

RIGHT TO FOOD POLICIES, JUSTICE AND SOVEREIGNTY IN NIGERIA

Effiong JB^{1*}



John Effiong

*Corresponding author email: johneffiong@unical.edu.ng
johneffiong@yahoo.co.uk

¹Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Sociology, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Calabar, Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the right to food policies, justice and sovereignty in Nigeria. The main areas of concentration were: introduction, meaning of food policy, some food policies in Nigeria, types of policies, audit of right to food policies in Nigeria, past policy articulations (1900 – 1999), food policy articulation and policy thrust in 2003, food policy legislations, sovereignty of food and agricultural development among many others. The study indicated that food policy is a public declaration that conveys the decisions to pursue a specific course of action aimed at improving food production practices, ensuring output growth and the overall development of the food sector. Some food policies in Nigeria are; food crop production policy, livestock production policy, food commodity storage policy among others. The study identified three types of policies namely; position declaration, policy statements and discussion papers. Past policy articulations are: Timber/non timber policy 1937, food policy 1946 and food policy for the western region 1952. Some policy legislations were identified, namely: adulteration of produce ordinance No.67 of 1917; 29 of 1920, 8th November 1917, Weight and measurements Act No. 32 of 1974 to June 1975 and River Basin Development Authorities Act No.35 of 1st October, 1986. Some inventory of right to food sovereignty strategies in Nigeria includes: Sovereignty strategy formulations, commodity boards, National Accelerated Food Production Project (NAFPP), National Livestock Development Project (NLDP), Operation Feed the Nation (OFN) and Green Revolution among very many others. One major problem of food policy implementation is lack of a well-defined programme. In conclusion, Right to Food Policy, Justice and Sovereignty Implementation means money spent, laws enforced, employees hired, plan of action formulated and carried out successfully for the development of the Nigerian food sub-sector. But the problem with Nigerian food policies is the structure among which is the absence of central coordinating members. Also, the study recommended that there is the need for government to set institutions that will monitor the planning and execution of food policies projects.

Key words: Agricultural Development, Food, Justice, Legislations, Nigeria, Policies, Rights, Sovereignty



INTRODUCTION

The agricultural development plan (food), the economic development plan and the annual budgets are the three tools commonly used to guide the development of the Nigerian economy [1]. Such policies normally take care of government plans, food projections strategies, targets, goals and objectives. Budget brings out the aspects of implementation, allocation and release of funds for the attainment of food policy strategies. In Nigeria, the periodic national food development plans and the budgets have been common sources of food and agricultural development policies [2].

Against this background, this position paper discussed the meaning of food policy, types of policies, audit of right to food policies in Nigeria, right to food policy trust, current right to food policy in Nigeria from 2007 to date, policy legislations and sovereignty of food and agricultural development in Nigeria and right to food sovereignty in Nigeria [3].

MEANING OF FOOD POLICY

Food Policy is a public declaration that conveys the decision to pursue a specific course of action aimed at improving food production practices, ensuring output growth and the overall development of food sector. A typical food policy indicates objectives that must be formally declared, strategies, time for the implementation, financial implications and addresses the interest of the identifiable stakeholders and interest groups [4].

Food policies specify the framework and action plans of government for the achievement of increased food, raw materials, reduction in unemployment, export crop production, modernization of agricultural production, improved income, standard of living and increased health status among many others [1,5,6].

Policy can also be said to be a plan statement of beliefs, goals, objectives and recommendations on the specific areas such as food, shelter and water among others [1,4,6].

METHODS

This study is the review of the National Food Policy articulations, right to food strategies, legislations and sovereignty in Nigeria. Nigeria is a sovereign nation in the sub-Saharan West Africa. It occupies a land mass of about 923,769 square kilometers with population of about 230 million people. The country has two distinct seasons, the dry and wet seasons, that makes it possible for the planting of cash crops, food crops and animal production. The country is divided into six geopolitical zones namely: Northern, South South, North East, North West, South East and South West zones.

This study was conducted by eliciting information from the following literature: National Council on Agriculture (NCA) bulletins, United States Agency for International Development News Letter, Agricultural Policy for Nigeria Ministry of Agriculture, 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, Federal Ministry of Water Resources,



Central Bank of Nigeria, National and Financial Policy Review, National Economic Policy, Nigerian Financial Review, Fadama Development Projects, Literature from eminent scholars around the world, Food Policy, Agricultural Development, Food Legislations, Food Justice, Food Rights, Food Sovereignty in Nigeria. These were made available through soft and hard copies.

The review took cognizance of the stakeholders in Nigerian Agriculture, Food Policy Reviewers and Legislators. All the stakeholders have been discussed and referenced under right to food policies, justice, legislations and sovereignty in Nigeria.

