NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONS

ANNUAL CONFERENCE 2026

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

REPUTATION MANAGEMENT AS A STRATEGIC ASSET FOR PUBLIC SECTOR TRANSFORMATION

A diagnostic of the public standing of Nigeria's civil service, and a programme of action for the National Council of Civil Service Commissions

Responding to the conference theme

"Towards a Future Ready Civil Service: The Role of Institutional Re-engineering, Reputation Management and Culture Change at the Civil Service Commission in Nigeria"

DATE	**Sunday, 1st November 2026 to** Friday, 6th November 2026
VENUE	**Top Dome Event Centre** Opposite Federal Secretariat, Okpanam Road Asaba, Delta State
HOST	**Delta State Government**

Presented by

Anthony Ojobo, PhD, mnipr, fimc, fcai

Strategic Communications & Reputation Management Professional | Climate Action Strategist | ESG Advisor | Digital Transformation & Regulation Specialist

Contents

Protocol 3
Executive summary 3
Introduction 3
The asset and the currency 3
Defining reputation management 4
Reputation lives in perception 5
Why reputation is a strategic asset 5
1.0 The argument in brief 5
2.0 Reputation as institutional capital and the Reputation Gap Matrix 6
3.0 The public standing of Nigeria's civil service 7
4.0 Why reforms do not endure: the Oronsaye experience 11
5.0 How credible institutions earn trust 11
6.0 The eight pillars of institutional reputation 12
7.0 The RESPECT Framework 13
8.0 Measuring reputation 14
9.0 Programme of action 17
10.0 Anticipated objections and responses 21
11.0 Questions for deliberation 21
12.0 Conclusion and request to the Council 22
Thank you 23
Appendix A: Commission reputation self assessment 24
Appendix B: Reputation scorecard worksheet 25
References 26

Protocol

I acknowledge the Chairman of the Federal Civil Service Commission, Professor Tunji Olaopa, and the leadership of the National Council of Civil Service Commissions. I acknowledge the Delta State Government, our gracious host, and the Head of the Civil Service of the Federation. I acknowledge the Chairmen and Commissioners of the Federal and State Civil Service Commissions, permanent secretaries, heads of service, directors, development partners, and colleagues drawn from public administration, governance and communication practice across the federation. It is a privilege to address you.

Executive summary

Nigeria's civil service has no shortage of reform plans, performance policies and digital human resource systems, and the Federal Civil Service Commission, the constitutional gatekeeper of the service, now has a strategic plan for the first time. What the service has produced far less of is public evidence that these instruments are working, and the public judges institutions by what it can see. This address presents a diagnostic of the reputation of the civil service, drawn from independent evidence. It identifies five fault lines along which public trust is lost, and draws on the Oronsaye experience to show why reforms without a public constituency do not endure. It then sets out the eight pillars on which institutional reputation rests, the RESPECT Framework as an operating model for Commissions, and a weighted scorecard through which a Commission can measure its own standing. A programme for the first 100 days and three decisions for the National Council follow. The address closes with a specific request of this Council. Gold labels in the text mark the points at which each slide appears.

Introduction

SLIDE 3

I open with an image. A cracked egg cannot be returned to its shell. A broken reputation is far harder to mend than to protect, and repairing it often costs far more than preventing the damage. That is the case for the rest of this address: reputation is cheaper to protect than to rebuild, and the Commissions in this hall are the institutions best placed to protect it.

The asset and the currency

SLIDE 4

Reputation is an asset. Trust is a currency. An institution builds the asset slowly, and it spends the currency quickly. Credibility is the foundation, because nothing an institution says is believed without it. Performance is the proof, because it shows the public that the claim is true. Trust is the reward, and it is what citizens give to an institution that has earned it: they comply, they cooperate and they defend its reforms. Perception is the trigger, because trust is released only when the public sees what the institution has done.



Figure 1. Reputation is an asset and trust is a currency: credibility, performance, trust and perception.

Defining reputation management

SLIDE 5

Two definitions come first, so that we argue about the same thing.

Conceptually, reputation is the collective perception that stakeholders hold about an institution, based on its actions, behaviour, performance, values and communication over time. Reputation management is the strategic and systematic process of planning, monitoring, shaping, maintaining and enhancing the perceptions and opinions that stakeholders and the general public hold about an individual, organisation or institution.

Operationally, reputation management is a formal system with an owner, a budget, instruments and measures. It diagnoses where an institution stands, closes the gap between what the institution does and what the public is able to see, and reports the results in public, on a fixed date, in language citizens can follow.

Together the two definitions say what we are protecting and what a Commission must do to protect it.

Reputation lives in perception

SLIDE 6

Perception sits at the centre of the definition. Stakeholders form it from three sources: their own experience at the counter, on the portal or through a complaint; the information they receive from the media, social media and official reports; and the stories that critics, unions and peers tell about the institution.

The chain runs from performance to what the public sees, from what the public sees to perception, and from perception to reputation. Perception can be slow to follow performance, and that delay is where the credibility gap opens. Perception cannot replace performance, so a Commission must improve the service people receive and tell them about it honestly, and do both together. That is why the measures later in this address include citizen perception surveys alongside service records.

Why reputation is a strategic asset

SLIDE 7

Reputation qualifies as a strategic asset because it behaves as one: it takes years to build and is lost faster than it is built, and it lowers the cost of every later transaction between an institution and its public.

For a Civil Service Commission, a strong reputation delivers five practical advantages. Citizens comply more readily with rules and directives, and capable people are willing to join and to stay. Political interference becomes harder, because an institution with strong public standing is costlier to attack. Leverage improves in dealings with partners and financiers, and new policy is adopted faster, because the public gives the benefit of the doubt to institutions it already trusts.

A deficit produces the mirror image: resistance to policy, loss of talent, exposure to disinformation, and reform fatigue. In reform fatigue, each administration announces again the reforms of its predecessor, because the public never trusted them enough to protect them.

The evidence points the same way. The OECD argues that trust is necessary for building and implementing public policy, and that low trust raises transaction costs (OECD, 2017). In the corporate sector, a good reputation has been linked to sustained superior financial performance (Roberts and Dowling, 2002).

1.0 The argument in brief

SLIDE 8

I begin with a number. In the most recent Afrobarometer survey of Nigeria, fielded between June and July 2024, fifty six percent of citizens who had sought a government document in the previous year reported paying a bribe to obtain it (Afrobarometer, 2025). The document may have been an identity record, a certificate or a letter of confirmation. A public officer stood at the end of each process, and the citizen left with a view of the entire state formed in that single encounter.

