

BECANS BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT REPORT

Volume 1, Number 11, 2007

DELTA STATE

BECANS BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT REPORT

Volume 1, Number 11, 2007

DELTA STATE



AFRICAN INSTITUTE FOR APPLIED ECONOMICS

In collaboration with



National Planning Commission



Central Bank of Nigeria

BECANS Business Environment Report

Volume 1, Number 11, 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

DELTA State scores 50.7% on the business environment index. It scores highest on infrastructure and utilities while the least score is on legal and regulatory services.

Infrastructure and Utilities: The state scores 59.5% on infrastructure and utilities, performing relatively better on transportation, access to information and social infrastructure, while it performs relatively low on energy and water supply.

Legal and Regulatory Environment: The state scores a total of 41.0% on legal and regulatory services. It performs relatively better on business registration and comparatively low on tax administration, contract enforcement/commercial dispute resolution as well as land registration and property rights. The performance on land registration and property rights is the weakest.

Business Support and Investment Promotion: The state scores 47.75% on business support and investment promotion. Relatively, the state performs better on investment promotion services and support for industrial clusters/layouts/parks. It performs relatively low on entrepreneurship promotion, access to finance as well as public-private partnership.

Security: The state scores a total of 55% on security. It performs relatively better on police coverage than on major and minor crimes as well as public perception of security.

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SYNOPSIS.....	5
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	6
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	7
List of Tables.....	8
List of Figures.....	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: Scores across the Benchmarks.....	10
Table 3: Scores on the measures under Infrastructure and Utilities.....	11
Table 4: Values on Infrastructure and Utilities Indicators	12
Table 5: Scores on the measures under Legal and Regulatory Services.....	16
Table 6: Values on indicators of Legal and Regulatory Services	16
Table 7: Scores on the Measures under Business Support and Investment Promotion.....	21
Table 8: Values on Indicators of Business Support and Investment Promotion	22
Table 9: Scores on the Measures under Security	24
Table 10: Values on Security Indicators.....	25

List of Figures

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

1.0 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1. Geopolitical Profile

Delta State is located in the South-South geopolitical region of Nigeria. It lies between longitudes 5° 00' and 6° 45' east and latitudes 5° 00' and 6°30' north. The state has a population of 4,098,391 according to the 2006 national census, with a total area of 17,440km². It has 25 local government areas.

1.2. Economic Potentials

The state has considerable economic potentials and resources in oil and gas, agriculture, solid minerals, commerce and tourism. The state is the leading producer of oil and gas in Nigeria, accounting for about one quarter of the daily volume of oil produced in Nigeria. In addition, the state is also endowed with various deposits of other minerals, including silica, clay, lignite, kaolin, limestone, gypsum, tar sand, phosphate, feldspar and decorative rocks and aggregate, including granite. Some of the major agricultural products include oil palm, plantain/banana, rubber, timber/wood, cassava, yam, maize, melon, cocoa, cocoyam, fruits and vegetables, as well as livestock and fisheries products. The vast creeks and coastal areas offer huge tourism opportunities.

1.3. Investment Climate, Policies and Institutions

The state has some of the major oil based industries and facilities, including refinery, petrochemical complex, a gas plant, steel complex, oil export terminals and sea port. The policy objective is anchored on industrial and infrastructural development.

1.4. Budget Profile

Internally generated revenue (IGR) accounted for 12.27% of total budgeted revenue in 2005. Health capital and education capital budgets in 2005 were ₦1,593.47 and ₦1,156.34 respectively on per capita basis.

Table 1: Budget Profile. 2005

Budget	Total value (₦m)	Per capita value (₦)*
Federal Accounts Revenue	84,171.80	7,791.83
Internally Generated Revenue	11,769.77	2,870.68
Total Budget	115,999.87	28,292.66
Capital Budget to Health	6,533.23	1,593.47
Capital Budget to Education	4,741.00	1,156.34

2.0 BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT SCORECARD

The state scores a total of 50.7% on the business environment index. The performance across the benchmarks is as follows:

Table 2: Scores across the Benchmarks

Benchmark	Actual Score	Maximum Score	Percentage Score
Infrastructure (F)	17.85	30.0	59.5
Legal and Regulatory (R)	12.3	30.0	41.0
Business Support and Investment Promotion (B)	9.55	20.0	47.75
Security (S)	11.0	20.0	55.0
Total	50.7	100.0	




Figure 1: Performance across Benchmarks

2.1 Infrastructure and Utilities

The state scores about 59.5% on infrastructure and utilities. The details are summarized in tables 3 and 4.