SOME FOOD POLICIES IN NIGERIA

The food policies in Nigeria are: Crop production policy, forest food resources policy, livestock production policy, fisheries policy, food processing, commodity storage policy and agricultural extension service policy [1]. Food Crop Production Policy - The policy on food crop production is to enhance increased food crop production [7]. Its objectives are to attain self-sufficiency in food crop production and improve level of efficiency in food crop production and processing. Livestock Production Policy - This policy was established to support and encourage the livestock sector for increased supply of livestock products. Its objectives are to attain self-sufficiency in the supply of livestock products, improve the nutritional status of the consumers, use local inputs for livestock by-products, improve income of farmers and other stakeholders in the livestock industry [5, 13]. Forest Food Resource Policy - The plan of the policy is to establish sustainable development and maintenance of the country's forest resources such as the timber and non-timber forest products. The objectives of this policy are to: consolidate and expand forest estates, proper management and controlled use of forest resources, reduce all forms of forest encroachment among others [6, 8]. Food Commodity Storage Policy - This policy encourages storage of food commodity as a way of boosting food production. The objective of the policy is to ensure seasonal price stability and all year round food availability in Nigeria [9, 10]. Fisheries Policy - This policy was put in place to support the development of fisheries at all levels so as to achieve satisfactory level of fish supply in Nigeria. The main objectives of this policy are to enhance the adoption of improved technology and modern management practices by all categories of fish folks, enhance research and training in agriculture, reduce unemployment and improve the standard of living of the fisher folks [1, 13]. Food Processing Policy - The policy encourages the processing of food products for local and international markets. The objectives of the policy are to; bring in increased number of facilities for processing farm produce, widen the demand base of the food sector, reduce seasonal price fluctuation, encourage commodity processing business activities in rural communities of the Nigerian state [11,12]. Agricultural Extension Services Policy - This is the policy of government geared towards the provision of agricultural extension services to operators of the food sector especially crop livestock and fishery farmers. The main objectives of the extension services policy are to improve the food and fisheries practice through effective agricultural training and



development, soil management, nutrition and health needs of the farmers [13]. Others are to teach farmers how to adopt better technological innovations that would increase food and cash crop production, on farm adaptive research and other agricultural extension services.

In Nigeria, despite the high number of people employed in the agricultural sector and the increasing contribution of the sector to real GDP growth a growing number of the people face food insecurity. The right to food advocacy in Nigeria has steadily garnered momentum in the last decade culminating a bill for an amendment of the constitution to recognize the right. An underlying basis for the right to food advocacy is hinged on the expectation that the recognition of an enforceable right to food in the national constitution advances the prospects of food in Nigeria based on relevant fundamental objectives and directive principles of state policy, and fundamental rights guaranteed under the CFRN1999 constitution [37, 38].

TYPES OF POLICIES

The following are the types of policies in Nigeria [19, 38, 42] Position Declarations - Concise statements that declares position on particular issues broadly or alternatively in response to current and emerging issues. Policy Statement- Papers that provide details of the proponent's position and recommendations regarding a particular issue, and include details regarding the aims, backgrounds, principles and specific issues addressed. Discussion Papers - Papers that have been developed by the policy makers to engage and obtain input from members and stakeholders regarding a specific issue. Discussion papers will often be developed into policy statements following constitution [14].

POLICY CYCLE

Policy cycle is a tool used for analyzing the development of policy items. It can also be referred to as "strategies approach", one standardized version includes the following stages; Agenda setting (problem identification), Policy formulation, Implementation and Evaluation.

AUDIT OF RIGHT TO FOOD POLICIES IN NIGERIA

The focus of policy audit is on articulation and legislation of food policies, as well as highlights of discernible trends in policy making for the food sector [15].

PAST POLICY ARTICULATIONS (1900 – 1999)

During the colonial period, the policies on food production were articulated on paper into statutory documents, and published in the government gazettes or as pamphlets or handbooks [18, 22, 36]. The official titles and main features of some of these policies were as follows: Timber/Non Timber Policy 1937 - The policy problem pertained to the depreciating forest capital resulting from unregulated exploitation of forest food resources. Forest Policy 1945 - This was articulated to revise the forest policy in line with the new



