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ABSTRACT

While Nigeria boasts as the most populous nation and the biggest economy in Africa in terms of nominal GDP, the Country lags behind some of its peers on the continent in development. The country has had five development plans since independence, without truly reaping the benefits of such projections. This paper, therefore, reviewed the reasons behind such failures and noted that the failures could be attributed to a lack of continuity in development planning from one government to another; a lack of political will by the incumbent government because of corruption across all sectors of the government and national life. Other factors identified by this paper for the repeated failure include the lack of a true sense of commitment and clear vision by the successive leadership. There is also the over-politicization of the entire process, by not tackling the core development issues in the country. Nigeria’s development plans are also too tailored along those of the developed economies rather than evolving a plan that is realistic and suitable to our environment. The paper also recognized other major constraints such as lack of financial capacity to implement these lofty ideas, the inadequacy of professional planners, indiscipline, and unnecessary partnership; poor and inadequate feasibility studies in planning; lack of accurate data; erratic and conflicting government policies which result in policy summersault and abandonment. There are also issues of lack of inter-ministerial and inter-disciplinary coordinating machinery, lack of proper project monitoring, lack of efficient public sector, and lack of proper public and private sector partnership. As a remedy to these repeated failures in development planning, the paper brought to the fore the constitutional roles of the legislatures as the bastion of any democracy, to stand up to their constitutional duties, in not only passing the bills, but also ensuring that they are signed into law, and also implemented to the benefit of the country.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The global population is presently battling with COVID-19 Pandemic, which has for the first time in more than 20 years, nearly brought the global economy to a precipice, through extensive lockdowns and social distancing, forcing nearly every economy into recession. While the battle for effective vaccination continues to control the spread of various strains, there are other threats, such as the ongoing energy transition, into cleaner renewable energy to combat the ravaging effects of greenhouse gas emissions, mostly from fossil fuel, and the twin threat of 4th Industrial Revolution and Artificial Intelligence, Robotics, and Internet of Things, all of
which, if not adequately handled by developing economies, can potentially disrupt their development plans and trajectories. There is also the ongoing Russian-Ukraine war and the geopolitical polarization between the Developed West and the Asian continent. Already, according to the World Bank, the COVID-19 pandemic pushed additional 97 million people into extreme poverty in 2020, and this is beside the instrumentalities of climate change, and other developmental challenges that are confronting the world. Of these 97 million, extremely poor in 2020, Sub-Saharan Africa contributed about 63.8% of this number. While the global extreme poor is projected to decline from 732 million in 2020 to 711 million in 2021, Sub-Saharan Africa sadly is projected to rise from the 2020 figure of 467 million to 478 million extremely poor in 2021. (Mahler et al, 2021). Extreme poverty, according to the World Bank is defined as living on less than $1.90 a day, and Sub-Saharan Africa has the lion's share of the global poor. The World Bank opined that in order to reverse this serious setback to development progress and poverty reduction, it would expect individual countries to prepare for a different economy post-COVID, by allowing capital, labor, skills, and innovation to move into new businesses and sectors. However, as is expected, the World Bank Group will continue to provide help to developing countries so they to resume growth and respond to the health, social, and economic impacts of COVID-19 as they work toward a sustainable and inclusive recovery. (WorldBank, 2020). The World Bank further projected that, unless something quick and drastic is done, extreme poverty will become a predominantly Sub-Saharan African phenomenon in the coming decade and the continent will be home to the lion’s share of the global poor by 2030. (Schoch, and Larkner, 2020). Sadly, Nigeria holds the title of the Poverty Capital of the World with 86,802,955 extremely poor people out of a population of 209,663,892, beating India with a population of 1,392,289,644 to the second position with 84,016,094 extremely poor people. (https://worldpoverty.io/map). This is despite its natural endowment, in human and natural resources, something that now begs the question of how the Country got into such a pitiable position. However, though most of Sub-Saharan Africa is grimming in poverty at an average of 35%, there are a few countries like Botswana-18%, Gabon-4%, Ghana-11%, and Mauritania -6% that are making significant progress in reducing their poverty levels. At the other extreme, the growth of some East Asian countries has been at rates that are historically unprecedented. Whereas it took the United Kingdom, the world’s first industrial nation 54 years to develop from a low per-capita income economy to a middle-income economy, it took Hong Kong, Singapore, and Taiwan only 10 years to achieve middle-income status. According to Addison, 2004, this sharp development of the Asian Tigers could be attributed to their development policies. (Addison, 2004). Discussions on development at the global scene became topical in the 1950s and 1960s, as African States began to gain independence from their colonial masters, with an initial concept of grooming the newly independent, poor African countries to grow industrially to catch-up with the developed Western economies. This idea was premised on transposing the ideals of the Western economic, social, cultural, and political ways of living upon non-European societies, which to the early development thinkers, would achieve speedy transformation of the new African states, in view of their natural resource endowments. They had thought that this would have worked with sufficient financial stimulus, just in the same way as the economy of Germany was transformed after World War II. Unfortunately, this model failed to achieve the desired development of these African states, and so, development thoughts began to shift to embrace Sustainable Development, which would now depend on the specific needs and different starting points of the individual nation. Sustainable Development itself was an offshoch of the 1987 report by the World Commission on Environment and Development (known as the Brundtland Report), which stated that
development had to satisfy the needs of the present without undermining the development prospects of future generations. This idea thus gave birth to the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio, with an emphasis on the careful use of natural resources so as not to jeopardize the needs of the future. Development, from then became one that included environmental issues in addition to the traditional economic and social requirements. With the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and rapid technological advances, like the Internet, development ideas were broadened to include globalization with the concept of human rights and universal standards. These ideas were reinforced in the Millennium Declaration in 2000 when 189 Heads of State and Government laid down a number of requirements such as respect for human rights, equal opportunities for men and women, the fair distribution of wealth, and good governance as part of the goals of development. Since then, development has no longer been a national or bilateral affair, but rather a global challenge with binding objectives and a binding timeframe. (FDFA, 2011). Since gaining independence in 1960, Nigeria has had four 5-year development experiments or plans, one structural adjustment program, two 3-year rolling plans, and four visions and strategies including the recently launched Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP). There seems to be an endless search for the best strategy for her developmental purposes as the country is still wandering around and manipulating all sorts of developmental initiatives. It is utterly disappointing that all the various planning initiatives the country had adopted had not delivered the much-expected results, as the country continues to battle with mounting developmental challenges such as widespread poverty, hunger, unemployment, illiteracy, diseases, decaying and dilapidated infrastructures, excessive debt burden, among other things. (Emmanuel, 2019).

This paper, therefore, presents Nigeria’s development challenges and the expected roles of the National Assembly in ensuring the implementation of the national economic development policies.

2.0 POLITICAL HISTORY AND GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE OF NIGERIA

Nigeria was a colony for about seven decades under British rule until October 1, 1960, when it gained political independence, and later became a Republic in 1963, with a strong central government. The pre-colonial setting within the present geographical space consists of mostly people of different histories, cultures, political development, and religion. We, therefore, have the Hausa, the Fulani, the Kanuri, Igberas, Igalas, and many others in the north, while the Southern part of the country consists of the Yoruba, the Edos, and the Urhobos, the Ibos, the Ibibios, the Ijaws and other small ethnic groups, with definite geographic location and distinct language and dialects. The country is also segmented into multi-religious states with a substantial population being adherents of Islam, and Christianity, and a host of indigenous. (Adeosun, 2011). Most of these people were organized under major kingdoms and caliphates, such as the Sokoto Caliphate and the emirates of the north that, together with the Kanem-Bornu Empire, were advanced Islamic theocracies. There were also the Benin, Oyo, and other Western kingdoms, as well as the Igala Kingdom in the middle belt or lower north, and the Bonny Kingdoms in the south. In these centralized systems, there were clear divisions between the rulers and the ruled, usually based on wealth and ascribed status. Institutions of a distinctly political nature, as well as taxation systems, were already established. Of all the centralized systems, the Sokoto Caliphate with its vassal emirates had the most advanced form of state organization. Not surprisingly, it provided the model for the British colonial policy of indirect
rule, i.e., the governance of indigenous people through their own institutions and rulers. In spite of these differences, and purely for economic interests, the British amalgamated the country in 1914 into one colony, a union that has been described by a prominent Nigerian political scientist as a forced brotherhood and sisterhood (Ayoade, 1998). Since then the country has been confronted with the challenges of accommodating diversity, fostering inclusiveness, and promoting national unity among the diverse groups that make up the country. After the amalgamation, the British enacted Clifford’s constitution, which set up a legislative council consisting of ten Africans, four of them elected, and 36 Europeans in 1922 to legislate for the South, while the north was still run by proclamation.

