

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|-----------|-------------------|----------------|--|
| | (vi) Completion of 30 ongoing electrification projects | 6. Number of project supervision and monitoring vehicles procured. | | | 4. Award of contract for the engagement of consultant for the development of electricity infrastructure master plan in progress | | <u>Completion of ongoing projects</u> 10 (2012), 10 (2013), 10 (2014) | | | 600,000,000.00 | |
| | (vii) Construction of 45km of street lights in local government headquarters. | 7. Unit of Design, Testing and Drawing equipment purchased. | | | | | <u>Installation of Streetlight</u> 15 (2012), 15 (2013), 15 (2014) | | | 3,000,000.00 | |
| | (viii) Purchase and Install 50 electricity meters in government buildings. | 8. Length of street light constructed in local government headquarters. | | | 2011 | | <u>Construction of IPP.</u> 25MW (2013) 25 MW (2014) | 2012-2014 | Electricity Board | 500,000,000.00 | |
| | (ix) Generate 50MW of electricity through public private partnership for independent power production and maintain existing power generators serving government buildings. | 9. Capacity of Independent Power Plant constructed through PPP and Number of Power Generators Maintained. | | | | | <u>Purchase of Vehicles</u> 2 (2012) 4 (2013), 4 (2014) | | | 50,000,000.00 | |
| | (x) Purchase of project supervision and monitoring vehicles. | 10. Number of pre-paid electricity meters installed. | | | | | <u>Purchase & installation of Meters</u> 60 (2012), 45 (2013), 45 (2014) | | | 45,000,000.00 | |
| | (xi) Purchase of Testing Equipment and Capacity Training. | 11. Length of electricity distribution network upgraded. | | | | | | | | | |
| | (xii) Upgrade electricity distribution network across the | 12. EKSG assess in PHCN network valuation report | | | 6. 8 Rural Electrification | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | State. | submitted. | | | <p>ication projects at different stages of completion</p> <p>7. 8.5 km of street light construction in progress in the state capital</p> | | | | | | |
| | (xiii) Construction of Office Building and temporary/mobile offices | 13. Size and Dimensions of Office Buildings/Mobile Offices constructed. | | | | | | | | | |

SPOA FOR INFORMATION COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY (ICT) SUB-SECTOR

| ACTIVITIES | REQUIRED ACTIONS | INPUT INDICATORS | OUTCOME INDICATORS | MEANS OF VERIFICATION | ONGOING INITIATIVE | TIME - FRAME | | IMPLEMENTATION PERIOD | IMPLEMENTATION AGENCY | COST |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|--------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------|
| | | | | | | BASE LINE | PLAN | | | |
| <p>1. To establish ICT Facilities with proper linkage to MDAs and Public by 2014.</p> | <p>Application Software</p> <p>1. Procurement of Servers, Mkrotik Radio (Indoor and Outdoor)</p> <p>2. Provision Mast and Network Cables Purchase of 1,000 Laptops.</p> <p>3. Installation of licensed application packages and antivirus.</p> <p>4. Purchase of 250 Blackberry device.</p> <p>5. Procurement of banded 500 printers for MDAs</p> <p>6. Procurement</p> | <p>1. Improved Productivity & Services delivery in MDAs</p> <p>2. Implement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . E-document system . To put in place ICT Policy & Regulations by 2013 . Education Management Information System (EMIS) . Safe City Programme . Network Infrastructure Support . Digital Ekiti/Broadband Programme </p> | <p>All MDAs connected to the internet.</p> <p>ICT Training for 300 officials carried out.</p> <p>ICT Infrastructures harmonize. To link the DATA Centre to erected Mast.</p> <p>1,000 Laptops purchased and installed License procured and installed.</p> <p>50C printers procured and procurement of 100 ipad for top government officials.</p> <p>25 Megabyte Bandwidth subscription for Internet access.</p> <p>. Provision of Fibre Optics for LAN/WAN Infrastructure</p> | <p>Increase accesses to internet Infrastructure and increase Paperless communication on within MDAs Reduction in the usage of Clone and unauthorized system in government establishment Durability of Computer facilities secured.</p> <p>To facilitate training programme purchase easy access to state License procured</p> | <p>Number of staff with ICT facilities.</p> <p>No of laptops purchased Effective & efficient service delivery.</p> <p>Investors are attracted to the state. Enhanced employment.</p> <p>IGR Processes Automated.</p> <p>Robust database for Ekiti Citizens. Established opportunities.</p> | 2011 | 2012 2013 2014 | 2011-2014 | DICT, BIPU | 38M |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Software and Infrastructure Support . Digital Ekiti/Broadband Programme . Software and Application Systems. . E-Revenue and Tax card Backend Infrastructure . Identity Infrastructure, e-payment & Backend System (IllePBS) . Disaster Recovery & Govt. Business Continuity Programme (DRGBCP). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Payment of Hosting for Ekiti Website . Construction of ICT Training Hall with 200 student capacity . Establishment of ICT Academy at Ekiti State University. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> and Installed, 50C printers procured and distributed. 1000 ipad procured and distributed ICT Academy established | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To facilitate training programme purchase easy access to state information ICT Policy and Regulation put in place. Training of both Govt. officials and private officials. | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

4.10 SPOA FOR CITIZEN PARTICIPATION, SOCIAL INCLUSION AND PROTECTION

Some of the challenges identified in this sector include:

- Generally, in all the MDAs concerned with citizen participation, social inclusion, protection and issues around legislative and executive relationships, the working condition of the staff was pathetic.
- The major problem militating against increased performances and productivity of staff is with respect to inadequate professional staff to effectively manage some professional desks in the MDAs.
- There is also a dire need of office equipment and working tools such as, generating set, computers, photocopiers, furniture, vehicles, office accommodation and funding for the activities of the MDAs is grossly inadequate.
- There is low impact of the laws on violence against women and the child rights at the grassroots levels.
- All the MDAs most especially the MoWA and Job Creation Agency have no Zonal/LGA offices at the grassroots this made it impossible for some of the initiatives to have the desired impact at the grassroots level.

The following recommendations were also made:

- In line with the above, there is need for adequate budgetary provisions for the MDAs to establish Zonal/LGA offices, provide necessary working equipment such as computer sets, photocopiers and vehicles.
- Importantly, recruitment of qualified professional staff, provision of good working conditions and office accommodation coupled with necessary tools to work with will not only boost staff morale but will increase productivity.
- Further, the MoWA and Job Creation Agency should at least create Zonal offices so as to allow implementation to be spread to the LGAs.

In case of MoWA, the zonal family courts could also double as the zonal offices. There is also the need to continue with all the current programmes as well as introducing new strategies to publicise and implement the laws on violence against women and child's rights.

Based on the above challenges and recommendations, the State Programme of Action focuses on resource allocation, capacity building and policy issues as presented in the log frame below:

| ACTIVITIES | REQUIRED ACTIONS | INPUT INDICATORS | OUTCOME INDICATORS | MEANS OF VERIFICATION | ON GOING INITIATIVES | TIMEFRAME | | IMPLEMENTATION PERIOD | IMPLEMENTATION AGENCY | COST | COMMENTS |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|-----------|------|-----------------------|------------------------|------|--------------------------------|
| | | | | | | BASE-LINE | PLAN | | | | |
| Conduct Baseline Survey on situation of women, children, people with disability and other vulnerable groups in all the 16 LGAs | Sensitisation, Meetings, advocacy, prepare instruments and conduct survey | Number of meetings held, number of advocacy materials, survey instruments, personnel | Availability of baseline data Availability of information for planning and implementation of activities | Reports of the survey Analysed data Documentary evidence of the survey | | | 2013 | 2013 | MoWA | N20M | Baseline for future assessment |
| | Publicise the report | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Establish a data bank for the data and report | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Engage consultants | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conduct Needs assessment of all unemployed women, youths, people with disability and other vulnerable groups in the State | Sensitisation, Meetings, advocacy and conduct survey | Logistics for meetings, advocacy materials, survey instruments, personnel | Availability of baseline data on needs assessment Availability of information for planning and implementation | Reports of the survey and data analysed Documentary evidence of the survey | | | 2013 | 2013 | MoWA MoL&P JC&EA | N15M | Basis for meeting their needs |
| | Publicise the report | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Establish a data bank for the data and report | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Engage Consultants | | | | | | | | | | |
| Enact and domesticate laws on equal opportunity for employment of the disabled and | Advocacy and sensitization programme for stakeholders and policy makers | Human, materials resources | Improved representation of Women in key positions Increase | Availability of the Laws Documentary evidence of establishing of | Capacity assessment of civil servants including | | 2014 | 2013-2014 | MoWA HoASC | N10M | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|------|-----------|------|-------|--|
| adherence to 30% appointment of women in key positions | Production and distribution of abridged version of the Laws | | access to employment by women, the disabled and other groups | the law Report showing compliance against baseline | females Provision of equipments and working tools for some disabled | | | | | | |
| | Sponsorship of radio and T.V programmes to publicise the laws | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Purchase and Distribution of equipment and provision of grants to beneficiaries | | | | | | | | | | |
| Strengthen the women centres | Publicise the centres | Human and material resources and cash grants, Equipment | Increase in the No of women centres, enrolment and employed women | Number of equipment | | | 2013 | 2013-2014 | MoWA | N100M | |
| | Resuscitate the women centres | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Provision of additional equipment at the centre | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Recruitment of capable and qualified facilitators | | | | | | | | | | |
| Establish family courts in all the 16 LGAs | Establish additional 10 family courts in LGAS | Financial resources Facilitators, workshop materials, Equipment for office, Human resources | Improved information and access to the court Attitudinal change observed | Number of family courts established Report of training | 6 Zonal courts already established | | 2014 | 2013-2015 | MoWA | N100M | |
| | Sensitise the public on the mandate of the court | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Develop the capacity of Judges and Magistrates on provision of CRL and Child Justice Administration | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Establish Zonal offices | | | | | | | | | | |
| Produce , distribute and disseminate the laws on Women and child 's rights | Prepare and produce simplified versions | Funds, sensitisation materials, meetings | Increased awareness created Increased | Reports, minutes Records showing | Abridged copies of the law available | | 2013 | 2013-2015 | MoWA | | |
| | Distribute to all the 16 | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|------|--------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | LGAs | | access to facilities Copies of laws adequately disseminated | increase in cases treated against baseline | Partnering with PACTS and MSH on vulnerable children Children parliament in existence | | | | | N10M | |
| | Carry out sensitisation | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Monitor awareness and compliance with the laws | | | | | | | | | | |
| Increase in Budgetary allocation | Advocacy visits to Budget office, law makers, policy makers etc | Meetings, Advocacy materials, visits to budget office, policy and opinion leaders | Increased budgetary provisions and releases for MDAs | Actual Releases against previous years | Assessment of budget performance of MDAs Monitoring of MDAs work plans by OTSD | | 2013 | 2013-onwards | MoWA MoL&P JC&EA | N200,000 | |
| Increase access to credit facility for women, physically challenged and other vulnerable groups | Create awareness programme for assessment of micro credit facility for rural women physically challenged Provide counterpart fund to be assessed as revolving loans | Human and materials resources Grants | Reduction in poverty rate Increased No with access to credit facility | Report of activities against baseline | Empowering of 1,600 women in all the LGAs | | 2013 | 2013 onwards | MoWA | N2M | Continuous process |
| Implementation of various laws on women and child's rights at the 16 LGA levels | Develop simplified copies Produce and distribute copies Embark on awareness creation to publicise the | Visits, advocacy meetings. radio and V jingles | Increased awareness, Increase in right attitudes Reduction of cases against | Assessment of performance or compliance Monitoring report of | | | 2013 | 2013-onwards | MoWA | See foot of page 2 | Continuous process |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|------|---------------|--------------------------|------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| | laws Monitor compliance and usage | | women and children | distribution, sensitisation and access to facilities | | | | | | | |
| Harmonisation and clarification of roles | Visits to relevant MDAs Meetings to clarify roles and responsibilities | Meetings and visits Human resources | Improved understanding and sensitisation on roles of individuals / MDAs | Report of visits Meetings | 2013 | 2013-2014 | MoWA MoL&P JC&EA | | | | |
| | Develop capacity development plan | | Increased capacity personnel | Availability of capacity development plan | 2013 | | MoWA & ESTAB 5m | | | | |
| Provision of befitting accommodation, furniture and office equipment | Train staff in areas identified including the use of ICT | | Improved performances | Report of staff performance of roles | | | | | | | |
| | Increase the number of rooms/ office space | Financial resources Contractors | | No of additional office space against previous no | 2013 | 2013-2014 | MoWA & GAD | | | | |
| Continuation of Youth Empowerment Scheme | Purchase and distribute relevant office equipment, furniture etc | | | No and availability of furniture and equipment | | | | | | | |
| | Establish centres to connect youths in LGAs | Human, Financial resources Consultants | Reduction in youth unemployment rate | Records showing increase in No against baseline | 2013 | 2013- onwards | JC&EA | | | | Continu ous process |
| | Regular audit of youths employment with skills/ MDAs | | Increased access to employment | Performance report of the state | | | | | | | |
| | Monitor utilisation of funds given to youths Establish and implement strategies to avoid duplication, leakages and waste | | Reduction in crime rate and poverty rate | | | | | | | | |
| Continuation of Social | Increase No of | Human and | Improved well | Performance | 2013 | 2013-2014 | MoL&P | 2.4Billion | | | Continu |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|---------------------|--|----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------------|
| security scheme for the aged | beneficiaries and target aged with disability | financial resources | being of adults Improved confidence in government | report of activities | | | | | | | ous process |
|------------------------------|---|---------------------|--|----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------------|

ANNEXES

ANNEXES 1: Ekiti State Ministries, Commissions, Departments and Agencies by Number of staff

| S/n | MINISTRIES | No of Staff |
|-----|--|-------------|
| . | Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development | 604 |
| 2. | Ministry of Commerce, Industries and Cooperatives | 289 |
| 3. | Ministry of Education, Science and Technology | 884 |
| 4. | Ministry of Housing and Environment | 71 |
| 5. | Ministry of Finance, Budget and Economic Development | 388 |
| 6. | Ministry of Health | 352 |
| 7. | Ministry of Information and Civic Orientation | 191 |
| 8. | Ministry of Justice | 98 |
| 9. | Ministry of Physical, Urban and Regional Planning | 178 |
| 10. | Ministry of culture, Arts and Tourism | 76 |
| 11. | Ministry of Integration and Intergovernmental Affairs | 23 |
| 12. | Ministry of Youths and Sports | 63 |
| 13. | Ministry of Women Affairs, Gender Emp. and Social Dev. | 134 |
| 14. | Ministry of Works and Transportation | 557 |
| 15. | Ministry of Local Government and Chieftaincy Affairs | 93 |
| 16. | Ministry of Employment, Labour and Human Capital Dev. | 16 |
| 17. | Ministry of Special Duties | 14 |
| 18. | Ministry of Budget and Economic Planning | 69 |
| | TOTAL | 4100 |
| | STATUTORY COMMISSIONS | |
| 1. | Civil Service Commission | 76 |
| 2. | Local Government Service Commission | N.A |
| 3. | Hospital Management Board | 130 |
| 4. | Teaching Service Commission | 44 |
| 5. | State Independent Electoral Commission | 150 |
| 6. | Judicial Service Commission | N.A |
| 7. | House of Assembly Service Commission | 51 |
| 8. | Ekiti State Pension Commission | 52 |
| | Ekiti State Pension Board | 28 |
| 9. | Auditor General of State | 117 |

| | | |
|-----|--|------------|
| 10. | Auditor-General of Local Governments | N.A |
| | TOTAL | 648 |
| | DEPARTMENTS/BUREAU | |
| 1. | Bureau of Information Communication and Technology | 18 |
| 2. | Bureau of Land Services | N.A |
| 3. | Bureau of Statistics | 38 |
| 4. | Bureau of Infrastructure | 24 |
| 5. | Bureau of Tourism | 48 |
| 6. | Bureau of Public Procurement | 39 |
| 7. | Bureau of Transformation and Strategy | N.A |
| | TOTAL | 167 |
| | AGENCIES | |
| 1. | ADP/FADAMA | 332 |
| 2. | Micro Credit Agency | 74 |
| 3. | Ekiti Enterprise Development Agency | 20 |
| 4. | Adult and Non-Formal Education | 52 |
| 5. | Teachers Service Commission | N. A. |
| 6. | SUBERB | 848 |
| 7. | Scholarship Board | 19 |
| 8. | Schools Enterprise | 26 |
| 9. | Board of Technical and Vocational Education | 395 |
| 10. | Education Trust Funds | 16 |
| 11. | Library Board | 29 |
| 12. | State Environmental Protection Agency | 23 |
| 13. | Waste Management Board | 44 |
| 14. | Housing Corporation | N. A |
| 16. | Signage and Advertisement Agency | 18 |
| 17. | Hospital Management Board | N. A |
| 18. | Central Medical Store/ Unified Drug Revolving Fund | 42 |
| 19. | Primary Health Care Dev. Agency | 32 |
| 20. | College of Health Science and Technology | N.A |
| 21. | University Teaching Hospital | N.A |
| 22. | Gov't. Printing Press | N.A |
| 23. | Broadcasting Service of Ekiti State | N.A |
| 24. | Law Review Commission | N.A |
| 25. | Office of the Surveyor General | 43 |
| 26. | Urban Renewal agency | 19 |
| 27. | Sports Council | N.A |
| 28. | Women Development Centre, Igede | N.A |
| 29. | Children Home | N.A |
| 30. | Rehabilitation Centre | N.A |

| | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| 31. | EKCSDA | N.A |
| 32. | Job Creation Agency | 14 |
| 33. | FAMA | 62 |
| 34. | Peasant Farmers settlement | N.A |
| | TOTAL | 2,108 |
| | GOVERNOR'S OFFICE | |
| 1. | Cabinet and special services | 46 |
| 2. | Office of Establishment and Training | N.A |
| 3. | State Action Committee on AIDS | 15 |
| 4. | Staff Loan Scheme | 31 |
| 5. | Political and Economic Department | 22 |
| 1. | DEPUTY GOVERNOR'S OFFICE | 105 |
| 2. | State Emergency Management Agency | 92 |
| | TOTAL | 311 |

* N.A, at the time of writing this report, the data are not available

SPRM REPORT OF SURVEY - ANNEX 2

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Ekiti State is one of the six States created in October 1, 1996 with Ado Ekiti as the State capital. The State lies between Longitudes $4^{\circ}45^1$ and $5^{\circ}45^1$ East of the Greenwich meridian and Latitudes $7^{\circ}15^1$ and $8^{\circ}05^1$ North of the Equator. This implies that the State is within the Tropics. It is bounded in the North West by Kwara, in the North East by Kogi, in the South by Ondo and in the West by Osun States.