philosophy of food administration, as reflected in certain statements in the policy documents, namely that “agriculture and food must take priority over forestry”; that “the satisfaction of the need of the people at the lowest possible rates must take precedence over revenue”; and, the focus on “the production of greatest revenue compatible with the sustained yield”. Food Policy 1946 - This was articulated in furtherance of the gradual shift in the philosophy of government from forest exploitation towards food production; in this policy document therefore the country was divided up into five food production zones namely; the “Northern Province Pastoral Livestock Production Area”, “Northern Province Export Crop (Groundnuts and Cotton) Production Area”, “Middle Belt Food Production Area”, “South East Export Crop (Palm Oil and Kernels) Production Area”, “South West Food and Export Crop (Cocoa and Palm Kernel) Production Area” [16]. Policy for the Marketing of Oils, Oilseed and Cotton 1948 - This was made specifically to capture the new emphasis of government on market intervention policy for food crop development with a view to addressing the raw material needs of British industries after the Second World War that ended in 1945; towards this one market intervention board had been created for cocoa in 1947 subsequently creating three more of them in 1949, leading to the first generation of market intervention boards namely; Cocoa Marketing Board/Palm Produce Marketing Board, Groundnut Marketing Board, and Cotton Marketing Board [15,17]. Forest Policy for the Western Region 1952 - The articulation of this policy was necessitated by the advent of regional governments on trial basis during the late 1940s and the early 1950s, which led to boundary maintenance attitudes and declaration of territorial policies of agricultural and food crop development among the three regions (West, East and North); it appeared that the Western Region moved faster than other regions in policy articulation in this regard by quickly legislating and publishing a separate forest policy corresponding to what previously existed at the national level [18]. Food Policy for the Western Region 1952 - The articulation of this policy also followed directly from the regional spirit emerging at that time and it also corresponded to the national policy on food that previously existed in Nigeria [18,19]. Policy for Natural Resources of Eastern Region 1953 - The Eastern region followed suit in the articulation of territorial food policies, but adopted a combined approach to legislate a single policy document for natural resources rather than separate documents for forestry and food. Western Nigeria Policy for Food Development 1959 - In this policy the West articulated an original policy initiative towards the development of food in the region; specifically, the policy document provided for the establishment of farm settlements of the Israeli Moshav types in the region. Food Policy for Nigeria 1988 - After the constitution induced interregnum as established earlier, policy making in food at the federal resumed in 1987. The articulation of food policy was undertaken by the erstwhile Federal Agricultural Coordinating Unit (FACU). The document entitled “Food Policy for Nigeria 1988” was produced together with an accompanying implementation strategy, both under the auspices of NCA [20]. National Seed Policy 1992 - The national seed policy was articulated as part of a project for developing the seed sector under the technical support of FAO. This was not produced for mass publication as

separate reference material guiding the activities of stakeholders. Rather it exists in its original form inside some project documents. It also exists in its legal form and promulgated as a decree in 1992 for the establishment of the institutions for implementing it, namely National Seed Council and its organs. An attempt was made in 2003 towards reviewing the Seed Act which also warranted a limited revision of the national seed policy itself. The exercise has not been concluded to date. Nevertheless, the national seed policy is presently due for a more comprehensive review and re-articulation to reflect recent changes and developments in the global seed industry [19,20].

FOOD POLICY ARTICULATION

The policies in the present era are elaborated a little bit more, in terms of a short background in each case; followed by a highlight of the policy challenges or objectives and then by the policy directions or instruments [20,21].

RIGHT TO FOOD POLICY THRUST 2003

According to the Federal Republic of Nigeria, the original policy on agriculture of a general nature was articulated in 1987 under the auspices of the Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Water Resources and Rural Development, wherein the Federal Agricultural Coordinating Unit, Ibadan undertook the technical works involved. It was adopted by NCA together with a detailed formulation of the implementation strategy, and subsequently published as a quick reference material for use by stakeholders in the agricultural sector. It was this document that was revised in 2003 against the background of a new democratic government charting a new direction for agriculture [21,22]. Policy Challenges/Objectives - The major challenges include the following: disharmony between economic policies and food policies; inconsistencies and instability of macroeconomic policies; poor harassing and conservation of natural resources; poor state of rural infrastructure; poor funding of agriculture; lack of appropriate technology; inadequate availability of inputs; poor targeting of intended beneficiaries; weak agricultural extension; low capacity of organized farmers groups; ineffective control of pests and diseases; inadequate database; poor implementation. In light of these, the original policy was not re-articulated as such; rather it was revised with a view to putting a new thrust behind it [23].

Thus, the new policy thrust has broad objectives the attainment of self sustaining growth in all the subsectors of agriculture and the structural transformation necessary for the overall socio-economic development of the country as well as in the quality of life of Nigerians [23, 24]. Policy Directions/Instruments - The general direction of the new policy thrust is in terms of refocusing food policy through demand driven, needs-oriented, forward looking thrust for lifting Nigerian agriculture to new heights in meeting national needs and those of the West Africa sub-region. Towards this end the various policy instruments employed cover the aspect of: (i) Role definition for three tiers of government (federal, state and local governments); and, (ii) Agricultural improvement programmes (development activities; supportive activities; as well as service delivery activities) [25].



FOOD POLICY LEGISLATIONS, SOVEREIGNTY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

By legislated policies, mean those policies that have been promulgated in part or whole as decrees under the military, or enacted laws under the civil regime by appropriate legislative authorities. While it is not compulsory to pass formally approved policies of government into laws, the practice is sometimes desirable especially when the implementation of the policy borders on establishments matters such as creating statutory bodies or associated with imposition of punishments which are actionable in law courts. Policy legislation may also be required when lumpy budget burden are imposed by the articulation of such policies [14, 26].

Hereunder, according to Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources; Effiong a survey of such legislated policies is tabulated as they usually derive from parts or whole of policies that may or may not have been formally articulated.