2.1.1 Performance on the measures

Table 3: Scores on the measures under Infrastructure and Utilities

Measure	Actual Score	Maximum Score	Percentage Score
Energy	3.1	8.0	38.75
Water supply	1.5	5.0	30.0
Access to information	3.85	5.0	77.0
Transportation	5.0	5.0	100.0
Social infrastructure	4.4	7.0	62.86
Total	17.85	30.0	XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

2.1.2 Performance on the indicators

Table 4: Values on Infrastructure and Utilities Indicators

Indicator label	Benchmark Indicator	Actual Score	Maximum Score
	F1: Energy		
F1.1	Annual per capita public electricity supply (kilowatts per capita)	0.5	2.0
F1.2	Average hours of public electricity per 24-hour day	0.0	2.0
F1.3	Difference between the actual price and the officially regulated price of petroleum products in the last quarter of 2006	1.2	2.0
F1.4	Evidence of availability of petroleum products in the last quarter of 2006	1.4	2.0
	Subtotal (F1)	3.1	8.0
	F2: Water supply		
F2.1	Daily per capita liters of water supply	0.0	2.0
F2.2	Average price of 20 liters of private water supply	1.5	2.0
F2.3	Proportion of firms' total daily water requirement obtained from private supply	0.0	1.0
	Subtotal (F2)	1.5	5.0
	F3: Access to information		
F3.1	Number of post offices per 100, 000 of the population	0.75	1.0
F3.2	Tele-density for fixed lines (number of telephone lines per 1000 persons)	0.5	0.5
F3.3	Incidence of mobile phone ownership	0.2	0.5
F3.4	Availability of local television stations	0.7	1.0
F3.5	Availability of radio stations	0.7	1.0
F3.6	Availability of functional website	1.0	1.0
	Subtotal (F3)	3.85	5.0
	F4: Transportation		
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	2.0	2.0
	Subtotal (F4)	5.0	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 a ratio of total capital budget in 2005	0.5	1.5
F5.4	Capital budget to health as a ratio of total capital budget	1.0	1.5
F5.5	Private sector rating of waste management	0.1	0.5
F5.6	Frequency of waste disposal services	0.75	1.0
F5.7	Average monthly waste disposal levy	0.3	0.5
	Subtotal (F5)	4.4	7.0
	Total	17.85	30.0

F1: Energy

F1.1: Annual per capita electricity supply (kilowatts per capita): With an estimated annual power supply of 135,630.45kw, the per capita power supply was 0.03 and the state scores 0.5 out of 2.0.

F1.2: Average hours of public electricity per 24-hour day. Survey shows that public power supplies below 2 hours of electricity out of 24 hours in a day. The state scores 0 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: Evidence shows 10 to 20% price difference between the official prices and what the people pay for petrol, while for kerosene and diesel, the price difference is 11 to 20%. The state scores 1.2 out of 2.0.

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

F2: Water supply

F2.1: Daily per capita liters of water supply: Total daily water supply was estimated at 700,000 liters, giving per capital daily water supply of 0.2 liters. The state scores 0 out of 2.0.

F2.2: Average price of 20 liters of private water supply: Evidence shows that water is obtained from private water vendors at an average price of ₦5.00 per 20 liters. The state scores 1.5 out of 2.0.

F2.3: Proportion of firms' total daily water requirement obtained from private supply: Evidence shows that business firms get 60 to 70% of their total water need through private supplies. The state scores 0 out of the maximum of 1.0.

F3: Access to information

F3.1: Number of post offices per 100, 000 of the population: The state has 68 post offices, and dividing this by the state's 2006 population figure gave the number of post offices per 100,000 as 4.69. The state scores 0.75 out of 1.0.

F3.2: Tele-density for fixed lines (Number of telephone lines per 1000 persons): The state has 203,400 fixed lines, and dividing this by the state 2006 population figure gave the number of telephone lines per 1000 as 49.63, and the state scores the maximum point of 0.5

F3.3: Incidence of mobile phone ownership: The state has 33.7% and scores 0.2 out of 0.5.

F3.4: Availability of local television stations: There are federal and state television stations operating, giving the state 0.7 out of 1.0.

F3.5: Availability of radio stations: There are federal and state radio stations operating. The state scores 0.7 out of the maximum 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.deltastate.gov.ng and is regularly updated. The state scores the maximum of 1.0.

F4: Transportation

F4.1: Average cost per kilometer of intra-state road transportation in the last quarter: The 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: The state has an airport in Warri, and scores the full points of 2.0.

F5: Social infrastructure

F5.1: Primary school enrolment rate: Primary school net enrolment for 2006 was 71.8% and the state scores 0.75 out of 1.0.

