

BECANS BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT REPORT

Volume 1, Number 37, 2007

YOBE

BECANS BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT REPORT

Volume 1, Number 37, 2007

YOBE



AFRICAN INSTITUTE FOR APPLIED ECONOMICS

In collaboration with



National Planning Commission



Central Bank of Nigeria

BECANS Business Environment Report

Volume 1, Number 37, 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

YOBE State scores 41.15% on the business environment index. Among the four benchmarks, it scores relatively high on security and low on business support and investment promotion and legal and regulatory services.

The state scores 37.33% on infrastructure and utilities. She performs relatively better on transportation and lower on energy, water supply and social infrastructure. There is need for increased priority to infrastructural facilities, especially in the areas of energy, water supply and education and health.

It scores relatively low (26%) on legal and regulatory services. The score on contract enforcement/commercial disputes resolution is the lowest. There is need for increased priority to improving business registration, tax and land administration, contract enforcement and commercial dispute resolution.

The score on business support and investment promotion is 28.25%. It performs relatively better on support for industrial clusters/layouts/parks. There is need for increased emphasis on the promotion of entrepreneurial incentives, investment promotion, access to credit and public-private partnership.

The state scores 82.5% on security. It performs relatively low on incidence of crimes. It performs relatively high on 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. Investment Climate, Policies and Institutions.....	9
1.4. Budget Profile	9
2.0 BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT SCORECARD	10
2.1 Infrastructure and Utilities	11
2.2 Legal and Regulatory Services.....	15
2.3 Business Support and Investment Promotion	21
2.4 Security.....	24

List of Tables

Table 1: Budget Profile, 2005.....	10
Table 2: Performance across the Benchmarks	10
Table 3: Scores on the Measures	11
Table 4: Values on Infrastructure and Utilities Indicators	12
Table 5: Scores on measures under Legal and Regulatory Services.....	16
Table 6: Values on Legal and Regulatory Indicators.....	16
Table 7: Scores on Measures under business Support and.....	21
Table 8: Values on Business Support and Investment Promotion Indicators	22
Table 9: Scores on Measures under Security	24
Table 10: Values on Security Indicators.....	25

List of Figures

Figure 1: Performance across Benchmarks	11
---	----

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

Yobe state is located within the North Eastern part of the country and consists of 13 Local Government Areas. It lies between latitude 10.5° and 13.0° N; and longitude 9.5° and 13.0° E. It has a population of 2,321,591 in 2006 and land area of approximately 47,153 square kilometres.

1.2. Economic Potentials

The state is endowed with agriculture and mineral resources. Major agricultural products include maize, millet and sorghum, wheat, rice, cowpea, onions, tomatoes, red pepper, groundnut, cotton and gum-arabic, as well as livestock and fisheries products.

Some of the key agro-based firms include Nguru Oil Mills, Yobe Flour and Feed Mills, Potiskum, Gujba Fertilizer Blending Plant, Leda bag and woven sack factories at Damaturu and Soda Ash Factory at Yusufari. The state has some mineral deposits including limestone, kaolin, diatomite, gypsum, potassium, silica sand, mineral water and natural salt.

1.3. Investment Climate, Policies and Institutions

The state has incentives aimed at attracting both local and foreign investors for boosting investment, employment, as well as the utilization of local raw materials. Policy strategies include facilitation of land acquisition, development of infrastructure and other services and promotion of exports of commodities

1.4. Budget Profile

Internally generated revenue accounted for 5.14% of total revenue in 2005 budget. Health capital budget and education capital budget in 2005 were ₦411.64 and ₦1,758.22 respectively, on per capita basis (Table 1).

Table 1: Budget Profile, 2005

Budget	Total value (Nn)	Per capita value (Nn)*
Federal Accounts Revenue	18,460.24	7,957.00
Internally Generated Revenue	1,000.00	431.03
Total Budget	33,126.60	14,278.71
Capital Budget for Health	955.00	411.64
Capital Budget for Education	4079.08	1,758.22

* Based on 2006 population figure

2.0 BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT SCORECARD

The state scores 41.15% on the business environment index. The performance of the state across the benchmarks is as follows. .