INVENTORY OF RIGHT TO FOOD SOVEREIGNTY STRATEGIES IN NIGERIA

Sovereignty Strategy Formulations: This category refers to sovereignty strategies that their initiative or implementation dates back to the period before 1999 when the last agricultural and food administration under the military came to an end and the present civilian administration commenced [15,27]. Some of such strategies are described as: Commodity Boards - The commodity (marketing) boards where market intervention agencies established since the colonial era and which operated through the early post-independence period up to 1986 when they were collectively abolished at the outset of Structural Adjustment Programme in 1986. The sequence of establishments of these agencies is as follows: first generation boards (national) – Cocoa Marketing Board (1947), Palm Produce Marketing Board (1949), Groundnut Board (1949), and Cotton Marketing Board (1949); second generation boards (regional) – Western Nigeria Marketing Board (1954), Eastern Nigeria Marketing Board (1954), Northern Nigeria Marketing Board (1954), Mid-Western Nigeria Marketing Board (1963); third generation boards (national) – Nigerian Cocoa Board (Ibadan, 1976), Nigerian Groundnut Board (Kano, 1976), Nigeria Grain Board (Minna, 1976), Nigeria Cotton Board (Funtua, 1976), Nigeria Palm Produce Board (Calabar, 1976), Nigerian Rubber Board (Benin, 1976), Nigerian Roots and Tuber Board (Markudi, 1976) for the marketing of crops with economic advantage located in the regions [6, 17, 36].

A typical marketing or commodity board bought export produce at fixed prices after harvest and sold at a profit; but there was no provision for export restitution. In the case of food commodities, the board served only as buyer of last resort, also at fixed prices, and held strategic or buffer stock until the time of scarcity when it resold to the public. In this way, farmers were to be protected against drastic falls in price after harvest and pronounced fluctuations in prices in the world market. At the same time, consumers were to be



protected against abnormal food price increases during the period of scarcity. The series of boards also undertook commodity development programs as part of their functions and rights [28,29]. National Accelerated Food Production Project (NAFPP) - The NAFPP represents the first programming approach of the Federal Department of Agriculture when it was newly created in the early 1970s. The department initially embarked on "Accelerated Cereal Production" initiative towards increased food production, with initial emphasis on rice, maize, sorghum, millet, wheat and cassava. This initiative subsequently transformed into the NAFPP which employed the green revolution techniques to meet its objectives such as high-yielding seed varieties and fertilizers combined with extension and credit services, as well as adaptive research and staff training [30].

Under the project, technology transfer to the farm level involved pilot schemes, including "mini-kit" and "production kit" trial. A number of national crop centers were established at different locations (Ibadan for rice and maize; Sarnaru, Zaria for sorghum, millet and wheat; Umudike for cassava) with increased production advantage to undertake training of extension supervisors and farmers, on-farm trials and seed multiplication. In addition, a number of food crop production technology transfer stations were established to: (a) offer training courses, (b) conduct farmers' field days and adaptive research, (c) render on-farm extension services to farmers, and, (d) serve as improved seed extension centers and as zonal testing ground for new crop releases. National Livestock Development Project (NLDP) - The first National Livestock Development project was established in 1976 with a loan from the World Bank. Thus, the major policy instrument employed was expatriate capital to provide technical assistance and supervised credit to livestock producers. The main element include (a) establishment of large scale public breeding ranches; (b) establishment of medium scale private commercial ranches for breeding, and/or fattening, supported by the large scale ranches; (c) development of grazing reserves for producers; and (d) identifying and supporting a large number of small-holder fattening schemes with short term loans and providing essential supervisory technical services. The first phase of the project, which was completed in 1983, covered Bauchi, Borno, Gongola, Kaduna, Ondo, Ogun, arid Oyo state which focused on commercialization of beef cattle.

The second livestock development project took off in 1987, to cover the remaining states and other species of livestock.

Operation Feed the Nation (OFN): The OFN was launched in April 1976 and subsequently superseded the NAFFP and soon afterwards overshadowed it. A "Freedom from Hunger Campaign" was initially mounted with a view to sensitizing the public to the looming food problem in the early 1970s, to be transformed into a full-blown programme as OFN with a view to accelerating the solutions to the problem [31].

Green Revolution: The Green Revolution was the successor campaign to OFN following regime change from military to civilian in 1979. A food production plan was drawn up which

aimed at attaining self-sufficiency in food by 1985, and becoming a net exporter of food by 1987. The programme entailed massive distribution of fertilizer and other farm inputs.

Directorate of Food, Roads and Infrastructure (DFRRI): DFRRI was established in 1986 against the background of the slow pace of rural development in the country, following the launching of the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP). Thus, as a directorate in the presidency, the agency was charged with the responsibility for accelerated provision of rural infrastructure to complement the role of ADPs in terms of increased density of rural roads network, rural water supplies, rural electrification, among others. Originally the fund for DFRRI's activities was anchored on the proceeds expected from the newly liberalized, foreign exchange market wherein significant devaluation of the Naira incomes to the government as the main supplier of foreign exchange at that time. DFRPJ represented a massive injection of public funds into rural infrastructure provision through increased budget provisions – N360million (1986); N400million (1987); N500million (1988); N300million (1989) [32].

National Agricultural Land Development Authority (NALDA): The NALDA was establish initially in the presidency as an agency for providing services for stimulating development of land resources in several dimensions ranging from optimal size of production to proper soil types, exploitation of special environmental niches and ecological advantages, and other support services. Enclave-type projects were been established in all states of the country beginning with the ones located at Elebu in Kwara state, Agu Ukehe in Enugu State and Nbamgbe Ugambe in Benue State. NALDA adopted a 4-ha unit of land allocated to members of the community for cultivation to specified crop combinations with the support of the agency in terms of technical inputs such as farm machinery fertilizer and agrochemicals.

