

Institutionalizing Development Planning in Nigeria: Context, Prospects and Policy Challenges

Nazifi Abdullahi Darma^{1*} Bappah Tijjani²

1. Department of Economics, University of Abuja, P.M.B 117, Abuja, Nigeria
2. Department of Macroeconomic Analysis and Research, National Planning Commission, Plot 421, Independence Avenue, Abuja, Nigeria.

*nazeefdarma@gmail.com

Abstract

Sustainable economic growth and development is strongly linked to defining developmental needs and deploying resources towards solving same using the instrumentality of national development plans framework especially in a developing economy such ours that is additionally operating a federal fiscal system. The main objective of the research is to review previous planning experience of Nigeria relative to other developing countries and define key initiatives required for institutionalizing development planning model in Nigeria. In the process, five key benefits of planning have been identified; aligning sectoral needs with resource availability, implementing a mutually supporting sectoral development strategy, value for money in public expenditure spent, result based programme budgeting and strengthened fiscal federalism. Pursuant to the need for Nigeria to achieve the goals and objectives encapsulated in the Vision 20:2020 Economic Transformation Blueprint, specific legal, institutional and policy initiatives are required. However, strong and committed political leadership, sustained plan funding and development of a results based national monitoring and evaluation framework are required for a successful reverting to national development planning framework after a 27 years break.

Keywords: Development planning, Policy making and Economic Transformation

1.0 Introduction

Scarcity of national resources relative to needs and want warrant prioritization of resource allocation towards securing maximum benefit with existing limited resource outlay. For many developing economies Nigeria inclusive, the attainment of political independence manifest glaring multi-dimensional development needs that must be addressed to lay a foundation for sustainable economic development and prosperity. With a population of over 56 million in 1963 at the early years of independence to its present population of approximately 170 million citizens, a structured and coordinated multi-sectoral development strategy is required to translate the benefits of political freedom into macroeconomic stability, accelerated domestic and international trade, employment creation, infrastructural development and industrialization leading to economic prosperity and wealth for citizens.

With these major objectives in mind, development planning in post-independence years (1st National Development Plan 1962-68, 2nd National Development Plan 1970-75, 3rd plan 1976-80 and 4th plan 1981-85) were all directed at laying a solid foundation for sustainable economic growth and development for Nigeria. From 1960-1985, a period characterised with national development planning and its implementation, Nigeria witnessed sustained growth in infrastructure, industrial development, agricultural prosperity, increased per capita income and above all fiscal discipline in public financial management.

However, years of military intervention on political governance between 1985-1998, have had a serious negative implication for planning and development as the national development plans within the defined period were either not implemented accordingly or development planning was abandoned completely leading to the adoption of perspective or ad-hoc planning arrangements that appear national but really federal in nature and limited to same tier of government.

With the return of democratic governance in 1999, same culture of ad-hoc planning was maintained partly due to the military nature of the newly elected President, more strongly due to dearth of planning culture due to a 28 years absence of national development plan.

In the year 2009, the civilian administration of late President Umaru Musa Yar'adua, embarked on a laudable programme of fashioning a long term national development planning strategy and its resuscitation with the launching of the Nigeria Vision 20:2020 Economic Transformation Blueprint whose main objective is the economic transformation of Nigeria towards emerging as one of the twenty leading economies of the world by the year 2020. This goal of economic transformation is envisaged to be realized through the attainment of US\$900 billion GDP and per capita income of US\$4,000 by the year 2020.

Its preparation and development is characterized with a national outlook and participatory process as over 5,000 Nigerians from every sector of economic, political and social life engaged in its preparation and a full participation of bureaucrats from federal government, 36 states of the federation and local councils To facilitate the realization of the aforementioned targets in the context of the overall national long term plan of vision 2020,

the overall macro-economic and sectoral objectives, strategic initiatives and targets were transformed into three national implementation plans of 2010-2013, 2014-2017 and 2018-2020, with inputs from all tiers of government (federal, State and Local Governments) manifested in costed and implementable projects and programmes.

2.0 Literature Review.

Theoretically, development plans of any sort involve deliberate efforts on the part of the government to speed up the process of social and economic development of a country. In some countries, such as the former Soviet Union with a socialist ideology, the development plan efforts were usually found to be rewarding, as the government was able to intervene directly and extensively in the lives of the people (Ogunjimi, 1997:97). Similarly, in other countries like the mixed advanced Western economies and many developing countries with a purely capitalist ideology, the economy is structured in such a way that though the interventionist role of the government is usually relatively small, there is always emphasis on the provision of a policy framework, usually through development plans, within which the economy and other sectors operate. This implies that a structured and organized process of sectoral development is required through the instrumentality of national development plans.