It was in 1939 that Governor Bernard Bourdilloun who succeeded Sir Hugh Clifford as the Governor General of Nigeria, while still in power, turned the Northern and Southern Protectorates into provinces and divided the Southern province into Eastern and Western provinces, while the Northern Province remained untouched. Eventually, Clifford’s constitution was replaced with Richard’s constitution in 1946 which was specifically drafted to promote the unity of Nigeria and give more room for greater participation of Nigerians in the administration of their country. The Richards constitution of 1946 brought regionalism to Nigeria – Eastern, Western, and Northern regions, regional houses of assembly in the east, west, and north, with a House of Chiefs in the north. Two other constitutions, the Macpherson Constitution (1951), and Lyttleton Constitution (1954) came into force, with the Lyttleton Constitution also granting the regions significant autonomy which remained in force, with slight amendments, until independence in 1960, as it enabled the regions to become self-governing at their own pace. One of the aberrations of the British rule was that they encouraged Islamic civilization in the north to the detriment of western education and influences, while the southern region had a head start in western education. Besides this, there was constant mistrust between the two regions for fear of domination. The different exposure also differentiated their economic development with the south way ahead of the north. The country became even more divided with the common creed of the north for northerners, west for westerners, and east for easterners. Despite the periodic creation of more states during the postcolonial period, these regionalist feelings continued to affect national politics, especially in the distribution of national resources. One manifestation of this tendency was the ceaseless disagreements and rancor over revenue allocation. The colonial heritage, therefore, produced a country that was only weakly united and is constantly under the existential threats of secession.

3.0 POST-INDEPENDENCE NIGERIA

Nigeria at Independence in 1960 adopted the Westminster-style parliamentary system operated under three regions, which later became four, with the midwestern region, between 1960-1963 with Dr. Nnamdi Azikwe as Governor General, and Alhaji Tafawa Belew, as Prime Minister. When the country became a Republic on October 1, 1963, Dr. Azikiwe became the President, while Alhaji Balewa remained as the Prime Minister. Their government was truncated through a military coup in January 1966, with General Ironsi as the new Head of State, who suspended the regional constitutions, unified the federation under a Federal Military Government, and sadly, this has become the norm in Nigeria, a “Unitary Federalism” even under democratic rule. The country, unfortunately, precipitated into a civil war from June 1967 to January 1970 that claimed more than 1 million Nigerians, and thereafter, the military government held on to power until 1979 when the second Nigerian Republic (1979-1983) emerged through an
election, which attempted to restore civilian rule by also establishing the 1979 Constitution that re-introduced the presidential system of government. The 1979 constitution also recognized local governments as the nation’s third order of government, and unfortunately also shifted the fiscal and legislative powers from the states to the central government. Of course, the civil rule was short-lived with another military takeover in 1983 that perpetrated itself until the emergence of the third republic in 1999 with the election of Chief Obasanjo as President and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces under the platform of the People Democratic Party (PDP). Since then, Nigeria has never known peace, as the process of leadership became one of “Do or Die” affairs. The People's Democratic Party (PDP) ruled the country for 16 years from 1999-2015, when Goodluck Jonathan, lost the presidency to General Buhari’s All Progressive Congress (APC) in a keenly contested election 2015. Between 1960 to 2015, Nigeria had 16 Leaders as Heads of State or Presidents with 8 of them as military leaders with a total of 30 years of military dictatorship, that infested our national psyche with misrule and institutionalized corruption that has become our national identity as a people. A plague that has defied every known intention, may be, not too sincere intentions by previous and current administrations for a country that is heavily fractionalized along ethnic, linguistic, and religious lines; with more than 250 different ethnic groups, and between 500 – 600 languages and dialects, and nearly equal populations of Muslims and Christians. Unfortunately, Nigeria is wearing the ignominious crown of the Poverty Capital of the World with 86 million people out of its 209 million people as extreme poor.

4.0 ECONOMIC GROWTH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Economic growth is associated with a positive and sustained increase in aggregate goods and services produced in an economy within a given time period. Growth means the generation of a greater quantity of goods per unit of input through more efficient use of inputs. For a country, economic growth refers to upward movement in the country’s per capita output or per capita income sustained by growth in its labor force, consumption by its citizens, capital accumulation, and the volume of trade within a given period. (Jhingan (2006). This view is consistent with the thoughts of Uwakaeme, (2015) who stated that sustainable long-term growth is concerned with supplies of production factors, savings and capital formation, under appropriate growth accounting theory that measures the contributions of each growth determinant. Economic growth is differentiated from economic development in the view of Maddison as reported by Jhingan (2006), who sees economic growth as economic progress for developed economies, while economic development is associated with developing nations. This view was further expatiated by Mrs. Hicks, who opined that while developed economies have fully known and developed their resources, and therefore are on the path of growth, underdeveloped economies are still struggling with the problems of identifying their resources on the one part, while also working towards fully developing unused resources, and therefore cannot be said to be on the path of economic growth. (Jhingan (2006). Jhingan (2006) further reported the view of Schumpeter on this subject, who sees economic development as more of an unsteady state and isolated shifts from one equilibrium state to another, while growth is a continuous but gradual change as a result of the steady accumulation of both savings and population growth. Economic growth is driven mostly by policies adopted by each country based on its level and stage of economic development. Just as access to the sea was a key driver of growth in the 16th-century world, the 19th-century man and beyond relies more on technology and knowledge accumulation for his economy growth. Growth after World War II
was driven mostly through reconstruction and American Aid, while the 1980s got their impetus through globalization, and catching up with technological frontiers. According to Bhalla (2012), the trend in global economic growth, just as during the great depression, is moving increasingly away from the developed western economies to the emerging markets of the developing economies, led by China. Prior to the great recession of 2008, the world enjoyed several decades of unparalleled economic prosperity with America growing at more than 2 percent per capita for more than 60 years, while developing economies in Africa and Latin America, that stagnated from 1980 began to improve after 2000. On the Asian continent, emerging economies sustained 30 years of continuous growth despite some domestic and international crises. These performances have thus inspired many scholars and policy makers to investigate the actual cause of economic growth, some of which are hinged on effective policy implementation. Bhalla (2012) observed that shortly after World War 2, and during the great depression, John Maynard Keynes postulated the need for government intervention as a solution to the great depression, and this gave birth to several policies that became collectively known as the Washington Consensus, which held sway for a long time. The policies that emerged included Keynesianism and monetarism, import substitution and export promotion, naturalization and openness, infrastructure investment, and enhanced social spending. Ndambiri et al, 2012 added the importance of Research and Development (R&D) as a critical determinant of economic growth through the introduction of new technologies, processes, and superior products. According to him, sustainable economic growth also requires appropriate policies and conducive macroeconomic environments, such as moderate inflation, effective fiscal policies, and prudent management of budget deficits and tax burdens, to thrive. Well-articulated policies that are directed at improving human capital, social infrastructure, and most importantly supporting viral political and legal institutions, will undoubtedly propel economic growth in any country. Acemoglu (2007) also identified such determinants of economic growth as rapid capital accumulations, investment in capital projects, and human capacity development plus technological innovation, which can accelerate economic growth. Consequently, countries with high investment and appropriation of these factors will grow faster due to the differences in technical input and knowledge application in the production processes. He further noted that such differences would soon result in organizational differences, product differentiation, and diversification, and hence the market structures. Acemoglu (2007) further postulated that Countries with well-laid-out institutional frameworks, grow better economically than those with poor institutions. Efficient institutions are incentives to investments as they provide the needed confidence in areas of property rights, and sanctity of contracts, and also ensure the proper allocation of scarce resources for growth optimizations. Such institutions, also encourage capital accumulation, technology, and knowledge acquisition and transfer, and protect the rights of citizens and investors, which will, in turn, encourage risk-taking by all economic agents to grow the economy. One natural experiment that speaks clearly on this hypothesis is the economic growth differences between the Koreans – the North and the South.
Figure 1: Evolution of income per capita in North and South Korea after the separation. Source: Acemoglu (2007).

The North and South Koreans enjoyed the same type of institution within the same geography under a single country before the end of World War 2 as depicted in figure 1 above. Upon separation after the war, the North adopted a social system of government similar to that of the Soviets and the Chinese where they centralized all ownership to the central government. The state now makes all economic decisions rather than being driven by the market structure. On the other hand, the South adopted the western system of government with private participation in the economic system. The outcome of such choices is clear in the figure as the South clearly outperformed the North by the late 1960s, to become one the Asian tigers, with the per capita income of the South nearly 16 times that of the North by 2000 at $16,100 and $1000 respectively.