Now the question. How many Commissions represented in this hall could place before the public, today, a published figure showing what the institution is doing about that experience? I ask without any intention to embarrass anyone. I ask because the answer defines the subject of this address.

Nigeria's civil service has reform plans, performance policies, audits and strategic plans. What it has too rarely produced is public evidence, in a form citizens can read, that those plans are working. Reputation is built in the space between what an institution does and what the public is able to see.

Every administration depends on the civil service to deliver its agenda. Which of them has invested in the public standing of the institution on which it depends?

SLIDE 9

I will advance three claims. I expect some of you to disagree with at least one of them, and I welcome that, because this Council will decide better after hearing the argument tested.

Claim one. The Nigerian civil service has a reputation problem that is distinct from its performance problem, and that compounds it. Where performance is strong but unseen, the public assumes failure. Where performance is weak but standing holds, the trust is borrowed and will be recalled.

Claim two. Nigeria has plenty of reform ideas. What it has lacked is reform constituencies. Our major reforms were designed for administrators and defended by no one outside the administration, which is why each could be delayed at no political cost.

Claim three. Reputation can be managed as a discipline, with an owner, a budget, instruments and measures. The Civil Service Commissions, which hold the constitutional power to recruit, promote and discipline, are the institutions best placed to own it.

I will close with a specific request of this Council, and with an offer of practical help.

2.0 Reputation as institutional capital and the Reputation Gap Matrix

SLIDE 10

Image is what an institution projects. Brand is the promise it makes. Reputation is the accumulated judgment of those who deal with the institution, formed by what it does, how consistently it does it, and how well that record is communicated. It behaves as capital because it lowers the cost of every later transaction between an institution and its public.

Fombrun (1996) introduced the idea of reputational capital. For a public institution I distinguish four forms of it. Trust capital lets an institution act with authority and secure cooperation. Performance capital makes difficult decisions acceptable even when they are contested. Influence capital shapes opinion and behaviour. Resilience capital is the reserve of goodwill that carries an institution through a crisis. As Stephen Covey observed, when the trust account is high, communication is easy, instant and effective.

SLIDE 11

To make the idea usable, I offer a simple diagnostic that I call the Reputation Gap Matrix. It sets actual performance against public standing and yields four institutional types.

Institutional type	Performance and standing	What the institution must do

Trusted Performer	Strong performance, strong standing	Protect trust by disclosing results routinely and early, before others do it for you.
Hidden Performer	Strong performance, weak standing	Close the visibility gap with public scorecards, plain language reporting and proactive engagement with the media.
Fragile Favourite	Weak performance, strong standing	Repair delivery before the standing is tested. Borrowed trust is recalled quickly when a crisis arrives.
Failing Institution	Weak performance, weak standing	Fix the service encounter first. Communicate progress only with evidence, and only after it exists.

Table 1. The Reputation Gap Matrix. © Anthony Ojobo, 2026.

The two types in which performance and standing diverge, the Hidden Performer and the Fragile Favourite, correspond to what I called, in June, the performance-communication gap. It runs in two directions. Genuine performers fail to communicate their achievements, and their standing stays depressed despite real improvement. Consider a Commission that clears a long backlog and tells no one: the public will go on judging it by the backlog it remembers. Weak performers communicate aggressively, and their standing is inflated until the gap is exposed. Stakeholders who feel misled are far harder to recover than those who were simply uninformed.

In my experience, most public institutions sit in the second or the fourth row. A few sit in the third and do not know it. I invite every Commissioner to place the institution honestly in the matrix before this session ends.

3.0 The public standing of Nigeria's civil service

3.1 The independent evidence

SLIDE 12

I rely on three independent sources and on the Federal Civil Service Commission's own public diagnosis. None of the independent sources surveys the civil service alone, and I will not pretend that they do. Taken together, they describe the climate in which every civil servant and every Commission now works.

Indicator	Finding	Source
Perceived public sector corruption, 2025	Nigeria scores 26 of 100 and ranks 142nd of 182 countries. The global average is 42. Singapore scores 84.	Transparency International, 2026
Bribes paid to obtain a government document (2024 survey)	56% of citizens who sought one	Afrobarometer Round 10, 2025
Rating of government performance in fighting corruption	90% say fairly badly or very badly	Afrobarometer Round 10, 2025
Income based trust gap, 2026	26 points, an all time high. Trust Index 85 among high income groups and 59 among low income groups.	Edelman Trust Barometer, Nigeria, 2026
Who is obligated to build trust	86% assign that obligation to government	Edelman Trust Barometer, Nigeria, 2026
Belief that the next generation will be better off	65%, the highest of 28 countries, tied with Saudi Arabia. The global average is 32%.	Edelman Trust Barometer, Nigeria, 2026

Table 2. The evidence base for the diagnostic

Three readings follow. Nigeria's 2025 score of 26 places it 142nd of 182 countries, two places lower than a year earlier. The experience at the counter matches the perception in the index, because a citizen who pays for a document needs no survey to form a view of the state. And Edelman finds a society that expects a better future and holds government responsible for building trust. A public that expects improvement, and holds government responsible for it, will reward visible delivery. The reputational ground has not been lost, and it remains open to any Commission willing to claim it.

3.2 The Federal Civil Service Commission's own diagnosis

The Chairman of the Federal Civil Service Commission has told the country that the Commission's strategic plan for 2026 to 2030, its first, responds to institutional decline, to which the Commission itself contributed, and to the erosion of merit in human resource management (News Agency of Nigeria, 2026). Few institutions have the candour to say so in public. That candour is reputational capital, and I commend it. The test is what follows it.

3.3 Five fault lines in public trust

SLIDE 13

From the evidence above, from the public record of reform, and from eighteen years inside a public institution, I identify five fault lines. I offer them as a working diagnosis for debate. Each is measurable, and each can be repaired.

These fault lines have a history. The colonial state governed by authority rather than consent, and it managed perception by controlling information rather than by demonstrating service. Public institutions inherited the template that they did not need to earn trust, because their authority did not depend on it. In the decades that followed, reputation was often separated from performance. The result is the credibility gap, the structured divergence between what an institution says about itself and what citizens experience from it. The five fault lines are the places where that gap shows.