Table 2: Performance across the Benchmarks

Benchmark	Actual score	Maximum score	Percentage Score
Infrastructure (F)	11.2	30.0	37.33
Legal and Regulatory Services (R)	7.8	30.0	26.0
Business Support and Investment Promotion (B)	5.65	20.0	28.25
Security (S)	16.5	20.0	82.5
Total	41.15	100.0	XXXXXXX




Figure 1: Performance across Benchmarks

2.1 Infrastructure and Utilities

The state scores 37.33% on infrastructure and utilities.

2.1.1 Performance on the Measures

Table 3: Scores on the Measures

Measure	Actual score	Maximum score	Percentage score
Energy	2.3	8.0	28.75
Water supply	1.25	5.0	25.0
Access to information	2.2	5.0	44.0
Transportation	3.0	5.0	60.0
Social infrastructure	2.45	7.0	35.0
Total	11.2	30.0	XXXXXXXXXXXX

2.1.2 Performance on the indicators

Table 4: Values on Infrastructure and Utilities Indicators

Code	Indicator	¹ Actual score	Maximum score
	F1: Energy		
F1.1	Annual per capita electricity supply (kilowatts per capita).	0.0	2.0
F1.2	Average hours of public electricity supply per 24-hour day	0.5	2.0
F1.3	Difference between the actual price and the officially regulated price of petroleum products in the last quarter of 2006	0.4	2.0
F1.4	Evidence of availability of petroleum products in the last quarter of 2006	1.4	2.0
	Subtotal (F1)	2.3	8.0
	F2: Water Supply		
F2.1	Daily per capita litres of water supply	0.0	2.0
F2.2	Average price of 20 litres of private water supply	1.0	2.0
F2.3	Proportion of firms' total daily water requirement obtained from private supply	0.25	1.0
	Subtotal (F2)	1.25	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 for fixed lines (Number of telephone lines per 1000 persons)	0.1	0.5
F3.3	Incidence of mobile phone ownership	0.0	0.5
F3.4	Availability of local television stations	0.7	1.0
F3.5	Availability of radio stations	0.4	1.0
F3.6	Availability of functional website containing information	1.0	1.0
	Subtotal (F3)	2.2	5.0
	F4: Transportation		

¹ 0% score does not necessarily imply that the state has zero units of the particular property or attribute. Also, 100% score does not necessarily imply that the state has full units of the particular property. Rather, the two extreme scores merely reflect the two extreme points of the measuring scale used to evaluate the performance of respective states on this property or attribute.

F4.1	Average cost per kilometer of intra-state road transportation in the last quarter of 2006	3.0	3.0
F4.2	Availability of airport	0.0	2.0
	Subtotal (F4)	3.0	5.0
	F5: Social infrastructure		
F5.1	Primary school enrolment rate	0.0	1.0
F5.2	Pupil-teacher ratio	0.0	1.0
F5.3	Capital budget to education as a ratio of total capital budget in 2005	1.5	1.5
F5.4	Capital budget to health as a ratio of total capital budget	0.5	1.5
F5.5	Private sector rating of waste management	0.1	0.5
F5.6	Frequency of waste disposal services	0.25	1.0
F5.7	Average monthly waste disposal levy	0.1	0.5
	Subtotal (F5)	2.85	2.0
	Total	11.2	30.0

F1: Energy

F1.1: Annual per capita electricity supply (kilowatts per capita): With an estimated annual power supply of 11,152.44kw, the per capita power supply is 0.005 and the state scores 0.0 out of 2.0.

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

F1.3: Difference between the actual price and the officially regulated price of petroleum products in the last quarter of 2006: There is 11 to 20% price difference between the official price of petrol and what the people pay, and above 20% price difference for kerosene and diesel. The state scores 0.4 out of 2.0.

