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ABSTRACT

The paper reviewed Agricultural Programmes in Nigeria which have been implemented over the years. The paper aimed to examined agricultural programmes and impediments to implementation of agricultural programmes with a view to making recommendations that would ensure sustainable development of these programmes in Nigeria. It was discovered that out of 15 programmes 4 of them still exist. These programmes still exist because they are in built in the civil service structure, and are being monitored and evaluated through existing Agricultural Project Monitoring and Evaluation Unit. It was also found that the percentage of the existing programmes is 26.1%, this meant there is a great failure in the implementation of these programmes. Based on the findings it was recommended that Government, stakeholders including farmers/rural people should be cooperate in the planning and implementation of future national agricultural transformation agenda for desired services and programs should be monitored and their efficiencies evaluated in terms of a specific geographical impact of that programme including that the philosophy of programmes/policies consistency should be adopted in Nigeria as a way to promote sustainability of programmes.
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INTRODUCTION

Agriculture is one of the most important sectors of the economics of developing countries of the world. The growth of this sector is however, not in consonant with its strategic importance in the economies of various countries, (Ogbonna, 2011). For example, in Nigeria, the growth of the agricultural sector has declined drastically since with the contribution of agriculture of national economy dropping from 80% in the 1960s to a mere 24% in 2003, (Amalu, 2005).

Conscious of the strategic importance of agriculture in the economy, the country has developed several agricultural development intervention programmes aimed at boosting agricultural production since independence in 1960. The effectiveness or otherwise the implementation of past national agricultural programmes shall be used as lesson for the implementation of the present national agricultural transformation agenda.

A programme is a comprehensive plan that includes objectives to be attained, specifications of resources required and stages of work to be performed, (Asiabaka, 2002).

According to Olatunji, (2005), defines programme as a collection of coordinated activities that are mutually directed toward the attainment of a definite goal and made up of several segments or projects which can be separately pursued as components of the whole.

National agricultural programmes, in the present study, are these programmes that were initiated and implemented by the Federal Government of Nigeria either singly or in conjunction with the World Bank, other financial agencies, foreign donors agencies, state or Local Government, among other bodies. Such programmes usually stated as pilots projects and then were expanded to cover all or most states and or local government in the country to make them “national” in outlook. There have been numerous national agricultural programmes in Nigeria in the past fifty years, especially since the country became...
independence in 1960 while the agricultural programmes conceived, planned and implemented by the colonial masters were geared towards the production of agricultural raw-materials for industries in their home country, during the pre-independence era, the post – independence period, on the other hand witnessed the conception, planning and implementation of agricultural programmes that tended to focus on, among others things, job creation, agricultural and rural development and food security for the country, (Agber and Akaaimo, 2003).

Objectives of the paper are:-
I Describe briefly the agricultural programmes that have been implemented.
II Examine the programmes that have remain till date and
III Adduce reasons why the programmes failed.

According to Jibouw, (2005), some national agricultural programmes that were established and implemented following Nigeria’s political independence in 1960 and the subsequent established by the Federal Ministry of Agriculture in 1970 included:


B. Programmes established after 1980 till date include:
   (i) Accelerated Development Area Project (ADAP, 1982).
   (ii) Nigeria Agricultural Insurance Scheme (NAIS, 1987).
   (iii) Multi-State Agricultural Development Project (MSAP, 1986).
   (v) Directorate for Food and Rural Infrastructure (DFFRI, 1986).
   (vii) National Fadama Development Project (NFDP, 1990s).
   (x) National Special Programme for Food Security (NSPFS, 2003) and Root and Tuber Expansion Programme (RTEP, 2003).

1. The National Accelerated Food Production programme (NAFPP). This Programme was established by the Federal Department of Agriculture during General Yakubu Gowon’s regime in 1972, following the end of the Nigerian Civil war and the end of the food crisis that engulfed the nation at that time. The programme was designed with the basic aim of increasing food production in the country, through: Education of farmers on that methods of increasing their productivity in the areas of food crop production, organisation of workshop, seminars and conferences for farmers to enhance their education for greater agricultural productivity.