F5.2: Pupil - teacher ratio: Primary enrolment is 379,087 while total number of teachers is 19,242. This gave a pupil-teacher ratio of 20:1. The state scores the maximum of 1.0.

F5.3: Capital budget of education as a ratio of total capital budget in 2005: The 2005 total capital budget was ₦67,975,000,000.00 while the capital budget to education was ₦4,741,000,000.00, representing 7.0% of total capital budget. The state scores 0.5 out of a maximum of 1.5.

F5.4: Capital budget to health as a ratio of total capital budget: The 2005 total capital budget was ₦67,975,000,000.00 while the capital budget to health was ₦6,533,230,000.00, representing 9.6% of total capital budget. The state scores 1.0 out of 1.5.

F5.5: Private sector rating of waste management: Based on rating of waste management, the state scores 0.1 out of 0.5.

F5.6: Frequency of waste disposal services: Evidence shows that collection of waste is carried out every fortnight. The state scores 0.5 out of 1.0.

F5.7: Average monthly waste disposal levy: The average monthly levy paid by business firms for waste disposal ranged from ₦201.00 to ₦500.00. The state scores 0.3 out of 0.5.

2.2 Legal and Regulatory Services

The state scores a total of 41.0% on the benchmark. The details are summarized in tables 5 and 6.

2.2.1 Performance on the Measures

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

Measure	Actual Score	Maximum Score	Percentage Score
Business registration	2.55	4.0	63.75
Tax administration	4.0	10.0	40.0
Contract enforcement and commercial disputes resolution	2.5	6.0	41.67
Land registration and property rights	3.25	10.0	32.50
Total	12.3	30.0	XXXXXXX

2.2.2 Performance on the Indicators

Table 6: Values on indicators of Legal and Regulatory Services

Label	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	0.75	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	0.3	0.5
R1.5	Evidence of publication of activities of the CAC branch (leaflets, fliers, handbills, booklets and/or websites) from where information on how to access CAC services can be obtained and which are freely issued	0.25	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	0.5	0.5
R1.8	Duration for obtaining certificate of registration for business names after filing all papers	0.5	0.5
	Subtotal (R1)	2.55	4.0

	R2: Tax administration		
R2.1	Evidence of database of taxable persons	1.5	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	0.75	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	0.0	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 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 nonpayment of business premises are enforced	0.5	1.0
	Subtotal (R2)	4.0	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	1.0	2.0
R3.3	Evidence of availability/establishment of formal Alternative Dispute Resolution	1.5	2.0
	Subtotal (R3)	2.5	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 in the State Capital	0.0	1.0
R4.4	Time taken for obtaining C of O (between submission of application form and eventual granting of consent)	0.5	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	1.0	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)	3.25	10.0
	Total	12.3	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: The state scores 0.5 out of 1.0

R1.2: Evidence that improperly registered business names are not given recognition: Evidence shows that the Business Premises Registry only admits business names registered by CAC. 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: Evidence shows that the state is yet to have in place a taskforce against display of unregistered business names. The state scores 0 out of 0.5.

R1.4: Existence of an office of the Corporate Affairs Commission: The state has a CAC branch office. The score is 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: Evidence shows that there is a publication of the CAC branch office location as well as services rendered. The state scores 0.25.

R1.6: Evidence that the CAC branch office has a service charter: Evidence shows that the state CAC branch relies on the service charter contained in the website – www.cac.gov.ng. There is none initiated by the branch office and the state scores zero 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 a V-Sat at the CAC branch office for on-line services, giving the state the maximum 0.5

R1.8: Duration for obtaining certificate of registration for business names after filing all papers: Evidence shows that the duration for obtaining certificate of registration for businesses names after filing all papers is one day. The state scores the full 0.5.

R2: Tax administration

R2.1: Evidence of database of taxable persons: Evidence shows that the state has computerized database for taxable persons. The state scores 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: Evidence shows that tax assessment notices are sent to tax payers, which it also places on its notice-board. The state scores 0.75 out of a maximum 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: Evidence shows no 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: Evidence shows that the state is yet to have a tax appeal tribunal/court for handling tax and related matters. The state scores 0 out of 1.5

R2.5: Evidence of one-stop shop for tax payment to state and local governments: Evidence shows that the state has no one-stop shop for tax payment. The state scores 0 out of 1.0.

R2.6: Number of taxes paid by manufacturing firms: Evidence shows that there are 15 taxes paid by manufacturers in the state, and the state scores 0.75 out of a maximum of 1.0.