The Main objective and goal of planning by government, therefore, is that it makes a deliberate effort and conscious choice regarding the rate and direction of economic growth and development with a defined time-frame. The most logical interpretation of this is that the relative rates at which any sub-sector of the economy (heavy industry, agricultural improvement, transport, housing and the like) are to be pursued become a matter of conscious policy (Ayinla, 1998:21). It is therefore reasonable to say here that, through a national comprehensive plan, it will be possible to make rational decisions to achieve deliberate, consistent and well-balanced action towards socio-economic development and good governance. The successful implementation of many projects before and after independence and up to a point in the history of Nigeria as a nation was due substantially to the strategy of pursuing economic and social development through periodic national development plans.

3.0 Development Planning prior to 2009

The history of conscious planning for development in Nigeria can be traced to the colonial days. To be specific, it has its origin in 1946 when the colonial government introduced what it tagged “Ten Year Plan of Development and Welfare for Nigeria”. This was under the Colonial Development and Welfare Fund. Under this historic Development Plan, a total planned expenditure of an equivalent of ₦110 million for a period of ten years was earmarked for the period starting from April 1, 1946 to March 31, 1956 (Ogunjimi, 1997:97). The plan focused on building a transport and communication system, while little provision was made for industrial development, meant to serve the interest of the colonial masters rather than that of the colony (i.e. Nigeria).

Later, a decision was taken to break the plan period into two five-year sub-periods and to formulate a new plan for the sub-period 1950-1956. However, the introduction of a federal system of government affected this revision as each of the regional governments became autonomous and adopted different economic policies.

Since independence in 1960, Nigeria has formulated and launched other development plans, which, of course, were more comprehensive than the pre-independence plans. Therefore, between 1960 and 1985, there were four development plans in Nigeria which were referred to as the First, Second, Third and Fourth National Development Plans. Each of these development plans had its own focus and well-articulated objectives which had far-reaching effects on the nation’s developmental aspirations.

The First National Development Plan was launched in April 1962 and covered a period of six years (1962-68). Under this plan, a total investment expenditure of about ₦2.132 billion was proposed. Out of this, public-sector investment was expected to be about ₦1.352 billion, while the remaining investment expenditure of ₦780 million was to be undertaken by the private sector. The full implementation of this development plan was however interrupted by two major political events, namely, the military intervention in 1966 and the 1967-70 civil war. Consequently, the period of the plan was extended to March 31, 1970. These major interruptions notwithstanding, both the Federal Government and regional governments recorded a number of landmark achievements during the development plan period. During the crisis period, the Federal Government alone successfully executed projects like the Oil Refinery in Port Harcourt, the Paper Mill, the Sugar Mill and the Niger Dam (in Jebba and Bacita respectively), the Niger Bridge, and ports’ extension, while it also constructed a number of trunk ‘A’ roads. It is interesting to note that it was also during this period that the first-generation universities were established: Ibadan and Lagos by the Federal Government, Ahamdu Bello University by the Northern Nigerian Government, University of Nigeria Nsukka (UNN) by the Eastern Nigerian Government and the University of Ife (now known as the Obafemi Awolowo University) by the Western Nigerian Government.

The federal and regional governments were able to achieve this much in spite of the crisis because, during the period, the annual capital budgets operated within the development plan framework. This was in itself made possible by the existence of a development plan which provided guidelines for meaningful and co-coordinated

development during the plan period despite two political crises.

General Yakubu Gowon launched the Second National Development Plan in 1970 on behalf of the Federal Government and the government of the then twelve states of the federation. It was launched shortly after the end of the war. Because it was a post-war development plan, its focus was on the reconstruction of a war-battered economy and the promotion of economic and social development in the new Nigeria. The main objectives of the plan include the building of a united, strong and self-reliant nation; a great and dynamic economy; a just egalitarian society; a land of bright and full opportunities for all citizens; and a free and democratic society.

