

A Review of the Draft Federal Government of Nigeria's National Agriculture Investment Plan (NAIP2)

Sheryl L Hendriks

Background and Introduction

Dramatic change has been happening in Africa for at least the past decade. Agricultural transformation in Africa is leading to tangible impacts on economic growth, poverty reduction and reducing under nutrition. Much of the progress can be attributed to the revived focus on agriculture as a driver of inclusive economic growth through the Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP). The CAADP was initiated through the 2003 Maputo Declaration on Agriculture and Food Security in Africa (AU 2003), and sought to achieve Millennium Development Goal One (MDG-1) to halve the turn of the century levels of extreme poverty and hunger by 2015.

The main goal of the 2003 CAADP is to help African countries attain higher rates of inclusive economic growth through agriculture, forestry and fisheries sector-led development that eliminates hunger, reduces poverty, food insecurity, and malnutrition, and enables the expansion of agricultural exports. Despite some progress, the growth has been unequal and not sufficient to significantly reduce food insecurity, malnutrition, and poverty. What is more, according to a review of progress (AU/NEPAD 2016), it was realized that (i) increased growth was not only dependent on the proportion of income allocated to the agricultural sector; (ii) encouraging private sector investment and growing trade called for a favorable business environment that extended beyond the powers of the ministry of agriculture, and (iii) multi-sectoral intervention and coordination were required to simultaneously remove constraints and barriers to growth and create an enabling environment for transformation.

In 2014, the 23rd AU Assembly adopted the Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods.

Key points to consider:

It is essential that NAIPs:

- Establish the pathways to change and link these to impact indicators;
- Align and consider international, African and regional instruments and declarations as well as domestic priorities;
- Establish appropriate technical and political structures that avoid duplication and complexity; and
- Ensure that clear coordination, supervision, monitoring, evaluation and reporting structures and frameworks are set out in a coherent and integrated manner.

Key messages regarding the zero draft of the Nigeria NAIP2:

- There is a disconnect between the APP, Agriculture Food and Nutrition Security Strategy and the NAIP2.
- The zero draft NAIP2 is intended to be the implementation plan for the APP. The Agriculture Food and Nutrition Security Strategy is intended to be the food security pillar of the APP but is not included in the design of the NAIP2.
- The conceptual framework, governance and implementation modalities and monitoring and evaluation sections would benefit from significant revision to align these with internal purposes and to the Malabo commitments and indicators.
- Benchmarks, pathways to change and appropriate indicators for monitoring and achieving progress on the Malabo commitments are missing.
- The elements on food security, nutrition, and gender are inadequate to achieve the CAADP Malabo commitments and contribute to the achievement of the ERGP and the APP.



The enhanced 2014 Malabo Declaration reaffirms the central commitments of the 2003 Maputo Declaration, but shifts away from the single-sector scope of the 2003 Maputo CAADP. This 2014 Malabo-focused CAADP approach pays attention to irrigation, mechanization and post-harvest losses and waste, while including areas of infrastructure, natural resources, land tenure, trade and nutrition elements that go beyond the mandate of the Ministry of Agriculture. Rather, the Malabo-aligned country-specific NAIPs provide a prioritized set of strategic agriculture, food security, and nutrition-centered initiatives as part of, and within the framework of, a nation's broader economic and social development agenda.

Since the 2003 Maputo Declaration, the execution of CAADP's evidence-based planning and implementation focus has brought technical credibility to African development processes, both at the continental and country level, instilling greater confidence from public, private and international investors and leading to more targeted actions. The CAADP process involves (i) stock taking of the current policies and programmes in the country, and (ii) an analysis of the trends with regard to development, whilst (iii) identifying future growth opportunities that will help the country achieve both the CAADP and the nationally defined targets, and then determining the basket of interventions to achieve these. In this way, the second generation (2014+) Malabo-aligned NAIPs provide the vehicle to link national development frameworks to multi-sectoral action to:

- (i) Further the commitment to the CAADP process;
- (ii) Increase investment finance in agriculture, forestry and fisheries;
- (iii) End hunger, improve food security and reduce malnutrition;
- (iv) Eradicate poverty through agriculture;
- (v) Increase intra-African trade in agriculture commodities and services;
- (vi) Improve resilience to climate variability; and
- (vii) Enforce mutual accountability for actions and results.

The Purpose of This Analysis

The Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Food Security Policy (FSP) seeks to conduct food security policy analysis and provide support to government policy and related reforms. This includes identifying a range of possible improvements with regard to agriculture, food security, and nutrition policies as well as to the design of the CAADP NAIPs. This support is intended to increase the probability that countries will be in a position to

deliver fully on (i) the food security and nutrition (FSN)-related commitments flowing from the 2014 AU Malabo Declarations¹ and the Sustainable Development Goals (hereinafter SDGs), and (ii) key FSN-related international, African, regional and the Federal Government of Nigeria's domestic policy, obligations and commitments.

