**The International Civil Service
Effectiveness (InCiSE) Index**

InCiSE

Technical Paper
Assessment of the applicability of the InCiSE methodology to Nigeria

April 2019

Contents

Assessment of the applicability
of the InCiSE methodology to Nigeria

Zenobia Ismail
University of Birmingham

InCiSE

Executive Summary

The InCiSE Index was developed to benchmark the effectiveness of the civil service in OECD countries. The Index is comprised of 12 indicators[1] and 60 themes relating to processes used in the civil service. This report examines the viability of including the Nigerian federal civil service in the InCiSE Index using the same or similar indicators, themes, and data sources as those used in compiling the 2017 Index. A companion report similarly assesses the viability of including Brazil in the InCiSE Index.

Of the 12 indicators covered in the 2017 report, we found data on 9 (policy making and capabilities were notable gaps; social security administration indicators were not checked, as agreed in advance). For each of these indicators, we assessed whether the sources used in the 2017 report were available for Nigeria, and the existence of comparable alternatives and/or regional and local supplementary sources.

Our analysis concludes that it is not possible to directly extend the InCiSE Index to include Nigeria, as there are insufficient data sources available matching the fine-grained data on civil service effectiveness available for OECD countries.

- Data are available for 26 of the 60 themes (43%) in the Index.

- Of the 76 metrics used in the 2017 report, we found 37 metrics (49%) for which the same data were available, with only a small number of potential alternative or supplementary metrics that could be considered.

- We found good alternative data sources for the fiscal and financial management indicator, but we did not find comparable data sources for the policy making, regulation, social security administration, or capabilities indicators.

We found data covering some themes within the human resource management, tax administration, digital services, openness and inclusiveness indicators, but these sources only provided partial information for these indicators. We found some other additional data sources that are relevant for assessments of selected aspects of the civil service and bureaucracy in Nigeria, but most do not fit easily into the existing InCiSE framework.

Although the InCiSE framework covers issues that are highly relevant for the civil service in Nigeria, such as merit-based appointment processes and ethnic composition, it neglects other pertinent issues such as performance in terms of service delivery outputs. The study tentatively suggests that the InCiSE team consider developing a second, more rudimentary civil service index for Nigeria and other developing countries using less fine-grained data on the civil service and data on service delivery.

---

1   The measurement framework includes 17 indicators, but the 2017 Index only used 12 of these in practice.

Objectives and methodology

This report is part of a joint study investigating the feasibility of applying the InCiSE methodology to Brazil and Nigeria, with the following objectives:

- Outline aspects of the structure and functions of the civil service of both countries that may affect application of the InCiSE framework;

- Identify international and national data sources relevant to the InCiSE framework and comment on the availability of data, the ease of accessing data, and the strengths and weaknesses of these sources for this purpose;

- Comment on the applicability of the InCiSE Index to cover these countries, and discuss (i) challenges that might be faced in using it and (ii) ways in which the Index might need to be adjusted to be more relevant, applicable, and feasible.

This project does not aim to evaluate the performance of the civil service in Nigeria, but only to comment on the potential applicability and relevance of the InCiSE methodology to the country, and in particular to assess the availability of relevant data compatible with the current InCiSE methodology.

We have attempted as far as possible to match the same sources and metrics for the same themes as in the 2017 InCiSE Report.

That report sought data for 12 indicators, although did not find sufficient data to include the social security administration indicator. In consultation with the Blavatnik School of Government, we similarly did not include the indicator on social security administration, and focused on the remaining 11 indicators. For each indicator, the analysis went through the following steps:

a. Are the sources used in InCiSE 2017 available? Assess whether, for Nigeria, the themes and indicators in the InCiSE framework were covered by the same metrics and sources as were used in the 2017 InCiSE Report, and comment on the quality of the data for each country.

b. What is the availability and quality of comparable alternative metrics? For the remaining themes, where the InCiSE team had found metrics for OECD countries but where the same data source does not cover Nigeria, search for alternative regional or local data sources that address the same themes. Where comparable alternatives exist, we comment on the quality of these metrics.

c. Are there supplementary regional and local sources? Identify supplementary metrics, where we find that regional and local sources could be used alongside or instead of the metrics that the 2017 InCiSE Report had selected.

The structure of the civil service

The civil service in Nigeria was introduced during the colonial era and was modelled on the British Parliamentary Civil Service System (Rasul & Rogger, 2017, p. 6). The primary objective of the colonial civil service was law and order. However, after independence in 1960 the focus shifted to infrastructure development and service delivery (Gberevbie, 2010, p. 1447). The civil service was indigenised but this led to regionalisation as the northern, eastern and western regions competed to fill service posts with people from their region (Anazodo, Okoye, & Chukwuemeka, 2012, p. 19).

The principle of the 'federal character' of Nigeria enshrined in the constitution was introduced to ensure equitable representation from all regions and ethnic groups in the federal government. Nigeria is composed of a federal capital territory and 36 states (Amah, 2017); each state has a government and there are 774 local governments at the municipal level (OECD, 2016). State governments have autonomy with regard to the delivery of public services but rely on the federal government for resources (Amah, 2017). A revenue sharing formula allocates federal revenue as follows: 55% for federal government, 25% for state government and 20% for local government (World Bank, 2018).

The federal government is made up of 63 organisations including ministries as well as educational and health facilities which are managed by the federal government (Rasul and Rogger, 2015, p. 6). The presence of federal educational and health facilities suggests that there could be some overlap between the functions of the federal and state governments. The constitution specifies a list of 68 items, the Exclusive Legislative List, for which the authority to legislate is reserved to the federal government. There is also a Concurrent Legislative List of 12 items on which state governments are permitted to legislate. However, the constitution gives the federal government authority to override state legislation on matters relating to the Concurrent List (Amah, 2017, p. 296).