CONTINUING STRATEGIES FORMULATIONS AND SOVEREIGNTY

The government of Nigeria has carried on with a number of agricultural development strategies that had their roots and sovereignty from the past regimes. Some of these include; National Fedama Development Project (NEDP), National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategies (NEEDS), National, Special Programme on Food Security (NSPFS), Root and Tuber Expansion Programme (RTEP) among others which are to be briefly described in terms of their objectives, strategies and achievements.

National Fedama 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.

Objectives: The main objective of NFDP-1 was to sustainably increase the incomes of the Fadama agricultural production users through expansion of farm and non-farm activities with high value-added output (<http://www.fadama.or//>)



Strategies: The programme covered twelve states of Adamawa, Bauchi, Gombe, Imo, Kaduna, Kebbi, Lagos, Niger, Ogun, Oyo, Taraba including the Federal Capital Territory (FCT).

Approach: NFDLP 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 emphasis poverty reduction, private sector leadership and beneficiary participation (<http://www.fadama.org/>).

Achievements: Overall appraisal of the first and second phases of the project show remarkable success, hence the invention of the current third phase.

Problems: The problems 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 [33,52] while environmental impact assessment conducted on behalf of the NFDLP showed that the programme does not pose serious threat to the environment [34,51].

National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS)

NEEDS was initiated by Olusegun Obasanjo in 1999.

Objectives: The key elements of this development strategy included poverty eradication, employment generation, wealth creation and value orientation. 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 agriculture.

Strategies: 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.

Achievements: NEEDS/SEEDS has brought for cordial relationship between federal and state level planning. The plans enumerate strategic roles for the private sector in agriculture [4,35,53].

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 civilian regime of Olusegun Obasanjo.



Objectives: The broad objective of the programme was to increase food production and eliminate rural poverty.

Aims: Other specific aim 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 programme and projects [2, 36].

Setback: The 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 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.

Root and Tuber Expansion Programme (RTEP)

RTEP was launched on 16th April, 2013. It covers 26 states.

Objectives 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 groups. At the national level the programme is designed to achieve food security and stimulate demand for cheaper staple food such as cassava, garri, yam and potatoes as against more expensive carbohydrate such as rice Research and communication unit Government in Action [1,37].

Strategies: 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.

Achievements: RTEP succeeded in multiplying and introducing improved root and tuber varieties to about 350,000 farmers in each state in order to increase productivity and income [5,38].

GENERAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FOOD SOVEREIGNTY RIGHT

Most projects suffer some failures at implementation stage. Reasons for this are as follows according to FMAWR; Effiong & Aboh: Inadequate definition of goals - Most times the goals lack clarity, compatibility, where various goals are pursued, implementation is also complicated. Over ambitious goals - Doing many things without achieving any objectives. Lack of well-defined programme - In Nigeria, for example, specific actions aimed at



achieving policy goals and objectives are often not well articulated. Hence, implementation usually takes the form of trial and error. In some cases programme chosen may not be politically acceptable and politically attractive to the national policy decision. Cultural consideration - Cultural consideration hampers project implementation in many areas. Policies in some communities are difficult to implement due to the belief of the people. The people see it as a taboo or violation of their culture. Compromises - during implementation could be a problem; it could alter the basic goals. Policies could be formulated but at the implementation in order to favour some factions of the country changes its direction which tends to alter the sole aim of such projects.

POLITICAL OPPOSITION

This refers to the resistance of all sorts which manifest themselves from all groups of people or individuals during the implementation process. Here primordial interests often overcome the rational, practical process. Decision makers only think of themselves and their immediate families [7,39].

Lack of Continuity and Commitment: A situation where there has been a developed plan and stated in the plan like building of shopping complex. Leaders "1" might start the project only for leader "2" to come in and abandon the project.

Insufficient Capital to Handle Projects: For any project to be effectively implemented, the resources for its implementation must be adequately put in place, when money is not available at the right time it hinders implementation [10,40].

Social Economic Factor: This is one of the problems of policy implementation in Nigeria. Predatory elites in Nigeria go out to borrow but do not invest the money. They exploit and deplete the economy [41,48].

Inexperienced Implementers: I know it all dispositions.

Lack of data to follow up event [42,45,46,47].

Abuse of Contract Awards: In some cases, contracts are awarded to contractors who have connections, even when their estimates exceed those of others and their efficiency is in doubt. Some collect mobilization fees, misuse them and perform very poorly. In certain cases, bad jobs are approved by officials who bribed to do so. Also, because there is not rigid law to be invoked against any defaulting contractor than to terminate the contract agreement and re-award it to another contractor, the indiscriminate abuses by contractors tend to delay project execution and seriously affect plan, implementation and cost [43].

Corruption: The 2004 corruption perception index, released by Transparency International (TI) the watchdog on global corruption, rank Nigeria as the third most corrupt country in the world. In 2003, the organization ranked Nigeria second, one step improvement from the previous position as the most corrupt country in the world. Although



President Olusegun Obasanjo disputed the rating, many Nigerians agreed that it was correct. No doubt these unfortunate and corrupt practices affect project implementation as they occur at various stages of project execution [43,49,50].