F1.4: Evidence of availability of petroleum products in the last quarter of 2006: The survey shows that petrol is available all the time, while both kerosene and diesel are available only 50% of the time, giving the state 1.4 out of 2.0.

F2: Water supply

F2.1: Daily per capita litres of water supply: The state scores 0 out of 2.0.

F2.2: Average price of 20 litres of private water supply: Private water supply is sold at an average price of ₦10.00 per 20 litres. The state scores 1.0 out of 2.0.

F2.3: Proportion of firms' total daily water requirement obtained from private supply: Business firms get 40 to 59% of their total water need through private supplies. The state scores 0.25 out of 1.0.

F3: Access to information

F3.1: Number of post offices per 100, 000 of the population: The state has 8 post offices and the number of post offices per 100,000 persons is 0.4. The state scores 0 out of 1.0.

F3.2: Tele-density for fixed lines (number of telephone lines per 1000 persons): The state has 3,500 fixed lines. The ratio of telephone lines per 1000 is 1.51. The state scores 0.1 out of 0.5.

F3.3: Incidence of mobile phone ownership: The incidence of mobile phone ownership is 7.7%. The state scores 0 out of 0.5.

F3.4: Availability of local television stations: There are federal and state television stations. The state scores 0.7 out of 1.0.

F3.5: Availability of radio stations: There is only a state radio station. The state gets 0.4 out of 1.0.

F3.6: Availability of functional website containing information: There is a state website from which some information was obtained. The website is www.yobestategov.com and is regularly updated. 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: From the survey, average transport fare per kilometer for intra-state road movement is ₦5.00 and below. The state scores the maximum point of 3.0.

F4.2: Availability of Airport: Yobe state has no airport but is close to, and served by the Maiduguri airport, about 100km and 1hour drive from Damaturu, the state capital. The state scores 0 out of 2.0.

F5: Social infrastructure

F5.1: Primary school enrolment rate: Primary school enrolment for 2006 is 36.3% and the state scores 0 out of 1.0.

F5.2: Pupil-teacher ratio: Pupil-teacher ratio for 2006 is 68.7:1. The state scores 0 out of 1.0.

F5.3: Capital budget to education as % of total capital budget in 2005: The 2005 total capital budget was ₦19,177,460,000.00, while the capital budget to education is ₦4,079,080,000.00, representing 21.27% of total capital budget. The state scores the maximum point of 1.5.

F5.4: Capital budget to health as % of total capital budget in 2005: The 2005 total capital budget was ₦19,177,460,000.00, while the capital budget to health is ₦955,000,000.00, representing 5.0% of total capital budget. The state scores 0.5 out of 1.5.

F5.5: Private sector rating of waste management: The survey shows that waste management is rated as fair, giving the 0.1 out of 0.5.

F5.6: Frequency of waste disposal services: Collection of waste is monthly. The state scores 0.25 out of 1.0.

F5.7: Average monthly waste disposal levy: The average monthly levy paid by business firms for waste disposal ranged from ₦501.00 to ₦1000.00. The state scores 0.1 out of a maximum of 0.5.

2.2 Legal and Regulatory Services

The state scores a total of 26% on the benchmark.

2.2.1 Performance on the Measures

Table 5: Scores on measures under Legal and Regulatory Services

Measure	Actual score	Maximum score	Percentage score
Business registration	1.05	4.0	26.25
Tax administration	2.25	10.0	22.5
Contract enforcement/commercial disputes resolution	0.0	6.0	0.0
Land registration and property rights	4.5	10.0	45.0
Total	7.8	30.0	XXXXXXXXXXXX