5.0 NIGERIAN ECONOMIC SITUATION

Nigeria as a colony was predominantly an agrarian society managed by colonial masters to satisfy their quest for raw materials for their industries. The economy was thus export-oriented in agricultural produce and the mining of mineral resources such as iron ore, tin, and coal, which brought in foreign exchange to the country. Each of the regions than had a comparative advantage through which it made its contributions to the center; the North was known for groundnut production, the West for its cocoa and the East produced palm oil. The colonial political economy by the British only encouraged the export of raw materials as feedstock to their industries, and therefore, did not introduce any form of industrialization in Nigeria. (Agnes, 2016). Nigeria, at independence in 1960, continued as a major producer and net exporter of six major agricultural products, cocoa, rubber, palm oil, groundnut, cotton, and palm kernel, which was about 69.4% of its total GDP for the year 1963/64. (Kabir, 2012). The Republican Constitution of 1963 instigated regional economic competitiveness around cocoa (southwest), coal (southeast) and groundnut (north), and palm kernel in the south. (Olaopa, 2017). The country, however, plunged into civil war from 1967 – 1970 as a result of the failure of the principal ethnic groups to maturely handle national affairs, which devastated its agro-based economy. The period also coincided with the crude oil boom in the mid-1970s, which totally replaced the agro-based economy with the petrodollar. Prior to the civil war, the Nigerian agrarian economy contributed about 65.6% of its economy in 1960-1961 but declined to about 32% with the coming of the petrodollar in the 1990s despite the fact that the sector still constitutes 70-75 percent of employment and livelihood. (Aderonke and David, 2012). Unfortunately, Nigeria, like most natural resource-based economies, wasted the new petrodollar wealth in bogus public sector expansion, which also came with dependence on external goods. By 1978, oil (Petroleum and associated components) composed a total of 89.1% of Nigeria’s export against agriculture, which had plummeted in its contribution to export to 6.8% in the same year. (Kabir, 2012). The economic wastage was more a result of ethnocentric-politically driven corruption by the opportunist ruling class, which distorted investment choices and eroded the confidence of foreign investors. This created a huge vacuum in industrialization and technological development. (Aderonke and David, 2012). This is the main reason why Nigeria has not benefited so much from globalization. (Kabir, 2012). Nigeria officially entered a recessed economy first in August 2016 after the last recession in 1987 during the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP). The country entered another recession in...
2020, as shown in figure 2, induced by the Global Economy Lockdown due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, which stifled the global demand and supply of Nigeria’s major export product, crude oil.

![Figure 2: Nigeria GDP Annual Growth Rate-2012-2021. Source – Trading Economics](https://tradingeconomics.com/nigeria/gdp-growth-annual)

Though the economy has exited the recession, with 0.5% growth in the first quarter of 2021, as COVID-19 lockdowns eases globally, it is still in the “Intensive Care Unit”, and must be managed with care, in view of the COVID-19 Pandemics. However, the non-oil sector, which the government is presently the focus of government diversification efforts, rose 0.79% in the first quarter of 2021. (Ohuocha, 2021). The Oil Sector that still accounts for around two-thirds of Nigerian government revenue and 90% of foreign exchange contributed 9.25% of the Q1 aggregate GDP with an average daily oil production of 1.72 million barrels per day (mbpd). This is higher than the production volume of 1.56mbpd recorded in the fourth quarter of 2020. The growth in the non-oil sector was driven mainly by the Information and Communication (Telecommunication) sector while other drivers include Agriculture (Crop Production); Manufacturing (Food, Beverage & Tobacco); Real Estate; Construction and Human Health & Social Services. In real terms, the non-oil sector accounted for 90.75% of aggregate GDP in the first quarter of 2021, higher than its share in the first quarter of 2020 which was 90.50% but lower than 94.13% recorded in the fourth quarter of 2020. Nigeria's Real GDP Grew by 0.51% YoY in Q1 2021 – NBS (Proshareng, 2021). According to NBS, the unemployment rate rose to 33.3% in the 4th QTR of 2020, with about 23.18 million persons out of employment in the fourth quarter (Q4) 2020, making Nigeria as 3rd most unemployed nation on the global unemployment list, after Boznia & Herz, at 33.7%, and Namibia at 33.4% respectively. (Olatunji, 2021)

### 5.1 Nigerian Debt Situation, and Other Economic Indices

In terms of debt stock, the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) disclosed that Nigeria’s total debt between the federal government and states rose to N33.11 trillion or $80.75 billion at N410/$ as of March 31, 2021. Of this number, external debt constitutes 37.67% or N12.47 trillion or $30.41 billion, while domestic debt constitute the balance of 62.33% or N20.64 trillion or $50.44 billion (Ukpe 2021). Figure 3 shows a constantly increasing debt profile from 2012.
Figure 3: Nigerian External Debt Profile from 2012 to January 2021.

The trend shows an increase from N32.92 trillion in Q4 2020 to N33.10 trillion in the first quarter of 2021, driven mostly by domestic debt (62.3% of total debt) which increased by 2.11% q/q to N20.64bn, following a 5.3% q/q increase in bond issuance. While the current debt stock only translates to a low debt-to-GDP ratio of 23%, which is still considered relatively low, compared to the Sub-Saharan African average of 58% and also below the 40% limit set by the Debt Management, the government’s interest payments continue to absorb a large portion of federal government revenues, making the otherwise low debt-to-GDP ratio highly vulnerable to shocks. (CSL Research, 2021)

Figure 4: Debt Service - Revenue Ratio

As shown in figure 4, the Federal Government utilized 83% of its total revenue in 2020 to service its debt; total revenue earned in 2020 was N3.93 trillion while the sum of N3.26 trillion was used for debt service in 2020. (Oliash, 2021). While there are continued public concerns about this ballooning debt profile and increasing share of the revenue to service the debt, the National Assembly still approved an additional $6.1 billion or N 2.343 trillion loan request by President Muhammadu Buhari on July 7, 2021. This additional borrowing according to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Local and Foreign Debts, Senator Clifford Ordia, is to part finance the N5.6 trillion 2021 budget deficit. The Senate President, Ahmad Lawan, in his approval remark assured that the National Assembly will ensure that there are no frivolous expenditures by the executive. (Iroanusi, 2021). In the meantime, Fitch Ratings, the world’s major credit rating agency, has projected that Nigeria’s debt-to-revenue ratio will rise to 395 percent by 2022, indicating that the growth rate in public debt would far outstrip its revenue. In a note announcing Nigeria’s ‘B’ rating, Fitch however said: “General government (GG) debt will further rise to 32.6 percent of GDP in 2022, from less than 13 percent a decade earlier. (Nnorom, 2021). Nigeria was also classified as a Mostly Unfree economy in the 2021 Economic Freedom Index Report by Heritage Foundation in collaboration with Wall Street Journal. The country ranked 105 out of the 178 countries ranked in 2021, and 13th amongst 47 other sub-Saharan African countries with Rwanda topping the list with 47th position, while Botswana came second with 51st position. Singapore was top on the list. The ranking considered the country’s Rule of Law, Government Size, Regulatory Efficiency, and Open Market Structures. Generally, in an economically free society, individuals are free to work, produce, consume, and invest in any way they please, also governments allow labor, capital, and goods to move freely, and refrain from coercion or constraint of liberty beyond the extent necessary to protect and maintain liberty itself. Nigeria’s ranking of 105 clearly shows a relatively unfree economy. This is coupled with chronic political instability and a range of other security threats, plus major policy failures and disregard for the rule of law also block economic freedom. (Heritage Foundation, 2021). In a similar vein, the 2020 Ease of Doing Business
Report ranked Nigeria as 131 out of 190 countries, way behind other sub-Saharan countries as Rwanda-38, Kenya-56, Botswana-87, Togo-97, South Africa-84, and Ghana-118. The country also scored below sub-Saharan Africa’s World Bank’s Women, Business, and Law (WBL) 2020 index which measures the laws and regulations that affect women’s economic opportunities. Nigeria scored 63.1 out of 100, while the sub-Saharan Africa regional average stood at 71, which is a clear indication of the need for Policy Makers to continuously improve the opportunities that accrue to women which are underpinned by cultural and social shifts that close gender bias not only in the economy but also in society and politics. (Cseafrica, 2021).

Based on the recently released Corruption Perception Index (CPI), Nigeria is still perceived to be among the most corrupt nations, with a ranking of 149 out of the 180 countries assessed. The CPI is based on a scale of 0 to 100; with zero representing extreme corruption and 100 indicating the least level of corruption. The increase in perceived corruption has been attributed partly to the reports by civil society organizations on the hoarding and mismanagement of COVID-19 palliatives and related supplies. This is another clear testimony of the Government’s failure to enforce anti-corruption policies, which could boost public trust, and attract both domestic and foreign direct investments. (Cseafrica, 2021). Policy missteps, entrenched corruption, and an over-reliance on oil revenue have pushed the country’s economy to the brink, in a country that is endowed with some of the world’s biggest oil reserves, vast arable land, and a young, tech-savvy population of 206 million that sets Africa’s music and fashion trends. Nigeria unarguably has the potential to break onto the global stage, and with its growth, also influence the continent’s growth, but sadly, all these have been sacrificed on the altar of corruption and public policy mismanagement. A country that makes up a quarter of the continent’s economy risks becoming its biggest problem, saddled with a dangerous cauldron of ethnic tension, youth discontent, criminality, and violence that are all spreading faster than poverty. The economy which has yet to recover fully from the COVID-19 Pandemic induced oil crash, and is unlikely to do so anytime soon, exposes its population continues to the poverty streak in what is already the poverty capital of the world. (Soto, 2021).

