

Lessons from Agricultural Policies and Programmes in Nigeria

Iwuchukwu J .C. and Igbokwe E.M.
Department of Agricultural Extension, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
julieiwuchukwu@yahoo.com

Abstract
The study reviewed several agricultural policies and programmes that were initiated in Nigeria. Through this, objectives/goals, achievements as well as problems that hindered realization of the dreams of the policies and programmes were known. Gaps in their invention, execution and management were also identified. Solutions/recommendations were then proffered based on these gaps as lessons/guide for future policies and programmes inventions.
Key words: agriculture policies programmes Nigeria

I. Introduction

Societies have in fact defined themselves by the way and degree in which they have succeeded in increasing agricultural production (FAO, 2004). Historically, the most common and effective extensive adjustment in agricultural production in Nigeria has been to increase the area of land planted. Therefore Nigerian agricultural/rural institutions are at a crossroad. This is because agriculture is growing but the growth is unsustainable. Agriculture also continues to suffer from the inertia associated with policies and programmes intervention and reformation that pervaded Nigeria especially in the post colonial era.

A policy is a deliberate plan of action to guide decisions and achieve rational outcomes (www. Monster. ca). It is also a guideline consisting of principles and rules governing the behaviour of persons in an organization. Policies prescribe how people in an organization should act or behave (Asiabaka, 2002). Policy differs from rule of law. While law can compel or prohibit behaviuors, policy merely guides actions toward those that are most likely to achieve a desired outcome (www. Monster. ca). Agricultural policy is a statement of action and a fundamental tool employed in achieving agricultural development (FBN, 1997). A programme, on the other hand is a comprehensive plan that includes objectives to be attained, specifications of resources required and stages of work to be performed (Asiabaka, 2002). Elaborate plans are called programmes (Kirkpatrick, 1987). According to Olatunji (2005), a programme is a collection of coordinated activities that are mutually directed towards the attainment of a definite goal and it usually comprises of several segments or projects which can be separately pursued as a component of the whole. The concept of programme implies that a goal is in focus and several activities would be needed and co-ordinated to attain the goal.

It is generally accepted that Nigerian agriculture has suffered as a result of the resource curse effect of oil and inappropriate policies and institutions. This, coupled with heavy handed and unpredictable government intervention programmes which has led to short term investment decisions and rent seeking behaviour by programmers has created dysfunctional and disconnected benefit to the poor masses. Clearly, the persisted failures of agricultural programmes in Nigeria have revealed the basic weakness of agricultural policies in Nigeria and the inability of the several administrations in Nigeria to solve the basic and fundamental problems of agricultural development (Amalu, 1998). A cream of authors (Amalu 1998, Ayoola 2001 and Madukwe 2008) have also laid the failure on the door-steps of governments for the absence of or weak agricultural policies.

In Nigeria agricultural policies and programmes have undergone changes especially in the postcolonial era. These changes have been a mere reflection of changes in government or administration (Amalu, 1998). This is because these policies and programmes vary only in nomenclature and organizational network. They emphasize almost same objectives like: to provide food for the inhabitants of the nation (food security and sufficiency) and export excess to other countries and to provide rural dwellers and farmers with extension services, agricultural support and rural development services etc. Despite all the policies and laudable programmes (Tables 1 and 2) with challenging themes, Nigeria is yet to achieve food security. Agriculture also continues to suffer from inertia associated with these policies and programme reformation that pervade Nigeria. To be successful, Nigeria's reform and agricultural programmes in particular need to be backed up or initiated through a policy or policies coupled with increased and better co-ordinated technical and financial assistance. It should also be a programme selected based on a rational, national and institutional structure that come from a national consensus on how best to achieve sustainable and equitable rural/ agricultural development. It is against these aforementioned facts that the study sought to critique agricultural policies and programmes in Nigeria. Specifically it:

- described agricultural policies and programmes in Nigeria and
- identified gaps in management of agricultural policies and programmes in Nigeria.

2. Methodology

The study relied on literature to describe historically agricultural policies and programmes/projects in Nigeria and from this deductions, gaps were drawn.

3. Agricultural policies and programmes in the colonial era.

The potential of agriculture for propelling Nigeria's economic development was recognized by the colonial government when policies were put in place to encourage output growth and to extract the surpluses there from (Aigbokhan, 2001). The predominant theme of development in this period was the surplus extraction philosophy or policy whereby immense products were generated from the rural areas to satisfy the demand for raw materials in metropolitan Britain (Ayoola, 2001). This early interest of the extraction policy was on forest resources and agricultural exports like cocoa, coffee, rubber, groundnut, oil palm etc.