The federal government provides "overall direction and leadership in the planning process from the formulation stage through the implementation and evaluation stages" (Philip & Peter, 2013, p. 60). The National Economic Council advises the president on economic affairs as well as measures for co-ordinating economic planning and development programmes. The Ministry of Finance and Ministry of National Planning play critical roles in the policy formulation process. The National Planning Office co-ordinates inputs from ministries, develops and evaluates policy alternatives and develops programmes to implement policies (Rasul & Rogger, 2017). The National Manpower Board and the Federal Office of Statistics report to the Ministry of National Planning. From 1999 to 2007 president Olusẹgun Ọbasanjọ introduced several public sector reform programmers including downsizing and payroll reform. Further civil service reforms were implemented at the federal level (e.g. medium-term policy-

based expenditure, procurement reforms and budget reforms) but not at the state level. The World Bank has funded public sector reform in Nigeria especially with regard to improving public financial management and human resources (World Bank, 2018).

There is little information on the processes in the civil service or the nature of relations between the civil service and ministries or the civil service and the executive. However, the executive in Nigeria and several other African countries is very powerful and dominates over ministries and the bureaucracy, due to a poor separation of powers in the constitution and a high concentration of authority in the office of the president (Prempeh, 2008; Van Cranenburgh, 2011). The country also has a reputation for corruption and patronage which taints the integrity of recruitment and procurement processes in the civil service (Anazodo et al., 2012). Furthermore, low levels of literacy and a limited supply of skilled information technology professionals inhibit the extent to which technology and e-government can be effective in the civil service (Azeez, Abidoye, Adesina, Agbele, & Oyewole, 2012).

Availability of metrics

The InCiSE Index analyses 12 indicators, composed of 60 themes. For the countries covered in the 2017 Index, data were found to be available for 40 themes, measured by 76 metrics coming from 19 different data sources. Table 1 shows that only seven of the 19 data sources provide coverage for Nigeria. These comprise 37 metrics, or 49% of the total metrics, which falls short of the InCiSE threshold for inclusion that requires 75% of the metrics to be available.

Policy Making

The InCiSE framework utilises data from the Bertelsmann Sustainable Governance Index for the policy-making indicator. This dataset is limited to OECD countries.

There is a Bertelsmann Transformation Index[1] which provides data for countries which can be regarded as 'new' democracies, including Nigeria. However, the variables in the Transformation Index are completely different

---

1   This is a governance index which evaluates the quality of a country's political decision making (https://www.bti-project.org/en/data/rankings/governance-index/).

Table 1: Availability of data sources used in InCiSE 2017 for Nigeria

Sources used in InCiSE 2017 available for Nigeria	Sources used in InCiSE 2017 NOT available for Nigeria
· Doing Business index · Hyogo Framework for Action · Quality of Government Expert Survey Data · Transparency International's Global Corruption Barometer · UN's E-participation Index · World Economic Forum (WEF) Global Competitiveness Index (GCI) · World Justice Project's Open Government Index	· Bertelsmann Sustainable Governance Indicators · European Commission E-Government Benchmarks · Government at a Glance 2013 · OECD medium-term budgeting · OECD performance budgeting · OECD PIAAC · OECD conflict of interest, private interest, and whistle-blower data · OECD Tax Administration 2015 · OECD's 'Indicators of Regulatory Policy and Governance · OECD's OURdata Index · Open Knowledge Foundation's Open Data Index · World Wide Web Foundation's Open Data Barometer

from those in the Sustainable Governance Index and none of them pertain to the civil service. We were unable to find reliable, comparable data on the process of policy making in Nigeria. However, there are data on policy performance with regard to economic management (fiscal policy, monetary policy, debt management and trade policy) from the African Development Bank. There are data on policy consistency and policy instability from the Global Insight Business Risk and Conditions dataset that may be proxy measures for assessing the degree of policy monitoring to a limited extent. These metrics do not fit well with the InCiSE framework but we have chosen to list them in the annex to provide a sense of the type of data that are available for Nigeria.

We found one metric of civil service integrity for Nigeria, which comes from the Global Integrity Index, and relates to the degree of political interference with the work of the civil service. This is a good metric for the civil service in Nigeria, as the general view in Africa is that the bureaucracy lacks independence from political influence (Van Cranenburgh, 2011). Although relevant, this metric does not fit well with the InCiSE framework. The closest match appears to be policy monitoring which relates to the extent to which the upper levels of the government monitor the lower levels.

Fiscal and Financial Management
The World Economic Forum (WEF) Global Competitiveness Index, which is used for two of the themes (economic appraisal and economic performance), has data for Nigeria. OECD data are used for the other two themes, which do not cover Nigeria. However, the African Development Bank has a metric related to the quality of budgetary and financial management, and the Open Budget Survey has several metrics on performance budgets and medium-term

budgets, which may be used as alternative metrics. We conclude that good data are available for this indicator for Nigeria.

Regulation
The InCiSE framework utilises data from the OECD Indicators of Regulatory Policy and Governance, which relate to impact assessments of proposed primary and secondary laws, processes for stakeholder engagement and ex-post evaluation processes relating to primary and secondary laws. This source does not cover Nigeria.

The governance related datasets which include Nigeria are orientated towards detecting the presence of regulation or the effectiveness of regulation rather than assessing the processes used to develop the regulation. For example, the African Development Bank Country Profile and Institutional Assessment has metrics which assess the quality of economic regulations, which include one metric on the transparency of legislation and metrics on general law enforcement effectiveness which may be of slight relevance. The African Development Bank Country Profile and Institutional Assessment focus on regulation of the economy only, and make no distinction between primary and secondary laws. The Economist Intelligence Unit has a metric on the quality of the bureaucracy and the quality of regulation pertaining to unfair competition practices, price controls, discriminatory tariffs, excessive protections and discriminatory taxes. Similarly, the African Development Bank has two metrics, on the business regulation environment and the quality of public administration. However, we do not feel that these metrics adequately respond to the definition of this indicator. Hence, we do not find good alternative metrics for Nigeria for the regulation indicator.

Crisis or Risk Management

The InCiSE framework utilises data from the Hyogo Framework for Action to assess this indicator. There are four reports for Nigeria, which should provide adequate data to calculate the metrics for the themes in the crisis or risk management indicator for Nigeria. The data are available for the five of the six themes that were in the 2017 InCiSE report.

Human Resource Management

This indicator is composed of six themes, but in the 2017 InCiSE report, data were only available for two themes. These data were from the Quality of Governance Survey, an expert survey, which also covers Nigeria. Therefore, there is adequate data for the two themes covered in the 2017 report. We did not find any suitable alternative metrics for the other themes for this indicator.