5.2 Nigeria Security Challenges

Besides the barrage of economic challenges mentioned in an earlier section, the country is also plagued with lots of security problems that can potentially push the country into a precipice if not adequately checked. The security problems range from the notorious Boko Haram and its offshoot the Islamic State in West Africa (ISWA) that started in the North East but have since spread to the entire North. This has evolved into Bandits Kidnappers and other criminality across the North. The recent spate of kidnappings with resultant of boarding schools for ransom taking is a major problem in the North, as the ransoms collected through these mass abductions have become a means of business for these criminal gangs.
There is also the infamous herders-farmers conflict that started within the Middle Belt and North West states, but has since split to other sections of the country in the South East and South South. This has spurred the formation of ethnic militias, vigilante raids, and extrajudicial killings. Historically, the North West and Middle Belt states have been the fertile plains and grazing lands of Nigeria where nomadic pastoralist and sedentary agriculturalist groups coexisted, traded, and turned to local peacekeeping mechanisms when land disputes arose. However, desiccation and urban development have pushed herders off their historical grazing routes. Likewise, according to aerial analysis by the U.S. Geological Survey, land available for open grazing in Nigeria’s Middle Belt declined by 38 percent between 1975 and 2013, while the area dedicated to farming nearly trebled. These dynamics have been driven by climate shifts, exclusionary land policies, and population growth. Meanwhile, demand for meat supplied by the country’s herders has been rising across the Country, and unfortunately, several interest groups, from politicians, large land holders, and their allies in the press have seized on these dynamics to politicize clashes between farmers and herders and between so-called “settlers” and “indigenous” communities in the region. Conspiracy theories and claims of coverups and ethnic cleansing around violence in the Middle Belt are common—and recycled even by well-meaning humanitarian groups and analysts. Despite this frequent framing in communal terms, religion and regional affiliation are not primary drivers of conflict. This is demonstrated by the fact that Islam-practicing Fulani and Hausa militias are often adversaries in these communal clashes, especially in the North West. The politicization of communal violence in Nigeria risks expanding the scope of ethnically organized militias. Already, violence between herding and farming communities is beginning to occur in states south of the Middle Belt. In places like Ibadan (Oyo State) and Isuikwuato (Abia State), negative Fulani sentiment that southern Nigerian politicians and news outlets have generated around the Middle Belt violence is being used by ambitious individuals to incite anti-Fulani protests and attacks by armed youth groups. There is also the conflicts and clashes between Nigeria’s security forces and the Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB)’s Eastern Security Network (ESN) established in December 2020 that has resulted in dozens of deaths in 2021. The Nigerian minister of defense had in the spate of these security challenges, enjoined Nigerians to take up arms to defend themselves against marauding bandits in their communities. The minister’s statement aligns with the grim reality that Nigeria has a serious internal security problem. Ransom frequently comes in the form of opaque government payments, a strategy that tends to undermine government authority. The level of coordination in the attacks seems to betray some type of paramilitary training or, at the very least, organization by leaders with military training.
(Wodu, 2021). Besides the Inland security challenges, there are also prevalence of piracy in the creeks and especially within the Gulf of Guinea. Piracy in the Gulf of Guinea is now the worst in the world, accounting for over 95 percent of crew members kidnapped. There were 35 recorded piracy events off the coast of Nigeria in 2020. These figures likely only represent a fraction of the incidents, given that ship owners have incentives to downplay the risk to avoid increasing insurance premiums. The groups behind these attacks are shadowy, but a number of pirate enterprises are known to be connected to the armed groups that have for decade’s sabotaged pipelines and kidnapped oil workers in Nigeria’s Delta (South South and South East regions). Equipped with arms and speedboats and countered by oil companies spending millions of dollars on private security to protect oil infrastructure, some of these groups have begun venturing out of their swampland hideouts to board international ships in the Gulf of Guinea before retreating to their coastal bases with kidnapped crew members to negotiate ransoms paid from abroad. (Duerksen, 2021). Solving Nigeria’s multidimensional security challenges also require an innovative set of solutions adapted to each context. This will entail understanding the local dynamics of each threat and integrating them into a multidimensional national security strategy. As Nigeria’s challenges are largely domestic in nature, this national security strategy will require active citizen engagement. Citizen cooperation may be the most essential element of a successful response in each context. Yet, in nearly every instance, Nigeria’s security forces are starting from a deficit of trust. Indeed, security force violence against citizens is often viewed as part of the security problem. Remediing this and building trust with citizens will be a top and ongoing priority of any national security strategy. (Duerksen, 2021). Nigeria is truly in dire need of a renaissance, a new birth, and this can only be achieved through the instrumentality of National Legislatures, the people’s representatives, only if they can focus on their constitutional obligations to the people. The next section therefore presents, Nigeria’s previous attempts at resolving its problems through several unsuccessful development plans, some of the reasons that can be adduced to these failures, the role of the legislatures, and globally acceptable practices at formulating and implementing development policies under a democratic governance.

6.0 National Development Plans

Development is very much related with aspirations and expectations of the people by harnessing their natural resources. It transcends beyond the improvement in income and output to the radical transformation in institutional, social and administrative structures. Although development is commonly seen in a national context, its holistic realization may necessitate fundamental modifications of the international economic and social system. Development is therefore a manysided process that involves all people and sectors of the economy. At the level of the individual, it also connotes increased skill and capacity, greater freedom, creativity, self-discipline, responsibility and material wellbeing. (Asabe Shehu Yar’ Adua, 2020). Ekundayo (2015) also attested to the manysided nature of development, as he sees development as an all-inclusive process geared towards providing qualitative and sustainable life for the citizens of a nation. It is therefore not a free gift but a product of careful design, effective resource mobilization and collaborative action with the people and their leadership. It thus entails sacrifice and dedication coupled with careful observation and openness to change efforts. Development thus requires the pivotal roles of the political leadership in directing the growth paths towards ensuring economic progress and development. They must also provide a systematic and co-ordinated policy intervention in order to steer the economy to the right path.
To Ekundayo (2015), development is seen as an encompassing process involving the steady and systematic change in the cultural, economic and political spheres of society in a way that increases production, empowers the people and their communities, protects the environment, strengthens institutions, grows quality of life and promotes good governance. Development cannot be measured only in terms of the economy but also in terms of freedom, equity and access to education, health and other social services, public participation and quality of life. This holistic view would require a multi-disciplinary approach that embraces socio-cultural, political, economic and technological factors leading to overall societal transformation. Also, development in contemporary times must encourage and accommodate modern values which include foreign aids, politics and technology transfer. National Development therefore involves the overall development or a collective socioeconomic, political and technological advancement of a country or nation, which can be achieved through development planning that involves the country’s collection of strategies, policies, plans, programmers and projects and others, mapped out by the government. (Ekundayo, 2015).

6.1 Nigerian National Development Plans

The first attempt at national development plan was initiated by the colonial masters between 1946 and 1956, a 10 year plan, which was a failure as it lacked the substance of the realities on ground, but rather a vehicle to continue to promote the colonial interests in Nigeria. In pursuit of a development paradigm post-independence, successive governments in Nigeria have also attempted four national development plans; namely: the First National Development Plan (Tafawa Balewa (1962-1968), the Second National Development Plan (1970 – 1974) (Yakubu Gowon 1970-1974); the Third National Development Plan (1975-1980), Murtala /Obasanjo; and the Fourth National Development Plan (1981 –1985) Alhaji Shehu Shagari, all of which failed to achieve their stated objectives. A Fifth National Development Plan and One Year Economic Emergency Programme (Ibrahim Babangida-1986) did not see the light of the day before it was replaced by the newly adopted method of planning – the perspective plans (1986 – 1990). Aside the five-year national development plans, the then Military Governments also adopted a three-year rolling plan between 1990 and 1998 and another long-term development plan in the continuous search for optimal strategy. Between 2003 and 2007, Chief Obasanjo led Federal Government initiated the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS), which became SEEDS at the States level, and LEEDS at the Local Government Levels. As a medium-term plan, NEEDs focused on poverty reduction and wealth creation, employment, and national value re-orientation (Iheanacho, 2014). Like other development initiatives, NEEDS suffered several setbacks such as poor poverty diagnoses; cosmetically descriptive rather than analytical approach, and inadequacy in setting of economic targets. The programme also suffered from the use of “trickle-down” approach to poverty reduction as opposed to globally recognized "Right Based Approach" in dealing with poverty syndrome. (Emmanuel, 2019). The trickle-down economics, or “trickle-down theory,” states that tax breaks and benefits for corporations and the wealthy will trickle down to everyone else. It argues for income and capital gains tax breaks or other financial benefits to large businesses, investors, and entrepreneurs to stimulate economic growth. The argument hinges on two assumptions: All members of society benefit from growth, and growth is most likely to come from those with the resources and skills to increase productive output. (Kenton, 2021). The human rights-based approach on the other hand, focuses on those who are most marginalized, excluded or discriminated against. This often requires an analysis of gender norms, different
forms of discrimination and power imbalances to ensure that interventions reach the most marginalized segments of the population. (UNFPA, 2014). The Chief Obasanjo led government shortly after the failure of the NEEDs project, formulated the vision 20:2020 in 2006, which was further developed and finally launched by the President Umaru Yar’ Adua’s government in September 2009, with the main aim of propelling Nigeria as the 20th biggest economy by 2020. As ambitious as it seemed, it also failed to provide the desired haven for the Nigerian economy and society. The Yar’adua/Goodluck Jonathan administration introduced its Seven Point Agenda, aimed at tackling the numerous problems of: power and energy; food security and agriculture; wealth creation and empowerment; transport sector; land reforms; security; education. Technically, an off-shoot of the United Nations Millennium Development, the Seven Point Agenda had the noble vision of eradicating extreme poverty and hunger by 2015; achieving universal primary education by 2015; reducing child mortality by two-third; improving maternal health by 2015; combating HIV/AIDS, malaria and other preventable diseases by 2015; ensuring environmental sustainability between 2015 and 2020 and developing a global partnership for development by 2015. However, in the adjoining term of President Goodluck Jonathan, his government introduced the Transformation Agenda (2011 – 2015), which technically dropped off the Seven Point Agenda. The transformation agenda promised to be a policy and programmer that will transform Nigeria to an economic powerhouse in the world, with specific focus on revamping all ailing industries, encouraging agriculture and agro-related businesses, promote small and medium enterprises (SMEs); secondly, to reduce poverty and create massive employment; and thirdly, to fight corruption at all levels of governance. In the view of the then Minister of Trade and Investment Olusegun Aganga, the Transformation Agenda as a development policy is embedded with good governance, security, energy, and human development. Just like its predecessors, this wonderful development plan also failed in its sail to the economic haven. In continuation of the development plan experimentation, the President Buhari administration introduced in 2017 its ambitious Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP). (Emmanuel, 2019). The ERGP which is a Medium Term Plan to run from 2017 – 2020, builds on the Strategic Implementation Plan (SIP) for the purpose of restoring economic growth while leveraging the ingenuity and resilience of the Nigerian people – the nation’s most priceless assets. The focus of the ERGP, which comes on the heels of Nigeria’s slump into recession for the first time in 25 years and the sharp fall in oil prices from highs of about $112 a barrel in 2014 to below $50 in 2016, was targeted at propelling Nigeria back to sustainable, accelerated development and restoring economic growth in the medium term, 2017-2020. Suffice to say that the Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP) is a medium term all- round developmental initiative focused on restoring growth, investing in people and building a globally competitive economy. (Williams, 2019). This has also failed to take Nigeria out of the economic tunnel.