The merit fault line. The public suspects that entry and advancement depend on connection rather than competence. The Commission's own strategy process examined the erosion of merit. The reputational consequence reaches beyond fairness. Capable candidates select themselves out and honest officers disengage, so every appointment, however sound, is received with suspicion.

The counter fault line. A civil service is judged one encounter at a time, at registries, screening panels, payment desks and portals. The fifty six percent figure belongs here. A service can be reformed at the top and still be judged at the counter.

The evidence fault line. The service reports upward and rarely outward. It has a new strategic plan, an e-recruitment platform and computer-based promotion examinations, and a stated commitment to link promotion to measurable results. These are serious instruments. I ask the Council a plain question: where can a citizen read the results? Reform without published measurement builds rumour, not reputation.

The narrative fault line. The public story of the civil service is written largely by others. Public commentary routinely describes the federal service as bloated, and officers themselves have asked publicly why the cost of the executive and the legislature is not cut first. An institution that leaves its record unnarrated leaves the task to its critics. In many institutions, nobody owns the story.

The workforce fault line. The first audience of any institution is its own staff. Globally, trust in one's employer stands at 78 percent against 53 percent for government, a gap of 25 points (Edelman, 2026). A service whose own officers feel unrecognised and unequipped to speak well of it cannot expect the public to do so.

SLIDE 14

Table 3 converts the five fault lines into indicators. Any Commission can begin collecting them without new legislation.

Fault line	What the public experiences	Evidence	What to measure
Merit	Appointments and promotions that look arbitrary	Commission's own acknowledgement of eroded merit	Share of decisions taken against published criteria; time to conclude disciplinary cases
Counter	Informal payment, delay, no feedback	56% paid for a document (Afrobarometer, 2025)	Charter compliance rate; complaint closure rate and time
Evidence	Reforms announced, results unseen	Questions over the status of agencies earmarked for merger or scrapping (press, 2026)	Publication of an annual scorecard by a fixed date
Narrative	A story told by critics	Public commentary on a bloated service	Share of media coverage originated by the institution
Workforce	Officers who cannot or will not advocate	Employer trust 78% against government 53% (Edelman, 2026)	Staff trust and advocacy index, measured annually

Table 3. Indicators for each fault line

3.4 A SWOT of the civil service

SLIDE 15

A SWOT analysis brings the diagnosis together. It draws on the evidence in this section and on the Federal Civil Service Commission's own public statements, and it looks at the service through a reputation lens.

Strengths. The Commission holds the constitutional power to appoint, promote and discipline, and its origins go back to 1954. It now has a strategic plan, its first, approved by the Federal Executive Council. It has introduced an e-recruitment platform and computer-based promotion examinations, and it has revived the National Council after more than twelve years. Its Chairman has said in public that the institution declined and that the Commission contributed to the decline. That candour is a reputational asset.

Weaknesses. Merit is widely seen as eroded, and 56 percent of citizens who sought a document paid a bribe for it. Reform results are not published, as the Oronsaye case shows. The Chairman has also named weak institutional capacity, inadequate digital infrastructure and a shortage of specialised staff as challenges, and has warned that reforms which ignore welfare may meet resistance.

Opportunities. The plan ties promotion to measurable results and recruitment to technology. Public expectations are high: 65 percent of Nigerians expect the next generation to be better off, and 86 percent say government is obliged to build trust. The Commission links its plan to the Federal Government's goal of a one trillion dollar economy by 2030. The National Council can convene Commissions, and Singapore, Rwanda and Ghana offer benchmarks.

Threats. Trust is low, with Nigeria at 26 out of 100 on the Corruption Perceptions Index. Social media crises such as #EndSARS, and disinformation, move faster than any institution can respond. Political interference, leadership turnover and reform fatigue erode continuity, and the narrative of a bloated service finds a ready audience under fiscal pressure.

3.5 Lessons from the SWOT, and the move from weakness to strength

SLIDE 16

Five lessons follow from the analysis.

1. Reputation follows evidence, so results must be published. The Oronsaye record shows what silence costs.
2. Reform needs a public constituency. Reforms should be designed so that citizens can see and defend them.
3. A strength that nobody sees is wasted. The plan and the mandate must be communicated in plain language.
4. Reform must carry welfare and capacity building with it, because the Chairman has warned that reforms which ignore welfare may meet resistance.
5. Honesty about the starting point builds credibility, and the Chairman's public candour is the model.

SLIDE 17

Each weakness can be turned into a strength with a specific move and a public proof. Eroded merit is met by publishing criteria before decisions are taken and issuing a merit dashboard. Bribery at the counter is met by service charters and a complaint tracker with a published closure rate. Unseen results are met by an annual public scorecard and a Reputation Index. Weak communication capacity is met by a reputation unit staffed by career officers, with a protected budget. Capacity gaps are met by capacity building, specialist recruitment and welfare support, reported on every year. Leadership turnover is met by writing the framework into civil service rules and appraisals.

The opportunities need deliberate harvesting. The 2026 to 2030 plan can serve as the public scoreboard. Digital recruitment and feedback dashboards can deliver early, visible wins in the first 100 days. A common scorecard lets the National Council compare Commissions, and third party validation adds credibility that self promotion cannot.

4.0 Why reforms do not endure: the Oronsaye experience

SLIDE 18

The Presidential Committee on the Restructuring and Rationalisation of Federal Government Parastatals, Commissions and Agencies submitted its report on 16 April 2012. It examined 541 federal institutions and documented duplication of mandates. A presidential directive to implement came in 2020, and two review committees were set up in 2021. In February 2024 the Federal Executive Council approved implementation and constituted a committee to carry it out (The Guardian Nigeria, 2024; Public and Private Development Centre, 2024). Some of the affected agencies were created by statute, so implementation also requires legislative action (Public and Private Development Centre, 2024).

SLIDE 19

In August 2026, press reporting recorded that the approved scope covered the merger of 29 agencies, the subsuming of eight, the relocation of four and the scrapping of two, which is narrower than the report's recommendations. The same reporting observed that several agencies earmarked for merger or abolition still carry separate budget lines, and that questions remain over the legal, administrative, budgetary and personnel status of the agencies earmarked for scrapping, merger or absorption (The Guardian Nigeria, 2026). I cite these points as reported, and I invite the Council's secretariat to verify them.

My conclusion concerns design, not blame. A reform with no baseline, no public scoreboard and no constituency can be announced, adjusted, delayed and redefined without the public noticing, because the public was never given the means to notice. Officials who prefer the status quo understand this. Citizens, who stand to gain from savings, were never invited to hold the reform to account. A reform nobody can see is a reform nobody will defend.