Within this context, a team has developed (i) a methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of development planning in terms of the alignment and linkages of (a) international, African and regional commitments and (b) national transversal development imperatives, (ii) a second methodology for assessing the quality of the NAIPs in attaining the Malabo and SDG2 targets related to food security and nutrition, and (iii) a third methodology for assessing the gender equality components against commitments.

It is against this framework that the zero draft of the Federal Government of Nigeria's NAIP2 (FMARD 2017a) for the implementation of the Nigerian Agriculture Promotion Policy (APP) or the *Green Alternative* (FMARD 2017b) for 2017 - 2020 was reviewed. The spirit in which the review is conducted and the purpose of this brief is to provide an independent assessment of the NAIP from the perspective of food security and nutrition to assist the country team in finalizing the NAIP2.

This policy brief reports on the findings of the review in order to provide (i) focused inputs into the finalization of the NAIP2, (ii) insight and lessons for other countries engaged in the design of their second CAADP NAIPs, and (iii) a framework for the application of the above-mentioned evaluation methodology in Nigeria and other countries in Africa. The policy brief is set out in four sections covering four areas: (i) the conceptual framework; (ii) content and programmatic areas; (iii) governance and implementation modalities; and (iv) monitoring and evaluation elements.

Overview of Nigeria's Zero Draft NAIP2

The 2017 - 2020 NAIP2 (17 August 2017) is the implementation plan for the 2016 - 2020 Agriculture Promotion Plan (APP) (FMARD 2017a). It replaces the 2011 - 2014 National Agriculture Investment Plan (FMARD 2010). The NAIP presents a strategy for the implementation of the APP.

¹ This includes the Malabo Declaration on Nutrition Security for Inclusive Economic Growth and Sustainable Development. <http://www.g20ys.org/upload/auto/f20d5372b44d38f099213d39bad3d251f90369dc.pdf>

The Agriculture Promotion Policy (APP) or Green Alternative focuses on achieving food security, import substitution, job creation, and economic diversification. The APP sets out to harness and deploy human and material resources to implement, review and consolidate existing objectives and strategies related to:

- Having a virile Breeder Foundation and certified seed regeneration system;
- Promoting the leasing of silos, agro-processing centres, farmers market and agro-industrial estates in the country to improve storage and agro processing facilities;
- Establishing a Cotton Corporation of Nigeria to expand output in the cotton, textile and garments sector;
- Reinforcing the National Programme on Grazing Reserves and Stock Routes to prevent pastoralists-farmers conflicts; and
- Re-activating the existing Agricultural Development Programmes (ADPs) for effectiveness at the grassroots Agricultural Extension Services.

The NAIP consists of three key programmes framed in line with the APP, namely:

- Product enhancement;
- Private investment; and
- Institutional realignment.

Each programme has sub-programmes that “further comprise of sub-sectorally aligned projects” (FMARD, 2017). The sub-programmes are:

- Comprehensive livestock development;
- Input transformation;
- Expanded access to finance and markets;
- Value addition and processing support;
- Agricultural water management;
- Agricultural research and innovation;
- Agricultural manpower development;
- Produce and commodity storage systems;
- Commercial agriculture expansion support; and
- Nutrition, quality control and standardization.

In addition, a number of thrusts are identified. These include:

- Agriculture as a business;
- Agriculture as a key to long-term growth;
- Food as a human right; and
- Value chain approach.

Assessment of the Policy Framework

Significant policy reform has occurred in Nigeria under the Agricultural Transformation Agenda in the period 2011 – 2015. A list of these reforms is provided in the NAIP2. The APP includes a detailed list of future policy reforms. This impressive list includes many elements relevant to food security and nutrition but strangely enough does not mention specific steps taken with regard to food security and nutrition despite this being one of the key pillars of the APP and a goal of the NAIP2.

While mention is made of the Sustainable Development Goals, there is very little alignment with the Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods and broader international, African, regional and Nigerian national priorities and commitments. In addition, the zero draft lacks a sound theory of change that should set out the pathways to the changes necessary to achieve these commitments. Many of the selected indicators are inadequate and do not include impact indicators (see the section on this later in the brief).

The binding obligations of key UN and African Union treaties and protocols are not discussed, such as the:

- UN 1948 Universal Declaration on Human Rights;
- UN 1966 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;
- UN 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women;
- UN 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child;
- AU 1981 African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights;
- AU 1990 African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child; and
- AU 2003 Protocol to the ACHPR on the Rights of Women in Africa.