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT

Right to Food Policy, Justice and Sovereignty implementation means money spent, laws enforced, employees hired, plan of action formulated and carried out successfully for the development of the Nigerian food sub-sector. But the problem with Nigerian food policies are the structure among which is the absence of central coordinating members. Nigeria has been having the problem of implementation of food policies. A lot of projects are not implemented. As pointed out in her food policy formulations. Nigeria is faced with the following problems: Lack of proper co-ordination, harmonization and control, Lack of focus, Lack of political will and Poor resource allocation.

The practical reality is that Nigerian framework exists only in principle.

Recently, Tinapa in Cross River State is not well managed, it has been sold to foreign firms, and this shows the problem of lack of continuity and not having the ability to continue the project left by the predecessors.

However, with the current efforts of government, the food policy, justice and sovereignty is bound to have tremendous improvements.

Table 1: Some Policy Legislations for Food and Agricultural Development in Nigeria

| S/N | Legislation | Provision |
|-----|---|---|
| 1. | Adulteration of produce Ordinance. No. 67 of 1917; 29 of 1920, 8 th November, 1917 | An ordinance to prohibit the adulteration and the export or dealing in for export of unclean or inferior produce. |
| 2. | The Quarantine Act. (No.18 pf 1926, 7 of 1929, LN. 131 of 1954) 27 ^o May 1926 | An act of provide for and regulate the imposition of quarantine and to make other provisions for preventing the introduction and spread in Nigeria and the transmission from Nigeria, of dangerous infectious diseases. |
| 3. | Agriculture Ordinance Bo. 37 of 1950; 5 th April, 1951 | An ordinance to make provisions for regulating the planting and growing of agricultural crops for the control of plant diseases and pests and for matters connected therewith. |
| 4. | Forestry Ordinance No. 38 of 1937; No. 47 of 1941; No. 5 of 1943; No. 28 of 1946 No.4 of 1947; No.16 of 1950, S. 244; and 6 th schedule 1 st February, 1938 | An ordinance for the preservation and control of forests. |
| 5. | Produce (Enforcement of Ex-point standard) Act. No. 21 of 10 December, 1959 | An act to make provision for the inspection of commodities for export from Nigeria at points of shipment for the purpose of enforcement of grades and standards of quality in, respect of such commodities and for matters incidental to the execution of powers conferred by this act. |
| 6. | Hides and skins Act. No.14 of 1942, LN 131 of 1954 and 52 of 1958 | An act to enable regulations to be made for maintaining and improving the quality of Nigeria Hides and skins and for regulating and controlling the trade and export of Hides and Skins. |
| 7. | Export Produces (Federal Powers) Act. No. 42 of 5 th October, 1961 | An act to convey sundry powers in relation to certain produce intended for export |
| 8. | Agricultural (Control of importation) Act. No.48 of 31 st March, 1964 | An act to make provision for regulating the importation of articles for the purpose of controlling plant diseases and pests. |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 9. | Live fish (Control of importation) Act No.29 of 1962 – 1 st February, 1965 | An act to regulate the importation of live fish and for purposes connected therewith. |
| 10. | International Institute for Tropical Agriculture Act. No. 32 of 196, No.45 of 1990. 24 th July, 1967 | An act of establish an international institute for Tropical Agriculture for the purpose of undertaking high Research into Tropical Agriculture and related matters. |
| 11. | Veterinary Surgeons Act No. 37 of 12. September, 1959 | An act to make provisions for the registration of Veterinary Surgeons and for matters connected there with. |
| 12. | Weights and Measurements Act No.32 of 1974. 10 th June, 1975 | An act of repeal the weights and measurements Act 1962 and re-enact that Act with additional provisions to facilitate the charge over to the Metric System. |
| 13. | Agricultural Credit Guarantee Scheme Fund Act No.20 of 8 th March, 1977 | An act to establish an Agricultural Credit Guarantee Scheme Fund into which shall he subscribed a certain sum to provide guarantee for loans granted for Agricultural purposes by any bank |
| 14. | Land Use Act. No.6 of 29 th March, 1978 | An act to vest all land comprised in the territory of each state (except land vested in the Federal Government or its Agencies). Solely is the Governor of the states, who would hold such land, in trust for the people and would henceforth be responsible for allocation of land in all urban areas to individual resident in the state and to organizations for residential, agricultural, commercial and other purposes which similar powers with respect to non urban areas as conferred on local governments. |
| 15. | Agricultural and Rural Management Training Institute Act. No.37 of 1 st February, 1980 | An act to establish a training organization know as the Agricultural and Rural Management Training Institute to provide among other things, detailed identification of management training needs in agricultural and rural development organizations throughout Nigeria and to develop and implement training programmes to meet the needs of Managers in |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| | | the Agricultural and Rural Development sector of the country. |
| 16. | River Basin Development Authorities Act. No.35 of 1 st October, 1986 | An act to repeal River Basins Development Authorities. Act 1979 and establish the River Basins Development Authorities listed under the first scheme to the act. |