Documented policies of the era and their histories as shown in Table 4 were: Forest Policy (1937), Forest Policy (1945), Agricultural Policy (1946), Policy for the Marketing of Oils, Oil Seeds and Cotton (1948), Forest Policy for Western Region (1952), Agricultural Policy (1952), Policy for Natural Resources (undated) and Western Nigeria Policy of Agricultural and Natural Resources (1959). As can be seen in the table, more than half of policies in the era focused on forest matters while less emphasis was made on food and animal production. Most of these policies were made without proper institutional arrangement, programmes, specific projects, strategies, goals or targets and specific objectives geared towards realization of the dreams of the policies. This can be proved by the fact that there was only one documented agricultural scheme that evolved towards the end of the era (early 1960s) termed Farm Settlement Scheme.

3.1.Farm Settlement Scheme (FSS)

This was initiated by some regional governments in Nigeria and was a critical element of Western Nigeria Policy of Agricultural and Natural Resources of 1959. The main objective of this scheme was to settle young school leavers in a specified area of land, making farming their career thereby preventing them from moving to the urban areas in search of white collar jobs. These settled farmers were also to serve as models in good farming systems for farmers residing in nearby villages to emulate. Unfortunately, the dream of this scheme was not materialized because some of the settlers were too young and inexperienced in farming thus causing a high percentage of drop-outs among the settlers (Amalu, 1998). Secondly lack of understanding of the meaning and implication of the scheme by some settlers who assumed that through their participation in the scheme they would eventually get paid job. They were discouraged and some withdrew as soon as the allowances were not given any more. Thirdly, the cost of establishing a viable farm settlement was too high in terms of cash and staff (Amalu, 1998). Finally, expenses made on the scheme was incurred mainly on installation of infrastructure like construction of houses, schools, markets, roads etc for the settlers which did not directly bring about increase in agricultural output by the participants as targeted.

4. Agricultural policies and programmes in post colonial era

4.1. From independence (1 st October 1960) to 15th January 1966.

New policies were formulated in the post independence era to actualize more equitable growth in agriculture. The earlier surplus extraction policies were quickly translated into the pursuit of an export-led growth (Ayoola, 2001). This led to the demarcation of the country into the Western Region (cocoa), Northern Region (groundnut) and Eastern Region (oil palm). In this era, there was also an import substitution policy which saw industrialization as the best strategy to achieve economic growth. It emphasized on establishment of domestic industries behind tariff and quota barriers. Manufacturing industries were considered as the most appropriate tool to initiate the process. In this policy, it was hoped that imports would be replaced and internal growth fostered; and that the costs of the strategy would be mostly borne by the advanced countries supplying the manufactured consumer goods (Pearce, 1986).

Surprisingly, there was no programme, project or scheme set out to accomplish the goal of these policies as can be seen in Table2 that no agricultural programme or project emanated within this period. For a policy to have meaningful impact, it must have strategies (that is programme or project) geared towards accomplishment of specific objectives and the ultimate goal of the policy.

4.2. 15TH January 1966 to 29TH May 1999 (military era)

This period is termed military era because apart from Alhaji Shehu Shagari's civilian administration (lasted from 1st October 1979 to 31st December 1983) that thrived within this period others were military administrations. The agricultural policies that existed within this period were Agricultural Policy for Nigeria 1988 (Table2) and Agricultural (Control of Importation 1990) (The Washington Times, 1999). There were also River Basin Development Decree (Decree 25 of 1976) and Land Use Decree promulgated under the military regime of General Olusegun Obasanjo in 1978, which was later changed to Land Use Act. The Act aims at ameliorating the problem of land tenure that existed mainly in Eastern Nigeria. Irrespective of the two policies, two decrees and an act that existed, several programmes/projects were initiated within this period which include:

4.2.1.National Accelerated Food Production Programme (NAFPP)

National Accelerated Food Production Programme (NAFPP) was an agricultural extension programme initiated in 1972 by the Federal Department of Agriculture during General Yakubu Gowon's regime. The programme focused on bringing about a significant increase in the production of maize, cassava, rice and wheat in the northern states through subsistent production within a short period of time. The programme was designed to spread to other states in the country after the pilot stage that was established in Anambra, Imo, Ondo, Oyo, Ogun, Benue, Plateau and Kano states. Mini –kit, production-kit and mass adoption phases were the three phases of the programme. Lapses found in the programme included:

- Farmers sponsored (financially) the last two phases of the programme. This discouraged some farmers from participathing in the programme.
- Farmers who could not form co-operatives were likely to be left out in the programme since the programme relied on disbursement of credits and farm inputs through co-operative societies.
- Abrupt/premature withdrawal of funding by the Federal Government due to the introduction of another programme termed Operation Feed the Nation.
- Demonstration trials were done on some selected farmers' plots by the research and extension personnel which did not give a true/good representation of the outcome of the technology or programme . In other words, it lacked farmers participation.