2. River Basin Development Authority (RBDAS). This was another national agricultural programme that came into existence in 1973, it aims and objectives include the provision of irrigation facilities through construction of dams for all year round agricultural production, provision of portable water to people in the rural areas for increased production, assisting to bring more land under cultivation by increasing the farm size of small scale farmers through provision of land clearing services using government tractor hiring services at minimum charges, construction of feeder roads to the rural areas for good transportation, improving the rural areas infrastructures, generally to help stem the rural-urban migration.

Some of the river basin and rural development authorities included: Lower Base River Basin and Rural Development Authority, Lake Chad Basin and Rural Development Authority, Niger River Basin and Development Authority among others.
3. **Agricultural Development Projects (ADPS)**

The Agricultural Development Projects came in 1975, after a bilateral agreement between the Federal Government of Nigeria and the World Bank. The two Basic aims and Objectives that ADPS were meant to achieve include, increased food production and raising of income of the small scale farmers, with the ultimate goal of improving their standard and welfare.

Initially, nine pilot (enclave) ADPS covering a few local government areas, were established in Funtua, Kaduna State (1975) Gusau, Sokoto State (1975), and Gombe, (then in Bauchi State). By end of 1981 they had spread to 18 out of 19 states. These project increasingly focused on extension work, fertilizer and credit schemes on the larger farmers. They concentrated on the “progressive” farmers who have enough land, labour and financial resources to follow World Bank recommendations, Like irrigation schemes, great emphasis was placed on increasing productivity: the increased output was for sale to industry (cotton, groundnuts) or for livestock feed (maize), not for household consumption in the rural areas.

Just like irrigation schemes, the farmer was expected to change his cropping patterns to meet market requirements. In order to do this, he was expected to grow crops for sale primarily and to abandon some of his risk minimizing strategies such as mixed cropping and the growing of traditional seeds which though not very responsive to fertilizer, were drought resistance. Again, (Voh, 1982) noted that many farmers relying on 1-2 hectare plots could not afford to take these risks and make themselves dependence on bought seeds which needed a lot of fertilizer, and were not resistant in an environment where both the rains and market were unpredictable and failure. Since the World Bank assistance to the ADP has more or less ended, the farmers are left with no option than to grapple with inadequate input supply and adulterated chemicals.

4. **Operation Feed the Nation (OFN)**

The 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 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 seeds/seedlings, day old chicks, sickle, hoe etc. freely to government establishments, individuals received these inputs at a subsidized rate. Although the campaign generated a lot of awareness, it went largely to urban dwellers and missed the farmers who are the real producers.

Wilmot (1979) in his own view maintained that the results of the Operation Feed the Nation could not have been otherwise, given the disarticulated structure of the economy.

5. **Green Revolution (GR)**

The Green Revolution was another mobilization scheme, convinced and executed within the same system, in which Operation Feed the Nation lived and terminated. The “Green Revolution” Programme was formulated by President Sheu Shagari in the second republic civilian administration in 1980, primarily aimed at making Nigeria self-sufficient and self-reliant in food needs. The change from Operation Feed the Nation to Green Revolution did not constitute a structural or systematic transition, premised on new societal goals and values. It was only a systematic gimmick, a change in the play of words. The Green Revolution was executed within the same system which has proven incapable of transcending its own contradictions, within structures which must live, more and have their being by continuing the underdevelopment of Nigeria. The whole of Nigeria may turn green but majority will continue to be impoverished, suffice to mention however, that in the current dispensation, it is sustainable agricultural production that can guarantee the survival and enhanced living standard of peasants.
6. **Directorate for Food and Rural Infrastructure (DFFRI)**
   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 Nation 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).

7. **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 with 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 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 led to low level of benefit accruing from the programme.

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 sufficiently. The land reform act/decree has been criticised most as what highly places officers used to usurp land that belonged to poor people.

9. **National Fadama Development Project (FDP)**
   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-1 was to sustainably increase the incomes of the Fadama users through expansion of farm and non-farm activities with high value – added output. The programme covered twelve sates of Adamawa, Bauchi, Gombe, Imo, Kaduna, Kebbi, Lagos, Niger, Ogun, Oyo, Taraba including Federal Capital Territory (FCT). The scheme was designed to improve the flooded plains of Savannah (Fadama). This led to the development of small irrigation pumps and shallow tube wells for small scale irrigation farming system (SSIFS). The relative success of Fadama – 1 led to the establishment of Fadama II and the current Fadama III. NFDP adopted community driven development (CDD) approach with extensive participation of the state holders at early stage of the project. This approach is in line with the policies and development strategies for Nigerian which emphasizes poverty reduction, private sector leadership and beneficiary participation (http./ww.fadama.org//). Overall appraisal of the first and second phases of the project show remarkable success, hence the invention of the current third phase. The main problem associated with the project was the unskilled handling of water application through irrigation (Afolayan, 1997).