The State enjoys tropical climate with two distinct seasons, the raining season (April to October) and dry season (November to March) with annual slight variations of between 1400cm and 1500cm per annum and with relatively high humidity. It has tropical forest in the South and Guinea Savannah in the North. The land area is 5,805.843sqkm with the population figure of 2,398,957 by 2006 population census and an annual growth rate of 3.1%.

Ekiti people are culturally homogenous and they speak a dialect of Yoruba language known as Ekiti. As one of the current thirty six States of the Federation, it is a statutory member of the Nigeria Governors' Forum (NGF), a coalition of the elected Governors in the country whose strategic objectives are to:

- Provide a forum for Governors' to discuss issues of mutual interest/national and state concern, share experiences, techniques and good practice and where appropriate reach a

consensus; and to present NGF and governors stand-point and views in discussion with Federal and other institutions/organizations both national and international;

- Act as a link between state governors and governmental and non governmental institutions on matters affecting governance and service delivery;
- Provide a vehicle for States to work together in areas of joint or mutual interest and support the development and implementation of coordinated solutions;
- Play a significant and influential role in dispute resolution at national, state and local government levels;
- Develop and implement a system of peer review at State level in order to encourage efficient and effective delivery, improved governance and enhanced development performance; and
- Develop an efficient and effective NGF Secretariat that is able to manage the day-to-day affairs of the NGF and provide specific technical support in a range of areas to States.

The purpose and overarching objective of developing and implementing a system of peer review at the State level is to assist Federating States in Nigeria to accelerate the pace of their development through periodic reviews of progress in the implementation of their development policies, plans and programmes.

Through participation in the peer review process of the NGF, State governors are expected to learn from their counterparts about innovative and good practice they could adopt and adopt in their respective States.

Towards this end, Ekiti State government decided to carry out its State Peer Review Mechanism (SPRM) process which was kick started in November, 2011 with a 2-day sensitization workshop in Ado Ekiti.

Towards the production of a comprehensive report about the State, the lead consultant for the State Peer Review Mechanism process considered it necessary to carry out a survey aimed at generating information from the public on government service delivery through the progressive improvement of policies, planning, budgeting and public service reform, hence the decision to conduct this survey titled "survey on Assessment of socio-economic Development in Ekiti State". The survey is aimed at generating complementary information in addition to the submissions and reports from relevant Ministries/Department/Agencies (MDAs)

1.2 ***Objectives of the Survey***

The major objectives of the survey are to:

- Ascertain the level of adequacy of socio-economic development and facilities provide in the state.
- Assess the process of policy formulation, programme implementation and project execution by the state government.
- Ascertain the degree of citizens' participation inclusiveness and right protection in the implementation of government programme.
- Ascertain the level of transparency in human resources management by the state government.

- Assess level of compliance of the people with environmental issues
- Provide basic Statistical data and information as a uniform template on the basis of which healthy competition among states and interstate comparisons can be made.

1.3 ***Scope and Coverage***

The survey designed to cover five (5) thematic areas incorporated in the peer review process. They are:

- Policy and Strategy
- Public Finance Management
- Service Delivery
- Citizen Engagement and Participation
- Monitoring and Evaluation

These are integrated into the core service delivery sectors of Health, Education, Agriculture, Economic, Environment as well as infrastructure including ICT.

The survey covered about thirty five (35) Stakeholders, such as: Farmers congress, Artisans, Iyalajes/Iyalojas and Conference of Nigeria Political Parties (CNPP). See Annex III.

1.4 ***Survey Sponsorship***

The State Peer Review Mechanism was conducted by the Ekiti State Government through the Ministry of Integration and Inter-governmental Affairs, which engaged the services Professor Okey Onyejekwe of LARENWAND Limited, to produce the State Self Assessment Report and the State Programme of Action.

The consultant collaborated with the State Bureau of Statistics to conduct the survey which report is hereby packaged.

1.5 ***Organization of the Survey Report.***

The survey report layout consists of five different chapters. Chapter one covered to the subject matter while the second chapter treated the survey methodology. Data presentation, covering all the thematic areas and core sectors of socio-economic development was dealt with in chapter three while chapter four covered summary, conclusion and recommendations. The last chapter which is chapter five covered annexes of the survey instrument and other documents such as statistical tables, the questionnaire and list of stakeholders covered by the survey.

CHAPTER TWO

2.0 METHODOLOGY

2.1 *Survey Design*

The exercise was a State wide survey, though, with due consideration to time and cost constraints, nine Local Governments were selected out of which twenty seven (27) political wards were further selected to represent the whole state for the statistical investigation. In other words, the survey exercise covered all the three senatorial

districts in the State with a total of twenty seven (27) out of 177 political wards canvassed across the whole state

2.2 *Sample Design*

A multi- stage stratified sampling was used for selection of a representative sample for the survey. Specifically, a two-stage sample design was used. The first stage was the selection of three (3) local governments from each of the three senatorial districts while the second stage witnessed selection of three political wards from each of the selected local government areas. The sampling units in the two stages were done through simple random selection without replacement.

Based on the selected procedure, the following tables of selected local governments and wards were produced.

Table showing selected local governments and political wards canvassed

| S/N | SENETORAL DISTRICT | LOCAL GOVT. | WARD |
|-----|--------------------|------------------|---|
| 1 | EKITI CENTRAL | Ado Ekiti | Ado B (inisa,) Ado J (Okesa) and Ado L (Igbehin) |
| | | Ijero | Ijero ward B,Ipoti ward B and Iloro / ijurin ward B |
| | | Efon | Efon II, Efon V & Efon VIII |
| 2 | EKITI NORTH | Oye | Isan/Ilafon Ilemeso, Oye II and Ire I |
| | | Moba | Otun I Igogo II and Ikun I |
| | | Ido/Osi | Ifaki I, Ayetoro II and Ido I |
| 3 | EKITI SOUTH | Ekiti South West | Ilawe II Ogotun I and Igbara Odo II |
| | | Ekiti East | Omuo Oke I, Kota II and Ilasa I |
| | | Ikere | Atiba/Aafin, Oke Osun & Afao/Kajola |

2.3 *Survey Instrument*

A well structured questionnaire covering all the variables of interest (ref to the scope and coverage of the investigation) was designed and used for collection of information from respondents. The questions are drawn in accordance with the thematic areas of assessment. The questionnaire consists of sixty items categorized into eleven (11) sections. The sections include General Information, Policy and Strategy, Economic Development, Public Finance Management and Human Resources Management. Others are Education, Health, Environment, Agriculture, Infrastructure and Citizens Participation & Social Inclusion.

Also, training manual was designed to explain the survey procedure as well as the items of the questionnaire.

2.4 ***Training***

A one-day training workshop, presided over by the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Integration and Inter-governmental Affairs was organized to discuss the modalities, logistics and organization of the survey fieldwork. The workshop witnessed presentation of questionnaire as well as the manual of instruction for the fieldwork.

2.5 ***Pretest***

The pretest was designed to test the adequacy of the survey instruments (questionnaire and manual), administration of questionnaire and logistics arrangements in preparation for the actual fieldwork.

It was carried out in Odo Community, Ado Local Government where residents had earlier been contacted and sensitized about the exercise. The pretest exercise witnessed administration of questionnaire to twelve (12) different Stakeholders.

Challenges encountered during the exercise include:

- Mis-interpretation of some question in the process of translation
- Non observance of skip instrument in some cases
- Time consumption in the process of explanation of questions and
- Complaints by most of the respondents that similar exercises had always been carried out without any positive impact on the life of the people.

The pretest was followed by revision exercise where all the challenges as well as other logistics for the fieldwork were discussed and resolved before the commencement of the actual survey.

2.6 ***Organisation of the Fieldwork***

The one-day fieldwork was carried out simultaneously in all the twenty seven (27) wards canvassed for the survey. The survey team for each of the 27 wards was made up of two enumerators and one team leader while a supervisor was assigned to each of the nine local governments. Furthermore, there were three senatorial coordinators, each coordinating a senatorial district all of whom were coordinated by a general coordinator at the centre. Each team of enumerators was assigned to administer questionnaire to the respondent stakeholders at designated centers already arranged in collaboration with the local government Community Development Officers. Towards this end, advocacy and sensitization visits had been carried out in the affected local governments.

2.7 ***Data Capture and Processing***

Preliminary scrutiny and editing of completed questionnaire were carried out by team leaders, supervisors and coordinators. The final scrutiny by a team of scrutiny officers was also done at the survey secretariat.