4.2.2. Agricultural Development Projects (ADP)**:**

ADP formerly known as Integrated Agricultural Development Projects (IADP) was earlier established in 1974 in the North East (Funtua), North west (Gusau) and North Central (Gombe) states as pilot schemes. The earlier impressive result of the programme led to its replication in 1989 to the entire then nineteen states of the Federation. This approach to agricultural and rural development was based on collaborative efforts and tripartite arrangement of the federal government, state government and World Bank (Amalu, 1998). Today this has grown to become the major agricultural and rural development programme existing in states in Nigeria. The important features of the programme are reliance on the small scale farmers as the main people that will bring about increase in food production and the feedback information mechanism which is a decentralized decision making process that allows farm families/households to give their responses to an innovation/technology, incentive, subsidies etc according to their judgment. The objectives of the programme are to bring about solution to the decrease found in agricultural productivity by sustaining domestic food supply, through massive infusion of world bank funds, the ADPs were established to provide extension services, technical input support and rural infrastructure (Ayoola, 2001) to the farmers/rural dwellers. Some problems that occurred in the course of executing the projects were; Shortage of fund due to decline in oil prices that started in 1982 which led to delays in recruiting competent staff and provision or purchasing of materials and facilities needed for the projects take off. This made implementation much slower than scheduled. Secondly, ADP emphasizes more on modern/ high input technology like sole cropping while majority of the farmers practiced mixed/relay cropping. There was also untimeliness of subsidized input supply for the programme. Present problems of ADP include: high frequency of labour mobility, limited involvement of input agencies, dwindling funding policies and counterpart funding, intricacies of technology transfer etc.

4.2.3. Operation Feed the Nation (OFN):

This programme evolved on 21st May 1976 under the military regime of General Olusegun Obasanjo. The programme was launched in order to bring about increased food production in the entire nation through the active involvement and participation of everybody in every discipline thereby making every person to be capable of partly or wholly feeding him or herself. Under this programme every available piece of land in urban, sub-urban and rural areas was meant to be planted while government provided inputs and subsidies (like agrochemicals, fertilizers, improved variety of seed/seedlings, day olds chicks, matchets, sickle, hoes etc) freely to government establishments. Individuals received these inputs at a subsidized rate.

The failure of the programme can be attributed to:

- Farming was done on any available piece of land irrespective of its suitability for agriculture.
- Majority of the participants in the programme had little or no farming background and there was no formal or informal preparatory teaching or advice given to them on how to manage their farms.
- They practiced mono cropping instead of mixed/ relay cropping and relied on hired labour to carry out their farming activities, which resulted in high input and low output /yield per unit of land.
- Preference was given to government establishments and individuals in authority/administration over the poor farmers (real producer of food) in terms of input supply.
- There was abundance of food in the market and less demand for the food because many people produced part or almost whole food they consumed.
- There was incidence of endemic poultry diseases especially new castle disease that wiped out the birds due to lack of quarantine and necessary routine inoculation /vaccination.

4.2.4**.** River Basin Development Authorities (RBDAs).
River Basin Development Decree was promulgated in 1976 to establish eleven River Basin Development Authorities (RBDAs) (Decree 25 of 1976) (Ayoola, 2001). The initial aim of the authorities was to boost economic potentials of the existing water bodies particularly irrigation and fishery with hydroelectric power generation and domestic water supply as secondary objectives. The objective of the programme was later extended to other areas most importantly to production and rural infrastructural development. Problems found in the programme were: a number of the authorities grew out of proportion and the operations of some suffered from intensive political interference. Also ,substantial public funds were wasted to streamline sizes and functions of RBDAs through the disposal of their non-water assets.