10. **National Special Programme for Food Security. (NSPFS).**
   This is a programme that was officially lunched in 2003. The aim of the programme was to attain food security and alleviate rural poverty in Nigeria. It aimed at helping farmers to increase output
and income, strengthen extension service delivery, promote simple farm technologies, utilize land, water and other resources for food productive setbacks associated with the programme were seen in the inability of majority of the beneficiaries to repay their loan on time, complexity and incapability of innovation and differently integrating technology into existing reduction 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 (Iwuchukwu and Igbokwe, 2012).

11. **Nigerian Agricultural and Co-operative Bank**

The Nigerian Agricultural and Co-operative Bank (NACB) is a development finance institution owned by Federal Government with a share of 60% and the Central Bank of Nigeria with a share of (40%). It is charged with the responsibility of credit delivery for the development of agriculture and other agro-allied industries, including marketing of agricultural products. Unlike other financial institutions, NACB assist all her clients “to adopt modern agricultural technologies and good management practices through advice from specialists among its staff” (NACB, 1986).

Starting from one office in its headquarters in Kaduna in 1983, the Bank was operating through a network of 22 area offices, 16 branch offices and 163 representative offices at local government level all over the federation by the late 1980s (Ndagwakwa, 1989). In his study on the role of NACB in financing farm production in 1989, Ndagwakwa found that small-scale farmers have not benefited much from the scheme. His respondents complained about inadequacy of the fund and late disbursement whenever available. From the NACB’s operational scheme, one would be inclined to believe that the Bank was established in order to facilitate credit for the “progressive farmers”. The equipments of the NACB are indicative of who the beneficiary will be. Loans under direct lending scheme for individual framers who are not corporate bodies should:

(a) Provide an attested statutory certificate of occupancy with an attested sketch survey;

(b) Convince the bank that they could provide property or any instrument to secure their loan to the tune of at least 40% of the loan required;

(c) Produce tax clearance certificates for three successive years and bank reference satisfactory to NACB;

(d) Convinced the bank of his/her ability to manage a project successfully. In this regard, a curriculum vitae of the applicant is required.

(e) Convince the bank that they have contributed or are capable of at least 15% of the total proposed project cost (NACB, 1986). The above conditionalities clearly indicate that the policy of government is to encourage capitalist farmers who plan for big farm projects. Since many small holder farmers are not always able to provide adequate collateral for required loans, many of them do not even try to ask for loans as they consider it an exercise in futility. It should be noted that the bank has metamorphosed into Nigerian Agricultural, Cooperative and Rural Development Bank (NACRDB) with same mandate, although with relaxed conditions, whereby farmers are encouraged to form co-operative groups to facilitate accessing credit facilities.

11. **National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS).**

NEEDS was initiated by Olusegun Obasanjo in 1999. The key elements of the 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 self sufficiency in food. NEEDS offered farmers improved irrigation, machinery and crop varieties which would help boost agricultural productivity and tackle poverty 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 programmes to stem rural – urban migration. NEEDS process have
recommended for bringing about cordial relationship between Federal and State level planning. The plans enumerated strategic roles for the private sector in agriculture.

12. **Root and Tuber Expansion Programme (RTEP)**

Root and Tuber Expansion Programme (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 farmer’s 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 crops. At the national level the programme is designed to achieve food security and stimulate demand for cheaper staple food such as cassava, garri, yam, potato etc. as against more expensive carbohydrate such as rice (//E: Presidential Research and Communications Unit – Government in Action htm).

Root and Tuber Expansion Programme also targets at multiplying and introducing improved root and tuber varieties to about 350,000 farmers in order to increase productivity and income.

The Agricultural Development intervention programmes which constitute the hub of this study, it becomes exigent to examine some of the reasons for programme failure with a view to making recommendation that would ensure sustainable development programmes in Nigeria.