Data entry was carried out by data processing officers at the secretariat and processed electronically to generate about fifty analysis tables for the report writing.

CHAPTER THREE

3.0 DATA PRESENTATION

3.1 *Policy and Strategy*

From the analysis, 46% of the respondents claimed to be involved in the formulation and adoption of government developmental plans concerning their communities while the remaining 54% declared that they were not usually involved. By implication therefore, majority of the stakeholders are not usually involved in the formulation and adoption of government developmental plans.

As regards the mechanisms put in place by the government for stakeholders to make their input into government developmental plans, 38% of those usually involved asserted that the mechanisms were good, 28% said they were very good, 24% of the respondents said the mechanisms were averagely okay. However, 10% of the stakeholders involved in formulation and adoption processes said that the mechanisms for their involvement in developmental plans were poor

On developmental priorities of the people, twelve options were to be ranked in descending order from 1 to 12. The priorities include employment, electricity, education, access to clean water and health care facilities. Others are road project, food security, good governance, social inclusiveness and clean environment.

- (a) Access to Clean Water: Out of the total number of respondents, 11% claimed that access to clean water was most important to them while 6% each ranked it as second and third respectively on their priority list. 11%, 16%, 12% and 7% selected clean water as their 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th on priority list while 8% did not have it on their priority list at all.
- (b) Clean Environment: This is of highest priority to 19% of the total number of respondents. Also, 19% considered clean and sustainable environment as the least on their priority list while 8% did not give it any priority.
- (c) Education was of highest priority to 16% of the stakeholders, average priority to 6% and of no priority to 10% of the total number of respondents.
- (d) Electricity: 6% of the respondents considered provision of stable electricity supply to be above all other options. 6% also took it as of average priority to them while only 1% did not consider electricity as having any position in their first twelve priorities.
- (e) Employment: 6% and 44% considered employment generation as their 1st and 2nd priorities respectively. 3% acknowledged it as their average priority while 9% considered it as of no priority to them.
- (f) Food Security: Out of the total number of respondents, 14% preferred mostly food security to any other developmental project. Out of the twelve rankings, 10% and 14% considered it as 6th and 7th highest priority to them while 2% had it as their least priority. However, 9% of the people did not have it on their list at all.
- (g) Good Governance: 14% of the respondents declared that good governance was their topmost priority compared to other developmental priorities while as insignificant as 3% believed that

good governance was of least priority. However, 6% did not regard good governance as a priority at all.

- (h) Health Care: The survey result shows that 8% of the population prioritized provision of health care service as their topmost priority. 7% and 16% said provision of health care service was not their 2nd and 3rd priorities respectively while 7% believed that provision of health care service was of no importance at all as far as their priority list was concerned.
- (i) Road: 8% of the respondents did not make provision of good roads their priority while 10% prioritized it as topmost on their list of projects. The highest number of respondents (17%) had it as their average priority.
- (j) Security: 15% of the stakeholders believed that providing a secured environment was the most important project that the government should concentrate on while 8% believed that ensuring the security of lives and property is of least importance.
- (k) Social Inclusiveness: 18% of the respondents believed that social inclusiveness as government developmental programme should be topmost on priority list while 17% of the population said social inclusiveness is of no priority to them. However, 13% had it as their least priority.
- (h) Others: 27% of the stakeholders believed that provision of other infrastructure other than the listed ones would be their highest priority while about 55% declared that no other infrastructural projects fell within the twelve priority items listed as far as they were concerned.

The survey also covered means by which people make their opinions known about government policy and strategy. It was observed that 31% usually used media approach, 28% were used to peaceful protest, 2% used violent protest, and 25% used suggestion box in making their opinions known. The remaining 14% were used to other means different from the options mentioned above. Such options include influencing those in the corridor of power, reporting to community leaders and phone calls to authorities concerned.

3.2 ***Economic Development***

As regards government assistance to support people on their economic activities, 33% claimed that they receive such assistance on occasional basis, 15% receive it regularly while as high as 49% of the people do not usually receive such assistance at all. However, only 1% did not know whether any assistance existed.

For those who have received such assistance from the government, 20% claimed to have received cash while 14% received supplies (equipments and materials). However, 64% have enjoined both cash and supplies while the remaining 2% received other assistance such as training and orientation courses.

On the level of support received so far by those who have enjoined one assistance or the other from the government, the highest proportion (32%) said the assistance received was not adequate, 28% claimed that the assistance received was averagely okay while 16% agreed to have received adequate support from the government. However, 24% could not assess the level of satisfaction enjoined from such support.

Concerning the level of economic development, the survey analysis shows that 39% of those interviewed said the level economic development was on the average, 14% believed that it was very good, while 19% said the economic development level was good. However, 25% assessed the level as poor while 1% of the respondents were indifferent.

On the assessment of the level of security for economic development, 26% observed that there was no security, the highest percentage (36%) said the level of security in their environment was inadequate, about 34% declared that security was adequate, while 4% claimed to be indifferent. In other words, more than 60% was not satisfied with the security level of business environment

3.3 Public Finance Management.

On whether people usually have input into government fiscal planning, 30% answered in the affirmative while as high as 70% claimed not to be involved in any form. This shows that only few stakeholders do have input into government fiscal planning. For those having involvement in it, 15% was only at collection stage, 10% at the stage of submission of priority list while the remaining 7% was at the stage of target/objective setting. It can therefore be deduced that majority of the people do not participate in government fiscal planning.

The result of whether women are given equal participation with men at Fiscal Planning Forum, the analysis shows that 53% claimed that women did not have equal participation with men while 47% participated. This shows that a little less than half of the women have equal participation with men at fiscal planning forum.

Also, from the result of the analysis, 42% of the vulnerable people were participating at fiscal planning forum while 58% was not. From this, one can conclude that less than half of the vulnerable people do participate at government fiscal planning forum.

On access to government fiscal information by the people, 57% said they did not have access, while 43% said they did not have access to information. This implies that less than half of the population has access to fiscal information.

Out of those who had access to fiscal information, the analysis shows that 74% of the people had it through media, 6% through the internet, 8% through visit to MDAs while the remaining 12% assess fiscal information through other means.

Access to budget document by stakeholders in the State was not encouraging as 48% did not have access to it at any stage. At the preparatory stage, about 2% had access while 3% had access at budget presentation stage and as high as 47% access it at implementation stage. It clear quite insignificant number of people (2%) contribute to budget preparation in the State.

Concerning the stage at which people have knowledge about government's plans to execute project in their communities, 19% of the respondents said they were aware of such projects at the decision stage, while 37% said they were aware at implementation stage and 10% at monitoring stage. However, 7% of the people did have knowledge of project execution at all stages while 27% was not usually carried along at all in any of the project execution stages

mentioned above, which implies that about two third of the people was usually carried along in one or more of the stages of project execution.

Information on payment of tax was known to only 7% of the tax payers at tax decision level, 61% usually got information about how more tax they would pay at the point of collection while 19% of taxable adults neither had any information about tax payment nor paid any tax.

On access to information on distribution and allocation of funds by the State to Local governments, only 12% of the respondents said they had such access while 88% said they lacked access. However, only 15% had access to information on distribution and allocation of funds by the Federal Government to the state while 85% did not have access. Hence, we can logically conclude that less than 15% of the stakeholders use to have information on budget distribution and allocation either from the Federal or State government.

3.4 Human Resources Management

From the analysis, it was revealed that 24% of the people were not sure whether government was transparent or not in its recruitment processes into the public service, 41% of the people assessed the processes of recruitment as far from being transparent, 13% claimed that the process was somewhat transparent and 22% said that government was actually transparent in the process of recruitment into the public service.

On whether merit and qualifications are used in the recruitment process into the public service, 21% agreed that it was always used, 12% said it was used most of the time, 43% claimed that merit and qualification were sometimes used while the remaining 6% did not know if merit and qualifications were applied in recruitment or not. It can be concluded therefore that majority of the people agreed that recruitment into the public service was more often based on merit and qualifications.

As to whether people are aware of existing government institutions for expressing dissatisfaction on government performances, 69% of the respondents denied ever being aware while 31% said they were aware of the existence of such institutions.

3.5 Education Sector

In the overall assessment, 38% of the total number of respondents said that schools in their communities were not adequate while 62% of them claimed that they did not have problem of inadequate schools.

The challenges facing the education sector were ranked from 1 to 6 in descending order by respondents. Concerning accessibility to the education facilities, it was most challengeable to 38% of the people, 15% ranked accessibility as second on priority list, 17% as third, 13%, 5% and 6% as 4th, 5th and 6th respectively while 8% did not have it on their lists.

On the challenge being posed by inadequate infrastructure, 10% did not care about it at all while 14%, 31%, and 21% had it as 1st, 2nd and 3rd respectively on their lists. Others are 13%, 6% and 5% of the respondents having it respectively as 4th, 5th and 6th on their various priority lists.

Also, on challenges being posed by non-availability of ICT facility, 6% each had it as 1st and 2nd priorities, 12%, 15% 36% took it as 3rd, 4th and 5th respectively on their lists, 8% had it as 6th while 17% did not have it on their topmost six priorities.