Leadership discontinuity compounds the problem. When administrations change, newly appointed leaders often distance themselves from the programmes of their predecessors, including reputation initiatives, in order to signal a break with the past. The reputational continuity an institution needs is traded for the political continuity a new leader wishes to show. The institution pays the price, and so do citizens.

The same test now faces the Commission's own 2026 to 2030 plan. It commits the Commission to link annual promotions to measurable outcomes and to digitise recruitment and promotion (News Agency of Nigeria, 2026). Those are the right instruments. Whether they produce public trust will depend on whether their results are published, on a fixed date, in language a citizen can follow. So I put one question to every Commission in this hall. When your plan is judged in 2030, what will citizens be able to see?

5.0 How credible institutions earn trust

SLIDE 20

Singapore ranked first among 120 countries in the 2024 Blavatnik Index of Public Administration, ahead of Norway and, jointly third, Canada and Denmark. Nigeria ranked joint 90th. The index measures the effectiveness of public administration. On the 2025 Corruption Perceptions Index, Singapore scored 84, third behind Denmark (89) and Finland (88). Its Public Service Commission has guarded integrity since 1951. Nigeria ranked 142nd of 182, scoring 26.

Rwanda and Ghana show the same tools in African settings. Rwanda publishes a Citizen Report Card every year, and in 2025 it found 76.7 percent of 10,676 citizens satisfied (Rwanda Governance Board, 2025). In Ghana, public bodies received 2,575 requests under the Right to Information Act in 2024, and 68 percent were approved (Ghanaian Times, 2025). SLIDE 21

The Nigerian Communications Commission, where I served for eighteen years from Deputy Director to Director of Public Affairs, offers a domestic example. In my experience, five practices explained the Commission's standing through leadership transitions and difficult regulatory episodes.

1. Proactive communication. Consumer information was published ahead of controversy, so the institution usually defined the narrative first.
2. Message discipline across transitions. Spokesperson continuity protected credibility as executive leadership changed.

3. Visible complaint resolution. The public saw evidence of resolution, which reassures more durably than a promise.
4. Transparent enforcement. Enforcement actions were communicated openly and treated as proof of institutional seriousness.
5. Media and civil society as partners. They were engaged in public education before any crisis, and not only during one.

In each case, reputation followed performance, and performance became reputation only once it was made visible and could be verified.

6.0 The eight pillars of institutional reputation

SLIDE 22

In June I presented to the Nigerian Institute of Public Relations, FCT Chapter, a paper on reputation management in the public sector. It set out eight pillars of institutional reputation. I bring it before this Council because each pillar maps to a failure pattern that public institutions in Nigeria have shown at some point in their history.

The pillars work in sequence and together. Performance must be visible to earn reputational credit, and crisis preparedness protects the investment made in every other pillar. An institution that neglects one pillar will find that the others cannot compensate for its absence.

#	Pillar	What it demands of a Commission	The question to ask
1	**Character and Integrity**	Ethics, transparency, accountability and honesty as prerequisites, not outputs	Would our recruitment, promotion and disciplinary decisions survive public scrutiny today?
2	**Performance and Competence**	Results that stakeholders can judge: service delivery, efficiency and measurable implementation	What results can we show, and who has verified them?
3	**Leadership Credibility**	Vision, competence, accessibility and personal accountability	Do officers and citizens believe our leaders stand behind our decisions?
4	**Strategic Communication**	Communication grounded in performance, because visibility without credibility damages reputation	Does our communication follow our performance, or run ahead of it?
5	**Stakeholder Relationships**	Durable relationships with citizens, staff, unions, media, the legislature and partners	Whose confidence matters most to us, and how often do we meet them?
6	**Social Impact**	Public value created for the society that sustains the institution	What public value can we demonstrate beyond compliance?
7	**Crisis Preparedness**	Preparation before adversity, not improvisation during it	Could we respond credibly within twenty four hours?
8	**Consistency and Authenticity**	Alignment between what is promised and what is delivered, over time	Do our promises and our delivery match, across changes of leadership?

Table 4. The eight pillars of institutional reputation presented to the NIPR in June 2026

Two of the eight deserve emphasis for this audience: integrity must come before communication, and visibility without credibility damages reputation rather than building it. A media presence that outruns performance is among the most common and most damaging errors in public sector communication.

7.0 The RESPECT Framework

SLIDES 23 AND 24

The eight pillars describe what reputation rests on. Drawing the lessons of this address together, I propose the RESPECT Framework as the operating model through which any Civil Service Commission, federal or state, can convert reputation from an incidental outcome of governance into a managed strategic asset. Each pillar carries a concrete action and a public measure, so that progress can be seen by citizens and verified by the Council.

Pillar	Core discipline	Concrete action for Commissions	Public measure
R Responsiveness	Speed and consistency in citizen facing service and correspondence	Publish response time charters at every counter and portal, and audit them quarterly	Share of requests resolved within charter time
E Ethical Leadership and Integrity	Verifiable due process in recruitment, promotion and discipline	Publish criteria before decisions and an annual merit and integrity report that goes beyond internal audit	Share of decisions taken against published criteria
S Stakeholder Engagement	Structured two way dialogue with labour, media, civil society and the legislature	Hold quarterly stakeholder dialogues before major service wide changes	Dialogues held and commitments tracked
P Performance Communication	Evidence based reporting of achievement	Issue an annual public scorecard in plain language, distributed beyond government channels	Scorecard published by a fixed date
E Employer Brand and Internal Culture	How serving officers see the institution before the public does	Run an annual staff survey and a structured advocacy and recognition programme	Staff trust and advocacy index
C Crisis Preparedness	Protocols that enable response in hours rather than weeks	Maintain a reputational risk register and rehearse the protocol every year	Time to first public statement
T Technology and Digital Infrastructure	Digital transformation, and digital channels as the arena where reputation is made or lost	Digitise core processes, automate routine approvals, computerise service points and use AI under published safeguards. Run a citizen feedback dashboard with a complaint tracker.	Share of core processes digitised; complaints closed and communicated to the citizen

Table 5. The RESPECT Framework, with actions and public measures. © Anthony Ojobo, 2026.