**Reasons for Programmes failure include:**

1. **Non interaction between and among stakeholders.**
   Nigerians have skills to initiate programmes and technological choices to achieve the sustainable development in agriculture. The continued absence in these 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 dialogue with other stakeholders. Agriculturist, scientist, researchers and more importantly the farmers/rural dwellers are normally ignored during planning and implementation of agricultural programmes. These stakeholders are in a better position to identity the programmes that will be tailored to the need of the farmers/masses. Their non-participation has led to failure of intervention programmes.

2. **Role conflict between different programmes and projects:**
   This may be due to new administration, lack of interest and invention of new programme. There was role conflict between FSP and FEAP while DFRRI and ADP in many states were 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 2011.

3. **Short Duration of Agricultural Programmes.**
   There has been continuity of existing programme by incumbent and new administration so that impact of the 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 and GR in 1980. All these changes retard development progress and do not allow the development policies and programmes to fulfil their mission and mandate to overcome the Nigerians food crisis.

**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 (Life beekeeping, fishing, hunting and growing of ornamental plants). Many of these activities that were previously overlooked and geographically quite dispersed have become true productive link involving agro-industrial operations, sophisticated system of distribution, communication and packaging.
Inadequate Funds/Corruption: Corruption in the form of embezzlement and misappropriation of funds has been major problems hampering the success of development intervention programmes in developing countries. Sometimes development projects were planned for the purpose of siphoning the money. In other case, money meant for development intervention programmes were hardly enough to complete the projects. This situation has often lead to abandon projects.

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 same that it helps in acquisition of entrepreneurial skills by small holder farmers. It also provides, teaches and convinced farmers to adopt and diffuse innovation. Its absence in education participants/beneficiaries on the meaning and goal of OFN, FSS and BLP contributed immensely to their failure.

Inconsistency/incompatibility of regional policies/programmes. It should also be recognised that programmes can have different impacts on different people (Clientele) because a given programme has different effects on the various target audience or as a result of existence of different programme at the same time for example RBDA (1976), and OFN (1976) etc. New programmes should also be consistent work in harmony and closely with regional and national policies and programmes.

Lack/inadequate monitoring and evaluation of programmes/ projects Evaluation is purposely done to determine achievements of rural development program vis-à-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) Evaluation 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, importances 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 exciting.

Poor Planning and Management: It was found that most of the community and agricultural development programmes were implemented by the top-bottom approach which apparently neglects the knowledge, skills and contributions of the ultimate beneficiaries of the programmes. CTA (2003), and Ogunfiditimi and Ewuola (1995), stated that the top-bottom approach had a command posture of “either take it or leave it”. Once the beneficiaries are not interested in the programme, the tendency to abandon it is usually very high. Ovwigho and Ifie (2009) recommend the Participatory Rural Appraisal and Participatory Action Research Approaches for planning and implementation of development intervention programmes. These and similar approaches are more likely to yield better outcomes and foster sustainability. Proper management of resources including money, manpower and equipment is essential to programme success. Sometimes plans might be realistic but programmes could fail if the required resources are not made available at the right time, place and quantity. Poor management sometimes results from lack of coordination between the preparation of plans and procedures used in allocation of resources.

CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATION
The past national agricultural intervention programmes have failed to improve the lot of millions of Nigerian farmers as well as the economy of the country. One of the most important reasons for this failure is the way the programmes were implemented. The recommendation here is that all the stakeholders need to cooperate in the planning and implementation of future national agricultural
programmes including the agricultural transformation agenda for desired success. Various stakeholders including farmers/rural people should be involved in planning and execution of agricultural programmes. Also, agricultural programmes should be open, transparent and must be framed within a contest in which agricultural development policy and programme are national issues that are based on a consensus broad enough to guarantees continuation and freedom of expression of individuals options on decisions. Government should promote a virile extension liaison services that is empowered and backed 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 programme by the target audience, relate their information to and for the research/government and increase their participation in the programmes since they are closer contact with this audience and consequently ensure success of the programme.

Programmes should be monitored and their efficiencies 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. Planners should also identify and evaluate alternative or different intervention programmes in terms of immediate and long term impacts and of their implications to the communities and society at large.

The philosophy of programme/policies 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 centres like Yankari games reserve, Obudu cattle Ranch, Museums etc. can serve this purpose.
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