Tax Administration

There are five themes for this indicator. The three themes included in the 2017 InCiSE report comprise six metrics, five of which use data from OECD sources that do not include Nigeria, while the sixth is from the World Bank *Doing Business Survey*, which does have data for Nigeria.

The African Development Bank Country Policy and Institutional Assessment has data on the efficiency of revenue mobilisation for Nigeria, and another variable which relates to the consistency of applying penalties for non-compliance which may also be useful. There are data on tax effectiveness and tax inconsistency from the Global Insight Business Risk and Conditions study. However, we do not regard this data as good substitutes for the OECD data. Furthermore, Nigeria has implemented e-filing of tax returns fairly recently, hence there are no reliable data on this.

We find suitable data for only one out of six metrics for the taxation indicator for Nigeria, covering one of the five themes for this indicator.

Digital Services

The themes in the digital services indicator are assessed using metrics from data provided by the European Commission, which does not include Nigeria. The World Bank's Digital Adoption Index, the United Nations E-Governance Survey and data from the Global Integrity Index provide related information on this indicator for Nigeria. We find data for two out of the four themes for Nigeria with regard to digital services.

Integrity

The integrity indicator is based on data from the Global Corruption Barometer, Global Competitiveness Survey and the Quality of Governance Survey. All these datasets include Nigeria, and we find data for all six themes (and sixteen metrics).

Openness

This indicator is assessed using data from the Open Governance Survey, Open Data Barometer and OURdata Index. There are six themes for this indicator. The Open Governance Survey includes Nigeria, providing data for three of these themes. The data for Nigeria can be augmented using data from the UN E-Governance Survey Participation Index and the Global Competitiveness Survey. Overall, there are data for four of the six themes (thus, six out of the nine metrics) for this indicator.

Capabilities

The Capabilities indicator is based on data from the OECD PIACC Survey, which does not include Nigeria. There are no publicly available data on the composition of the civil service in Nigeria with regard to educational attainment or skills capacity. We were not

able to find other relevant data to assess this indicator for Nigeria.

Inclusiveness

The inclusiveness indicator relies on data from the OECD and the Quality of Governance Survey. Although there are no public data on the gender profile of the civil service, the African Development Bank has a Gender Equality Index which may serve as a proxy measure. The Quality of Governance Survey provides data on the gender and ethnic representation of the public sector in Nigeria. There are no publicly available data on disability, socio-economic status or sexual orientation in the public sector in Nigeria.

We find relevant data on Nigeria for two out of the five themes relating to this indicator

Potential new data sources and metrics

Potential new data sources for Nigeria are summarised in the Table 2, below.

Our aim was to identify data for 12 indicators comprising 60 themes. Table 3, shows which indicators and themes we feel can be well represented (✔), approximately represented (~), or not represented (✘) for Nigeria, and whether the data sources would be the same as the sources that were used in the 2017 InCiSE report or whether new metrics are suggested, either instead of or in addition to the original sources.

Table 2: Summary of data availability by indicator and theme

Organisation	Instrument	Period	Frequency
African Development Bank	Country Policy and Institutional Assessment	2004-2015	Biennial
Global Insight Global Risk Service	Global Insight Business Risk and Conditions	1996-2017	Annual
Global Integrity	Global Integrity Index	2006-2017	Annual
International Budget partnership	Open Budget Survey	2006-2018	Biennial
The Economist Intelligence Unit	Country Viewswire Service	1997-2018	Monthly
World Justice Project	World Justice Project Rule of Law Index	2009-2017	Annual
African Development Bank	Gender Equality Index	2015	Unsure

Indicator	Theme	Data availability	Same sources as InCiSE 2017?	New metrics proposed?
Policy making	The quality of policy advice	✗	No	
	Degree of strategic policy direction	✗	No	
	Coordination of policy proposals	✗	No	
	Timeliness and accuracy of policy delivery	✗	No	
	Degree of policy monitoring	✗	No	
Fiscal and financial management	Economic appraisal (use, quality, guidance)	✔	Yes	
	Economic evaluation (use, quality, guidance)	✔	Yes	
	Medium-term budgeting	✔	No	Yes
	Performance budgeting	✔	No	Yes
Regulation	Ex ante appraisal: application, quality, sustainability, transparency, oversight.	✗	No	
	Stakeholder engagement: application, quality, transparency, oversight	✗	No	
	Ex post evaluation: application, quality, sustainability, transparency, oversight	✗	No	
Crisis/risk management	Integrated risk planning	✔	Yes	
	Risk monitoring	✔	Yes	
	Public information dissemination and public awareness strategies	✔	Yes	
	International cooperation and risk coordination	✔	Yes	
	Preparedness for disaster response	✗	No	
	Post disaster assessment methodology	✔	Yes	
Human resource management	Meritocracy of recruitment	✔	Yes	
	Attracting and retaining talent	✔	Yes	
	Talent deployment (i.e. minimising skills gaps)	✗	No	
	Performance management	✗	No	
	Quality of learning and development	✗	No	
	Level of customer (i.e. civil servant) satisfaction	✗	No	
Tax administration	Overall efficiency of collection	✗	No	
	User centricity of services	✔	Yes	
	Extent and quality of digital provision	✗	No	
	Prevention of tax evasion	✗	No	
	Level of tax gap measurement	✗	No	
Social security administration	Overall efficiency of distribution	✗	No	
	User centricity of services	✗	No	
	Extent and quality of digital provision	✗	No	
	Prevention of fraud	✗	No	
Digital service	User centricity of services	~	No	Yes
	Transparency of service	~	No	Yes
	Cross-border mobility of services	✗	No	
	The availability of 'key enablers'	✗	No	