RESPECT translates the eight pillars into practice. Responsiveness and Performance Communication carry pillars two and four. Ethical Leadership and Integrity carries pillars one, three and eight. Stakeholder Engagement carries pillars five and six. Employer Brand and Internal Culture carries the staff dimension of pillars three and five. Crisis Preparedness carries pillar seven. Technology and Digital Infrastructure carries them all into the digital arena, and it carries digital transformation: digitised processes, automation, computerised service points and the use of artificial intelligence in civil service work, with human review and published safeguards. A process should be corrected before it is digitised, because automation speeds up whatever it is given.

The framework answers the conference theme directly. The first four pillars address reputation management as an external discipline. Employer Brand and Internal Culture is the culture change pillar. Crisis Preparedness and Technology and Digital Infrastructure are the institutional re-engineering pillar. RESPECT is one operating model for delivering all three parts of the theme together.

8.0 Measuring reputation

SLIDES 25 AND 26

Reputation can be measured, and it should be. Public institutions apply rigorous measurement to their finances, and there is no defensible reason for reputational performance to receive less systematic attention The framework I presented to the NIPR in June treats reputation as the sum of five dimensions.

Reputation = Trust + Performance + Communication + Governance + Public Value.

Each dimension can be turned into indicators, given a weight and tracked on a scorecard. Table 6 shows the five weights and the indicator categories that feed each one.

Dimension	Weight	Indicator categories that feed it
Trust and Credibility	30%	Trust; Leadership
Performance and Delivery	25%	Performance
Stakeholder Relations	20%	Stakeholder; Employee
Communication and Visibility	15%	Media; Digital; Crisis
Social Impact and Governance	10%	Social Impact; Governance

Table 6. The weighted reputation scorecard. The weights are those presented to the NIPR in June. The grouping of indicator categories is a working convention that a baseline audit can refine.

Table 7 sets out the ten indicator categories, the metrics a Commission can track under each, and the RESPECT discipline that owns it.

Category	Key metrics	RESPECT link
Trust	Public trust index; transparency ratings; stakeholder confidence levels; credibility scores	Ethical Leadership and Integrity
Leadership	Leadership approval ratings; executive visibility; stakeholder confidence in senior management	Ethical Leadership and Integrity
Performance	Service delivery ratings; project success rates; citizen satisfaction scores; mandate fulfilment	Responsiveness
Media	Share of positive coverage; share of voice; sentiment analysis; editorial tone	Performance Communication
Digital	Social media sentiment; website engagement; online ratings; digital response rates	Technology and Digital Infrastructure
Stakeholder	Satisfaction surveys; partnership retention rates; community support indices	Stakeholder Engagement
Employee	Engagement scores; staff retention; internal trust; morale assessments	Employer Brand and Internal Culture
Governance	Audit outcomes; compliance ratings; ethics records; anti-corruption performance	Ethical Leadership and Integrity
Social Impact	Community impact assessments; ESG performance; sustainability outcomes; public value metrics	Public value, tracked across all seven
Crisis	Response time; recovery effectiveness; stakeholder confidence during and after adversity	Crisis Preparedness

Table 7. The ten indicator categories (the author's public sector adaptation, informed by the stakeholder tracking approach of the RepTrak system; Fombrun, Ponzi and Newburry, 2015)

Two rules govern how the scorecard is read. First, the indicators must never be read in isolation. A high performance score paired with a low trust score signals a credibility gap, and that is the pattern most common in Nigerian public institutions. Second, the scorecard places an institution in the Reputation Gap Matrix. The Performance and Delivery score supplies the vertical axis, and the Trust and Credibility score supplies the horizontal axis. An audit across all ten categories shows where an institution stands, as distinct from where it believes or claims it stands.

No Commission needs to measure everything in its first year. Begin with indicators already within reach: response time, staff retention, the share of positive media coverage and citizen satisfaction scores. Then commission an independent annual audit across all ten categories, and present the results to the Commission's governing body and to the public. An audit that drives no action is theatre.

8.1 How the scores are measured

The scorecard measures actual evidence. The figures in Appendix B are illustrative, but in practice every score comes from a baseline reputation audit, and the same method is repeated each year. The audit proceeds in five steps.

1. Collect the evidence from citizens, staff, the media and the Commission's own service and compliance records.
2. Convert each indicator to a common scale of 0 to 100.

3. Average the indicators within each category.
4. Combine the categories into the five dimensions, using the grouping set out in Table 6.
5. Apply the weights and add the results, as set out in Appendix B.

The detailed conversion rules, survey instruments and calibration are set for each Commission at the scoping stage of the audit, so that the scores reflect that institution's mandate and available data. Once set, they remain fixed, so that results can be compared from one year to the next, and across Commissions. The self assessment in Appendix A is a separate tool. The Commission scores it for itself out of 28, it is indicative only, and it does not feed the scorecard.

8.2 Classifying the score

The overall score, and the score for each dimension, is classified into one of four bands. The thresholds follow the published RepTrak Pulse tiers of the Reputation Institute, which place an excellent reputation at 80 and above, a strong reputation at 70 to 79, an average reputation at 60 to 69, and a weak or poor reputation below 60. Table 8 applies those thresholds to Commissions.

Band	Score	What it signals for a Commission
Excellent	80 to 100	Reputation is an asset. Protect it by publishing results routinely and early.
Good	70 to 79	Reputation supports the mandate. Close the remaining gaps in the weakest dimension.
Fair	60 to 69	Reputation neither helps nor hinders. Visible improvement in delivery and disclosure is needed.
Poor	Below 60	Reputation is a liability. Fix the service encounter first, then build the evidence to communicate.

Table 8. Classification bands for the overall reputation score and for each dimension. The bands are provisional, and are confirmed through calibration in each audit.

Two readings follow from the score. The band classifies the level of reputation. The gap between two dimension scores diagnoses its shape. Where the Performance and Delivery score materially exceeds the Trust and Credibility score, the Commission has a credibility gap and belongs in the Hidden Performer row of the Reputation Gap Matrix. Where the Trust and Credibility score materially exceeds the Performance and Delivery score, trust is borrowed, and the Commission belongs in the Fragile Favourite row. The size of gap that counts as material is set during calibration.

8.3 Continuous perception intelligence

SLIDE 27

An annual audit gives a Commission its baseline. It cannot give early warning. Perception moves in hours, and a negative story can spread before an institution knows that a crisis has begun. A Commission therefore needs continuous perception intelligence: a standing system that listens, analyses, informs decisions and reports back.