Source: Adapted from Nigerian Ministry of Agriculture and Modified for this survey

REFERENCES

1. **Eyo EO** Agricultural Development in Nigeria. Plans, Policies and programmes. Best prints business press (printers and publishers) Aka Road, Uyo, Nigeria, 2005.
2. **Effiong JB** Challenges and Prospects of Rural Women in Agricultural Production in Nigeria. *Lwati: A Journal of Contemporary Research*. 2013; **10(2)**: 183-190.
3. **Aboh CL and JB Effiong** Assessment of indigenous weed management techniques utilized by cocoa farmers in Akamkpa, Cross River State, Nigeria. *European Journal of Scientific Research*. 2019; **154(1)**: 134-141.
4. **Effiong JB and CL Aboh** Effect of Agrochemicals on the health of farmers in Akpabuyo Local Government Area, Cross River State, Nigeria. *European Journal of Scientific Research*. 2019; **154(1)**: 142-147.
5. **Nwachuku I** Globalization and rural development programmes in Nigeria. In Nwachuku I and KI Ekwe. (ed) Globalization and Rural development in Nigeria. *Extension centre MOUAU*, 2018.
6. **Effiong JB, Aboh CL and CF Aya** Perception of farmers on the contribution of vegetables to livelihoods in Yakurr Local Government Area, Cross River State, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Pure and Applied Sciences*. 2021; **27(2)**: 85-91.
7. **Aboh CL and JB Effiong** Income diversifications among small-scale farmers in Boki Local Government Area, Cross River State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development*. 2018a; **21(2)**: 3833-3848.
8. **Aboh CL and JB Effiong** Level of Participation in Telferia production among women farmers in Esit Eket Local Government Area, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development*. 2018b; **21(2)**: 3839-3842.
9. **Ariyo A** Quality of Macroeconomic Data on Africa: Nigeria - A Case Study. African Economic Regional Conference Special Paper 22 African Economic Regional Conference Special Paper Nairobi, Kenya, 2011.
10. **Asiodu PC** National Economic Policy. Nigerian Financial Review. 2010; **10(6)**.
11. **Central Bank of Nigeria**. Economic and Financial Review CBN, Abuja, 2010; **30(5)**.
12. **Cringles MS** in Egonmwam Public Policy Analysis, Concept and Applications. Benin, Resyin (Nig.) Company, 2010; **1(1)**: 2-5.



13. **Effiong JB and AB Asikong** Mid-term Assessment of the activities of Fadama III Development Project in Cross River State, *Global Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2013; **12 (1)**: 31-35.
14. **Effiong JB and CL Aboh** Rubber Production Technological and the related Socio-economic environments in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2018; **17(1)**: 15-22.
15. **Effiong JB** Challenges and Prospect of Rural Women in Agricultural Production in Nigeria. *Lwati: A Journal of Contemporary Research*. 2013b; **10(2)**: 183-190.
16. **Effiong JB and CL Aboh** Perception of farmers on the use of pesticides and fertilizers on locally grown crops in Akpabuyo Local Government Area, Cross River State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development*. 2018b; **21(2)**: 3843-384.
17. **Effiong JB, Effiong GB and UA Udo** Socio-economic determinants of Production of pro-vitamin A cassava varieties by farmers in Etim Ekpo Local Government Area, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Pure and Applied Sciences*. 2015; **21(2)**: 105-111.
18. **Effiong JB and GB Effiong** Adoption of improved rubber production technologies by farmers in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2015; **14(1)**: 37-44.
19. **Effiong JB, Etuk EA and DA Iyamah** Perceived Determinants of oil spillage on agricultural lands in Ibeno Local Government Area, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. *African Journal of Food, Agriculture, Nutrition and Development*. 2023; **23(2)**: 22397 – 22409. <https://doi.org/10.18697/ajfand.117.22425>
20. **Effiong JB, Ijioma JC and MO Effiong** Endogenous determinants of adoption of improved rubber production technologies among farmers in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics and Sociology*. 2016; **8(4)**: 2-7.
21. **Ekong EE** Poverty and Rural Development in Nigeria; An Introduction to Rural Sociology. Dove Educational Publishers, Uyo Nigeria, 2010.
22. **Effiong JB and IO Eneniyi** Perceived knowledge of self care among farmers with diabetes at University of Uyo Teaching Hospital, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2023a; **22(1)**: 175-181