Indicator	Theme	Data availability	Same sources as InCiSE 2017?	New metrics proposed?
Integrity	Levels/perceptions of corruption	✔	Yes	
	Fairness and impartiality	✔	Yes	
	Adherence to rules and procedures	✔	Yes	
	Striving to serve citizens and ministers	✔	Yes	
	Work ethic	✔	Yes	
	Processes in place to preserve integrity and prevent conflicts of interest	✔	Yes	
Openness	The degree and quality of societal consultation	✔	Yes	
	The existence and quality of complaint mechanisms	✔	Yes	
	Government data availability and accessibility	~	No	Yes
	Government data impact and support for re-use	✘	No	
	Right to information (e.g. FOIs)	✘	No	
	Publicised laws	✔	Yes	
Capabilities	Leadership capability	✘	No	
	Commercial capability	✘	No	
	Analytical capability	✘	No	
	Digital capability	✘	No	
	Core capability (e.g. problem-solving, numeracy, literacy skills)	✘	No	
	Educational attainment of the workforce	✘	No	
Inclusiveness	Proportionate gender representation	✔	No	Yes
	Proportionate ethnic minority representation	✔	Yes	
	Proportionate disability representation	✘	No	
	Proportionate socio-economic representation	✘	No	
	Proportionate Lesbian Gay Bi-sexual Transgender Other sexuality representation	✘	No	

Applicability of the InCiSE methodology to Nigeria

Considering the data sources used in the current InCiSE framework and the supplementary sources we have suggested, we find relevant data for 26 of the 60 themes in the framework, or 43%. The InCiSE methodology sets a threshold of 75% for countries to be included in the InCiSE Index. We therefore find that there is currently insufficient data available to include Nigeria in the Index.

The InCiSE Index is designed to assess the effectiveness of the civil service and is composed of indicators and themes which measure various aspects of the operation of the civil service. Generally, there is more data available, which is more fine-grained, for OCED countries than for non-OECD countries. For example, the Quality of Governance Survey provides a dataset specifically for the OECD countries which has additional, more fine-grained indicators than the standard dataset (Rothstein, 2015).

In principle, the InCiSE Index addresses some key issues which relate to the civil service in Nigeria, such as relations between the bureaucracy and the executive, appointments based on merit and the gender and ethnic profile of the civil service. Some indicators, such as those related to digital technology, or the e-filing theme in the taxation indicator, assume the use of technology currently unavailable in lower middle-income countries such as Nigeria. The most significant obstacle to replicating the InCiSE Index for Nigeria is the absence

of suitable metrics for the policy and regulation indictors.

Publicly available sources of data for Nigeria measure governance at a much broader level and focus primarily on outputs rather than the processes used by the civil service to arrive at the outputs. For example, the African Development Bank and the Economist Intelligence Unit provide assessments of the quality of regulations which affect the economy, rather than the processes that the civil service utilises to deliver regulation. Similarly, the African Development Bank provides overall assessments of policy or institutions in Nigeria and other African countries.

In general, the approach to the public sector and governance in sub-Saharan Africa focuses on service delivery. The effectiveness of the public sector is usually gauged in terms of outcomes, such as number of schools or clinics built, school completion rates, vaccination rates and access to basic health care services. This approach to assessing the effectiveness of the public sector differs notably from the InCiSE approach which focusses on processes used in the civil service and on attributes such as transparency and accountability.

The quality of the data used by InCiSE sources such as the Quality of Governance Survey, the Global Competitiveness Survey and the Open Data Index are high. Most of the data are based on expert surveys or public opinion surveys. The data are widely

used and cited in the governance and economics literature. The additional datasets which have been proposed for Nigeria are produced by reputable organisations and are used as inputs by the World Bank to develop the Worldwide Governance indicators.

One option for Nigeria and other countries where data are lacking is to create an alternative index for these countries. The Bertelsmann Foundation has adopted this multiple index approach. They produce the Sustainable Governance index for OECD countries and the Transformation Index for 'new' democracies or countries in transition. Similarly, the Quality of Governance Institute at the University of Gothenburg also produces three datasets for its index (basic, standard and OECD) which have varying amounts of data.

The new index could be more orientated towards assessing outcomes rather than processes and would rely on overall ratings of the civil service and the bureaucracy rather than the detailed metrics used for InCiSE. The World Bank in partnership with the African Development Bank and the African Economic Research Consortium supports the Service Delivery Indicators project (https://www.sdindicators.org/). These indicators are based on data from site visits to a sample of health facilities and primary schools. Data are available for nine countries in Africa: Kenya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Tanzania, Togo and Uganda. Additional, data on government performance with regard to service delivery is available in the Afrobarometer public opinion survey (http://www.afrobarometer.org/. Some very tentative suggestions with regard to potential metrics and data sources which may be considered for developing a new index are listed in the table below.

Metric	Source	Number of countries	Region
Service delivery	Service Delivery Indicators	9	Africa
E-government	World Bank Digital Adoption index	180	Global
Accountability of public officials	Economist Intelligence Unit	204	Global
Political stability of absence of violence	Economist Intelligence Unit	204	Global
Quality of bureaucratic/institutional effectiveness	Economist Intelligence Unit	204	Global
Excessive bureaucracy/red tape	Economist Intelligence Unit	204	Global
Regulatory quality	Economist Intelligence Unit	204	Global
Corruption among public officials	Economist Intelligence Unit	204	Global
Tax Effectiveness	Global Insight Global Risk Service	over 200	Global
Quality of bureaucratic/institutional effectiveness	Global Insight Global Risk Service	over 200	Global
Civil service effectiveness	Global Integrity Index	138	Global
Civil service recruitment	Global Integrity Index	138	Global
Procurement in the public sector	Global Integrity Index	138	Global
Transparency of public records	Global Integrity Index	138	Global
Asset disclosure for public officials	Global Integrity Index	138	Global
Websites for ministries and government agencies	Global Integrity Index	138	Global

The viability of a new index may be affected by the following issues:

- Adopting a data driven approach skews the index towards indicators and metrics from available data sources. Other considerations such as the principles which should underpin such as exercise or the validity and legitimacy of the index may be undermined;

- The index may be not sufficiently different from other governance indices;

- Data may only be available for a small group of countries.

Since the brief for this report was to examine data sources for Nigeria, some of the sources that were found are applicable to African countries only. However, we anticipate that similar data for other regions may be available from the Asian Development Bank. Inter-American Development Bank, Asian Barometer, Arab Barometer and Latinobarómetro.

