, giving 1.49 police personnel per 1,000 persons. The state scores 1.0 out of 2.0.

S4. Perceptions on security

S4.1: Assessment of the security: Based on assessment by business and company executives, the state scores 0.75 out of 1.5.

S4.2: Rating of police performance: Based on assessment by business and company executives, the state scores 0.75 out of 1.5.