Like the First National Development Plan, the Second National Development Plan also recorded a number of major projects, which were successfully executed by both the federal and state governments. Such projects include the successful construction of many federal roads; the successful take-off of the National Youth Service Corps scheme; the introduction of federal scholarship and loan schemes for Nigerian students, etc.

General Gowon also launched the Third National Development Plan on behalf of all governments in the country. The plan covered a five-year period from April 1975 to March 1980. It was a unique development plan because, apart from its huge initial investment of about ₦30 billion (which was later revised to ₦43.3 billion), extensive consultations with the private sector of the economy were made in the course of its preparation.

The cardinal objectives of this plan were also part of its uniqueness. Such objectives include increase in per capita income during the plan period; more even distribution of income; reduction in the level of unemployment; diversification of the economy; pursuit of a balanced development strategy; and indigenization of economic activities. As laudable as the objectives of this development plan were, the implementation was adversely affected by the change of government in July 1975, barely three months after the plan was launched. In particular, the change of government led to a reappraisal of some of the cardinal objectives as contained in the plan. Here, more emphasis was placed on those projects which were thought to have direct effects on the living standard of the common man. Sectors that were thus given priority included agriculture, water supply, housing and health (Olaniyi, 1998:108).

The Fourth National Development Plan, (1981-85) was launched by President Shehu Shagari in 1981 on behalf of the Federal Government and the governments of the then nineteen states of the federal. This was the first plan to be formulated by a democratically elected government under a new constitution based on the presidential system of government. As observed by Ogunjimi (1997:100), the plan was intended to further the process of establishing a solid base for the long-term economic and social development of Nigeria. Unlike the previous development plans, the fourth plan was the first in which the local governments were made to participate at two levels. One, they participated at the level of preparation, and two, they were allowed to have their own separate programmes under the plan. The capital investment target was ₦82.2 billion shared between the public and private sectors with the former putting in about ₦70.5 billion, while the latter put in the balance of ₦11.7 billion. The Fourth Development Plan was again affected by the change of government in 1983 and another change in 1985. These two changes seriously disrupted the implementation of the programmes embodied in the plan and, consequently, the performance of the economy during the fourth plan period was generally poor. Whatever the case (success or failure), it is interesting to note that between 1945 and 1986, the concept of development planning was common: planning for social and economic development in Nigeria. Beyond the end of this period, this concept gradually faded away and has now become a thing of the past.

Nigeria is abundantly blessed with enormous human and natural resources that should translate to a decent standard of living. With a population of over 160 million, in spite of these blessings, the poor performance of the Nigerian economy in many sectors is very evident. The real sector (manufacturing and agriculture) is performing rather poorly. While the country still imports a lot of the agricultural produce for consumption, the capacity utilization in industry is very low and oil is still exported in its crude form. The country's per capita income which was as high as \$1,281.4 in 1980, declined continuously to its lowest level of \$240.0 in 1992; it stood at around \$250.0 in 1995, at \$270.0 in 1997 and above \$2000 in 2012.

The overall consequence of the macroeconomic problems is the deplorable poverty profile of Nigerians. Indeed, the poverty profile of Nigerians appears to be worsening. The UNDP Human Development Report for 2010 places Nigeria at No. 142 out of the 169 countries surveyed. The situation was marginally better when compared with the 2003 report, which puts Nigeria at 152 among the 175 countries covered in the survey. Official statistics indicated that the national incidence of poverty has remarkably risen from a modest level of 15 percent in 1960 to 28 percent in 1980. It rose further to 46 percent in 1985 and 66 percent in 1996. As at 2001, it was estimated to stand at over 70 percent (FRN, 2001 and Obadan, 2001), while a recent survey by the Nigerian National Bureau of Statistics in 2011 indicated a national poverty rate of 56 percent.

These negative development indices are no doubt a manifestation of neglecting the practice of successive development planning and its implementation, which denies the country the required blueprints for development on a sustainable basis similar to other developing countries with a strong and consistent planning culture.

The new democratic administration has made concerted efforts at redressing the various crises and reviving the economy, but the fact remains that in the year 2000, the economy "neither improved nor deteriorated

significantly but was static and still low-income, low-growth, with distortions in several areas”. Indeed, President Olusegun Obasanjo made reference to the static nature of the economy while presenting the 2001 Appropriation Bill to the National Assembly in November 2000 when he stated, “for this government and most Nigerians, our hard-won democracy is yet to translate into significant improvements in our lives (Taiwo, 2001). By implication, there is no corresponding relationship between extant resource endowment with economic development and prosperity of citizens. Realizing the full potentials of our economic capability would require prioritization of resource allocation to the most important needs that can propel the economy towards full employment and sustainable development. In the context of the aforementioned assertion, it is logical to analysis specific benefits associated with development planning for a developing economy like that of Nigeria.