4.2.5. Green Revolution (GR)
Green Revolution (GR) was a programme inaugurated by Shehu Shagari in April 1980. The programme aimed at increasing production of food and raw materials in order to ensure food security and self sufficiency in basic staples. Secondly, it aspired to boost production of livestock and fish in order to meet home and export needs and to expand and diversify the nation's foreign exchange earnings through production and processing of export crops. The federal government ensured the success of the programme by providing agrochemicals, improved seeds/seedlings, irrigation system, machine (mechanization), credit facilities, improved marketing and favourable pricing policy for the agricultural products. The programme did not achieve its objective of increasing food supply because there was delay in execution of most of the projects involved in the programme. There was also no monitoring and evaluation of the projects for which huge sums of money were spent.

4.2.6. Directorate for Food Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI)
The Directorate was initiated in Nigeria in January 1986 under General Ibrahim Babangida's administration. It was a kind of home grown social dimensions of adjustment (SDA) that was embarked upon in most sub Saharan African countries by the World Bank, African Development Bank and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The programme was designed to improve the quality of life (improvement in nutrition, housing, health, employment, road, water, industrialization etc) and standard/level of living of the rural dwellers through the use of many resources that exist in the rural areas and mass participation of the rural people.The poor quality of infrastructures provided by the directorate probably due to embezzlement / mismanagement of fund made the impact of the programme almost insignificant.However, the directorate has been criticized in the past for lack of proper focus and programme accountability (Idachaba, 1988).

4.2.7. Better Life Programme (BLP) For Rural Womenj
Better Life Programme (BLP) for rural women was founded in Nigeria by Mrs Maryam Babangida (wife of the then president of Nigeria) in 1987. The programme aimed at stimulating and motivating rural women towards achieving better living standards and sensitizing the rest of Nigerians to their problems. Others include; to raise consciousness about their rights, the availability of opportunities and facilities, their social, political and economic responsibilities; encourage recreation and enrich family life; and inculcate the spirit of self development particularly in the fields of education, business, arts, crafts and agriculture (Obasi and Oguche, 1995). Over publicity of the programme was criticized by people who thought that the programme might turn into a mere fashion parade. Also, cultural and religious inhibition of the muslims that do not allow easy access to women in 'purdah' reduced level of participation and consequently 1ed to low level of benefit accruing from the programme.

4.2.8 National Agricultural Land Development Authority (NALDA):
This was established in 1992 much more later than the Decree (Land Use Decree, 1978) and Act (Land Use Act 1979). The authority aims at giving strategic public support for land development, assisting and promoting better

uses of Nigeria's rural land and their resources, boosting profitable employment opportunities for rural dwellers, raising the level/standard of living of rural people, targeting and assisting in achieving food security through self reliance and sufficiency. The land reform act/decree has been criticized most as what highly placed officers used to usurp land that belonged to poor people.

4.2.9. Family Support Programme (FSP)/ Family Economic Advancement Programme (FEAP)
Family Support Programme (FSP) was initiated in 1994 while FEAP was initiated in 1996 by late General Abacha and his wife Mrs. Maryam Sani Abacha. This programme culminated in the creation of the Ministry of Women's Affairs and Social Welfare (http;//www.ilo:org/public//english/employment/gems/eeo/program/nigeria/fami.htm). The programme stressed on areas like health, education, women in development, agriculture, child welfare and youth development, disability, destitution, income generation as well as facilitating the provision of shelter for the less privileged in the society from on going housing programme of government. It is unfortunate that these programmes (FSP and FEAP) died as soon as the administration that initiated them was dethroned thereby limiting their impact on the women and the masses.

4.2.10. National Fadama Development Project (NFDP)
The first National Fadama Development Project (NFDP-1) was designed in the early 1990s to promote simple low-cost improved irrigation technology under World Bank financing. The main objective of NFDP- I was to sustainably increase the incomes of the fadama users through expansion of farm and non-farm activities with high value-added output (http://www.fadama.org//). The programme covered twelve states of Adamawa, Bauchi, Gombe, Imo, Kaduna, Kebbi, Lagos, Niger, Ogun Oyo, Taraba including the Federal Capital Territory (FCT). NFDP adopted community driven development (CDD) approach with extensive participation of the stakeholders at early stage of the project. This approach is in line with the policies and development strategies for Nigeria which emphasize poverty reduction, private sector leadership and beneficiary participation (http.//www.fadama.org//). Overall appraisal of the first and second phases of the project show remarhkable success, hence the invention of the current third phase. The problem associated with the project lies on the fact that unskilled handling of water application through irrigation can degrade and deplete the soil of its productive capacity (Afolayan, 1997) while environmental impact assessment conducted on behalf of the NFDP showed that the programme does not pose serious threat to the environment (Agriscope, 2001).