Availability of qualified teachers was 1st, 2nd and 3rd priorities respectively on the lists of 24%, 26% and 20% of the people interviewed, 10% of them had it respectively as 4th, 6% as 5th and 5% as 6th priorities while 9% of the people did not at all consider to be among their six priorities.

The need for involvement of parents in decision making in the education sector was of most paramount to 8% of the people. However, 9%, 15% and 32% had it as 2nd, 3rd and 4th priorities respectively. It was 5th and 6th on the priority lists of 32% and 5% respectively.

3.6 Health Sector

From the analysis, 50% of the respondents declared that they had adequate health care facilities in their communities while the remaining 50% disagreed with the view. We can infer from here that health care facilities in the State are adequate on an average level.

Though, there are health care facilities, yet 59% of the stakeholders declared that only few of the available ones in their communities had access to safe water and sanitation, 16% of the people said that all the health care facilities in their communities had access to safe water and sanitation while the remaining proportion of 25% claimed that none of the health care facilities in their area enjoined availability of safe water and sanitation.

From the analysis, 71% of respondents said they did not have client/patient feedback mechanism at all levels of health facility while 29% claimed that they had feedback mechanism. On participation in Health Insurance Scheme, we found out that as high as 79% of the stakeholders did not participate in any insurance scheme while only 21% of them did participate. Generally speaking from the analysis, most people do not appreciate the health insurance scheme despite its numerous advantages. This orientation can be changed through more sensitization.

The proportion of people that regularly participated in Health Information, Communication and Advocacy in their communities was 46%, 46% did participate occasionally while 35% did not usually participate in any Health Information, Communication and Advocacy in their communities at all.

On the involvement of people in the Health Management System, 35% claimed to be involved while as high as 65% of the people said they were not involved.

Analysis on those that have enjoyed one free health care programme and/or the other in the last three (3) years shows that 7% each benefited in General Health Care and Free Eye Glass programmes, 28% enjoyed Immunisation programme, 12% benefited in Free Drug while 46% enjoyed some other free health care programmes.

3.7 Environment.

Means of waste disposal, protection of environment and availability of environmental court are examined in this section.

Out of the several alternative means of disposing waste materials, 44% of people used dump site, 22% used refuse bins provided by the government and 12% of the population dumped wastes in the drainage. Those who usually burnt their wastes accounted for 19% while 3% of the people used all the means mentioned above.

From the analysis, 75% of those who used refuse bins claimed that the bins were not regularly evacuated 25% claimed otherwise. This implies that at least three quarter of the refuse bins provided by the government were not regularly evacuated.

In an attempt to know whether dump sites are protected to avoid diseases and infections, 54% of the respondents claimed that dump sites in their environment were not protected while 46% said that dump sites in their environment were usually protected.

Considering availability of environmental court, 45% of the respondents declared that they had environmental court to prosecute offenders while the remaining 55% declared that such courts did not exist in their communities.

3.8 Agriculture

This section takes care of forest conservation facilities and farmers' access to agric extension services.

From the analysis, 15% of the respondents declared that they regularly had access to agriculture extension services while about 32% claimed to enjoy occasional services from the extension workers. However, 53%, according analysis had no access to the services.

For those who answered yes for the existence of conservation facility, 33% of them said that the facilities were protected while the remaining 67% submitted that the facilities were not protected.

3.9 Infrastructure

From the analysis, 61% of the respondents declared that road projects were embarked upon in their communities from 2010 to date. 19% enjoined electricity project and 12% enjoined building project in their areas. Other projects apart from those mentioned above were executed in areas covered by 8% of the population from 2010 to date.

In project implementation, 61% of the respondents declared that they were involved at planning stage, 19% were carried along at the execution stage, 12% were involved in project implementation at maintenance stage while the remaining 8% were carried along at all stages of project implementation. On maintenance of government projects through communal efforts towards sustainability by the people, only 6% had the culture while the whole lot of 94% lacked communal maintenance culture.

3.10 Citizen Participation, Social Inclusion and Protection

Questions covered by this section are on women and vulnerable people's representation in decision making, violence against women and girls as well as citizens' welfare among others.

Concerning representation by women in public decision making, 72% admitted that women were adequately represented, 9% submitted that women were not adequately represented while 19% were not sure whether they were adequately represented or not.

Considering the most common method by which women are identify for key positions in their communities, 50% of the respondents said such women are chosen by merit, 21% said it was by popularity and 23% claimed that women were chosen by personal recognition. Only 4% of the people believed that choices were haphazardly done while 2% could not precisely know how women were selected foe key position in their environment.

In decision making, 36% submitted that citizens with disability were adequately represented, 40% believed they were not while the remaining 24% were not sure of how adequate such citizens were represented.

About cases of violence against women and girls, 5% said there used to be such cases, 28% said that such cases occurred only occasionally while as much as 67% claimed that there were no reported cases of violence against women and girls in their communities, which generally implies that serious cases of violence against women and girls are not common.

On police-community relation, 66% said it existed in their communities while 34% of the respondents claimed there was no police-community relations committee in their communities.

Government's care about the welfare of the people were affirmed to be always in place by 28% of the respondents, 48% declared that government sometimes cared about the welfare of the citizens, 14% said the government never care about citizens' welfare and 9% could not say whether such care existed or not.

CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 *Conclusion and Recommendations*

4.1 *Conclusion*

The survey on the assessment of socio-economic development of the State brought into limelight most contending issues on the government policy and strategy, approach to economic development, public finance and human resource management. It revealed important issues on developmental aspects concerning key sectors such education, health, environment, agriculture and infrastructure. It also beamed its search light on the level of citizens' participation, social inclusion and protection.

Observations from the survey results show that less than half of the stakeholders were usually involved in the formulation and adoption of development plans and that only one tenth of those being involved claimed that the mechanisms being used were poor. On development priorities, access to clean water ranked 1st to 6th on the lists of about 60% while the same item ranked 7th to 12th positions on the priority lists of the remaining 40%. Employment was also of very high priority as 63% of the people ranked it from 1st to 3rd on their lists while it fell within 4th and 12th of the remaining 37%. Electricity was also of high priority of stakeholders because it ranked between 1st and 4th to 55% of the respondents compared with the remaining 45% that ranked it between 5th and 12th positions on their lists.

Government support to people on economic activities was low as less than half of the people claimed to receive such assistance either regularly or occasionally, even though only 16% of those who received such support were adequately taken care of. Only 33% of the people also perceived the level of economic development in the State as good, a situation which is below expectation.

On public finance management, stakeholders input into government fiscal planning was at 33% level. Participation by women in fiscal planning was averagely okay, but that of the vulnerable people was a little below average. Also, only 43% of the stakeholders had access to fiscal planning information and as low as 7% of people were carried along at all levels of government plans to execute projects. The survey also revealed that only 16% of the respondents usually had knowledge about allocation of fund by one government to the other.

Transparency in the recruitment process into the public service was rated by 35% to be in place either perfectly or not while 41% adjudged the process as non-transparent. More than half of the people believed that merit and qualifications were either fully or sometimes used as basis for recruitment into the service.

Educational institutions were fairly adequate as over 60% were satisfied about the number of schools available in the state. On the ranking of challenges in the education sector, inaccessibility to the facility ranked between 1st and 3rd to more than two third (70%) of the people, inadequate infrastructure ranked between 1st and 3rd to 66%, problem of qualified teachers ranked between 1st and 3rd to 70% and challenges of ICT facility ranked between 1st and 3rd to 24% of the stakeholders.

In the health sector, not more than half of the stakeholders claimed adequacy of health care facilities as one quarter of the people claimed that health facilities in their communities had access to save water and sanitation. Feedback mechanism on health services was very low as less than one third of the users claimed to have the feedback process in place. Also, participation by people in health insurance scheme was very low at 21% while above half of the people had participated in free health care programme in the last three years.

On the means of disposing waste materials, 22% used government refuse bins as against other means being used by 78%. Also, only one quarter of the available refuse bins were regularly evacuated into dump sites which were claimed by 54% as not being protected. Environmental courts were also provided to cover less than half of the State population.

Extension services on agriculture were received either regularly or occasionally by less than half of the stakeholders while only 33% of the conservation facilities in the State were protected.

On infrastructural facilities, about 60% of the population claimed that road projects topped government agenda from 2010 to date; this is followed by electricity and building projects. Less than one tenth of the stakeholders were involved at all stages of projects implementation while people also lacked communal maintenance culture on government projects in their environment.

Considering citizens' participation, social inclusion and protection, 72% claimed that women were usually involved in decision making, 50% submitted that women were chosen to key

positions on merit and that people with disability were not well represented in decision making. However, there were very few reported cases of violence against women and girls while police-community relations committees were available in most places. However, most people observed that government always or sometimes cared about the welfare of the citizens.