2.2.2 Performance on the Indicators

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 (or regulatory actions) against the display of unregistered business names by firms	0.0	0.5
R1.4	Existence of an office of the Corporate Affairs Commission in the state	0.3	0.5
R1.5	Evidence of publication of activities of the CAC branch (leaflets, fliers, hand bills, booklets and/or websites) from where information on how to access CAC services can be obtained and which are freely issued	0.0	0.25
R1.6	Evidence that the CAC branch office has a service charter	0.0	0.25
R1.7	Availability of accessible on-line real-time services through which names can be searched for and reserved at the CAC branch office	0.0	0.5
R1.8	Duration for obtaining certificate of registration for business names after filing all papers	0.0	0.5
	Subtotal (R1)	1.05	4.0

R2: Tax administration			
R2.1	Evidence of database of taxable persons	0.0	1.5
R2.2	Evidence of publication of tax notices and sending of Tax Assessment Notices to registered tax payers in the last three years	0.0	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	0.0	1.5
R2.5	Evidence of one-stop shop for tax payment to state and local governments	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 capital per annum	0.5	1.0
R2.8	Number of days between receipt of demand notice and enforcement of penalties for late payment of taxes by tax authorities	0.0	1.0
R2.9	Penalties for non payment of business premises are enforced	1.0	1.0
	Subtotal (R2)	2.25	10.0
R3: Contract enforcement/commercial disputes 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 of availability/establishment of formal alternative dispute resolution	0.0	2.0
	Subtotal (R3)	0.0	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 operationalise the Land Use Act	0.75	1.0
R4.3	Official cost (charge) of obtaining Governor's consent relative to the price of land	0.5	1.0
R4.4	Time taken for obtaining C of O (between submission of application form and eventual granting of consent	0.75	1.0
R4.5	Computerization of land transactions	0.0	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 of land	0.75	1.0
R4.7	Time taken for obtaining the Governor's consent for transfer of rights of ownership of land	0.75	1.0

R4.8	Evidence of active support for and promotion of equipment leasing	1.0	1.0
R4.9	Evidence of a law that requires mandatory subscription to insurance and mortgage contributors	0.0	1.0
R4.10	Evidence of effective protection of private property rights	0.0	1.0
	Subtotal (R4)	4.5	10.0
	Total	7.8	30.0

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: Evidence shows that the state does not register business names. The state scores 0.5 out of 1.0.

R1.2: Evidence that improperly registered business names are not given recognition: Evidence shows that recognition is only given to legally registered businesses. The state scores 0.25 out of 0.5.

R1.3: Evidence of existence of a task force (or regulatory actions) against the display of unregistered business names by firms: There is no evidence of a taskforce against the display of unregistered businesses names. The state scores 0 out of 0.5

R1.4: Existence of an office of the Corporate Affairs Commission: The state has a branch of CAC, with a registry, and scores 0.3 out of 0.5.

R1.5: Evidence of publication of activities of the CAC branch (leaflets, fliers, hand bills, booklets and/or websites) from where information on how to access CAC services can be obtained and which are freely issued: There is no evidence of publication of CAC activities. The state scores 0 out of 0.25.

R1.6: Evidence that the CAC branch office has a service charter: There is no evidence of a service charter at the CAC state office. The state scores 0 out of 0.25.

R1.7: Availability of accessible on-line real-time services through which names can be searched for and reserved at the CAC branch office: There is no facility for online real-time services at the CAC branch office. The state earns 0 out of 0.5.

R1.8: Duration for obtaining certificate of registration for business names after filing all papers: Evidence shows that it takes more than a week to obtain certificate of business registration after filing all papers. The state scores 0 out of 0.5

R2: Tax administration

R2.1: Evidence of database of taxable persons: The database of taxable persons is manually compiled. The state scores 0 out of 1.5.

R2.2: Evidence of publication of tax notices and sending of tax assessment notices to registered tax payers in the last three years: There is no evidence of publication of tax notices. The state scores 0 out of 1.0.

R2.3: Evidence of a mechanism for validation of tax paid to other tiers of government and other states in the Federation: The state is yet to put in place a mechanism for validation of tax paid in other tiers of government and other states. The state scores 0 out of 1.0.