The system draws on five streams: citizen and staff surveys, complaints data, media monitoring, social media listening and frontline feedback. It runs as a cycle. The Commission listens, analyses the gap between performance and perception, decides what to fix, what to say and whom to engage, acts, reports the results, and then listens again.

Four decisions depend on it: the service failures that most damage trust at the counter, what to publish and when, which stakeholders need engagement now, and which risks belong on the crisis

register. This is the purpose of the real-time dashboard that I recommended to the NIPR, and of the monitoring function under Technology and Digital Infrastructure in RESPECT. A Commission with this intelligence can shape its reputation deliberately, because it knows where perception stands before the headlines do.

9.0 Programme of action

9.1 For every Commission: the first 100 days

SLIDE 28

The following six steps need no new legislation and only modest resources. A Commission that completes them will hold a stronger reputational position than it holds today.

1. Name an accountable officer and set up a reputation unit. Place the role at Commissioner or Director level, with authority to convene the legal, human resources, ICT and public affairs functions. Staff the unit with career officers rather than political appointees, so that it survives changes of leadership. Test a budget benchmark of two to three percent of operating costs, which I proposed to the NIPR as a strategic investment rather than an overhead.
2. Publish a one page service charter at every public counter and on every portal, stating what a citizen can expect and by when.
3. Commission a baseline reputation audit. Use the ten indicator categories and the weighted scorecard, covering public perception, staff perception, media coverage and the service encounter, in a method that can be repeated each year. Present the results to the Commission's governing body and publish them.
4. Publish a first merit dashboard. Report recruitments, promotions and disciplinary cases completed, the criteria applied and the time taken.
5. Stand up a complaint tracker that records every complaint, its closure and the feedback given to the citizen, and publish the closure rate.
6. Rehearse a crisis protocol. Run one simulation with the Commission's leadership and spokespersons, built on five principles: respond quickly, communicate facts, show empathy, accept responsibility where it is clear, and keep leaders visible Fix what the simulation exposes.

9.2 For the National Council: three decisions

SLIDE 29

1. Constitute a standing Reputation and Communication Committee under the Council, to coordinate method and share practice across federal and state Commissions.
2. Adopt the weighted scorecard and the ten category audit as the common methodology so that results from Delta, Kano, Lagos and the Federal Commission can be compared on the same basis.
3. Publish an annual Civil Service Reputation Index built from the scorecard, voluntary in its first year. It will be contested, and that is useful. A contested index starts the conversation that a communique never does.

9.3 Closing the gaps that cost us trust

SLIDE 30

Three gaps cost our Commissions trust, and each has a remedy that institutions elsewhere have proved. I offer the remedies as pathways to progress, and not as a verdict on any Commission.

The first gap is that the citizen's verdict is measured by others, and not by us. The trust and bribery findings I have cited come from Afrobarometer and Edelman, and not from the Commissions themselves. In Rwanda, the Governance Board publishes a Citizen Report Card every year. The 2025 edition, the fourteenth, surveyed 10,676 citizens in all 30 districts and found 76.7 percent satisfied, with the weakest sector at 65.7 percent. The results count for 10 percent of each district's performance contract (Rwanda Governance Board, 2025). A government board runs that survey, which is why I propose that each Commission publish its results in full and invite independent verification. The pathway is an annual citizen trust and satisfaction survey for every Commission.

The second gap is that results are neither published nor compared. In 2023 only 91 of about 800 public institutions fully complied with the Freedom of Information Act, or 11.4 percent (The Guardian Nigeria, 2025). In 2025 only 108 of the 1,309 federal bodies reported to the Attorney General (Media Rights Agenda, 2026). The Public Complaints Commission resolved 716,688 of the 1.28 million complaints it received in two years, or 56 percent (News Agency of Nigeria, 2026). Ghana, a West African neighbour with a similar legal tradition, takes a different course. Its Right to Information Commission, created under the Act of 2019, recorded 2,575 requests to public bodies in 2024, an increase of 47 percent, and 68 percent were approved. Public bodies filed 345 annual reports, and the Commission has penalised those that did not comply (Ghanaian Times, 2025). Ghana still scores only 43 on the Corruption Perceptions Index, so I offer it as proof of a working mechanism and not as a finished success. The pathway is a yearly scorecard for every Commission, covering compliance with the Freedom of Information Act, complaints closed and days taken to resolve them.

The third gap is that merit and integrity are not seen to be guarded. Nigeria ranks 142nd of 182 countries on the Corruption Perceptions Index, with a score of 26 (Transparency International, 2026). In Singapore, the Public Service Commission has guarded merit and integrity since 1951, and the country scores 84, third in the world. The pathway is to publish appointment, promotion and discipline decisions with their reasons, and to report merit outcomes every year.

Each pathway needs a baseline before it can begin. That is the purpose of the audit that I describe next.

THREE PATHWAYS TO PROGRESS

1. An annual citizen trust and satisfaction survey for every Commission, published in full.
2. A yearly scorecard for every Commission: FOI compliance, complaints closed and days to resolve.
3. Appointment, promotion and discipline decisions published with reasons, and merit outcomes reported every year.

9.4 REPUTE360°: the baseline audit in practice

SLIDE 31

Decision two asks the Council to adopt a common scorecard and a common audit. A method on paper does not move an institution. It moves when someone applies the method to a Commission, with evidence that Commissioners can read and act on. I therefore want to describe a programme that I have designed for that purpose, which I call REPUTE360°, and which Imagexetera International Limited delivers.

REPUTE360° is a 360 degree reputation audit, management and perception intelligence programme for a State Commission and the civil service it governs. The number is deliberate. A Commission that reads only its own records sees one side of itself. The programme therefore gathers six streams of evidence: a citizen perception survey in every local government area; a pulse survey of the civil servants themselves; mystery citizen visits to the counters, portals and offices where the public meets the Commission; a review of two years of media coverage; continuous social listening; and forums and interviews with unions, traditional and faith leaders, youth, women and business.

The evidence is scored on the five dimension scorecard presented earlier in this address. Trust and Credibility carries 30 points, Performance and Delivery 25, Stakeholder Relations 20, Communication and Visibility 15, and Social Impact and Governance 10. The result is a single reputation index from 0 to 100, classified in the four bands of Table 8. Because every State applies the same scorecard, the National Council can compare results across the Federation, while each Commission calibrates the instruments to its own communities. That is the answer to the objection, which I address shortly, that States differ too much for one model.