4.0 Development Planning and Implementation in Other Countries. Practical experience and empirical evidence have lend credence to a fact that developing countries that are consistent with development planning as a development strategy have achieved macroeconomic stability, higher export revenues, improved life expectancy, higher disposable income and overall structural transformation of their societies over the long run. India Malaysia and south-Africa are developing economies characterized with a culture of consistency in development planning. In the case of India for example, it is today implementing its 12th five year development plan from 1960 to date, leading to high confidence by domestic and foreign investors, hence attracting Public-Private Partnership based investment in infrastructure totaling over US\$480 billion in the 12th plan (2011-2015), with an additional commitment of over US\$ 1 Trillion investment committed by the private sector in the 13th plan commencing in the year 2016. A close evaluation of the table below indicates that India was able to improve on the life expectancy of its citizens from 56 years in 1990 to 65 years in 2010, a period of 20 years, giving a cumulative additional nine years of higher life expectancy for its citizens which is strongly related to marked improvements in national income that rose from US\$270.5 billion in 1990 to US\$1,159 trillion in 2007 or an increase of 429% over a period of 17 years.

Besides India, Malaysia is another country that lessons of consistent planning can be evaluated relative to Nigeria. Although life expectancy was relatively high over 20 years ago at 70 years of age on average for the population it never the less increased to 74 years within the analysis period, though national income increased by 480% within 18 years, though Nigeria also witnessed remarkable increase in GDP by over 590% over the same period, but widespread poverty is entrenched at 56% according to official figures but real estimates put the poverty rate at over 70%. This distorted income expansion with no corresponding improvement in per capita income and poverty reduction can be partly attributed to the absence of development plan implementation leading to a distortionary and skewed income expansion limited to the Oil and Gas sectors that accounted for less than 20% of GDP and employing less than 1% of the population in addition to being highly import dependent in its orientation.

Table 1. Indicators of Nigeria and other Countries

Countries	Life expectancy (years)			GDP US\$(Millions)	
	1990	2000	2010	1990	2008
Malaysia	70.1	72.1	74	45,716	221,800
India	56.3	61.6	65.1	270,500	1,159,200
South Africa	61.5	54.8	52.2	112,014	276,400
Nigeria	45.6	46.3	51.4	35,026	207,100

Sources: World Development Indicators and UNDP, 2013

5.0 Benefits of Development Planning in Nigeria

As stated earlier, development planning entails a coordinated process of development intervention towards achieving defined macroeconomic goals and objectives with multi-oriented economic, social and political benefits for the citizens. Arising from the foregoing, we can evaluate the benefits of national development planning in the contest of the following;

5.1 Aligning Sectoral Needs with Resource Availability. It is pertinent to indicate that adoption and implementation of a national development plan for a developing economy like Nigeria possesses immense benefits towards clearly defining each sectors needs and resource outlay requirements and allocating the limited state resources to the most important and economically beneficial sectors towards attaining optimality in resource usage. Without a national plan that clearly articulate sectoral intervention requirement, resources allocated among sectors in the absence of clear prioritization lead to wastage and sub-optimal benefits realization for citizens.

5.2 Mutually Supporting Sectoral Development Strategy. As every economy is composed on multi-oriented sectors with activities in each sector having externality on other sectors, adoption of a national development strategy facilitates the choice and adoption of key initiatives and projects that mutually enforce each other, hence smoothening the phase of national development and prosperity. It is pertinent to realize that

development of an industrial estate as a standalone project in the absence transport infrastructure and other services may not lead to the attainment of objectives that spur the construction of the industrial estate. It is only through national planning that clusters of mutually benefit projects and programmes are identified for implementation.

5.3 Value for Money in Public Expenditure Spent. A key requirement in public financial management is the allocation of resources among competing needs towards achieving increasing returns to scale manifest in input-output relationship. As development needs are carefully evaluated and costed, financial outlay towards programme and project implementation secure the required financial prudence in line with the best principles of public expenditure and financial management. Contrary practices often lead to resource wastage; hence compounding development needs outlay needs relative to resource availability and increasing demand for social and economic services.