4.2 **Recommendations**

Based on various observations from the survey, the following are very critical to improvement in the socio-economic development of the State:

- Government should make effort to improve on the involvement of Stakeholders in the formulation and adoption of development plans.
- Mechanisms used in involving the stakeholders should also be improved upon.
- Developmental priorities should be ranked in the following descending order: Employment, Education, Electricity, and Health care, Access to clean water, Good government, clean environment, Road, Security and Social inclusiveness.
- Efforts should be made to increase participation by stakeholders in fiscal planning. Involvement of more vulnerable people and women in fiscal planning forum should also be achieved.
- Fiscal planning information has to be made more accessible to reduce all claims of ignorance by the stakeholders.
- Effort should be stepped up to carry along people at all stages in the execution of projects. This will encourage people to claim ownership of and sustain such projects.
- Information about allocation of fund from one tier of government to the other should be readily available to the people.
- Merit and qualifications are used in public servants recruitment but machinery should be put in place to increase transparency in the process.
- Though there are fairly adequate educational institutions in the State, the sector has challenges ranked in the following descending order of importance; Accessibility to educational facilities, availability of qualified teachers, adequate infrastructure and involvement of parents in decision making,
- Though, the number of health institutions is averagely okay but effort needs to be made to provide save water and sanitation for the health institutions.
- Client/patient feedback mechanism should be institutionalized in the health sector to achieve improvement in health service delivery.
- More refuse bins have to be provided by the government to minimize dumping of refuse in unauthorized places.
- Available refuse bins should also be regularly evacuated to avoid diseases.
- There is need for establishment of more environmental courts to try offenders.
- Agriculture extension services should be increased to cover more farmers especially in the rural areas.

- Stakeholders should be more involved in project implementation and communal maintenance of the projects to enhance sustainability.
- There is need for more involvement of people with disability in government decision making.
- Though, many people claimed that the government is responsive to their welfare, but effort should be increased towards addressing the above recommendations in order to gain more confidence from the governed.

Annex 3: EKITI STATE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

| S/N | NAME | DESIGNATION |
|------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 1. | Dr. Kayode Fayemi | Governor |
| 2. | Mrs. Funmilayo Olayinka | Deputy Governor |
| 3. | Barr. Dayo Akinlaja | Attorney-General & Comm. For Justice |
| 4. | Mr. Babajide Arowosafe | HC Agriculture and Natural Development |
| 5. | Mr. Debo Ajayi | HC Economic Planning and Budget |
| 6. | Otunba Remi Bodunrin | HC Commerce and Industries |
| 7. | Alhaji Seidu Ayodele Jinadu | HC Culture, Arts and Tourism |
| 8. | Dr. (Mrs.) Eniola Ajayi | HC Education, Science & Technology |
| 9. | Mr. Dapo Kolawole | HC Finance |
| 10. | Prof. Olusola Fasubaa | HC Health |
| 11. | Mr. Paul Omotoso | HC Housing and Environment |
| 12. | Hon. Funminiyi Afuye | HC Inform and Civic Orientation |
| 13 | Mrs. Bunmi Dipo-Salami | HC Integration, Intergovernmental Affairs |
| 14 | Mr. A Wole Adewumi | HC Labour Productivity, Human Capital Development |
| 15 | Chief Dayo Fadipe | HC L.G, Community Development |
| 16 | Arch. Ebun Awoyemi | HC Physical, Urban and Regional Planning |
| 17 | Dr. Wole Olugboji | HC Special Duties |
| 18 | Mr. Sola Adebayo | HC Works, Transportation |
| 19 | Mrs. Fola Richie Adewusi | HC Women Affairs, Social Dev. Gender Empowerment |
| 20 | Chief Folorunso Olabode | HC Youth, Sport, Social Development |
| 21 | Mr. Biodun Oyebanji | Head, Office of transformation, Strategy, Delivery |
| 22 | Mr. Olalekan Faromika | SA/DG Bureau of public procurement |
| 23 | Mr. Segun ologunleko | SA, Bureau of tourism Development |
| 24 | Chief Goerge Akosile | SA, Chieftaincy Matters |
| 25 | Mr. Kayode Jegede | SA, Infrastructure, Public utilities |
| 26 | Mr. Remi Olorunleke | SA/DG, Land Matters |
| 27 | Mr. Tolulope Dare | SA, Legal Matters |

| | | |
|----|-----------------------------|--|
| 28 | Hon. Oladapo Karounwi | SA, Legislative Affairs |
| 29 | Hon .Kayode Olaosebikan | SA, Political and Inter-party Relation |
| 30 | Mr. Tolani Olufemi | SA/DG, (PPP Office) |
| 31 | Hon. Tale Oguntoyinbo | SA, Rural Development |
| 32 | Mrs.Bunmi Adelugba | SA, Taxation Matters, Revenue |
| 33 | Alhaji (Dr.) Ganiyu Owolabi | Secretary to the State Government |
| 34 | Mr. Bunmi Famosaya | Head of Service |
| 35 | Mr. Yemi Adaramodu | Chief Staff |
| 36 | Mr. Yinka Oyebode | Chief Press Secretary |

Annex 4: EKITI STATE FOURTH HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY HONOURABLE MEMBERS

| S/N | NAMES | CONSTITUENCY |
|-----|---|---------------------|
| 1. | Rt Hon. Omirin Adewale Albert (Speaker) | Gbonyin |
| 2. | Hon. Orisalade Adetunji Taiwo (Deputy Speaker) | Ido/Osi II |
| 3. | Hon. Adedipe Churchill Olubunmi (Majority Leader) | Irepodun/Ifelodun I |
| 4. | Hon. Orinowo Olubunmi Anike | Ido/osi I |
| 5. | Hon. Ogunlola Omowunmi Olubunmi (Chief Whip) | Ijero |
| 6. | Hon. Ajayi Olajide Idowu (Deputy Leader) | Ise/Orun |
| 7. | Hon. Ajayi Isaac Adebawale (Deputy Chief Whip) | Oye I |
| 8. | Hon. Adeloje Adeyinka Olubunmi | Ikole I |
| 9. | Hon. Adejo Alexander Ayodele | Ekiti South West II |
| 10. | Hon. Agidi Peter Tope | Ekiti South West I |
| 11. | Hon. Ajibola Samuel Oyedele | Ekiti East II |
| 12. | Hon. Boluwade Bolics Kehinde | Emure |
| 13. | Hon. Daramola Israel Oluyomi | Ikere I |
| 14. | Hon. Erinle Samuel Olusegun | Ilejemeje |
| 15. | Hon. Fatunbi Olajide Ojo | Moba II |
| 16. | Hon. Olabode Odebunmi Gbenga | Ekiti West I |
| 17. | Hon. Ogundele Gabriel Folorunso | Efon |
| 18. | Hon. Ogunrinde OkoOlaseinde | Ekiti East I |
| 19. | Hon. Olayinka Modupe Abeni | Ado II |
| 20. | Hon. Olajide Olaniyi | Moba I |
| 21. | Hon. Olugbemi Joseph Dele | Ikole II |
| 22. | Hon. Shittu Ahmed Oluwaseyi | Ado I |
| 23. | Hon. Fasakin Kayode Ajayi | Ekiti West II |

| | | |
|----|----------------------------|----------------------|
| 24 | Hon. Adu Clement Sunday | Ikere II |
| 25 | Hon. Ajiboye Isreal Olowo | Oye II |
| 26 | Hon. Odu Ayodele Olurotimi | Irepodun/Ifelodun II |

Annex 5: HEAD OF SERVICE AND PERMANENT SECRETARIES (EKITI STATE OF NIGERIA)

| S/N | NAME | POST / DUTY |
|------------|---------------------------|--|
| 1 | Mr. B.P. Famosaya, mni | Head of Service, Office of Head of Service |
| 2. | Mr. Oluropo Famubode | PS, Ministry of Labour, Productivity and Human Capital Development. |
| 3. | Dr. (Mrs.) O.O. Fakunle | PS, Ministry of Housing and Environment |
| 4. | Mr. P.A. Amujo | PS, Ministry of Finance, Budget and Economic Development |
| 5. | Mr. M.O. Aiyaleso | PS, Office of Establishments and Training |
| 6. | Mr. J.S. Fatoba | PS, Local Government Service Commission |
| 7. | Mrs. K.O. O. Aderiye, mni | PS, Ministry of Education, Science and Technology |
| 8. | Mrs. F.A. Oke | PS, Ministry of Youth & Sports |
| 9. | Mr. E.O. Abegunde | PS, Ministry of Physical, Urban & Regional Planning |
| 10. | Mrs. M.O. Babafemi | PS, Ministry of Women Affairs, Gender Empowerment & Social Development |
| 11. | Dr. E.O. Ojo | PS, Ministry of Health |
| 12. | Mr. F.E. Daramola | PS, Bureau of Infrastructure |
| 13. | Mr. I.B Akilo | PS, Ministry of works |
| 14. | Mr. S.I. Folorunso | PS, State Planning Commission |
| 15. | Mr. Akin Oso | PS, Chief of Staff's Office |
| 16. | Mr. Alfred Ologuntoye | PS, General Administrative Department, Governor's Office |
| 17. | Dr. D.K. Aina | PS, Hospitals' Management Board |
| 18. | Mr. O.B Ajayi | PS, Ministry of Commerce and Industry |
| 19. | Mr. D.A. Akinola | PS, Ministry of Arts, Culture & Tourism |
| 20. | Mrs. F.O. Falore | PS, Primary Health Care Development Agency |
| 21. | Mrs. Adekunbi Obaisi | PS, Ministry of Information, Communication & Civil Orientation |
| 22. | Mr. O. Owoseni | PS, Ministry of Special Duties |
| 23. | Mr. J.O. Dada | PS, Political and Economic Affairs Department |
| 24. | Dr. (Mrs.) E.A. Dada | PS, State Universal Basic Education Board |
| 25. | Mr. S.A. Ajayi | PS, Ministry of Local Government Affairs |
| 26. | Mr. S.A. Adebayo | PS, Civil Service Commission |
| 27. | Mr. I.O. Aluko | PS, Cabinet and Special Services Department |

| | | |
|-----|-------------------|--|
| 28. | Mr. K.G. Abe | PS, Ministry of Integration and Inter Governmental Relations |
| 29. | Mr. O.P. Faseluka | PS. Liason Office, Abuja |
| 30. | Mrs. F.A. Ajayi | PS, Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources |
| 31. | Mr. B.J. Ogundare | PS, Teaching Service Commission |