SLIDE 32

The programme runs for about sixteen weeks in four phases. Inception and design takes the first three weeks, in which the mandate, the sample, the instruments and a pilot are settled. Fieldwork and intelligence gathering follows in weeks four to ten. Analysis and validation occupies weeks eleven to thirteen, and includes the index, the analysis of what drives trust in each district, and validation forums with stakeholders. Strategy and handover completes the work in weeks fourteen to sixteen.

Phase	Timeframe	What happens
Phase 1: Inception and design	Weeks 1 to 3	Mandate and scope agreed. Sample, instruments and pilot settled.
Phase 2: Fieldwork and intelligence	Weeks 4 to 10	Household, staff and mystery citizen surveys. Forums and interviews. Media analysis and social listening.
Phase 3: Analysis and validation	Weeks 11 to 13	Index and drivers of trust. Heatmap by district. Validation forums.
Phase 4: Strategy and handover	Weeks 14 to 16	Trust roadmap, executive briefing, Council presentation and dashboard handover.

Indicative delivery programme for a State Commission. Calibrated to the size and geography of each State.

At the end, a Commission holds five things: its reputation index; a perception heatmap by senatorial district and local government area; an audit of the service points where citizens meet the Commission; a trust roadmap, with a 100 day plan and a 36 month path; and a live dashboard, with a pulse check six months after handover to show whether perception has moved.

Three features matter to those who must approve such work. The findings go first to the Commission's governing body in a confidential briefing, and the Commission then decides how to publish them, which I encourage it to do early. The programme delivers step three of the first 100 days, the baseline audit, in a single exercise. And the handover leaves the Commission with a dashboard it can keep using, so that the audit becomes a practice and not an event.

AN INVITATION TO THE STATES

I extend this offer to every Chairman, Commissioner and Secretary in this hall, and to the State Governments that stand behind you. If your Commission would like to see how REPUTE360° would work for your State, I invite you to a scoping conversation here in Asaba this week. The conversation commits no one. It will show you what your Commission would learn, and what it would do with that knowledge.

Anthony Ojobo, PhD, MNIPR, FIMC, FCAI
Imagexetera International Limited | tonyojobo@imagexetera.com | +234 803 314 1630

9.5 The 36 month implementation roadmap

SLIDE 33

Phase	Timeframe	Milestone and visible output
Phase 1: Foundation	0 to 6 months	Reputation and Communication Committee constituted. Baseline audit on the ten category scorecard completed across federal and state Commissions. First service charters and merit dashboards published.
Phase 2: Rollout	6 to 18 months	RESPECT training delivered to Heads of Service and Directors of Public Affairs across all 36 states and the FCT. First annual public scorecard and first Reputation Index released.
Phase 3: Institutionalisation	18 to 36 months	Framework embedded in civil service rules and appraisal instruments, so that reputation stewardship becomes a measurable leadership responsibility.

Table 9. Implementation roadmap for the National Council

10.0 Anticipated objections and responses

SLIDE 34

I expect four objections in the corridors after this session. I answer them here so that we can argue about the substance.

"Reputation is public relations." That is a misreading, and the difference matters. Public relations tells the story. Reputation management begins with performance, builds the evidence, and then tells a story the evidence supports. Where the order is reversed, the institution is exposed within a news cycle.

"Our problems are funding and political interference, not reputation." The two are linked. Institutions with strong public standing are costlier to interfere with and easier to fund, because the public and its representatives can see what the money buys.

"Publishing performance data exposes us to attack." Silence exposes an institution more. The Oronsaye record shows what happens when results are not published: nobody can defend a reform they cannot see, and anyone can claim it failed. Early and honest disclosure, including of weak results, is the strongest protection a Commission has.

"States differ too much for one model." The method can be common while the calibration is local. A shared methodology is what allows a Commission in one state to learn from another, and the National Council is the natural convenor.

11.0 Questions for deliberation

SLIDE 35

I would like the discussion that follows to begin with these five questions. I ask Chairmen and Commissioners to answer them for their own institutions.

1. In which row of the Reputation Gap Matrix does your Commission sit, and what scorecard evidence would persuade a sceptic that you are right?
2. Would your Commission publish a merit dashboard in 2027? If not, what prevents it?
3. Who in your Commission owns reputation today, and what authority does that person hold?

4. What did the last citizen who complained to you hear back, and after how many days?
5. Should this Council publish a comparative reputation index, knowing that some of us will not like our position in it?

12.0 Conclusion and request to the Council

The three parts of this conference's theme belong together. Re-engineering that nobody sees earns no trust, culture change that citizens never notice earns no credit, and reputation work without either is only words that the public can see through. The RESPECT Framework manages the three as one. Trust is earned through performance, sustained through communication, protected through governance, and measured through reputation.

The Commissions represented in this hall hold the constitutional power over three decisions: who enters the service, who rises in it, and who is disciplined. Made visibly and fairly, those three decisions will do more for the standing of the civil service than any campaign. Made invisibly, they will undo any campaign.

SLIDE 36

I therefore make a specific request of this Council. Before the delegates disperse from Asaba, I ask that you resolve to:

1. constitute the Reputation and Communication Committee proposed in this address;
2. commission a baseline reputation audit on a common scorecard across federal and state Commissions; and
3. commit to publishing the first public scorecard within twelve months.

I also make an offer. I have spent my career at the intersection of regulation, public affairs and institutional reputation, and I will give practical help to any Commission in this hall that wishes to begin. That help can take the form of scoping a baseline reputation audit, building a Commission scorecard, designing a service charter and a merit dashboard, building and training a reputation team, or facilitating a retreat for a Commission's leadership.

I will be available for discussion with any Chairman, Commissioner or Secretary throughout this conference. A self assessment for Commissions is attached as Appendix A, and I invite you to complete it before we speak.

Reputation is the reform on which every other reform depends. Let us make the work of this Council visible, and let the public judge it by what they can see.

I thank the Chairman, the Federal Civil Service Commission, the Delta State Government as our host, and every delegate gathered here for the honour of this platform.

Thank you

SLIDE 41

Thank you for listening

Questions and discussion

I will be available for discussion with any Chairman, Commissioner or Secretary throughout this conference.

Signature

Anthony Ojobo, PhD, mnipr, fimc, fcai

Strategic Advisor | Reputation Management, Public Sector Transformation & Strategic Communications

Lead Consultant, Imagexetera International Limited | Consultant to GreenPlinth Africa Limited

Email: tonyojobo@gmail.com | tony.ojobo@greenplinthafrica.com

Phone: +234 803 314 1630

Appendix A: Commission reputation self assessment

Answer each question for your own Commission. Score two for Yes, one for Partly and zero for No. The maximum score is 28.