6.1.1 Factors responsible for the repeated failure of Nigeria’s Development Plans.

It is an undeniable fact that Nigeria excels in formulating brilliant, impeccable and well written policies as highlighted in previous section, but unfortunately, none of them achieved the dream objectives of pulling the country out of the economic pit. These well-crafted and expensively produced policies have all failed at the implementation phase, due to lack of continuity from one government to another, and mostly due to lack of political will by the incumbent government because of corruption across all sectors of the government and national life. Other factors that are attributable to the repeated failure includes the lack of a true sense of
commitment and lack of clear vision by the successive leadership. There is also the over politicization of the entire process, by not tackling the core development issues in the country. Nigeria’s development plans are also too tailored along those of the developed economies rather than evolving a plan that is realistic and suitable to our environment. Several writers have averred that until Nigeria deliberately disengage its development plans from the strangleholds of the developed countries, the country will continue to undergo experimentation. This is because this self-afflicted success trap will not bring true fulfilment or freedom but greater bondage. Other major constraints include lack of financial capacity to implement these lofty ideas, inadequacy of professional planners, indiscipline and unnecessary partnership; poor and inadequate feasibility studies in planning; lack of accurate data; erratic and conflicting government policies which results in policy summersault and abandonment. There are also issues of lack of inter-ministerial and inter-disciplinary coordinating machinery, lack of proper project monitoring, lack of efficient public sector, lack of proper public and private sector partnership, lack of political will to implement the plans, etc. (Emmanuel, 2019). Other sundry factors like misplacement of priorities, lack of self-reliance, ineffective executive capacity, public sector inefficiency, poor public/private sector partnership, technology transfer syndrome, and domestic-foreign resource generation ratio, have all made a genuine development path somewhat illusory (Asabe Shehu Yar’ Adua Foundation, 2020).

6.2 The Concept of Development Policies

Prior to delving into the concept of development policies, this section presents a brief note on policy and policy formulation. In its broad term therefore, policy can be defined as deliberate action of Government that can alter or influence the society or economy outside the government, and are always embodied in legal acts. Policy development therefore is the process of deciding what should be achieved, what should be done to achieve it, how to do it efficiently and economically, and who should do it, etc. Once there is a decision on the option(s) to follow, the legal drafting is initiated into language that fits the legal tradition, the constitution, etc, and this is where the legislatures come into the process of policy formulation. (Skopje, 2007). Policies are as varied as the sectors and the intentions of government; development policy, therefore focuses more on poverty reduction. However, early development planners placed more emphasis on raising output by increasing overall labour productivity, which eventually led to concentration of industrialization. The intention was to raise GDP per capita, and this in effect eliminated the smallholder (peasant) farmers, leaving them behind and hopelessly backward and unproductive. This was the core policy drive between 1940s to 1960, more as a mimicking of the successful Soviet Union type model which had achieved large-scale industrialization from the 1930s onwards. Sadly, this model created inequalities in the economy and in the society between the rich and the poor. With time, development policies began to shift away from GDP Growth model, to more of sustainable development, as the GDP Growth model is laden with inequalities that must be overcome through rapid GDP growth rate to achieve the same level of poverty reduction as low inequality economies. This model was adjudged as rather harsh for most developing economies, as reducing poverty, according to the UNDP, by 2 per cent would require 1 per cent increase in average per capita income. This is the albatross for African economies as only very few countries can actually rival such growth rates. Development policies then gradually shifted towards sustainable development aspirations to include the poor by deliberating protecting the poor through subsidizing primary education, basic health care, water and sanitation that will not only raise the human
development of poor people (measured by such indicators as life expectancy, infant mortality, and literacy) but also raise their productivity. (Addison, 2004). Economic development therefore requires a proper understanding of the policy type that best resolves specific development problem on the one part, and why and how these policies can be effectively implemented given the political, behavioral, and economic framework conditions in a specific country. Any successful development policy will thus be all encompassing beyond the economic discipline such that it interfaces with politics, and behavior (i.e., the incorporation of insights from psychology into policy design), and economics. The political interface however, has a major challenge, which is in identifying and pursuing technically sound policies due to political biases: some elected government has bias incentives to serve particular economic interest at the expense of the general public, or specific needs of the poor or marginalized groups are not sufficiently represented in the political process. This political constraint can be circumvented by technical experts and policymakers who can also use political incentives, knowledge, and behavior to chart expected outcomes. Behavioral economics on the other hand, brings new insights into how to craft better policies by offering new policy tools, improving predictions about the effects of existing policies, and generating new welfare implications. (Badiane and Krampe, 2018). Policy makers and technocrats can therefore, understanding these dynamics, pursue pro-poor development policies that will help the poor to diversify their livelihoods in both self-employment (for example, from dependence on subsistence agriculture and into cash crops and micro-enterprises) and wage-employment (the poor will earn more as skilled workers than as unskilled workers). They can also adopt Asset redistribution, such as the transfer of land from the rich to the poor, which occasionally meets with political resistance. Another development paradigm is the shift from lending to build infrastructure to agricultural investments, considered as the principal livelihood of the poor. UN research in the 1970s into poverty also confirmed the need of empowering the poor through new strategies of redistribution with growth and basic needs. (Addison, 2004). Consequently, the paradigm shift towards sustainable development would be achieved if the social, economic, and environmental dimensions are addressed in an integrated, balanced and coherent manner. There must be policies coherence across the different sectors and improved co-ordination among institutions to avoid working in silos. This is in respect of the challenges that are inherent in accelerated globalisation, increasing interconnectedness of countries and people through mobile communications; multi-country value chains; growing middle classes in developing countries; greater inequality within countries; urbanisation; and natural resource scarcity. At the same time, the nexus of macroeconomic, financial, and monetary policies and associated spillovers generates a complex environment for investment and competitiveness, regionally and globally. (OECD, 2014). Policy coherence in general, refers to a situation where various policy areas within a country are coordinated to ensure that they do not run counter to one another. Development policy is regarded as coherent if foreign policy, trade policy, financial policy, economic policy, agricultural policy, research policy, labour market policy, refugee policy and migration policy have all been aligned so as not to undermine the country’s development policy objectives. A state is regarded as acting inconsistently, for example, if it provides development aid while at the same time pursuing a foreign trade policy that defeats its own development policy objectives. (FDFA, 2011).