Bibliography

Amah EI (2017) 'Federalism, Nigerian Federal Constitution and the Practice of Federalism: An Appraisal', *Beijing Law Review* 8:287

Anazodo RO, Okoye JC and Chukwuemeka EE (2012) 'Civil service reforms in Nigeria: The journey so far in service delivery', *American Journal of Social and Management Sciences* 3(1):17–29

Azeez NA, Abidoye AP, Adesina AO, Agbele KK and Oyewole AS (2012) 'Threats to e-government implementation in the civil service: Nigeria as a case study', *The Pacific Journal of Science and Technology* 13(1):398–402

Gberevbie DE (2010) 'Strategies for employee recruitment, retention and performance: Dimension of the Federal civil service of Nigeria', *African Journal of Business Management* 4(8):1447–1456

OECD (2016) *OECD: Nigeria [online]*, https://www.oecd.org/regional/regional-policy/profile-Nigeria.pdf [last accessed 26 November 2018]

Philip DD and Peter DMB (2013) 'Public policy making and implementation in Nigeria: Connecting the Nexus', *Public Policy* 3(6)

Prempeh HK (2008) 'Presidents untamed', *Journal of Democracy* 19(2):109–123

Rasul I and Rogger D (2017) 'Management of bureaucrats and public service delivery: Evidence from the Nigerian civil service', *The Economic Journal* 128(608):413–446

Rothstein B. (2015) *The Quality of Government Institute Report for the first ten years of a Research Programme at the University of Gothenburg*, Gothenburg: The Quality of Government Institute, University of Gothenburg

Van Cranenburgh O (2011) 'Democracy promotion in Africa: the institutional context', *Democratization* 18(2):443–461

World Bank (2018) *Nigeria – Public Sector Governance Reform and Development Project (English)*, Washington DC: World Bank, http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/811381533573179080/Nigeria-Public-Sector-Governance-Reform-and-Development-Project

Annex: Detailed assessment of the applicability of the InCiSE methodology

The tables in this annex outline in detail the applicability of the methodology set out in the Technical Report for the 2017 edition of the InCiSE Index, assessing whether data is available for Nigeria and proposing potential alternatives where possible.

Theme	Metrics currently used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality of the InCiSE metrics for Nigeria	Alternative metrics available for Nigeria	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Policy making				
The quality of policy advice	Bertelsmann 'Scholarly Advice' sub-indicator is used as a proxy for the evidence base to policy decisions by assessing the degree of civil servant to academic coordination: 'How influential are non-governmental academic experts for government decision-making?'	Not available	There are no alternative metrics which capture these aspects of policy-making or oversight. The African Development Bank provides an overall index for country policy and institutional assessment (https://cpia.afdb.org/?page=data) which includes components related to economic management (fiscal policy, monetary policy, debt management) and 'structural policies' (trade policy), but this is not a good substitute.	There is a poor match between the Bertelsmann Sustainable Governance indicators, which are very specific, and the general policy ratings in the African Development Bank Index.
	Bertelsmann 'Government Office Expertise' sub-indicator assesses: 'Does the government office/prime minister's office (GO/PMO) have the expertise to evaluate ministerial draft bills substantively?'	Not available		
Degree of strategic policy direction	Bertelsmann 'Strategic Planning' sub-indicator assesses: 'How much influence do strategic planning units and bodies have on government decision-making?'	Not available	No comparable data	
Coordination of policy proposals	Bertelsmann 'Ministerial Bureaucracy' sub-indicator assesses: 'How effectively do ministry officials/civil servants coordinate policy proposals?'	Not available	Global Insight Business Risk and Conditions (WMO) provides data on policy consistency and instability, but these data look only at impacts on business, so are not good substitutes for the broader Bertelsmann indicators (www.globalinsight.com):	This is a private data source used to calculate the Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGIs) The metrics re loosely related to those used by InCiSE.
	Bertelsmann 'Line Ministries' sub-indicator assesses 'To what extent do line ministries involve the government office/prime minister's office in the preparation of policy proposals?'		Policy consistency and forward planning How confident businesses can be of the continuity of economic policy stance – whether a change of government will entail major policy disruption, and whether the current government has pursued a coherent strategy. This factor also looks at the extent to which policy-making is far-sighted, or conversely aimed at short-term economic advantage. Policy instability. The risk the government's broad policy framework shifts over the next year, making the business environment more challenging. This might include more onerous employment or environmental regulation; local content requirements; import/export barriers, tariffs, or quotas; other protectionist measures; price controls or caps; more "political" control of monetary policy, or simply more direct intervention into the operations and decisions of private companies etc.	

Theme	Metrics currently used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality of the InCiSE metrics for Nigeria	Alternative metrics available for Nigeria	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Timeliness and accuracy of policy delivery	No data identified	Not available	No comparable data	
Degree of policy monitoring	Bertelsmann 'Monitoring Ministries' sub-indicator assesses: 'How effectively does the GO/PMO monitor line ministry activities with regard to implementation?'	Not available	The Global Integrity Index has a metric for Civil Service Integrity: "In practice, civil servants' work is not compromised by political interference." (www. globalintegrity.org)	This metric is very relevant to the civil service but is not directly related to the metrics used in the framework. It is produced by an NGO and is used in the WGIs
	Bertelsmann sub-indicator 'Monitoring Agencies', assesses: 'How effectively do federal and subnational ministries monitor the activities of bureaucracies/executive agencies with regard to implementation?	Not available	No comparable metric	
	Bertelsmann 'National Standards' sub-indicator assesses: 'To what extent does central government ensure that subnational self-governments realise national standards of public services?'	Not available	No comparable metric	
Fiscal and financial management				
Economic appraisal (use, quality, guidance)	'Public Spending': WEF GCI business executive opinion: 'How would you rate the composition of public spending in your country?' (1) extremely wasteful; (7) highly efficient in providing necessary goods and services.	The data are credible and reveal an improvement in business conditions in Nigeria which most commentators agree with.	Same source is available	
Economic evaluation (use, quality, guidance)		Same source is available	African Development Bank Index – quality of budgetary and financial management https://cpia.afdb.org/?page=data	These metrics are related to the theme.