R2.7: Amount paid as business premises levy in the state capital per annum: Evidence shows that business premises levy paid ranges from ₦5,000.00-10,000.00. The state scores 0.5 out of a maximum 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: Evidence shows that the number of days between receipt of demand notice and enforcement of penalties is below 30 days. The state scores 0 out of 1.0.

R2.9: Penalties for non payment of business premises are enforced: Evidence shows that enforcement of penalties for non-payment of business premises is carried out by consultants appointed by the state government. The state scores 0.5 points of 1.0.

R3: Contract enforcement/commercial disputes resolution

R3.1: Establishment of information systems on caseload and judicial statistics: There was no documented evidence showing existence of caseload factor. The state scores 0 out of maximum 2.0.

R3.2: Average time (in weeks) between filing a business dispute in court and obtaining judgment: Evidence shows that the time spent between filing and obtaining judgment on business dispute ranged from 27 to 52 weeks. The state scores 1.0 out of 2.0.

R3.3: Evidence of availability/establishment of formal Alternative Dispute Resolution: Evidence shows the availability of formal ADR, giving the state 1.5 out of 2.0.

R4: Land registration and property rights

R4.1: Availability and usability of a cadastral Map of the State: Evidence relates to administrative/geographical map, not a cadastral map, giving the state 0 out of 1.0.

R4.2: Evidence that the state has enacted a land tenure law to operationalise the Land Use Act: The state is yet to have a state land tenure law that complements the land use act, giving the state 0 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 average cost of obtaining governor's consent is 6-15%. The state scores 0 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 the average length of time for obtaining C of O is 12-24 months. The state scores 0.5 out of 1.0.

R4.5: Computerization of land transactions: There is no evidence of the computerization of land registry. The state scores 0 out of a maximum 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 is less than one week. The state scores the maximum 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 2-4 weeks. The state scores 0.75 out of 1.0.

R4.8: Evidence of active support for and promotion of equipment leasing: There was 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 1.0.

R4.9: Evidence of a law that requires mandatory subscription to insurance and mortgage contributors: There was 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 law for protection of private property rights. The state scores 0 out of 1.0.

2.3 Business Support and Investment Promotion

The state scored 47.75% on the benchmark. The details are summarized in tables 7 and 8.

2.3.1 Performance on the Measures

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

Measure	Actual Score	Maximum Score	Percentage Score
Entrepreneurship promotion	1.5	3.0	50.0
Access to finance and credit	3.35	8.0	41.88
Investment promotion services	3.0	5.0	60.0
Support for industrial clusters/layouts/ parks	1.2	2.0	60.0
Public private partnership	0.5	2.0	25.0
Total	9.55	20.0	XXXXXXX

2.3.2 Performance on the Indicators

Table 8: Values on Indicators of Business Support and Investment Promotion

Indicator label	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)	1.5	3.0
	Subtotal (B1)	1.5	3.0
	B2: Access to finance and credit		
B2.1	Number of companies that has 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	NACRDB loans as % of agricultural capital budgets in 2005	0.75	1.5
B2.4	Volume of ACGSF loans disbursed to agro-businesses as a percentage of agriculture capital budget in 2005	0.0	1.5
B2.5	Repayment of ACGSF loans	1.0	2.0
	Subtotal (B2)	3.35	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)	1.0	1.0
B3.4	Existence of published and up-to-date directory of business firms	1.0	1.0
	Subtotal (B3)	3.0	5.0
	B4: Support for industrial clusters/layouts/parks		
B4.1	Existence of an industrial cluster /layout/park	1.0	1.0
B4.2	Government infrastructure programmes to support the cluster/layout/park	0.2	1.0
	Subtotal (B4)	1.2	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	9.55	20.0

B1: Entrepreneurship promotion

B1.1: Existence of specific policies and/or institutions to promote entrepreneurship (business start-up and business growth): Evidence shows budgetary provisions for entrepreneurship programmes and agencies/centres, as well as training for unemployed youths. The state scores 1.5 out of 3.

B2: Access to finance and credit

B2.1: Number of companies that benefited from SMEEIS in 2005 relative to national average: Evidence shows that 69.8% of companies had access to SMEEIS facilities relative to national average. The state scores 0.8 out of 1.5.

B2.2: Relative number of bank branches as at May 2006: Evidence shows that the number of banks branches in the state as a percentage of national average was 124. The state scores 0.8 out of 1.5.

B2.3: NACRDB loans as % of capital budget to agriculture in 2005: Evidence shows that the NACRDB loan as a percentage of capital budget to agriculture was 38.5, giving the state 0.75 out of 1.5.