5.4 Implementation of Programme Based Budgeting. Development expenditure and provision of public goods and services through a programmed based budgeting framework provides a solid base of synchronizing articulated objectives, goals and strategic initiatives of development intervention across sectors towards monitoring progress of plans and project implementation on a periodic basis. As each project being implemented is aligned to defined sectoral objectives and initiatives defined based on Key Performance Indicators (KPI), project monitoring and periodic evaluation of plan and budget implementation is made easier, with outcomes used as inputs towards correcting budget and plan implementation challenges and initiating new budget and plan framework.

5.5 Strengthening of Fiscal Federalism. Nigeria is a country operating a federal system of democratic governance composed of three tiers of government with clearly defined duties and responsibilities as defined in the Constitution. With 36 States and 774 Local Councils (Counties), areas of fiscal responsibility are clearly defined as Exclusive legislative list, residual list and concurrent list. In addition, the revenue allocation Formulae that defines proportion of federally collected revenues that goes to the states and local councils is such that over 50% of it goes to the states and local councils, with the federal government retaining the remaining half. The reality of development intervention justifies a coordinated approach towards addressing them in any federating entity as the overall macro-economic goals and objectives are the same for the national economy, but with no tier of government having adequate resource outlay towards their execution courtesy of its partial control of national resources and income.

Based on the foregoing analysis that clearly enumerated the manifest benefits associated with the adoption of a development planning framework by Nigeria, it is pertinent to note that similar developing countries experiences that are consistent with development planning strengthened our resolve towards adopting development plans as a catalyst for the attainment of a sustainable development process characterized with equity. As a strategy towards achieving a comprehensive implementation process based on the recent adoption of a medium term plan culture in Nigeria from 2009, what are the necessary legal, institutional and policy initiatives that can accentuate reaping the full benefits of reverting to development planning model in Nigeria?

6.0 Legal Initiatives:

6.1 A novel initiative that accompanied the Completion and launch of Vision 20:2020 Economic Transformation Blueprint is the introduction of a new legislation called “**Planning Development and Continuity Act**” to the National assembly as a way of institutionalizing development planning culture in Nigeria, hence insulating present and future development plans from changes in political leadership at all levels. Although the bill is yet to be enacted its speedy passage by the National Legislature is an initiative capable of eliminating the prevalence of abandoned projects in Nigeria numbering over 12,000, requiring over N7 Trillion for their completion. (Report of the Presidential Committee on Projects Assessment 2010)

6.2 Domestication of “Planning Development and Continuity Act” at the State and Local Government Level. As stated earlier, the Fiscal federalism Nigeria is implementing involved devolution of approximately 50% of all federally collected revenues to states and local councils. Domestication of the aforementioned Act by states and local councils would consolidate same initiative at the federal level, with a stronger impact on the national economy.

6.3 Domestication of Procurement Act by States and Local Governments. Arising from the entrenchment of rent seeking in public procurement and the need to ensure efficient allocation of fiscal resources towards provision of public goods and services, the federal government of Nigeria in 1996, enacted a Procurement Act that provided a strong institutional framework for public award of contract for goods, services and consultancy with a clearly defined rules right from advertisement, tender, selection and payment. Although some states have domesticated the Act, most of the states and local governments are yet to enact same, hence maintaining same bad practices that impeded on effective and transparent public financial management.

7.0 Policy Initiatives

7.1 Implementation of National Council on Development Resolutions. A key feature of the development policy framework in Nigeria is the existence of a National Council on Development Planning composed of all state planning Commissioners and Chairmen that meet on a periodic basis to review national development planning and sectoral policies, programmes and projects implementation. While the frequency of the meetings should be increased from existing semi-annual to a quarterly basis, the key policy resolutions reached at the meeting should be implemented by all stakeholders towards strengthening policy and plan coherence that can scale up fiscal federalism relations.

7.2 Development of a National Policy Compendium. Development policy making and intervention is strengthened where each sector has a policy document that guides sectoral interventions agreed upon by all stakeholders in a federation. Much as the national economy has reverted to a development planning path with the adoption of Nigeria Vision 20:2020 Economic Transformation Blueprint in 2009 and subsequent crafting of medium term plans, it is imperative for a review of existing sectoral policies in consultation with the states and local governments towards aligning key objectives, priorities and strategic initiatives encapsulated in the NV20:2020 document with national sector specific policy objectives.