4.3. 29TH May 1999 to date
Since 1999 Nigeria has embarked on an ambitious economic reform program that is yielding impressive results in budget discipline and implementation. The reform programme is also leading to less waste as many government benefits are now monetized (The washington Times, 1999). The thrust of current Nigerian government policy against poverty is to enable the poor and more vulnerable sections of the society to achieve sustainable livelihoods (The washington Times, 1999). Government programmes in the era that are related to agriculture emphasize poverty alleviation. They include.

4.3.1 National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS).
NEEDS was initiated by Olusegun Obasanjo in 1999. The key elements of this development strategy included poverty eradication, employment generation, wealth creation and value reorientation. NEEDS provided help to agriculture, industry, small and medium scale enterprises and oil and gas. It sets up a series of performance targets that government wanted to achieve by 2007.These include a 6 percent annual growth in agricultural GDP of US $ 3 billion per year on agricultural exports and 95 percent self sufficiency in food. NEEDS offered farmers improved irrigation, machinery and crop varieties which would help to boost agricultural productivity and tackle poverty head on since half of Nigerian's poor people are engaged in agriculture. Its activity with States' Economic Empowerment and Development Strategies (SEEDS) would help to implement integrated rural development programme to stem rural-urban migration. NEEDS differ from other reforms by its participatory process that will ensure ownership, sustainability, encompassing scope, coordination, attractiveness, problem solving and achievement oriented. NEEDS/SEEDS process has been commended for bringing about cordial relationship between federal and state level planning. The plans enumerate strategic roles for the private sector in agriculture.

4.3.2. National, Special Programme on Food Security (NSPFS)
This Programme was launched in January 2002 in all the thirty six states of the federation during the Olusegun Obasanjo's regime. The broad objective of the programme was to increase food production and eliminate rural poverty. Other specific objectives of the programme were: assisting farmers in increasing their output, productivity and income; strengthening the effectiveness of research and extension service training and educating farmers on farm management for effective utilization of resources; supporting governments efforts in

the promotion of simple technologies for self sufficiency; consolidating initial efforts of the programme on pilot areas for maximum output and ease of replication; consolidating gain from on-going for continuity of the programme and consequent termination of external assisted programmes and projects. Setbacks associated with the programme were seen in the inability of majority of the beneficiaries to repay their loan on time, complexity and incompatibility of innovation and difficulty in integrating technology into existing production system. Others include: insufficient knowledge of credit use, poor extension agent- farmer contact, unavailability of labour to carry out essential farming activities, lack of modern storage facilities and high cost of farm input.

4.3.3. Root And Tuber Expansion Programme (RTEP)

RTEP was launched on 16th April 2003 under Olusegun Obasanjo's administration. It covers 26 states and was designed to address the problem of food production and rural poverty. At the local farmers level, the programme hopes to achieve economic growth, improve access of the poor to social services and carry out intervention measures to protect poor and vulnerable groups. At the national level the programme is designed to achieve food security and stimulate demand for cheaper staple food such as cassava, gairi, yam, potato etc as against more expensive carbohydrate such as rice (//E;/presidential Research and communications unit-Government in Action htm). Small holder farmers with less than two hectares of land per household were the targets of the programme while special attention is being paid to women who play a significant role in rural food production, processing and marketing. RTEP also targets at multiplying and introducing improved root and tuber varieties to about 350,000 farmers in order to increase productivity and income.

5. Gaps identified

5.1. Non interaction between and among stakeholders:

Nigerians have the skills to make policies or initiate programmes and technological choices to achieve the sustainable development in agriculture. The continued absence of progress in these policies and programmes in agriculture in Nigeria is the consequence of non-interaction between the government and the various stakeholders within a particular programme as well as lack of opportunities for decision making and policy dialogue with other stakeholders. Agriculturists, scientists researchers and more importantly the farmers/rural dwellers are normally ignored during planning and implementation of agricultural/rural development policies and programmes. These stakeholders are in a better position to identify the policies and programmes that will be tailored to the need of the farmers/masses: Their non-participation has led to failure of intervention programmes, increased poverty and inaccessibility of basic social amenities with dwindling economic fortune.