Theme	Metrics currently used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality of the InCiSE metrics for Nigeria	Alternative metrics available for Nigeria	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Medium-term budgeting	OECD 'Medium-term Budgeting' index	Not available	The Open Budget Index has data on Nigeria for three indicators: Public participation in the budgeting process Transparency through public information about the budget Budget oversight by the legislature and supreme audit association IBP Open Budget survey - Question 48 - ' Does the Executive's Budget Proposal or any supporting budget documentation present information on how the proposed budget (both new proposals and existing policies) is linked to government's policy goals for a multi-year period (for at least two years beyond the budget year)?'	These metrics are related to budgeting but they do not capture medium term budgeting in particular. The proposed metric captures medium term budgeting.
Performance budgeting	OECD 'Performance Budgeting' index	Not available	IBP Open Budget survey - Question 51 - 'Are performance targets assigned to nonfinancial data on results in the Executive's Budget Proposal or any supporting budget documentation? https://www.internationalbudget.org/open-budget-survey/open-budget-index-rankings/	The proposed metric captures performance budgeting.

Theme	Metrics currently used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality of the InCiSE metrics for Nigeria	Alternative metrics available for Nigeria	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Regulation				
Ex ante appraisal: application, quality, sustainability, transparency, oversight.	OECD i-reg indicators – Regulatory 'Impact Assessment – Primary Laws' OECD i-reg indicators – Regulatory 'Impact Assessment – Secondary Laws' #	Not available	Global Insight Business Risk and Conditions (WMO) Legislation An assessment of whether the necessary business laws are in place, and whether there any outstanding gaps. This includes the extent to which the country's legislation is compatible with, and respected by, other countries' legal systems. The World Justice project has a metric for law enforcement. https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/wip-rule-law-index/wip-rule-law-index-2017%E2%80%932018	Although there are several metrics on regulation in Nigeria they do not measure impact of the law. Enforcement of the law is not measuring the impact of the laws.
	Stakeholder engagement and ex post evaluation assessments are made on four areas of performance: methodology, systematic adoption, transparency and oversight/quality control.	Not available	The African Development Bank has a metric for quality of regulation which is comprised of: Regional integration Trade policy Business regulatory environment The Economist Intelligence Unit – Quality of bureaucratic/institutional effectiveness The Economist Intelligence Unit –Regulatory quality which is based on the following: Unfair competitive practices Price controls Discriminatory tariffs Excessive protections Discriminatory taxes www.eiu.com	The African Development Bank regulation sub-index focuses on economic regulation only. There is no disaggregation between primary and secondary laws. The Economist Intelligence Unit also focuses on regulation which affects the economy.
Stakeholder engagement: application, quality, transparency, oversight	OECD i-reg indicators – 'Stakeholder Engagement – Primary Laws' OECD i-reg indicators – 'Stakeholder Engagement – Secondary Laws'	Not available Not available	African Development Bank Index has two possible metrics: Quality of Public Administration Business regulatory environment	The metric on public administration does not fit regulation well. There is metric on the quality of business regulation only.

Theme	Metrics currently used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality of the InCiSE metrics for Nigeria	Alternative metrics available for Nigeria	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Ex post evaluation: application, quality, sustainability, transparency, oversight	OECD i-reg indicators – Ex-post 'Evaluation – Primary Laws' OECD i-reg indicators – Ex-post 'Evaluation – Secondary Laws'	Not available Not available	Global Integrity Index In practice, citizens can access legislative processes and documents.	This metric assesses the transparency of legislation to a limited extent.
Crisis/risk management				
Integrated risk planning	'Risk Planning Extent': The extent to which disaster risk is integrated into national policy planning is measured by counting the types of policy planning into which risk is integrated (out of 7, e.g. national development plans). 'Disaster Spending Appraisal': A score for economic appraisal looks at whether the costs and benefits of spending related to disaster spending are considered.	The progress reports are up to date and the Framework has been used to upgrade Nigeria's readiness for contending with disasters.	Same source is available – 2017 Report for Nigeria https://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/reports/v.php?id=53091&pid:223	
Risk monitoring	'Risk Assessment Quality': The quality of multi-hazard risk assessment is measured by assessing the processes behind risk assessments (out of 5, e.g. whether risk assessments have agreed national standards); The 'Degree of Risk Monitoring' is measured by assessing the extent and use of reports and databases of this type.	See previous comment	Same source is available	It may not be possible to calculate data for all the indicators.
Public information dissemination and public awareness strategies	'Early Warning Systems': The quality of early warning systems is assessed by looking at the processes in place (out of 3, e.g. whether protocols are used and applied). 'Public Information' dissemination is scored by looking at the types of communications in place (out of 4, e.g. is a national disaster information system publicly available?). 'Public Awareness Strategy' looks at the relevant workstreams in place (out of 5, e.g. whether public education campaigns for risk awareness exist).	See previous comment	Same source is available	

Theme	Metrics currently used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality of the InCiSE metrics for Nigeria	Alternative metrics available for Nigeria	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
International cooperation and risk coordination	'International Cooperation' is measured by assessing the number of processes/activities in place for international cooperation and international risk management (out of 6, e.g. whether transboundary protocols are in place).	See previous comment	Same source is available	
Preparedness for disaster response	No data identified	Not available		
Post disaster assessment methodology	'Post Disaster Assessment': A score is given for post disaster damage and loss assessment by considering, for example, whether a specified methodology for this exists (out of 3).	See previous comment	Same source is available	

Theme	Metrics currently used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality of the InCiSE metrics for Nigeria	Alternative metrics available for Nigeria	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Human resource management				
Meritocracy of recruitment	'Applicant Skills': QoG expert assessment of extent to which the skills and merits of the applicants decide who gets the job when recruiting public sector employees; 'Connections Bias in Recruitment: Political': QoG expert assessment of extent to which political connections of the applicants decide who gets the job; 'Connections Bias in Recruitment: Personal': QoG expert assessment of extent to which personal connections of the applicants decide who gets the job; 'Recruitment via Formal Exam System': QoG expert assessment of extent to which public sector employees are hired using a formal examination system.	This is an expert survey which is produced by the University of Gothenburg. The dataset won an award from the American Political Studies Association Comparative Politics Section. The survey is based on 1035 experts from 135 countries.	Same source is available https://qog.pol.gu.se/data/datadownloads/qogexpertsurveydata Same source is available Same source is available Same source is available	
Attracting and retaining talent	'Comparable Salaries': QoG expert assessment of extent to which senior officials have salaries that are comparable with the salaries of private sector managers with roughly similar training and responsibilities.	See previous comment	Same source is available	
Talent deployment (i.e. minimising skills gaps)	No data identified	Not available	No comparable data	
Performance management	No data identified	Not available	No comparable data	
Quality of learning and development	No data identified	Not available	No comparable data	
Level of customer (i.e. civil servant) satisfaction	No data identified	Not available	No comparable data	