R2.4: Evidence of a Tax Appeal Tribunal/Revenue Courts: There is no evidence of existence of tax appeal tribunal/court. The state scores 0 out of 1.5.

R2.5: Evidence of one-stop shop for tax payment to state and local governments: The state is yet to have a one-stop shop for tax payments. The state scores 0 out of 1.0.

R2.6: Number of taxes paid by manufacturing firms: Evidence shows that there are 14 kinds of taxes paid by manufacturing firms. The state scores 0.75 out of 1.0.

R2.7: Number of taxes paid by manufacturing firms: Business premises levy paid ranges from ₦5,000.00 to ₦10,000.00. The state scores 0.5 out of 1.0.

R2.8: Number of days between receipt of demand notice and enforcement of penalties for late payment of taxes by tax authorities: The number of days between receipt of demand notice and enforcement of penalties is less than 30 days. The state scores 0 out of 1.0.

R2.9: Penalties for non payment of business premises are enforced: Enforcement of penalties for non-payment of business premises is carried out by the state government. The state scores the maximum 1.0.

R3: Contract enforcement/commercial disputes resolution

R3.1: Establishment of information systems on caseload and judicial statistics: The survey shows a listing of cases handled within the 2nd quarter of 2006 which did not represent information systems on caseload and judicial statistics. The state scores 0 out of 2.0.

R3.2: Average time (in weeks) between filing a business dispute in court and obtaining judgment: Evidence shows that the time spent from filing and obtaining judgment on business dispute is more than 52 weeks. The state scores 0 out of 2.0.

R3.3: Evidence of availability/establishment of formal alternative dispute resolution: The state is yet to have an alternative dispute resolution (ADR) system. The state scores 0 out of 2.0.

R4: Land registration and property rights

R4.1: Availability and usability of a cadastral Map of the State: A cadastral map is available only for Damaturu and Potiskum, and produced in 1978 (more than 20 years). The state scores 0 out of a maximum of 1.0.

R4.2: Evidence that the state has enacted a land tenure law to operationalise the Land Use Act. The state has a land edict (YBS Edit No. 5 of 1994) for land tenure administration and scores 0.75 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 area in the state capital: The official cost of obtaining governor's consent is a fixed sum of ₦2000.00 and not a percentage while stamp duty and registration fees are 3% and 2% respectively. The state scores 0.5 out of 1.0.

R4.4: Time taken for obtaining C of O (between submission of application form and eventual granting of consent): Evidence shows that it takes one week to one year (or 6-12 months, on the average) to obtain C of O. The state scores 0.75 out of 1.0.

R4.5: Computerization of land transactions: The state is yet to have computerized land transaction system and scores 0 out of 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 of land: The time taken to search the registry and obtain confirmation of validity of transfer of ownership ranges from 1 to 2 weeks. The state scores 0.75 out of 1.0.

R4.7: Time taken for obtaining the governor's consent for transfer of rights of ownership of land: The length of time spent to obtain governor's consent for transfer of rights of ownership of land is 2 weeks to one month. The state scores 0.75 out of 1.0.

R4.8: Evidence of active support for and promotion of equipment leasing: There is no evidence of active support for equipment leasing. However, the state ADP renders tractor hiring services to farmers, and this is a form of support for equipment leasing. The state scores the maximum point of 1.0.

R4.9: Evidence of a law that requires mandatory subscription to insurance and mortgage contributors: There is no evidence of law requiring mandatory subscription to insurance and mortgage. The state scores 0 out of 1.0.

R4.10: Evidence of effective protection of private property rights: There is no evidence of a state law for private property protection. The state scores 0 out of 1.0.

2.3 Business Support and Investment Promotion

The state scores 28.25% on the benchmark.