23. **Effiong JB and IO Enenyi** Practice of Diabetic self-care among with diabetic farmers in University of Calabar Teaching Hospital, Nigeria. *A Journal of Agriculture and Crops*. 2023b; **9(3)**: 302-308.
24. **Effiong JB and DA Iyamah** Analysis of Perceived causes of conflicts among yam farmers in Cross River State, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2022; **21(2)**: 141-146.
25. **Federal Ministry of Agricultural and Rural Development (FMARD)**. National Agricultural Policy (Revised), Abuja, 2011.
26. **Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources FMAWR**. Abuja, Nigeria, 2013.
27. **Federal Republic of Nigeria**. 1999 constitution of the Federal Republic of and fundamental rights, enforcement procedure and rules. Government press, 2008; 27-30.
28. **Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN)**. Agricultural Policy for Nigeria. Federal Ministry of Agriculture, and Rural Development Lagos, 2012
29. **Garba PK** An Analysis of the Implementation and Stability of Nigeria Agricultural Policies, 1970-1993, African Economic Regional Conference Research Paper. *African Economic Regional Conference*. Nairobi, 2009; **6(101)**: 3-6.
30. **Idachaba FS** Desirable and Workable Agricultural Policies for Nigeria, Ibadan University Press Ibadan, Nigeria, 2009.
31. **Ijioma JC, Effiong JB, Ogbonna MO and NO Okolie** Small scale farmers participation in cassava (*Manihot esculenta*) production in Osisioma Ngwa Local Government Area, Abia State, Nigeria. *Lwati: A Journal of Contemporary Research*. 2012; **9(4)**: 54-65.
32. **Ikpi A** Nigeria's Agriculture Sector Assessment; Issues of Technology Development Transfer. Report Prepared for the United States Agency for International Development, Rural Sector Strategy Study. *Technology Development and Transfer in Agriculture*. 2011.
33. **Jibowo AA and AO Ajayi** History of Agricultural Extension in Nigeria in Madukwe, M. C. (ed) *Agricultural Extension in Nigeria* (2nd ed), Agricultural Extension Society of Nigeria, Ilorin, 2011.
34. **Katz E** Financial Participation in Practice Berater Inner News 1/2002, 2002; 16-23.

35. **NCA.** National Council on Agriculture, Abuja, Nigeria, 2010
36. **Nneoyi IO, Ndifon HM, Angba AO, Effiong JB and OC Akinmosin** Impact of conflict on agricultural production in the Niger-Delta: Evidence from Cross River State, Nigeria. *A Journal of Food, Agriculture and Environment*. 2012; **10(1)**: 445 - 449.
37. **Obani P** Reflections on the right to food under the constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, Nigerian Current Law Review 2019/2020 University of Bradford. <https://ssm.com/abstract-4269469>. Accessed November 2023.
38. **Odezie VA** Current Monetary and Banking Policies in Nigeria and the Prospects in the Third Republic. Central Bank of Nigeria. *Economic and Financial Review*. 2011; **3(30)**: 130-143.
39. **Ogada MI** External Sector Policy Performance in the year 2010. Federal Budget National Center for Economic Development, 2010.
40. **Omokore DF** The Crises Facing the Nigerian Peasantry Since Independence, in Agbamu, J. U. (ed) Perspectives in Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, Spring Field, Owerri, 2009.
41. **Rival L** Sustainable Development through Policy Integration in Latin America. A comparative approach. 2012. <http://www.unrisd.org> Accessed September 2014.
42. **Umar S, Akpoko JG, Musa MW, Shuaibu H and LL Yakubu** Agricultural Development Policies and the Performance of Agricultural Extension Services in Nigeria; Lessons for the Agricultural Transformation Agenda: In Transforming Nigerian Agriculture through Agricultural extension conference proceedings of the 18th Annual National Conference, Agricultural Extension Society of Nigeria (5th – 9th May, 2013), 2013.
43. **NPC.** Nigerian National Population Commission, 2016.
44. **Worldometer.** <https://www.worldometers.info.nigeria>. Accessed January 18, 2024.
45. **Effiong JB and Aboh CL and CF Aya** perception of awareness of information and communication technologies among yam farmer in Ikom Africultural Zones, Cross River State, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2021; **20(1)**: 47-51.

46. **Effiong JB and CL Aboh** effectiveness of Agricultural Extension models in food crop production in Cross River State, Nigeria. *African Journal of Food, Agriculture, Nutrition and Development*. 2024; **24(3)**: 25871 – 25881.
<https://doi.org/10.18697/ajfand.128.24285>
47. **Aboh CL and JB Effiong** contribution of vegetable production to food security in Uruan Local Government Area, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. *Global of Pure and Applied Sciences*. 2019; **25(1)** 1-6.
48. **Aboh CL and JB Effiong** Adoption of different weed management techniques among cocoa farmers in Akamkpa Local Area, Cross river State, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Pure and Applied Science*. 2021; **25(1)**: 7-12.
49. **Effiong JB** Youth participation in community development; evidence from Yakuur Local Government Area, Cross River State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Science Tomorrow*. 2012; **1(6)**: 1-12.
50. **Nkang MO and JB Effiong** The influence of consumer's perception on pork and poultry meat consumption in Calabar South Local Government Area, Cross River State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Agricultural Science Research*. 2015; **4(5)** 86-91.
51. **Effiong JB** Assessment of the Effect of Conflicts on yam production farms in Cross River State. *Agricultural Science Digest*. 2023; **43(4)**: 536-539.
52. **Effiong JB, Enenyi IO and AE Etim** Perceived influence of Agricultural Extension on Cassava Production by the farmers in Southern Nigeria. *Agricultural science Digest*. 2023; **43(4)**: 883-888.
53. **Effiong JB** An analysis of Agricultural Livelihood activities prevalent among rural farmers in Itu Local Government Area, Akwa Ibom State. *African Journal of Agricultural Research and Development*. 2012; **5(3)**: 3-45.