B2.4: Volume of ACGSF loans disbursed to agro-businesses as a % of capital budget to agriculture in 2005: Evidence shows that ACGSF loan as a percent of capital budget to agriculture in 2005 was 5.23. The state scores 0 out of 1.5.

B2.5: Repayment of ACGSF loans: Evidence shows that total ACGSF loan repayment rate for the period 2002-2005 was 48.35%. The state scores 1.0 out of 2.0.

B3: Investment promotion services

B3.1: Existence of special programmes/incentives that promote technology innovations: The state scores 1.0 out of 2.0.

B3.2: Evidence of special incentives to promote linkages between large firms and small and medium enterprises: 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 a publication on investment potentials and opportunities (Industrial Guide) published in 2006. This is also contained in the state's website. The score is 1.0.

B3.4: Existence of published and up to date directory of business firm: The state has a directory of business establishments. The score is 1.0.

B4: Support for industrial clusters/layouts/parks

B4.1: Existence of industrial cluster/layout/park: There are industrial clusters/layouts/parks at Asaba, Ugheli and Warri. The state scores the maximum 1.0.

B4.2: Government infrastructure programmes to support the cluster/layout/park: Evidence showed infrastructural provision in the industrial clusters/layouts/parks. The state scores 0 out of 1.0.

B5: Public-Private partnership

B5.1: Public-Private partnership in security, infrastructure and utilities, credit provision, training and mentoring: The state scores 0.5 out of 2.0.

2.4 Security

The state scores a total of 55% on the benchmark and summarized in tables 9 and 10.

2.4.1 Performance on the Measures

Table 9: Scores on the Measures under Security

Measure	Actual Score	Maximum Score	Percentage Score
Major crimes (crime with violence)	6.0	12.0	50.0
Minor crimes (crimes without violence)	1.5	3.0	50.0
Police resources and availability	2.0	2.0	100
Perception of security services	1.5	3.0	50.0
Total	11.0	20.0	XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

2.4.2 Performance on the Indicators

Table 10: Values on Security Indicators

Indicator Label	Benchmark Indicator	Actual ¹ Score	Maximum Score
	S1: Major crimes (crime with violence)		
S1.1	Number of reported armed robbery cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons	1.0	2.0
S1.2	Number of reported murder cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons	1.0	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	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
	Subtotal (S1)	6.0	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	1.5	3.0
	Subtotal (S2)	1.5	3.0
	S3: Perception of security services		
S3.1	Police-population ratio 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	11.0	20.0

¹ Major and minor crimes are indexed on a negative scale, the higher the percent the smaller the incidence of major or minor crimes.

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 177 and the population is 4,098,391. The number of reported cases per 100,000 persons is 4.31. The state scores 1.0 out of 2.0

S1.2: Number of reported murder cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons: The number of reported murder cases is 117 and the population is 4,098,391. The number of reported cases per 100,000 persons is 2.85. The state scores 1.0 out of 2.0.

S1.3: Number of reported rape cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons: The number of reported rape cases is 77 and the population is 4,098,391. The number of reported cases per 100,000 persons is 1.88. The state scores maximum 2.0.

S1.4: Number of reported assault cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons: The number of reported assault cases is 888, and the population is 4,098,391. The number of reported cases per 100,000 persons is 21.67. The score is 0 out of 2.0.

S1.5: Number of reported burglary and theft cases (including motor vehicle snatching) in 2005 per 100,000 persons: Number of burglary/theft cases and motor vehicle theft/snatching in 2005 was 979 and the population is 4,098,391. The number of reported cases per 100,000 persons is 23.89. The score is 0 out of 2.0.

S1.6: Number of reported arson/vandalism cases in 2005 per 100,000 persons: The number of reported vandal/arson cases is 11 and the population is 4,098,391. The number of reported cases per 100,000 persons is 0.27. The state scores the maximum 2.0.

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): The number of reported fraud cases is 327, and the population is 4,098,391. The number of reported cases per 100,000 persons is 8.0 and the state scores 1.5 out of 3.0.

S3: Police coverage

S3.1: Police-population ratio in 2005 per 1,000 persons: The number of combatant policemen in 2005 is 7,295 and the state's population is 4,098,391. The number of combatants per 1000 persons is 1.78. The state scores the maximum 2.0.

S4: Perception of security services

S4.1: Assessment of the conduciveness of security to business in 2005: Based on the assessment of security by business and company executives, the state scores 0.75 out of 1.5.

S4.2: Rating of police performance in 2005: Based on assessment of police performance by business and company executives, the state scores 0.75 out of 1.5.