Theme	Metrics currently used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality of the InCiSE metrics for Nigeria	Alternative metrics available for Nigeria	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Tax administration				
Overall efficiency of collection	'Collection Cost': Data from OECD Tax Administration on: cost of collection ratios (administrative costs/net revenue collected);	Not available	African Development Bank – Efficacy of revenue mobilisation.	These indicators are related to taxation but they are not as fine-grained as those used in the OECD survey.
	'Tax Debt' ratios (total year end tax debt (excl. disputed)/net revenue collected).	Not available	Global Insight Business Risk and Conditions (WMO) Tax Effectiveness How efficient the country's tax collection system is. The rules may be clear and transparent, but whether they are enforced consistently. This factor looks at the relative effectiveness too of corporate and personal, indirect and direct taxation. Tax inconsistency. Tax inconsistency also captures the risk that fines and penalties will be levied for non-compliance with a tax code that appears disproportionate or manipulated for political ends.	
User centricity of services	'Time to Pay Taxes – Business': Data from the World Bank's 'Doing Business' Index on the time it takes businesses to pay taxes.	The data are reliable	Same source is available	
Extent and quality of digital provision	'E-Filed Tax Returns – Personal': Data from OECD Tax Administration on: the percentage of tax returns e-filed during the last fiscal year for personal taxes;	Not available	There is no comparable data.	The Nigerian government announced that electronic tax returns would be introduced in 2017. It is too early to obtain reliable data on this.
	'E-Filed Tax Returns – Corporate': Data from OECD Tax Administration on: the percentage of tax returns e-filed during the last fiscal year for corporate taxes;	Not available	There is no comparable data.	
	'E-Filed Tax Returns – VAT': Data from OECD Tax Administration on: the percentage of tax returns e-filed during the last fiscal year for VAT taxes.	Not available	There is no comparable data	
Prevention of tax evasion	No data identified	Not available	There is no comparable data.	
Level of tax gap measurement	No data identified	Not available	There is no comparable data.	

Theme	Metrics currently used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality of the InCiSE metrics for Nigeria	Alternative metrics available for Nigeria	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Social security administration				
Overall efficiency of distribution	Administration costs as a percentage of total expenditure on social security.	Not available	There is no comparable data.	
User centricity of services	No data identified	Not available	There is no comparable data.	
Extent and quality of digital provision	No data identified	Not available	There is no comparable data.	
Prevention of fraud	No data identified	Not available	There is no comparable data.	
Digital service				
User centricity of services	European Commission E-Government benchmark: 'User Centricity', indicates to what extent (information about) a service is provided online.	Not available	Digital adoption index (government sub-index) UN E-Governance Survey (e-government development index)	This is an overall ranking of e=government.
Transparency of service	European Commission E-Government benchmark: 'Transparency', indicates to what extent governments are transparent as regards a) their own responsibilities and performance, b) the process of service delivery and c) personal data involved.	Not available	Global Integrity Index In practice, ministries and autonomous agencies have websites. In practice public service regulatory agencies and the national ombudsman (where there is one) have websites.	These metrics provide some data on the extent of transparency of the government.
Cross-border mobility of services	European Commission E-Government benchmark: 'Cross Border Mobility', indicates to what extent European users can use online services in another country;	Not available	There is no comparable data.	

Theme	Metrics currently used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality of the InCiSE metrics for Nigeria	Alternative metrics available for Nigeria	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
The availability of 'key enablers'	European Commission E-Government benchmark: 'Key Enablers', indicates the extent to which five technical pre-conditions for eGovernment are used.	Not available	There is no comparable data.	
Integrity				
Levels/perceptions of corruption	'Corruption Perceptions': Global Corruption Barometer – % of people viewing public officials/civil servants as corrupt; 'Public Officials Stealing': QoG – expert opinion of how often public sector officials steal or embezzle public funds; 'Public Officials Favours for Bribes': QoG – expert opinion of how often public sector officials grant favours for bribes; 'Government Favouritism of Business': WEF GCI – business executive opinion of extent government officials show favouritism to well-connected firms.	The data comes from a public opinion survey of perceptions of corruption. The sample size is large so the data should be reliable.	Same source is available https://opendatabarometer.org/data-explorer/?_year=2015&indicator=ODB&lang=en&open=NGA Same source is available Same source is available Same source is available	
Fairness and impartiality	'Fair Treatment by Public Officials': QoG expert assessment of extent to which public sector employees treat some groups in society unfairly; 'Public Officials Act Impartially': QoG expert assessment of extent to which public sector employees act impartially when deciding how to implement policy.	See previous comment on QoG data	Same source is available https://qog.pol.gu.se/data/datadownloads/qogexpertsurveydata Same source is available	
Adherence to rules and procedures	'Public Officials Follow Rules': QoG expert assessment of extent to which public sector employees strive to follow rules.	See previous comment	Same source is available	
Striving to serve citizens and ministers	'Public Officials Strive to Help Citizens': QoG expert assessment of extent to which public sector employees strive to help citizens; 'Public Officials Strive to Implement Policies': QoG expert assessment of extent to which public sector employees strive to implement policies decided by political leaders; 'Public Officials Strive to Fulfill Ideology': QoG expert assessment of extent to which public sector employees strive to fulfil ideology of party in government.	See previous comment on QoG data	Same source is available Same source is available Same source is available	

Theme	Metrics currently used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality of the InCiSE metrics for Nigeria	Alternative metrics available for Nigeria	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Work ethic	'Employee Absences': QoG expert assessment of extent to which public sector employees are absent without permission; 'Employee Efficiency': QoG expert assessment of extent to which public sector employees strive to be efficient.	See previous comment on QoG data	Same source is available Same source is available	
Processes in place to preserve integrity and prevent conflicts of interest	'Post Employment Cooling Off': OECD data on whether a post-employment cooling off period exists and whether it's paid; 'Lobbyist Protection': OECD data on degree of protection against lobbyists and other private interests influencing advisory groups; 'Whistleblower Protection: Coverage': OECD data on number of groups who receive whistleblower protection; 'Whistleblower Protection: Degree': qog expert assessment of degree of whistleblower protection.	Not available Not available Not available See previous comment on QoG data	No comparable data No data is available No data is available Same data source.	