Annex 6: HIGH COURT JUDGES

Hon. Justice A.S. Daramola Chief Justice
 Hon. Justice. M.A. Agbelusi
 Hon. Justice C.I. Akintayo
 Hon. Justice J.O. Adeyeye
 Hon. Justice M.O. Abodunde
 Hon. Justice A.K. Fowe
 Hon. Justice A.L. Ogunmoye
 Hon. Justice O.I.O. Ogunmoyemi
 Hon. Justice A.A. Adeleye

Annex 7: CHAIRMEN OF THE STATE STATUTORY COMMISSIONS

- i. Hon. Barrister Bayo Idowu
House of Assembly Service Commission
- ii. Prince Bayo Adeniran
Teaching Service Commission
- iii. Chief Aderemi Ajayi
Local Government Service Commission
- iv. Professor (Mrs.) Modupe Adelabu
State Universal Basic Education Board (SUBEB)
- v. Alhaji Afolabi Ogunlayi
Civil Service Commission

Annex 8: Ministries in Ekiti State

- i. Agriculture & Rural Development
- ii. Arts, Culture & Tourism
- iii. Commerce, Industry Cooperatives
- iv. Education, Science & Technology

- v. Employment, Labour & Human Capital Development
- vi. Finance & Economic Development
- vii. Budget & Planning
- viii. Health
- ix. Housing & Environment
- x. Information & Civil Orientation
- xi. Integration & Inter-Governmental Affairs
- xii. Justice
- xiii. Local Government & Community Development
- xiv. Physical, Urban & Regional Planning
- xv. Special Duties
- xvi. Women Affairs, Gender Empowerment & Social Development
- xvii. Works & Transport
- xviii. Youth & Sports

Annex 9: Offices, Bureaus, Agencies and Units

- i. Office of Secretary to Government
- ii. Office of Head of Service
- iii. Office of Chief of Staff
- iv. Office of Transformation, Strategy & Delivery
- v. Bureau of Tourism Development
- vi. Bureau of Rural Development
- vii. Bureau of Public Procurement
- viii. Bureau of Public-Private Partnership
- ix. Bureau of Land Matters
- x. Bureau of Information Communication Technology

- xi. Bureau of Ekiti Enterprises Development Agency
- xii. Bureau of Chieftaincy Affairs
- xiii. Bureau of Infrastructure and Public Utility
- xiv. Legal Matters
- xv. Legislative Affairs
- xvi. Political and Inter-party Relations
- xvii. Revenue Matters and Taxation
- xviii. Chief Press Secretary

Annex 10: MEMBERS OF THE STATE SPRM STEERING COMMITTEE

- i. Felix Ajakaye – Chairman
Bishop of Catholic Diocese Ekiti
- ii. Mrs. Bunmi Dipo – Salami – Member
Hon. Commissioner for Integration & Intergovernmental Affairs.
- iii. Mr. Biodun Oyebanji - Member
Head, Office of Transformation, Strategy & Delivery
- iv. Professor Abimbola Odu - Member
Dean Faculty of Education
Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti
- v. Dr. Bimbo Oni - Member
Director General,
National Directorate of Employment Member.
- vi. Mr. Laolu Omosinlade - Member
President, Nigeria Union of Journalist
Ekiti State
- vii. Mr. Kayode Abe - Secretary
Permanent Secretary Ministry of Integration
Intergovernmental Affairs.

Annex 11: MEMBERS OF SPRM CORE TEAM

- i. Mrs. Bunmi Dipo-Salami - Chairman
Hon. Commissioner

Ministry of Integration &
Inter-governmental Affairs

- | | | | |
|-------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| ii. | Mr. Kayode Abe Permanent Secretary Ministry of Integration & Inter-governmental Affairs | - | Member |
| iii. | Mr. P.K. Agidigbi Director Expenditure Ministry of Finance & Economic Development. | - | Public Finance Management |
| iv. | Mrs. F.J. Ogunyemi Director Women Affairs Ministry of Women Affairs. | - | Citizen Engagement and Inclusion |
| v. | Dr. Joshua Ileke Director, Primary Health Care | - | Health Sector |
| vi. | Engr. Julius Olofin Director, Civil Engineering Ministry of Works. | - | Infrastructural Sector |
| vii. | Mr. G.A Balogun Asst. Director Planning, Research & Agriculture Statistics. | - | Agricultural Sector Ministry of |
| viii. | Mr. F.A. Otewogbola Director Macro Economics Ministry of Budget & Economic Planning | - | Economic Development |
| ix. | M.r. A.O. Adeleye Director Planning, Research & Statistics Ministry of Housing & Environment | - | Environment Sector |
| x. | Mr. O.B. Akinyemi DPRS, Ministry of Education | - | Education Sector |
| xi. | Mr. Dayo Ajobiwe Director, Office of Establishment & Training | - | Human Resources |
| xii. | Mr. Wale Omole Office of Transformation, Strategy & Delivery (OTSD) | - | Policy & Strategy |
| xiii. | Mr. Jide Fayomi SPRM (Focal Person) | - | Secretary |

Annex 12: SPRM TECHNICAL TEAM

- | | | | |
|-------|--|---|-----------------|
| i. | Prof. Okey Onyejekwe | - | Lead Consultant |
| ii. | Dr. Olupelumi Adebisi University College Hospital (UCH) Ibadan | | |
| iii. | Dr. Adeniyi A.E. Federal Polytechnic Ado-Ekiti | | |
| iv. | Dr. E.A Oladimeji Beautiful Beginning Integrated Idea School, Ado-Ekiti. | | |
| v. | Mr. P.C. Odigbo Federal Polytechnic Ado-Ekiti. | | |
| vi. | Mr. Wale Omole | | |
| vii. | Mr. Jide Fayomi | | |
| viii. | Mr. Otewogbola | | |

Annex 13: MEMBER OF SPRM VALIDITY TEAM

- | | | | |
|------|--|---|--|
| i. | Dr. J.B. Adeyemo Executive Secretary Agency for Adult and Non Formal Education | - | Education |
| ii. | Mr. J..B. Folorunso Ministry of Budget & Economic Planning. | - | Economic Development/ Director Budget |
| iii. | Mr. Niyi Familoni Director Public Prosecution Ministry of Justice. | - | Citizen Participation & Inclusion |
| iv. | Engr. Johnson Adeola Director, Bureau of Project Monitoring | - | Infrastructure |
| v. | Mr. J.O. Alonge Deputy Accountant General | - | Public Finance Management |
| vi. | Mr. Oluwatosin Osho State Health Data Bank | - | Health |
| vii. | Mr. Sola Alabi Office of Establishment & Training | - | HRM |

- viii. Mr. Adebayo Adesina
Director, Cassava Revolution - Agriculture
- ix. Mr. O.A. Adegbola
General Manager
State Environmental Protection Agency. - Environment

Annex 14: SPRM SURVEY TEAM

- i. Mr. Sola Agboola
Director, Bureau of Statistic - State Coordinator
- ii. Mr. Ogunsakin F.B - Ado Local Government
- iii. Mr. Ogunjobi F.O. - Ijero
- iv. Mr. L.A. Ajayi - Efon
- v. Mr. Aribilson J.O. - Moba L.G
- vi. Mr. Oni J.O. - Ekiti East L.G
- vii. Miss Feyisayo Babatunde - Ido/Osi
- viii. Mrs. Ojo Dolapo - Ikere L.G
- ix. Mrs. Omoju Kemi - Oye L.G
- x. Mrs. Anifowose Taiwo - Ilawe

Annex 15: COORDINATOR

- i. Mr. F.J. Agboola
- ii. Mr. Jide Fayomi
- iii. Mr. Otewogbola
- iv. Mr. Ajeyomi C.O

Annex 16: SPPRM STATE FOCAL PERSON

Mr. Jide Fayomi

Annex 17: EXTERNAL PEER REVIEWERS

- i. Prof. Gbenga Aribisala
Deputy Vice Chancellor
Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti
- ii. Mr. George Ogboro,
United Nations Economic Commission for Africa,
Addis Abba

- iii. Prof. Bayo Oloyede
Dean Faculty of Management Science
Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti

Annex 18: NON STATE ACTORS WHO ATTENDED STAKEHOLDERS MEETINGS.