5.2. Weak agricultural policy:

Agricultural policies are not specific and are handled as cross sectoral policy related to forestry in which environmental factors also come into play e.g. forest policy (1945). Developed economies have their agricultural policies spelt out for the masses and the world to know. Also a policy should have strategy, targets, goals, specific objectives and most importantly programme or projects geared towards accomplishment of the goals. This is not the case in Nigeria as can be seen that from 1st October 1960 to 15th January 1966, there were several agricultural policies but no agricultural programme/project to carry out the directives of the policies. Sometimes, agricultural programmes/projects are not consequences of agricultural policies. For example in the military era where very few agrijcultural policies, decree and act existed with invention of numerous agricultural programmes like NAFPP, OFN, ADP, RBDA, GR, DFRRI, BLP, FSP, FEAP and NALDA which was initiated in 1992 much more later than the decree (1978) and an act (1979) backing it. There is urgent need to reverse this situation so as to ameliorate the persistent failure of agricultural policies and programmes in Nigeria.

5.3. Role conflict between different programmes and projects:

This may be due to new administration, lack of interest and invention of new policy and programme. There was role conflict between FSP and FEAP while that of DFRRI and ADP in many states were most pronounced. Reports has it that DFRRI merely removed the sign post of some ADPS and replace it with its own to lay claim to the construction of certain rural roads and borehole (Ayoola, 2001). Also before the streamlining of RBDAS to the original eleven, much resource wastage had occurred in time of role confusion and role conflict with ADPS as well as inefficient direct production activities.

5.4. Short duration of agricultural policies and programmes:

There has not been continuity of existing programme by incumbent and new administration so that impact of the policy/programme will be realized. Examples FSP (1994) and FEAP (1996), OFN and RBDAS were initiated almost the same time (1976) and initiation of NAFPP in 1972, OFN in 1976 and GR in 1980. All these changes

retard development progress and do not allow the development policies and programmes to fulfill their mission and mandate to over come the Nigeria food crisis.

5.5. Inconsistency/incompatibility of regional policies/programmes with the national policies/programmes:
It should also be recognized that programme/policy can have different impacts on different people (clientele) because a given programme/policy has different effects on the various target audience or as a result of existence of different policies or programme at the same time for example RBDA (1976) and OFN (1976), DFRRI(1986) and BLP (1987). New policies and programmes should also be consistent, work in harmony and closely with regional and national policies and programmes. The good rapport /relationship and peaceful atmosphere will always ensure success of agricultural policies and programme and consequent agricultural development.

5.6. Emphasis on mainly food and animal production:
Agricultural growth and development need diversification into different sectors like manufacturing and services. Relying exclusively on farm output as most agricultural policies and programmes emphasize means subjecting the inhabitants of the nation to chronic poverty, marginalization and stagnation. Policies should aim at mobilizing resources (human and material) with the aim of developing programmes or projects in rural non-farm employment (like fee fishing, hunting lodges, and growing ornamental plants) and in secondary and tertiary sectors (like tourism, recreational and environmental services or preservation). Many of these activities that were previously overlooked and geographically quite dispersed have become true productive links involving agro-industrial operations, sophisticated system of distribution, communication and packaging.

5.7. Delay, embezzlement, misappropriation and lack of fund to pursue specific policy/programme to an expected end:
Government may need to channel funds from the informal sector to the formal sector of the economy to make developed policies and programmes both workable and more effective. As can be seen that abrupt withdrawal of fund by the government in NAFPP contributed to its failure and lack of fund delayed implementation of ADP schedule. This problem of lack of fund persist in ADP till today. Misplacement of priority or misdirection of fund to unnecessary components of agricultural programmes should also be avoided to avoid wastage of resource that will hamper programme success. For example in FSS where expenses incurred mainly on infrastructure which did not directly increase agricultural output was one of the problems that led to the failure of the scheme.

5.8. Inadequate virile technical advisory/extension services:
It should be borne in mind that United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) succeeded today because of their systematically timely technical advisory services provided within the ambit of the university based or Land Grant colleges of Agriculture. Provision of extension services has been likened to a factor of production in the sense that it helps in acquisition of entrepreneurial skills by smallholder farmers. It also provides, teaches and convinces farmers to adopt and diffuse innovation. Its absence in educating participants/beneficiaries on the meaning and goal of OFN, FSS and BLP contributed immensely to their failure.