#	Area	Question	Yes	Partly	No
1	R	Does every public counter and portal display a service charter with response time standards?			
2	R	Do you measure and record actual response times against the charter?			
3	E	Are the criteria for recruitment, promotion and discipline published before decisions are taken?			
4	E	Do you publish an annual merit and integrity report that goes beyond internal audit?			
5	S	Do you hold structured dialogues with unions, media, civil society and the legislature before major service wide changes?			
6	S	Can a citizen or officer learn the outcome of a complaint, and the number of days it took?			
7	P	Do you issue an annual public scorecard in plain language?			
8	P	Is every claim of achievement in your public statements supported by a figure and a source?			
9	E	Do you measure at least once a year how serving officers perceive the institution?			
10	E	Do officers have a structured channel through which to advocate for the institution?			
11	C	Do you keep a reputational risk register that is reviewed at least once a year?			
12	C	Has your crisis protocol been rehearsed in the last twelve months?			
13	T	Do you monitor media and social channels systematically for what is said about the institution?			
14	T	Do you track complaints on a system that records closure and feeds back to the citizen?			

Score	Indicative reading
22 to 28	**Trusted Performer** profile. Protect the position by publishing results routinely.
14 to 21	**Hidden Performer or Fragile Favourite** profile. Gaps exist between delivery and visibility. A baseline diagnostic is recommended.
0 to 13	**Failing Institution** profile. Begin with the service encounter, then build the evidence to communicate.

The bands are indicative only. Placing an institution in the matrix requires external perception data, which a baseline diagnostic supplies.

Appendix B: Reputation scorecard worksheet

Score each dimension out of 100 from your audit evidence, using the method set out in Section 8.1. Multiply each score by its weight, and add the results to obtain an overall reputation score out of 100.

Weighted points = Score × Weight. Overall score = the sum of the weighted points.

Worked example (illustrative scores)

Dimension	Weight	Score out of 100	Calculation	Weighted points
Trust and Credibility	30%	58	58 × 0.30	17.40
Performance and Delivery	25%	72	72 × 0.25	18.00
Stakeholder Relations	20%	65	65 × 0.20	13.00
Communication and Visibility	15%	52	52 × 0.15	7.80
Social Impact and Governance	10%	60	60 × 0.10	6.00
Total	**100%**		17.40 + 18.00 + 13.00 + 7.80 + 6.00	**62.20**

Table B1. The scores are invented for demonstration only. They are not an assessment of any Commission.

In this example the overall reputation score is 62.20 out of 100, which falls in the Fair band (60 to 69). The Performance and Delivery score of 72 stands 14 points above the Trust and Credibility score of 58. That gap is material. It signals a credibility gap and a Hidden Performer profile in the Reputation Gap Matrix: the institution performs better than the public believes. The classification bands are set out in Table 8 of Section 8.2, and are provisional until a baseline audit confirms them.

Your Commission

Dimension	Weight	Score out of 100	Weighted points
Trust and Credibility	30%		
Performance and Delivery	25%		
Stakeholder Relations	20%		
Communication and Visibility	15%		
Social Impact and Governance	10%		
Total	**100%**		

Key performance indicators for reputation monitoring: Trust Index; Reputation Index; Media Sentiment Score; Digital Sentiment Score; Stakeholder Satisfaction Score; Employee Advocacy Score; Leadership Credibility Index; Governance Compliance Score; Community Impact Rating; Crisis Response Effectiveness Index.

References

SLIDE 42

Afrobarometer. (2025). Nigerians say corruption is worsening, and citizens risk retaliation if they speak up, Afrobarometer survey finds [News release, Round 10, fielded June to July 2024].

Blavatnik School of Government, University of Oxford. (2024). Blavatnik Index of Public Administration.

Edelman Trust Institute. (2026). 2026 Edelman Trust Barometer global report: Trust amid insularity. Edelman.

Edelman Trust Institute. (2026). 2026 Edelman Trust Barometer, Nigeria: Top 10 findings. Edelman.

Federal Ministry of Information and National Orientation. (2026). FCSC unveils plan to strengthen meritocracy, enhance competency, and reposition civil service.

Federal Ministry of Information and National Orientation. (2026, May 21). FCSC Chairman advocates merit-driven civil service reform at global conference.

Fombrun, C. J. (1996). Reputation: Realizing value from the corporate image. Harvard Business School Press.

Fombrun, C. J., Ponzi, L. J., & Newburry, W. (2015). Stakeholder tracking and analysis: The RepTrak system for measuring corporate reputation. Corporate Reputation Review, 18(1), 3–24.

Ghanaian Times. (2025). Right to Information Commission five years on.

Media Rights Agenda. (2026). NBC received highest number of FOI requests in 2025, according to AGF's latest report to NASS.

News Agency of Nigeria. (2026, May). FCSC targets merit based reforms, digital transformation with new strategic plan.

News Agency of Nigeria. (2026, October 14). We received 1.28m complaints, resolved over 716,000: PCC.

OECD. (2017). Trust and public policy: How better governance can help rebuild public trust. OECD Publishing.

Ojobo, A. (2026). Reputation management in the public sector: Challenges and prospects [Conference presentation]. Nigerian Institute of Public Relations, FCT Chapter, Abuja.

Parliament of Rwanda. (2025, November 19). Parliament briefed on RGB report: 76.7% of citizens are satisfied with governance.

Public and Private Development Centre. (2024). Federal Government excavates Oronsaye report for implementation. PLAC Legist.

Republic of Ghana. (2019). Right to Information Act, 2019 (Act 989).

Roberts, P. W., & Dowling, G. R. (2002). Corporate reputation and sustained superior financial performance. Strategic Management Journal, 23(12), 1077–1093.

Rwanda Governance Board. (2025). Citizen Report Card 2025 (14th ed.).

The Guardian Nigeria. (2024). Cost of governance: Curious developments that may frustrate execution of Oronsaye report.

The Guardian Nigeria. (2025). 14 years of FoI Act: How weak enforcement shields 709 public institutions from compliance.

The Guardian Nigeria. (2026, August 24). 14 yrs after Oronsaye report, bloated agencies cost Nigeria N1tr in 2026.

Transparency International. (2026). Corruption Perceptions Index 2025.