6.3 Policy Implementation
Policy development and implementation are often described as distinct and separate stages within policy cycles. In practice, the lines between policy development and implementation can become quite blurred. During the policy development stage, policy makers must address both political and technical issues that may frustrate successful implementation. Political issues include securing buy-in, and strategy of managing the opposition, while technical issues include gathering evidence and data of what works, implementation planning and other mandatory steps required in government policy development, including public consultation. Every effort must be expended to ensure a pragmatic policy as there is no good way to implement a bad policy. Poor policy design therefore is a common reason for poor implementation, even though a well-designed policy can also be poorly implemented. Therefore, it is critical that policy makers incorporate strategies for policy implementation as an integral feature of the policy development stage. This is also the reason why policy makers must interact and involve front line services in the entire policy process. Policy initiatives tend to be more effective when they are designed with direct front line input, as policy professionals do not always have training or direct experience in delivering frontline services. (Centre for Effective Services (2021). Policy formulation stage according to Ishola, 2019, is where those involved in the policy process must make sure they understand global issue and some identified problems that might affect domestic issues and what and who is needed to proffer solutions to those identified problems. This is to ensure that they take care of all the factors and issues that might impinge on the success of the policy execution of the policy, signing contracts, data collection and analysis and to ensure that the programme of the government is put into effect. Though, policy implementation strategies are embedded in the formulation stage, policy Implementation is technically a distinct stage in the policy process. This is the point where the programme of the government is put into effect. It is the stage where the complete process of policy circle is translated into a legal mandate whether it is an executive order of an enacted statute. Policy implementing stage is the phase when the policy is publicised and made to work. At this stage, the parameters of those the policies are meant for, the circumstances under which the policy statements are made and the directives, conditions and restrictions are all spelt out in clear statements. (Ishola, 2019). Policy implementation also requires coherence of other implementation efforts that may be occurring at the same time in different parts of the system. Coherence can help to create a climate for implementation success. Just as policy development requires legislation, the same legislative act may be required before a policy can be fully implemented, or there may be a need to ensure coherence with existing domestic and international legislation. This is to ensure synergies with, or divergence from other government policies or strategies. Policies may interact with each other, producing new, unplanned, and sometimes unintended consequences. More complex governance and accountability arrangements are required to oversee policy implementation. (Centre for Effective Services (2021). Implementation affects how well policies are accepted, not just by faithfully adhering to the policy mandate but also by adapting to changing circumstances over time. Successful implementation does depend a great deal on administrative discretion and the know-how to get results. Narrowing the range of administrative latitude in implementation may limit the value of the process, while too wide a scope can frustrate a successful implementation. Due to the ever changing global dynamics, implementation process must also be dynamic and continuously evolving in response to changing forces and circumstances; it is a struggle over the realization of ideals. Successful implementation process thus requires some actors, both formal as well and informal actors, including legislators, courts, bureaucracies, pressure groups, community organizations, and even individuals. Since policies differ, different actors
would be required for different policies; for instance: -on specific legislation, there may be legislative monitoring, oversight, and intervention to ensure that there is periodic reporting to the sponsoring committee. For policies that deals with grants-in-aid, loans, or direct service provisions, sanctions, or other coercive strategies, there may be a regulatory agency that is involved in implementation and oversight. It is also important that, all three tiers of government, federal, state, and local agencies may need to cooperate in program implementation; there must be sufficient incentives and/or possible sanctions to ensure implementation by other levels. Policy implementation through inter-agency collaboration may result in bureaucratic and administrative delays, resource hoarding, withholding of information, and other games, which must all be factored into the policy formulation and implementation phases. (CSULB, 2002).

6.4 Reasons for Policy Failure

There is an increasing awareness that policies do not succeed or fail on their own merits; rather their progress is dependent upon the process of implementation. Therefore, the factors that shape and influence implementation are seen to be complex, multifaceted and multileveled with public policies invariably resembling “wicked problems” that are resistant to change, have multiple possible causes, and with potential solutions that vary in place and time according to local context (Rittel and Webber 1973). With increasing understanding of these complexities, governments have also come to recognize the need to focus on critical areas to ensure that the good intentions are translated into results in order to avoid policy failures. Governments also avoid policies to drift into full or even partial failure, by adopting strategies that can strengthen and support the implementation phase. Consequently, Hudson et al, 2019, have identified four broad contributors to policy failure: overly optimistic expectations; implementation in dispersed governance; inadequate collaborative policymaking; and the vagaries of the political cycle.

6.4.1 Overly optimistic expectations

Five interacting factors have also been observed that usually contribute to such over optimism, and these are: (i) complexity (underestimation of the delivery challenges); (ii) evidence base (insufficient objective, accurate and timely information on costs, timescales, benefits and risks); (iii) misunderstanding of stakeholders (optimism about the ability to align different views); (iv) behavior and Incentives (interested parties boosting their own prospects); and (v) challenge and accountability (decision-makers seeking short-term recognition

6.4.2 Implementation in dispersed governance

Policies formulated at national level may face the challenge of ensuring some degree of consistency in delivery at subnational level, a process that is especially fraught where the subnational level has some separate degree of political authority Even where governance is concentrated rather than dispersed, implementation will still be highly dependent on local context – it is known from the literature on complex systems that an intervention that is successful in one location does not necessarily (or evenly routinely) deliver the same results elsewhere.

6.4.3 Inadequate collaborative policymaking
Policy-making has tended to be developed in distinct administrative siloes even though most interventions will almost certainly have wider implications that affect external parties. Moreover, despite growing academic interest in developing ideas and tools for promoting interorganizational partnering, improvement has been at best patchy and limited. Other than for the most simple of tasks, policy design requires continuous collaboration with a range of stakeholders at multiple political, policy-making, managerial and administrative levels as well as the engagement of local “downstream” implementation actors such as end users, frontline staff and a range of local service agencies.

6.4.4 Vagaries of the political cycle

Politicians tend not to be held accountable for the outcomes of their policy initiatives – in the event of failure the likelihood is that they will have moved on or moved out. One consequence of this is that they are too easily attracted to the prospect of short-term results. This can lead to the pushing through of policies as quickly as possible, rather than getting involved in the messy, protracted and frustrating details of how things might work out in practice. In general, there is evidence to suggest that the political will necessary to drive long-term policy-making tends to dissipate over time.

6.5 Strategy for a successful policy implementation

Successful policy formulation and implementation also requires four sequential points: preparation; tracking; support; and review. This is to ensure that policy-makers are more alert to the practicalities of implementation by scrutinizing the feasibility of policy proposals more carefully at the outset in effect, better “policy design”. This is to avoid faulty policy design, which could stem from many causes: a poor understanding of the problem; insufficient knowledge of the implementation context; unclear and even contradictory goals; poor quality evidence; and an absence of political backing. Policies generally are defined as fitting one or more of several criteria: addresses a top government priority; has significant budget implications; makes major or complex changes to existing policies; involves significant cross-agency issues; is particularly sensitive; requires urgent implementation; involves new or complex delivery systems; and has been developed over a very short period. This is why a full implementation plan has to be developed during the drafting process, covering seven domains: planning, governance, stakeholder engagement, risks, monitoring, review and evaluation, resource management and management strategy. Effective management of each of these domains are summarized under Policy Tracking, Implementation Support, and Implementation Review.

(i) Policy tracking.

Policy tracking entails closely monitoring of the progress against key policy priorities through the analysis of a constant stream of departmental performance data, problem-solving; undertaking field visits to identify obstacles to delivery and flagging up where additional resources may be needed to address specific problems and progress assessing: supplying heads of government with routine progress reports.

(ii) Implementation support
Policy implementation support entails, tapping into the perceptions and experiences of those whose behavior will shape the implementation process. Such implementation support, besides seeking explanations to the legal obligations or the requirements of statutory guidance, is more concerned about promoting the art and craft of policy implementation, which involves assessing existing capacity to deliver, knowing what is being done well, what needs improving and how best to build new capacity. All of this would require finding new ways of bridging the understanding between national and local narratives via some intermediary body.

(iii) Post Implementation review

This is the last step in a policy support cycle, which provides the opportunity to assess the extent to which – by some agreed point – policy objectives have been met. Where done well, it seeks to answers to several key questions: Was the problem correctly identified? Were any important aspects overlooked? Were any important data left out of the analysis? Were policy expectations fulfilled? Have lessons been learned for future programs? In a rational evidence-based context, the answers to these questions can help to modify implementation trajectories and support decisions on whether or not to renew, expand or terminate an initiative. (Hudson et al, 2019). Given the repeated failures in our critical development policies, it is clear that a major gap exist between policy formulation and policy implementation in the Nigerian democratic system. The following section now presents the role of the legislature in development policy implementation.

7.0 THE ROLE OF THE LEGISLATURE IN DEVELOPMENT POLICIES IMPLEMENTATION

Legislature is one of the basic structures of any political system, known by a variety of names in different countries, such as the Congress, Parliament, Duma or Knesset, the Soviet, Diet, or Assembly, etc. (Tom and Attai, 2014). It is the key institutions in the democratic process, to the extent that any attack on its composition or functioning is seen as a blow against democracy. The legislature thus symbolizes democracy and avails the people the opportunity to participate in governance and serves as the fulcrum of all democratic institutions and features, as it is the main difference between a democratic and all other forms of undemocratic regimes. Its inviolability is seen on the grounds that any attack on the composition or functioning of the legislature is seen as a blow against democracy. (Saliu and Bakare, 2020). The indispensability of the legislative roles is in ensuring good governance and the subsequent sustainability of the democratic project from external intruder (the military and rebel forces) especially in developing democracies. The democratic institutions and structures are thus built around the legislature. The legislature across the globe thus performs four cardinal functions: lawmaking, representation, oversight, and budgeting. They make laws for the good governance of the polity, represents the people's interest in the government, performs oversight functions on the executive to prevent democratic tyrannical tendencies, and also guards the guardians of the treasury by appropriating money for the running of government businesses. Aside from these, each country’s legislature performs other functions as conferred on it by the country’s constitution. For instance, Section 88 of the Nigerian 1999 constitution (as amended) confers investigative functions and responsibilities on the National Assembly. The constitution also charges the National Assembly to receive and enquire into Public Petitions and Complaints brought to its attention. In the same vein, section 8 of the 1787 United States Constitution
granted legislative powers to the Congress on the four core functions and other matters ranging from collection of taxes, the constitution of tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court, and military deployment, among other powers and functions. (Saliu and Bakare, 2020). Of the various functions that legislature performs, the oversight function forms the critical lever in ensuring good governance and implementation of various policies. It has been observed that the watchdog function is perhaps more important for a legislative assembly than that of lawmaking. They constitutionally, provide the institutional mechanism for ensuring accountability and good governance of the executives to the electorates. Some of the oversight functions include scrutinizing and authorizing revenues and expenditures of the government and ensuring that the national budget is properly implemented. The constitutional power to participate in budgetary appropriation gives the legislature needed political influence to shape governance, and possibly carry out reforms that leads to national development. In this regard, Saffell (1989) asserted that no function of the congress is more jealously guarded or more basic to administrative control than the power of the purse. (Tom and Attai, 2014).