7.3 Increased Frequency of National Councils Meetings. As part of our development policy implementation architecture, each sector is characterised with a national council composed of technocrats from federal and state Ministries, Departments and Agencies. They are responsible for developing and review on a periodic basis, national policy objectives and initiatives for implementation across the national economy. The national council on Agriculture, Water Resources, Health, Education, Environment, and Housing and Urban Development are cases in point that meet on a periodic basis to review implementation of agreed national policy, programmes and projects relating to the sector. Pursuant to the need for an enhanced flat-form for policy and programmes implantation review, the Councils should meet on quarterly basis as opposed to the present semi-annual or annual meetings as a strategy of policy implementation review and adopting innovative strategies towards addressing sectoral development challenges.

8.0 Institutional Initiatives

8.1 States Bureaus for Statistics (SBS)

To strengthen planning and institutionalize planning process, states that are yet to establish their States' Bureau of Statistics (SBS) should urge their respective State House of Assemblies to pass the Bill to institutionalize planning process in the country. Out of the 36 States only 14 States are yet to either pass the bills or establish the SBS in the country. The main objective of establishing the SBS is to generate data necessary for identifying sectoral development needs and challenges for the preparation of development plan as well as computation of State GDP.

8.2 State Planning Commissions (SPC) and their Autonomy

Similarly, to institutionalize the planning process, the State Governments are required to establish independent and autonomous State Planning Commission separate from the Ministry of Finance, responsible for planning and budget implementation processes. This will allow for proper alignment between the plan and the annual budget, provide a mechanism for policy implementation, monitoring and review.

8.3 Planning and Statistics Departments in Area Councils

At the Local Government level, similar institutions should be created. Planning and Statistics and M&E Department should be created at the Area Councils to plan, coordinate the implementation and monitor and evaluate plan implementation in area councils as part of grass-root development strategy.

8.4 Strong PRS Departments in federal and State MDAs

As part of the efforts to ensure effective coordination and harmonization of inputs, outputs, outcomes and impact, all Federal and State MDAs should have Planning, Research and Statistics Department. The main function of the department is to develop sectoral plan and work-plan for the organization and also forward inputs to the NPC for the development of National Development Plan as well as monthly, quarterly, half yearly and annual M&E report to the NPC. In the PRS Department, a unit known as Monitoring and Evaluation is created to monitor and evaluate all the projects, programmes and policies of the organization for onward transmission to the coordinating agency (National Planning Commission) and State Planning Commission for the production of relevant policy documents and reports.

9.0 Challenges

9.1 Political will and leadership. The success of any developing economy depends on to a significant extent on its adherence on the planning and its implementation. The president, the governors and the chairmen are the chief planning officers who are expected to drive the process and take the lead in compliance. In Nigeria, political office holders seem to be reluctant about development planning, with the result is that little or no

attention is paid to its implementation and compliance. The leaders prefer and entertain projects outside the plan, thus leading to extra- budget spending. This means that projects/programmes outside the plan are implemented and this adversely affects its proper implementation. The key success factor in the Indian planning discipline and success story is the political leadership provided by the Indian Prime-Minister as the Chief Planning Officer of the Indian Economy, with no extra budgetary spending incurred on any project outside the national with exceptions being emergencies.

9.2 Sustainable financing. Finance is the live wire for project and programmes implementation. A visionary leadership gives priority to the funding of planned projects/programmes on a sustainable basis. There is always no sustainability in financing planned projects/programmes due to the reason advanced earlier. A change in government in Nigeria, mostly affects the sustainability of financing planned projects, as each government come with its different agenda. At the end of the day, the on-going or planned projects suffer set back and are eventually abandoned. The implication is that the environment is not business friendly and as such investors are scared away.

9.3 Reward and Punishment Framework. In order to encourage and reward hard work, a framework should be in place to reward compliance, hard-work and performance, while spelling out punishment for non-compliance or violation of the rules. In our own case, apparently due to high rate of corruption, neither non-compliance is punished nor is hard work rewarded.

9.4 Synergy between federal and state institutions. The relationship between federal and state institutions is said to be weak, perhaps due to the nature of the federal system Nigeria operates in which the sub-national entities are autonomous and independent of the federal government. The relationship is even weaker sometimes, where the state government is an opposition party to the federal government.