- i. Representatives of Women Groups
- ii. Representatives of Market Women
- iii. Representatives of Religious Associations
- iv. National Association of Nigerian Students (NANS)
- v. Representatives of Children Parliament
- vi. Representatives of Physical Challenged and Other Vulnerable Groups in the State.
- vii. Representatives of Transportation Unions.
- viii. Farmers Congress
- ix. Representatives of Ekiti State Chapter of Nigeria Bar Association
- x. Representatives of Ekiti State Medical Associations
- xi. Representatives of Labour Unions/Associations in the State
- xii. Representatives of Civil Society and other Non-governmental organizations in Ekiti State
- xiii. Representatives of all Political Parties in the State
- xiv. Opinion Leaders
- xv. Representative of Ekiti State Youth Councils
- xvi. Traditional Rulers
- xvii. Academia
- xviii. Press/Media Association in Ekiti State
- xix. Community Based Association.
- xx. Elite/Opinion Leaders

ANNEX 19: THE SPRM PROCESS IN EKITI STATE

Nigeria Governors' Forum Peer Review tour of Ekiti State held in December, 2010:

The implementation of the State Peer Review Mechanism (SPRM) in Ekiti State began with the tour of the officials of Nigeria Governors' Forum of the State in December, 2010 . The objective of the tour was to assess various government policies and the impacts on the lives of the people of the state with the aim of identifying major gaps and giving recommendations where necessary. An assessment report was thereafter produced by the team at the end of the tour and this was forwarded in August, 2011 to the Government of Ekiti State for observations, comments and attention . This was to allow for inputs and feedback before the finalization of the report. The Government set up a committee to work on the report and the committee came up with observations, comments and additional information.

However, it was noted that some of the activities reflected in the assessment report had already been overtaken by events and would therefore be reviewed. For critical State Self Assessment Report (SSAR) of Ekiti State, an Initiation/ Sensitization workshop was held in November 2011 in Ado-Ekiti .

Initiation and Sensitization Workshop

The workshop which was held between 10th and 11th November, 2011 marked the journey for the production of State Self Assessment Report in Ekiti State. In attendance at the workshop were different interest groups, citizens of the state and many other stakeholders across the length and breadth of the State (See annexure).

Presentations at the Initiation Workshop

Different presentations were made by different professionals and experts. These cut across the following areas:

- i. *Primary objectives of the SPRM*

- a) The concept of SPRM is to assist States in accelerating the pace of their development through periodic reviews of progress in the implementation of their development policies, plans and programmes. The other objectives include:
- b). Enhancing collaboration among States in their quest for development;
- c). Promoting of good governance through enhancement of transparency, accountability, participation and communication;
- d). Achieving better service delivery nation-wide through the progressive improvement of policies, planning, budgeting and public service reform, on the one hand, and core sectors such as education, health, roads, water supply and agriculture on the other.

ii. *Stages of the SPRM*

There are six basic stages for the implementation of SPRM. These are:

Stage 1: Initiation and stakeholders' workshop to sensitize state stakeholders on the methodology, objectives, questions and indicators of the assessment instrument.

Stage 2: The preparation of the SSAR and SPoA and their submission to the NGF. (6 Months envisaged for this stage).

State 3: Technical review visit and validation by experts.

Stage 4: Following the consultations, the TRP will produce a State Peer Review Report (SPRR).

Stage 5: Tabling of the SPRR and SPoA before the NGF.

Stage 6: Publication and dissemination of the SPRR marks the final Stage. Following NGF's discussion of the SPRR and SPoA, a date would be set for the SPRR to be publicly launched in the reviewed State. It will also be posted on NGF website.

iii. *The SPRM Framework of Indicators covers the five thematic areas*

- a. Policy and Strategy
- b. Resource Management
- c. Service Delivery
- d. Citizen Engagement and Participation, and
- e. Monitoring and Evaluation

iv. *Key Elements of Assessment*

The framework for the SPRM indicators is based on four key elements

- a. Existence and Application of Law, Regulation and Policy Framework
- b. State Government Performance
- c. Ensuring Goals are being met at the right cost (Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness)
- d. Capacity of the generated improvements to endure (sustainability)
- e. Scopes of Indicators

The ten Areas of Assessment the review would cover are:

1. Policy and Strategy/ Monitoring and Evaluation 21(Twenty One) indicators
2. Economic Development 8 (Eight) indicators

3. Public Finance Management 29 (Twenty Nine)
4. Human Resource Management 13 (Thirteen) indicators
5. Education Sector 29 (Twenty Nine) indicators
6. Health Sector 36 (Thirty Six) indicators
7. Environment 38 (Thirty Eight) indicators
8. Agriculture 28 (Twenty Eight) indicators
9. Infrastructure 17 (Seventeen) indicators
10. Citizen Participation, Social Inclusion and Protection 34 (Thirty Four) indicators .

v. *Goodwill Messages*

At the occasion, Goodwill Messages were delivered by the following bodies:

UNDP Country Director
 DFID South-West Coordinator
 Representative of Religious Leaders
 Representative of ALGON
 Representative of Iyalojas
 Representative of NBA
 Representative of National Association of Nigerian Students (NANS)
 Representative of Children Parliament
 Representative of Physically Challenged
 Representative of NURTW

SPRM Secretariat

The SPRM Secretariat resided in the Ministry of Integration & Intergovernmental Affairs with the technical supports from of Office of Transformation, Strategy and Delivery, Bureau of Statistics and Ministry of Budget and Economic Development.

Constitution of the SPRM Steering Committee

The Steering Committee was constituted to advise government and provide supports to all stakeholders involve in the process . The committee comprised eminent citizens of the State.

(See annexure 10)

Selection of SPRM Core Team

The Sate Government constituted SPRM Core Team. The Membership cuts across planning officers and programme co-coordinators across various Ministries, Department and Agencies of

the State. The Nigerian Governor's Forum between 2nd and 3rd February, 2012 conducted a two-day capacity building workshop for the members of Core Teams and other stakeholders. In line with the specified areas of assessment spelt by NGF, the following sectors were the basis of the selection of the members of the Core Team:

- i. Policy and Strategy
- ii. Agricultural Sector
- iii. Public Financial Management
- iv. Environment Sector
- v. Health Sector
- vi. Education Sector
- vii. Human Resources Sector
- viii. Infrastructure Sector
- ix. Economic Sector
- x. Citizen Engagement and Inclusion in Governance (See Annexure 11)

Capacity Building Workshop Organised for Stakeholders

The Nigeria Governor Forum in conjunction with the United Kingdom, Department for International Development organised a 2-day training for members of the Core Team and other relevant stakeholders on the 2nd and 3rd of February 2012 to enhance their skills to participate in the SPRM. At the end a work plan was adopted for the implementation of the exercise.

Box 7: SPRM Revised Work plan

| | Action By | Status |
|---|-------------------------|--------|
| Ekiti State Draft SPRM Work Plan | | |
| Initiation and Sensitization Workshop | NGF/SPARC Consultants | Done |
| Appointment of SPRM Consultant(s) | State Government | Done |
| Selection of SPRM Core Team from Relevant MDAs | State Government | Done |
| Initial Training for the State SPRM Core Team | NGF/SPARC Consultant; | Done |
| Further Training for the State SPRM Core Team | NGF/SPARC Consultants | Done |
| Establishment of a fully Functional Secretariat | Ministry of Integration | Done |

| | | |
|--|-----------------------------|------|
| | & Intergovernmental Affairs | |
| Circular from HoS to the Public Service Flagging of SPRM Studies | Head of Service | Done |
| Sensitization of Management-Level Staff of the MDAs to the SPRM | SPRM Core Team | Done |
| Design and Adoption of Data Collection Instruments | Consultants | Done |
| Field Work – Data Collection | Consultants/SPRM Core Team | Done |
| Report Writing (Draft Report) | Consultant/SPRM Core Team | Done |
| *Validation of Findings and Recommendations | Consultants/SPRM Core Team | Done |
| Revision of and Finalization of SSAR | Consultants/SPRM Core Team | Done |
| Presentation of SSAR to Cabinet for Adoption | Consultants/SPRM Core Team | Done |
| Finalization of SSAR for Submission of Report to NGF | Mr. Governor | Done |

Appointment of SPRM Consultant

The State Government appointed Professor Okey Onyejekwe, of LARENWAND Limited to drive the process and produce the SSAR and the SPoA. The team of consultant was led by Prof. Okey Onyejekwe.

The Survey Exercise

A number of activities were carried out as t of programme of action for the implementation. These included:

- Design of appropriate methodology
- Primary data collection from MDAs through desk research
- Adoption of the revised work plan
- Design of research instrument
- Interface with MDAs and other non state actors
- Recruitment and training of enumerators for the survey.
- Mobilisation of stakeholders for focus group discussions.
- Pilot Test
- Surveys (Focus Group, Elite and Household surveys)
- Analysis of survey findings
- Reporting
- Validation of the reports

Collation of Information for the Preparation of the State Programme of Action (SPoA)

The collection of data from different government agencies for the production of the State Programme of Action (SPoA) was done based on the gaps and challenges identified in the operation of various arms of government in the State.