Theme	Metrics currently used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality of the InCiSE metrics for Nigeria	Alternative metrics available for Nigeria	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Openness				
The degree and quality of societal consultation	The 'Civic Participation' component of the Open Government Index, which "measures the effectiveness of civic participation mechanisms, including the protection of the freedoms of opinion and expression, and assembly and association, and the right to petition the government. It also measures whether people can voice concerns to various government officers and members of the legislature, and whether government officials provide sufficient information and notice about decisions affecting the community, including opportunities for citizen feedback"; 'E-Government Engagement': The UN's E-Participation Index, which reviews the quality and usefulness of e-government programs for the purpose of engaging people in public policy-making and implementation; 'Negotiating Public Support' Bertelsmann sub-indicator, which "assesses how successfully the government consults with societal actors such as trade unions, employers' associations, leading business associations, religious communities, and social and environmental interest groups in eparing its policy."	The data is based on a public option survey. The sample is restricted to three cities per country is anticipated to have an urban bias. Data is reliable Not available	Same source is available Open Governance Index has information on civic governance (factor 7) Same source is available UN E-Governance Survey (e-government participation index) No comparable data	
The existence and quality of complaint mechanisms	The 'Complaint Mechanisms' component of the Open Government Index, which "measures whether people are able to bring specific complaints to the government about the provision of public services or the performance of government officers in carrying out their legal duties in practice, and how government officials respond to such complaints. It also measures whether people can challenge government decisions before another government agency or a judge."	See previous comment.	Same source is available Open Governance Index has information on complaints mechanisms (factor 3.4)	

Theme	Metrics currently used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality of the InCiSE metrics for Nigeria	Alternative metrics available for Nigeria	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Government data availability and accessibility	'Open Data Practice and Impact': The Open Data Barometer (ODB) measures the implementation of open data practice and is the only index to also measure the impact of open data (e.g. how many use it).	Not available	Global Competitiveness Survey – Transparency of government policy making	This is related metric of transparency.
Government data impact and support for re-use	'Government Datasets Openness': The Open Data Index (ODI) measures whether publicly held data across 13 areas is defined as open, with results crowdsourced from volunteers reviewing websites.	Not available	No comparable data	
	'Data Availability and Government Support': The OURdata index also aims to capture the availability and accessibility of data but uniquely it also attempts to measure the level of pro-active support governments provide to foster innovative re-use of the data.	Not available	No comparable data	
Right to information (e.g. FOIs)	The 'Rights to Information' component of the Open Government Index which "measures whether requests for information held by a government agency are granted. It also measures whether these requests are granted within a reasonable time period, if the information provided is pertinent and complete, and if requests for information are granted at a reasonable cost and without having to pay a bribe. This dimension also measures whether people are aware of their right to information, and whether relevant records – such as budget figures of government officials, ombudsman reports, and information relative to community projects – are accessible to the public upon request."	See previous comment	Same data source.	

Theme	Metrics currently used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality of the InCiSE metrics for Nigeria	Alternative metrics available for Nigeria	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Publicised laws	The 'Publicised Laws' component of the Open Government Index, which "measures whether basic laws and information on legal rights are publicly available, presented in plain language, and are made accessible in all languages used by significant segments of the population. This dimension also measures the quality and accessibility of information published by the government in print or online (i.e. active transparency), and whether administrative regulations, drafts of legislation, administrative decisions, and high court decisions are made accessible to the public in a timely manner."	See previous comment	Same source is available	
Capabilities				
Leadership capability	No data identified	Not available	No comparable data	
Commercial capability	No data identified	Not available	No comparable data	
Analytical capability	No data identified	Not available	No comparable data	
Digital capability	No data identified	Not available	No comparable data	
Core capability (e.g. problem-solving, numeracy, literacy skills)	'Literacy Skills': Taken from the OECD's PIAAC (Survey of Adult Skills) data (analysis of the microdata): the proportion of the public sector getting level 4 or 5 for literacy skills; 'Numeracy Skills': The proportion of the public sector getting level 4 or 5 for numeracy skills; 'Problem Solving Skills': The proportion of the public sector getting level 3 for problem skills.	Not available Not available Not available	No comparable data No comparable data No comparable data	
Educational attainment of the workforce	'Educational Attainment': The proportion of the public sector with tertiary education, taken from the OECD's PIAAC (Survey of Adult Skills) data (analysis of the microdata).	Not available	No comparable data	

Theme	Metrics currently used in InCiSE Index	Comments on the quality of the InCiSE metrics for Nigeria	Alternative metrics available for Nigeria	Comments on the quality of the alternative metrics
Inclusiveness				
Proportionate gender representation	'Gender: Central Government Share': OECD data – the absolute difference between the share of total central government employment filled by women and the share of women in the labour force;	Not available	African Development Bank Gender Equality Index https://www.afdb.org/en/topics-and-sectors/topics/quality-assurance-results/gender-equality-index/	This is an overall proxy measure of gender equity.
	'Gender: Public Sector Share': QoG data – the absolute difference between proportion of women in public sector and in the labour force;	See previous comment on QOG data.	Same data source	
	'Gender: Management Share': OECD data – the absolute difference between the share of employment in top management positions within central government filled by women and the share of women in the labour force;	Not available	No comparable data	
	'Gender: Senior Management Share': QoG data – the absolute difference between proportion of women in central government senior positions and in the labour force	See previous comment	Same data source	
Proportionate ethnic minority representation	'Ethnic and Religious Group Representation': QoG data – expert opinion as to whether 'Key ethnic and religious groups in society are proportionally represented among public sector employees (1=hardly ever, 7=almost always)'	See previous comment	Same data source	
Proportionate disability representation	No data identified	Not available	No comparable data	
Proportionate socio-economic representation	No data identified	Not available	No comparable data	
Proportionate Lesbian Gay Bi-sexual Transgender Other sexuality representation	No data identified	Not available	No comparable data	

InCiSE