2.3.1 Performance on the Measures

Table 7: Scores on Measures under business Support and

Measure	Actual score	Maximum score	Percentage score
Entrepreneurship promotion	0.75	3.0	25.0
Access to finance and credit	2.0	8.0	25.0
Investment promotion services	1.0	5.0	20.0
Support for industrial clusters	1.4	2.0	70.0
Public private partnership	0.5	2.0	25.0
Total	5.65	20.0	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

2.3.3 Performance on the Indicators

Table 8: Values on Business Support and Investment Promotion Indicators

Code	Indicator	Actual score	Maximum score
B1: Entrepreneurship promotion			
B1.1	Existence of specific policies and/or institutions to promote entrepreneurship	0.75	3.0
	Subtotal (B1)	0.75	3.0
B2: Access to finance and credit			
B2.1	Number of companies that benefited from SMEEIS in 2005 relative to national average	0.0	1.5
B2.2	Relative number of bank branches as at May 2006	0.0	1.5
B2.3	NACRDB loans as % of capital budget to agriculture in 2005	0.0	1.5
B2.4	Volume of ACGSF loans disbursed to agro-businesses as % of capital budget to agriculture in 2005	0.0	1.5
B2.5	Repayment of ACGSF loans (2002-2005)	2.0	2.0
	Subtotal (B2)	2.0	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 small and medium enterprises	0.0	1.0
B3.3	Availability of published and up-to-date investment or business information guide (base year 2004)	0.0	1.0
B3.4	Existence of published and up to date directory of business firms	0.0	1.0
	Subtotal (B3)	1.0	5.0
B4: Support for industrial clusters/layouts/parks			
B4.1	Existence of industrial cluster/layout/park	1.0	1.0
B4.2	Government infrastructure programmes to support the industrial cluster/layout/park	0.4	1.0
	Subtotal (B4)	1.4	2.0
B5: Public-private partnership			
B5.1	Public-private partnership in security, infrastructure and utilities, credit provision, training and mentoring	0.5	2.0
	Subtotal (B5)	0.5	2.0
	Total	5.65	20.0

B1: Entrepreneurship promotion**B1.1: Existence of specific policies and/or institutions to promote entrepreneurship:**

The 2006 budget contains provisions for entrepreneurship programmes and agencies/centres. The state scores 0.75 out of 3.

B2: Access to finance and credit

B2.1: Number of Companies that have benefited from SMEEIS in 2005 relative to national average: Evidence shows that no enterprise or company has had access to SMEEIS facilities. The state scores zero out of a maximum of 1.5.

B2.2: Relative number of bank branches as at May 2006: The number of bank branches represents 31% of the national average. The state scores 0 out of 1.5.

B2.3: NACRDB loans as % of capital budget to agriculture in 2005: NACRDB loans represented 13.25% of capital budget to agriculture in 2005. The state gets 0 out of 1.5.

B2.4: Volume of ACGSF loans disbursed to agro-businesses as % of capital budget to agriculture in 2005: ACGSF loan represented 1.4% of capital budget to agriculture in 2005, and the state scores 0 out of 1.5.

B2.5: Repayment of ACGSF: Total ACGSF loan repayment rate for the period 2002 to 2005 was 83.15%. The state scores the maximum point of 2.0.

B3: Investment promotion services

B3.1: Existence of special programmes/incentives that promote technology innovations: There were provisions for industrial estate and technological acquisition centre in Damaturu. The state scores 1.0 out of 2.0.

B3.2: Evidence of special incentives to promote linkages between large firms, small and medium enterprises: There is no record of special incentives that promote linkages between large firms and SMEs. The state scores 0 out of 1.0.

B3.3: Availability of published and up-to-date investment or business information guide to enlighten investors (base year 2004): There is no evidence of published, up-to-date investment/business information guide. The state scores zero out of a maximum of 1.0.

B3.4: Existence of published and up to date directory of business firms: There was no recent directory of business establishments. The state scores 0 out of a maximum of 1.0

B4: Support for industrial clusters/layouts/parks

B4.1: Existence of an industrial cluster/layout/park: There are provisions for an industrial estate at Damaturu. The state scores the maximum point of 1.0.