Globally, the legislatures have two features that distinguish them from other branches of government: they have the formal authority to pass laws, which are implemented and interpreted by the executive and judicial branches and their members normally are elected to represent various elements in the population. It is significant to note that legislatures vary in terms of composition, structure and role, from one democracy to the other. Strictly speaking, legislatures are divided into two types. They are the bicameral and the unicameral types. The unicameral legislature has only one chamber or house while the bicameral variation has two. All communist regimes, including China, many Latin American countries, Norway, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Israel, Lebanon, and New Zealand had unicameral legislature while the bicameral structures are made up of the Upper House and the Lower House. Some countries designate their Upper House as the Senate and the Lower House as the House of Representative. Typical examples of this are the United States of America and Nigeria. In England, the House of Lords and the House of Commons are the designations for the Upper House and Lower House respectively. This structural variation notwithstanding, legislatures tend to exhibit some basic common characteristics. Generally legislatures are formally equal to one another in status, however, the authority of members depends on their claim to representation of the rest of the community. The human society is an organic phenomenon. As such, it is never static. (Tom and Attai, 2014).

7.1 History of the Nigerian Legislature

The development of the legislative institution in Nigeria is traceable to 1861 when the colonial government officially occupied Lagos. As a means of governing the colony of Lagos, the colonial Governor established a Legislative Council to oversee the affairs of the Colony in 1862. (Tom and Attai, 2014). However, historical evidence suggest that some form of legislative activities (especially lawmaking and oversight) existed within the kingdoms such as Oyo empire, Sokoto caliphate, and Kanem Borno empire long long before the advent of colonialism. Though all powers were vested in kings during the precolonial era, (fusion of power), legislative functions were noticeable in the Councils. (Saliu and Bakare, 2020). However, the first formal legislature established by the British colonial government was the Lagos Legislative Council in 1862 with the declaration of Lagos Colony with the Governor as the Head Council and the executive head, which fused the legislature and the executive fused
under one leadership. The legislature then thus acted only as an advisor to the Governor. (Saliu and Bakare, 2020). In 1900, the protectorates of Northern and Southern Nigeria were established by the British Government to replace the administration of the Royal Niger Company and the Niger Coast, protectorate over the North and South respectively. Six years later, the colony of Lagos was annexed to the Southern Protectorate. The two protectorates were amalgamated in 1914 to form the Colony and protectorate of Nigeria, with the formation of a new legislative body called the Nigerian Council which comprised of thirty-six members randomly selected and handpicked by the colonial government to represent, business and other interests. Six of the members were Nigerians. Just like the Lagos Council, the new Nigerian Council also had no legislative power and thus performed no legislative functions. However, a major constitutional development that affected the development of the legislature occurred in 1922 when the Clifford Constitution made provisions for the election of four Nigerians out of a total Council of forty-six members. The remaining forty-two members were selected, nominated or handpicked by the Colonial Governor to represent private and business interests. (Tom and Attai, 2014). At inception, the Legislative Council in 1922 was operated as a unicameral legislature with both official and unofficial members partly selected, nominated, and elected. The membership strength was forty-six (46), out of which twenty-seven (27) were official members including the Governor and Lieutenant Governors. The fifteen (15) unofficial members included six (6) Nigerians while the remaining four (4) were elected with three (3) from Lagos and One (1) to represent Calabar.20 Its jurisdiction covered only Lagos and Southern Provinces of the country. (Saliu and Bakare, 2020). The introduction of this elective principle was carried over into the 1946 Richard’s and the 1951 Macpherson Constitutions as each subsequent constitution tried to increase the number of elective Nigerians into the Colonial Legislative Council. (Tom and Attai, 2014). In 1946, Sir Arthur Frederick Richards through the Nigeria (Legislative Council) Order-in-Council of 1946 reviewed and established a new national legislature still known as the Legislative Council but different in terms of membership composition. For the first time in the history of the country, the new Legislative Council was empowered to legislate for the whole country. In 1951, based on the recommendations of the 1950 Hugh Foot-led Ibadan conference, Sir John Stuart Macpherson through the Nigeria (Constitution) Order-in-Council of 1951 abolished the Legislative Council and established a new central legislature known as the Legislative Council but different in terms of membership composition. For the first time in the history of the country, the new Legislative Council was empowered to legislate for the whole country. In 1951, based on the recommendations of the 1950 Hugh Foot-led Ibadan conference, Sir John Stuart Macpherson through the Nigeria (Constitution) Order-in-Council of 1951 abolished the Legislative Council and established a new central legislature known as the “House of Representatives. “The House of Representatives continued to serve as the only central legislature (though with amendments in membership composition and electoral method by Oliver Lyttelton in 1954) until 1959, when the Nigerian Senate was established bringing about the adoption of a bicameral legislature in the country. As part of the arrangement for the 1960 independence, the country thus switched to a bicameral legislature. The 1960 independence constitution granted full legislative power to the two chambers. (Saliu and Bakare, 2020). There were, for the Federation, the Senate and the House of Representative and, for the Regions, the House of Chiefs and the House of Assembly. The Senate and the House of Chiefs were the Upper Houses for the Federation and the Regions respectively. The House of Representatives was made up of 312 members elected nation-wide to serve for five years and a senate of 44 members selected from the various components of the Federal System. (Tom and Attai, 2014). However, the military intervention in Nigerian politics in 1966 led to the suspension of the legislature. Thirteen years later, democratic rule was restored in 1979 and the legislature renamed as “National Assembly.” Nigeria dropped the parliamentary system and opted for the presidential system retaining the bicameral type of legislature. The return to democratic rule in 1979 ushered in the Second Republic, during which the country switched from parliamentary to presidential system as
provided for in the 1979 constitution. Section 43 of the constitution retained the bicameral legislature and named it “National Assembly” which consisted of the Senate and House of Representatives. Section 44 – 45 provided that 5 Senators are to be elected from each state with 450 members representing the whole country on the basis of population. For the first time in the history of the country, the legislature is totally separated from the executive and there was a clear separation of powers among the organs of government. However, the National Assembly was suspended following the Buhari-led military intervention of 1983, however, inspite of these aberrations, the 1979 constitution became a turning point in the history of legislative politics in Nigeria. The contents and provisions of subsequent constitutions (1989 and 1999) were heavily influenced by the provisions of the 1979 constitutions except for few amendments. The current National Assembly derives its legislative powers from section 4 of the 1999 constitution (as amended). It grants the National Assembly the power to make laws for the peace, order and good government of the country. However, sections 47 – 89 explicitly provide for the institutional composition, framework, and legislative procedures. These range from membership composition, legislative procedures, qualification for membership, elections as well as powers and control over public funds. In terms of composition, section 48 provides that the Senate shall consist of 3 Senators from each of the 36 states of the federation and 1 from the FCT, Abuja; making a total of 109 members. Section 49 provides that the House of Representatives be made up of 360 members representing federal constituencies of nearly equal population. (Saliu and Bakare, 2020). Section 60 provides that the two chambers shall have the power to regulate its own affairs and procedures. It is on this premise that the Senate and the House of Representatives enacted for themselves other rules and regulations to guide their activities. Prominent among these is the Standing Orders which govern the legislative procedures and behaviors of members both within and outside the National Assembly. For instance, section 50(1) only provides that a Senate President, Deputy Senate President, Speaker and Deputy Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be elected among the members to direct the affairs of the National Assembly. However, legislative activities and procedures are much a responsibility that could be shouldered by only four persons. Therefore, the Standing Orders of both chambers make provisions for the appointment, selection, or election of more legislators as Principal Officers. For example, Order 7 makes provision for the nomination of members to fill the following positions: Majority Leader and Deputy, Majority Whip and Deputy Whip, Minority Leader and Deputy, and Minority Whip and Deputy.26 For administrative convenience, section 51 provides for the recruitment of a Clerk and such other staff that may be required for the optimal functioning of the National Assembly. It is against this backdrop that the National Assembly has three Clerks and several assistants. While the Clerk to the National Assembly is the most senior, he is assisted by two other Clerks: the Senate Clerk and House Clerk. (Saliu and Bakare, 2020).