5.9. Lack/inadequate monitoring and evaluation of programme/project:
Evaluation is purposely done to determine achievements of rural development programme vis a vis the set aims/objectives. Evaluation techniques can serve to improve implementation and efficiency of programmes after interventions have begun, provide evidence as to the cost efficiency and impact of a specific intervention within and between policy sectors (FAO, 2003). Evaluations especially continuous/on-going and stage by stage evaluation are important because they expose lapses associated with achievement of programme objectives thereby affording opportunities for adjustment. Unfortunately importance of monitoring and evaluation have not gained full recognition in Nigeria. This is evident in GR where there was no monitoring and evaluation of programme which huge sums of money was spent on executing.

6. Conclusion/Recommendations

Various stakeholders including farmers/rural people should be involved in planning and execution of agricultural policies and programmes. Also agricultural policy and programme should be open, transparent and must be framed within a context in which agricultural development policy and programme are national issues that are based on a consensus broad enough to guarantee continuity and freedom of expression of individuals opinions on decisions.

Government should promote a virile extension liaison services that is empowered and backed up with adaptive research and mobile personnel equipped with necessary media facilities and information. This will help to solve

the problem of misconception of the objectives of the policy/programme by the target audience, relate their information to and fro the research/government and increase their participation in the programme since they are in closer contact with this audience and consequently ensure success of the programme.

Programmes should also be monitored and their efficacies evaluated in terms of a specific geographical impact of that programme. This provides a highly useful approach for gauging the direct and indirect impact of different programmes and project interacting simultaneously. Policy makers/planners should also identify and evaluate alternative or different intervention programmes in terms of both their immediate and long term impacts and of their implications to the communities and society at large.

The philosophy of policy/programme consistency should be adopted in Nigeria.This is the easiest way to streamline, direct and focus to agricultural development. This philosophy should be a critical issue our future policies and programmes should address.

Government should provide enabling environment for private sectors involvement in agricultural development especially in areas like processing, preservation, exportation, tourism, recreational and environmental services. This will promote agricultural development and project us to the entire world. Our tourist centers like Yankari games reserve, Obudu cattle Ranch, museums etc can serve this purpose.

References

Afolayan, S.O. (1997), Effect of irrigation frequency on soil moisture potential and fruit yield of okra (Abelmoschuss esculentus. Paper presented at the 15th annual conference of HORTSON held at NIHORH, Ibadan: April 8-11, 1997.

Agriscope (2001), *Newsletter of the Projects Coordinating Unit*, Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, 1(18):1-6.

Amalu, U.C. (1998), *Agricultural Research and Extension Delivery systems in Sub-SaharanAfrica:* Calabar: University of Calabar Press

Asiabaka, C.C. (2002), *Agricultural Extension; A Handbook for Development Practitioners.* Omoku, River State: Molsystem United Services.

Ayoola, G.B. (2001), *Essays on The Agricultural Economy 1: A Book of Readings on Agricultural Development Policy and Administration in Nigeria:* Ibadan: TMA Publishers.
Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO), (2004) *The Ethics of Sustainable Agricultural Intensification.*

FAO Rome, Italy www/fao,org: Editional Production and Design Group Publishing Management Services. http://E:/presidentialresearchandcommunicationsunitgovernmentinaction.htmaccaccessed 23/05/08. http://www.fadama.org//accessed 23/05/08

Idachaba, F.S. (1988), Strategies for achieving food self sufficiency in Nigeria. Key Note Address, 1st National congress of science and technology, University of Ibadan: 16th August, 1988.

Kirkpatrick T.O. (1987), *Supervision.* Kent Publishing Company: Boston.

Madukwe M.C. (2008), Practices without Policy. The Nigeria Agricultural Extension Service 30th inaugural lecture of the University of Nigeria, Nsukka delivered on April 29, 2008, published by the University of Nigeria Senate ceremonials committee. University of Nigeria Press Ltd, Nsukka.

National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) (2004), Abuja: National Planning Commission.

Obasi, I. N. and oguche D. (1995), Innovative programmes in Rural Development: An Evaluation of the Better life programme using the APBs framework. In: Eboh EC, Okoye C.U. and Ayichi D. (eds.) *RuralDevelopment in Nigeria: Concepts, process, and prospects*., Enugu: Auto Century Publishing Company. 73-85.

ObibuakuO.(2006),http://www.businessonine.com./http://www.ilo:org/public//htm),english/employment/ gems/eeo/program/Nigeria/famihttp://www:fadama.org//accessed23/05/08

Olatunji, S.O. (2005), Monitoring and evaluation of Agricultural Extension programmes. In ;

Nwachukwu.I.and Onuekwusi G. (eds.) *Agricultural Extension and Rural Sociology*. Enugu: Snap press Ltd. 287-306.