B4.2: Government infrastructure programmes to support industrial cluster/layout/park: Evidence shows that the state's 2005 budget made provisions for infrastructural provision for the Damaturu Industrial estate. The state scores 0.4 out of 1.0.

B5: Public-Private partnership

B5.1: Public-private partnership in security, infrastructure and utilities, credit provision, training and mentoring: The survey shows collaboration between the state government and private firms in business ownership and management. The state scores 0.5 out of 2.0.

2.4 Security

The state scores a total of 82.5% on the benchmark.

2.5.2 Performance on the Measures

Table 9: Scores on Measures under Security

Code	Measure	Actual score	Maximum score	² Percentage score
S1	Major crimes (crime with violence)	10.0	12.0	83.33
S2	Minor crimes (crimes without violence)	3.0	3.0	100
S3	Police coverage	2.0	2.0	100
S4	Perception of security	1.5	3.0	50.0
	Total	16.5	20.0	XXXXXXXXXX

² Major and minor crimes are indexed on a negative scale, the higher the percent the smaller the incidence of major or minor crimes.

2.5.3. Performance on the Indicators

Table 10: Values on Security Indicators

Code	Indicator	Actual score	Maximum score
	S1: Major crimes (crime with violence)		
S1.1	Number of reported armed robbery cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons	2.0	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 reported assault cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons	2.0	2.0
S1.5	Number of burglary and theft cases (including motor vehicle snatching) reported/recorded 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
	Subtotal (S1)	10.0	12.0
	S2: Minor crimes (crimes without violence)		
S2.1	Number of reported fraud (including forgery and counterfeiting and extortion cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons	3.0	3.0
	Subtotal (S2)	3.0	3.0
	S3: Police coverage		
S3.1	Police population in 2005 per 1,000 persons	2.0	2.0
	Subtotal (S3)	2.0	2.0
	S4: Perception of security services		
S4.1	Assessment of the conduciveness of security to business	0.75	1.5
S4.2	Rating of police performance	0.75	1.5
	Subtotal (S4)	1.5	3.0
	Total	16.5	20.0

S1: Major crimes (crime with violence)

S1.1: Number of reported armed robbery cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons: The number of reported armed robbery cases is 38. The number of reported cases per 100,000 persons is 1.64. The state scores the maximum point of 2.0.

S1.2: Number of reported murder cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons: The number of reported murder cases is 117. The number of reported cases per 100,000 persons is 1.51. The state scores the maximum point of 2.0.

S1.3: Number of reported rape cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons: The number of reported rape cases is 8. The number of reported cases per 100,000 persons is 0.34, and the state scores the maximum point of 2.0.

S1.4: Number of reported assault cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons: The number of reported assault cases is 22. The number of reported cases per 100,000 persons is 0.95, giving the state the maximum score of 2.0.

S1.5: Number of reported burglary and theft cases (including motor vehicle snatching) reported/recorded in 2005 per 100,000 persons: Number of burglary/theft cases and motor vehicle theft/snatching in 2005 was 271. The number of reported cases per 100,000 persons is 11.67. The state scores 0 out of 2.0.

S1.6: Number of arson/vandalism cases reported/recorded in 2005 per 100,000 persons: The number of reported vandal/arson cases is 11. The reported cases per 100,000 persons is 0.47. The state scores the maximum 2.0.

S2: Minor crimes (crimes without violence)

S2.1: Number of fraud (including forgery and counterfeiting and extortion cases reported/recorded in 2005 per 100,000 persons: The number of reported fraud cases is 42. The reported cases per 100,000 persons is 81. The state scores the maximum point of 3.0.

S3: Police coverage

Police-population ratio in 2005 per 1,000 persons: The number of combatant policemen in 2005 is 5,250. The number of policemen per 1000 persons is 2.26, giving the state the full score of 2.0.

S4: Perception of security services

S4.1: Assessment of the conduciveness (in terms of security) of the business environment in the state last year. Based on business/company executives' rating of conduciveness of security, the state scores 0.75 out of 1.5.

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