7.2 Performance of Nigerian Legislators

The powers, duties and functions of Nigerian legislature are well spelt out in the 1999 constitution. In section 4 of the 1999 constitution of the federal Republic of Nigeria provisions for the exercise of legislative powers by both the National Assembly and the States Houses of Assembly which powers must be exercised for purposes of achieving good governance, amongst others are made.
These oversight functions are enshrined in their constitutional powers as contained in section 4 of 1999 constitution:

The legislative powers of the Federal Republic of Nigeria is vested in a National Assembly for which consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives. The National Assembly have power to make laws for the peace, order and good government of the Federation or any part thereof with respect to any matter included in the Exclusive Legislative list set out in Part 1 of the Second Schedule of the Constitution.

In addition the National Assembly have power to make laws with respect to the following matters:

(a) Any matter in the Concurrent Legislative list set out in the first column of Part II of the Second Schedule to the Constitution to the extent prescribed in the second column opposite thereto; and

(b) Any other matter with respect to which it is empowered to make laws in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution.

(5) If any Law enacted by the House of Assembly of a State is inconsistent with any laws validly made by the National Assembly, the law made by the National Assembly shall prevail, and that other Law shall to the extent of the inconsistency be void. Similarly

The national assembly has exclusive right over the Exclusive Legislative List with consists of matters of national importance, such as Aviation, Banks, Commercial and Industrial monopolies, customs and excise duties, drugs and poisons, Export duties, immigration, maritime shipping and navigation, incorporation and winding up of bodies corporate, construction, alteration and maintenance of federal roads, insurance, prisons, Railways, Mines and minerals, police and security agencies, posts, telegraphs and telephones, trade and commerce etc. The concurrent legislative list contains matters over which both the federal and state houses of parliament can make laws and the extent of the exercise of such legislative powers. The Nigerian legislatures, like those of other developing nations have some identified characteristics that deter their legislative duties, such as uninformed debates that are focused on parochial concerns, frequent changes in the membership of the house during elections, inexperience and even ignorance of legislative proceedings often displayed by newly elected members, leadership tussle and frequent changes in the leadership of the legislative houses, all of which become cogs in the wheels of national development. The Nigerian legislature has been heavily criticized for the current state of the economy and the nation, given the constitutional oversight powers vested on them. The oversight functions generally include: identifying the inefficiency and waste in government such as extravagance, fraud and misuse of public funds as well as redirection, redistribution and/or restructuring; making sure that government agencies are carrying out public policy effectively; determining whether each of the parties responsible for administering the law fairly and properly are doing so throughout the state and having a very good knowledge and understanding of governmental programmes, actions and activities. (Ishola, 2019). Sadly, the current state of the nation in all spheres points to a relatively inefficient legislature. This is as the Country continued to perform very poorly in most of the critical development indices, such as being the poverty capital of the world. Constitutionally, the Legislature screens and approves certain appointees of the executive, and
are also empowered to even remove the President, Vice President, Governor and the Deputy Governor through impeachment procedure provided for in the constitution. However, exercising these functions by the legislature for national development is often interfered with and hampered by the executive, by influencing the election of their cronies into the leadership of the legislatures. (Tom and Attai, 2014). The legislatures also have the poor records of processing public bills through both houses, as it takes years before bills are passed, which has largely led to the frightening number of bills that are still pending before the two houses of the National Assembly. Between 1999 and May 2019, the Senate has processed 2,482 Bills and passed 681 representing 27.4 per cent performance level. On the other hand, the House of Representatives in the same period processed the total of 3,514 Bills out of which only 928 were passed thus, putting the percentage of Bills passed by the House to stand at 26.4 per cent. (Saliu and Bakare, 2020).

In recounting on the midterm performance of the 9th National Assembly, which were both inaugurated separately on Tuesday, June 11, 2019, the Leadership of the Senate and the House of Representatives, each gave a resounding performance of the 9th Assembly through their collaborative relationship with the executives. They praised themselves for successfully amended and passed the Deep Off-Shore and Inland Basin Production Sharing Contracts Act Cap D3LFN 2004 (Amendment Bill 2009); which was specifically geared towards increasing collectable revenues from proceeds of crude sales. Others include the Public Procurement 2007 (amendment) bill 2019, Companies and Allied Matters Act, Cap C20 LFN 2004 (Repeal and Re-enactment) Bill 2019 etc, which were passed and assented to by President Muhammadu Buhari. They have also jointly passed the Petroleum Industry Bill (PIB), which had defied efforts in the past 13 years, since 2008, and is now waiting the Presidential Assent. They attributed their success in passing these bills to their constructive engagement and collaboration with the executive arm of government, even though, the general public impression of these claims is that, the 9th national assembly is a “rubber stamp” assembly to all the Executive, especially as it relates to approving excessive borrowing in the face of mounting debts and increasing debt/revenue ratios, when, the nation is increasingly sinking more and more into poverty. Making his view known, the Chairman of Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU), University of Abuja Chapter, Dr Kassim Umar cautioned the leadership of the 9th National Assembly on ‘the same page relationship’ it is running with the executive arm of government since the three arms of government in a presidential democracy, are meant to serve as check on one another. According to him, “Harmonious working relationship among the three arms of government and in particular, between the Legislature and the Executive in a presidential democracy like Nigeria is a welcome development but taking it to the realm of subservience by being on the same page with the executive on all issues, is dangerous for good governance. (Odewale, 2021). The National Assembly prides itself more in the introduction and passage of bills, as the key performance index (KPI), while they pay less attention to the number of bills that finally receive presidential assent, and the eventual implementation of these laws. They technically, do not score themselves in how many of these bills receive presidential assent, and the subsequential implementation of these laws for the benefit of the Nigerian people. In their own language, the then President of the Senate, Bukola Saraki, described the Eighth National Assembly as the most productive since 1999, going by the number of bills passed. He said the lawmakers passed 213 bills and handled 138 petitions in three years. He boasted that “In this time, we have passed 213 bills, cleared 138 petitions submitted by the public. We are happy to say that this Senate is the most productive since 1999.
It has surpassed the 5th Senate, which with 129 bills in four years, had the highest number of bills, as against the 6th Senate with 72 bills, and 128 passed by the 7th Senate. The number of petitions we have successfully treated to the satisfaction of Nigerians who filed them dwarfed the eight and six treated by the sixth and seventh Senate respectively.” However, the 8th National Assembly only received presidential assent on 80 bills out of the 515 they passed. (Baiyewu, 2019). This is a clear evidence that receiving presidential assent and subsequent implementation of these Laws was not as important as passing these bills on the floor of the national assembly. Successive national assembly rather only strive to out-do past Assemblies in the number of bills processed and passed on the floor of the house. So, while they celebrate the baskets of bills passed, even without presidential assent, Nigerians continue to wallow in insecurity, high rate unemployment, endemic poverty, economic degradation and high incidences of socio-political frustrations. (Salu and Bakare, 2020). However, while passing these bills are part of the legislative functions, their critical legislative function is the oversight function, to oversee the activities of the executive, and therefore, to follow up closely in the implementation of every successful passed, and assented bills. This is only when their impact can be felt when the legislature get down to this all-important brass task of the National Assembly. Rather, they pride themselves in how many bills they process and pass within any legislative calender. This has caused unprecedented failure in public policy implementation. This has made public policy implementation to be very defective in process, as the executives and their agencies, mishandle some critical social challenges confronting the nation such as poverty, unemployment, insecurity, lack of obedience to the rule of law by the executive, injustice, decay in the nation’s infrastructures, communal conflicts and many other social ills plaguing the nation. This is where the National Assembly falls flat on their Watchdog roles in the democratic system. Besides this gross negligence, they have also involved in many challenges and allegations in the last twenty years – 1999 – 2019 from leadership problems to allegations of corruption, in-effectiveness accusations by the public and other challenges. Sadly, one of their misgivings is to think that once a policy is adopted by government, it must be implemented, and the expected outcomes must be achieved. These lapses and carelessness is the bane of successful policy implementation in Nigeria. This has resulted in so many abandoned projects and well written policies that were not either implemented at all or not well implemented. (Ishola, 2019).

8.0 CONCLUSION

This paper has only shown the deep-seated problems that have refused to go- a country that is living in total denial of its core national responsibilities by all stakeholders from the Executives, the Legislators, the Judiciary and even the governed or the electorates. Our failure as a nation is the failure of all the Stakeholders. Though the paper addresses the roles of the legislators in development policy implementation, and their failure to carry out their Oversight functions on the executives in policy implementation, as clearly highlighted in this paper, there is also a major gap, the electorates have also failed the nation, buy repeatedly voting the same performing politicians. The development of this country can therefore not be left in the hands of the elected, but must be the responsibility of all stakeholders, including professional bodies, who should now take it up as a challenge and as a national service to always confront the legislatures in economic formulation. This paper is therefore a call for all stakeholders in the economic development of the country, including the private sectors and professional associations to mount pressures on the executives and the legislators not only during economic
policy formulation, but to also take the next step in ensuring successful implementation of these policies for the benefit of all Stakeholders.
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