Pearce (1986), In: Ayoola, G.B. (2001), *Essays on the Agricultural Economic*: *A book of Readings on Agricultural Development Policy and Administration in Nigeria.* Ibadan: T.M.A. Publishers.

The Washington Times (1999), A special international Report prepared by the Washington Times Advertizing Department, 1999.

www. Monster.ca accessed 23/05/08

Appendix

Table 1: Nigeria articulation of agricultural policy 1900 to 1989

	Official title	Description
1.	Forest Policy 1937	Base on proposal of chief conservator of forests after a forest conference". The problem of depreciating forest capital as a result of unregulated exploitation was addressed.
2.	Forest Policy 1945	Revision of 1937 policy: it incorporated the new position of government that (a) agriculture must take priority over forestry (b) the satisfaction of the need of people at the lowest rates (prices) must take precedence over revenue and (c) maximization of revenue must be compatible with sustained yield.
3.	Agricultural Policy 1946	First all embracing policy statement in respect of agriculture; Nigeria was demarcated into five agricultural areas; (i) Northern provinces pastoral or livestock production area (ii) Northern provinces Export crop (groundnut and cotton) production area (iii) Middle belt food production area (iv) Southern provinces Export crop (palm oil and kernels) production area and (v) south West food Export (cocoa and palm kernels) Area.
4.	Policy for the marketing of oils. Oil seeds and cotton 1948	Commodity–specific policy, directed toward stabilizing post-second world war prices in Britain.
5.	Forest Policy for Western Region 1952	Territoria policy declared during the trial of the regionalization concept focused on forest matters.
6.	Agricultural Policy 1952	Territorial Policy focused on agricultural matter for the Western Region
7.	Policy for Natural resources	Territorial: Eastern Region Resources of forest/ agricultural matters Eastern Nigeria.
8.	Western Nigeria Policy of Agricultural and Natural Resources 1959.	The farm settlement scheme was the critical element
9.	Nigeria Agricultural Policy Undated	Attempt of the federal Department of Agricultural planning to assemble numerous policies of federal government in Agriculture.
10.	Agricultural policy for Nigeria 1988	Latest policy statement comprehensive based on detailed analysis of quantitative targets aims at self –sufficiency in food and agricultural raw materials .

SOURCE: Ayoola (2001) Essays on the Agricultural Economy: A Book of Readings on Agricultural Development Policy and Administration in Nigeria. TMA Publishers Ibadan P. 81.

Table 2: Typology of agricultural programmes and projects in Nigeria, 1960-1989.

	Programme/Project	Description
1.	Farm settlement (Early, 1960)	Initiated in old western Region; aimed at solving unemployment problem among primary school leavers. Policy instruments include agricultural extension cooperative societies, credit facilities.
2.	National Accelerated food production programme (NAFPP) (1972)	Aimed at enhancing farmers' production project technical efficiency in the production of selected crop (mostly grains). policy instruments include subsidy, credit, adaptive research and demonstration plots.
3.	Operation Feed the Nation (OFN) (21st May 1976)	A mass mobilization and mass awareness programme. Policy instruments include mass media, centralized input procurement, massive fertilizer subsidy and imports.
4.	River Basin-Development Authorities (RBDAs) (1976)	To tap the potentials of available water bodies; first 11, then 18 and 11 in number, specific objectives are irrigation services, fishery development, control of flood, water pollution and erosion. Policy instruments include input distribution credit services, infrastructure development, manpower development.
5.	Agricultural Development projects (ADPS) (1974) Replication to entire then nineteen states (1989)	To enhance the technical and economic efficiency of small farmers in general. Policy instruments include rural infrastructure development (feeder road network, dams. etc). revamped input delivery system, revitalized agricultural extension system, autonomous project management, domestic cum. International capital.
6.	Green Revolution (April 1980)	To accelerate the achievement of programme and the agricultural sector objectives. Policy instrument include food production plan, in put supply and subsidy, special commodity development programme, review of Agricultural credit guarantee scheme, increased resource allocation to RBDAS etc.
7.	Directorate of food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (January, 1986)	Established to facilitate roads and rural infrastructure programmes, provision of rural infrastructure

Source: Ayoola (2001) Essays On The Agricultural Economy: A Book Or Readings On Agricultural Development Policy And Administration In Nigeria. TMA Publishers Ibadan P. 84.