9.5 Key-in overall Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) into national and state plans. Another challenge facing the coordination and implementation of development plans is the inability of the government to mainstream and coordinate the activities of Development Partners. Consequently, the Development Partners come into the country and begin to implement projects/programmes without recourse to the development plans either at federal or state level.

9.6 Development of a Result-Based National M&E Framework. A key requirement for quality planning and its implementation is the adoption of a coherent national Monitoring and Evaluation framework towards assessing plan implementation, defining challenges and using outcomes to correct plan implementation and initiate new ones. Presently, the national M&E system is at its infancy at the federal level, talk less of States and local governments.

References

- Aboyade, O. (1983). *Integrated Economics: A study of Development Economics*. London: English Language Book Society.
- Ayinla, M. A. (1998). *Essays on planning and Budgeting Systems in Nigeria*. Ilorin: Berende Printing and Publishing Company.
- Ayo, E. J. (1988). *Development Planning in Nigeria*. Ibadan: University Press Plc.
- Boeninger, E. (1991). "Governance and Development: Issues and Constraints." *Processing of the World Bank Annual Conference on Development Economic*, The World Bank.
- Cohen, H. J. (1995). "Good Governance, Democracy and Citizens Expectations in Africa" *In Africa Demos: A Bulletin of the African Governance Programme*. Vol III, No. 4. Atlanta: The Carter Centre.
- Edward, J. A. (1988). *Development Planning in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.
- Fika A. (2004). *Daily Trust*, May 3, Abuja.
- FRN (2001). *National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP): A Blueprint for the Scheme*, NAPEP Secretariat, Abuja.
- Galbraith, J. K. (1999). "Challenges of the New Millennium." *Finance and Development*. Washington D. C. IMF.
- Ihonvbere, J. O. (1991). "The State, Governance and Democratization in Africa: Constraints and Possibilities" *Hunger Teachenet*. Vol. 6, No. 3 Austin.
- Ilesanmi, O. A. (2000). *International Economics*. Lagos. Fapsony Nigeria Limited.
- Jukwey, J. (1996). "Nigerian Ruler Wins Some Accolades for Reforms" *Reuters*, November 28.
- Jukwey, J. (1997) "Committee Gives Abacha Plan on Nigeria's Development" *Reuters*, September 30.
- Obadah, M. I. (2002). "Poverty Reduction in Nigeria: The Way Forward." In Obadah, M. I; A. A. Adubi and E. O. Uga, (eds) *Integration of Poverty Alleviation Strategies into Plans and Programmes in Nigeria*. Ibadan: NCEMA/World Bank.
- Obadah, M. I. and F. A. Odusola (1999). "Savings, Investment and Growth Connections in Nigeria: Empirical Evidence and Policy Implications." *NCEMA Policy Analysis Series* Vol. 5, No. 2.
- Obadah, M. I; B. O. Oshinebo and E. O. Uga, (2002). "Democratic Governance and the Imperatives of Effective Planning and Budgeting". In Obadah, M. I., et al (eds.) *Effective Planning and Budgeting in a Democratic*

Setting, Proceedings of the English Annual DPRS Directors' Conference, 25 – 29 June, NCEMA, Ibadan.
Ogunjimi, S. O. (1997). *Public Finance for Polytechnics and ICAN Students*. Niger: Leken Productions.
Olaniyi, J. O. (1998). *Foundation of Public Analysis* Ibadan: Sunad Publishers Limited.
Oshionebo, B. O. (2003). “Democratic Governance and the Imperative of Efficient Development Management”. A Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of NCEMA, Ibadan, 23-27. June.
Oshionebo, B. O. (2004). “Capacity Building in a Democratic Era. “In Bello Imam, I. B and M. I. Obadan, (eds.) *Democratic Government and Development Management in Nigeria's Fourth Republic, 1999 – 2003* Ibadan: Centre for Local Government and Rural Development Studies (CLGARDS).

Author: Nazifi Abdullahi Darma PhD, Member Nigerian Economic Society since 1996, Born in Kano, Nigeria, on May 16, 1967. He obtained a B.Sc degree in Economics from Bayero University, Kano, Nigeria in 1990, M.Sc degree in Banking and Finance from Bayero University, Kano, Nigeria in 1996 and PhD in Economics from Usmanu Danfodio University, Sokoto, Nigeria in 2008. He specializes in Development Economics and Public Finance