Other key international and African non-binding declarations creating commitments that are not discussed include, but are not limited to:

- WHO 2014 Comprehensive Implementation Plan on Maternal, Infant and Young Child Nutrition;
- WHO 2012 Global Nutrition Goals;
- FAO WHO 2014 Rome Declaration on Nutrition and the Framework for Action;
- UN GA 2015 Resolution – The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development;
- UN 2016 UN Decade of Action on Nutrition 2016-2025 – Work Programme;

- AU 2015 Africa Regional Nutrition Strategy 2015-2025;
- AU 2014 Agenda 2063;
- AU 2015 Agenda 2063 – First Ten Years Implementation Plan 2014-2023;
- AU 2015 NEPAD CAADP Results Framework 2015-2025; and
- AU 2016 NEPAD CAADP Implementation Guidelines under the Malabo Declaration.

- National Policy on Non-Communicable Diseases;
- National Policy on Gender Mainstreaming;
- National Policy on Security;
- National Policy on Food Safety and its Implementation Strategy; and
- National Policy on Adolescent Health and Development in Nigeria.

In a similar vein, there is no detailed discussion of the existence or not of provisions relating to hunger, food and nutrition in regional (ECOWAS) instruments or the Constitution.

The introductory part of the NAIP indicates that the following policy measures have been put in place to stimulate and sustain development in the agricultural sector and to integrally promote commodity value chain activities for increased food production, expanded agribusiness undertakings and enhanced chain operators’:

- National Programme on Food Security [NDFS];
- National Programme for Agriculture and Food Security [NPAFS];
- National Fadama Development Projects [NFDPP]; and
- National Strategic Food Reserve Programme [NSFRP].

The NAIP’s overview of sector-specific policies is incomplete, neglecting, for example, policies related to the environment, disaster management and water and sanitation, to name but a few.

Notable is that the NAIP2 makes no mention of the 2016 National Policy on Food and Nutrition in Nigeria (MNFN 2016). This policy document recognizes a far richer policy context, listing many more existing policies and strategies to address the nutrition perspectives of their mandates in Nigeria. These documents include:

- The National Health Policy and Guidelines;
- The National Agricultural Policy;
- The Agricultural Transformation Agenda;
- Science, Technology, and Innovation Policy;
- National Policy on Education;
- National Policy on School Health;
- National Policy on Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF);
- Early Child Care and Development;
- National Population Policy;
- National Policy on HIV/AIDS and Orphan and Vulnerable Children;

Curiously, no mention made of the 2016 National Policy on Food and Nutrition (NPFN) in Nigeria nor the May 2017 Agricultural Sector Food Security and Nutrition Strategy for 2016 – 2025 (referred to as Agriculture FSN Strategy from here on). The NAIP2 only lists nutrition, quality control and standardization one of eight sub-programmes.

The 2016 NPFN provides the framework for addressing the problems of food and nutrition insecurity in Nigeria. The Agriculture FSN Strategy is meant to be the nutrition component of Agricultural Policy and the agricultural sector component of National Policy on Food and Nutrition. The Agriculture FSN Strategy seeks to operationalize one of the pillars of the ERGP and the APP or the Green Alternative and is the implementation strategy of the NPFN. The Strategy is meant to guide the identification, design, and implementation of intervention activities across different relevant sectors. It (correctly) recognizes that nutrition is a multi-sectoral and multidisciplinary issue involving various sectors including health, agriculture, science and technology, education, trade, economy and industry. It presents recommendations for making agriculture nutrition-sensitive and provides guidance on how to incorporate these into agriculture sector programming across the food system to improve diets and health (MNFN 2016).

The Agriculture FSN Strategy identifies eight priority areas. The first four incorporate nutrition into agriculture and food system programming. The second four priorities focus on creating an enabling environment for planning and implementing nutrition-sensitive actions.

- Enhance value chains for improved nutrition.
- Diversify household food production and consumption, especially targeting women, and increase access to micronutrient rich foods.
- Improve food safety along the value chain.
- Build resilience and social protection nets through food and nutrition systems for vulnerable groups - households without resilience to shocks periodically lack access to food and do not have stability of food supply.

- v. Promote nutrition research and information systems.
- vi. Improve the agricultural sector capacity to address food security and nutrition problems.
- vii. Nutrition education, social marketing, behavior change communication, and advocacy.
- viii. Nutrition surveillance and monitoring and evaluation.

The Agriculture FSN Strategy especially targets women of child bearing age, children 6 – 59 months old, school-aged children and internally displaced persons, recognizing that undernutrition is disproportionately higher in the North West and North East zones. It adopts a food systems perspective. The latter being innovative and seldom seen in the draft NAIP2s.

Assessment of the Content and Programmatic Areas

The content of the NAIP misses many opportunities to fulfill the aspirations of the ERGP, APP, and the Agriculture FSN Strategy. The thrusts set out in the NAIP could be significantly strengthened to achieve these broader objectives. Due to the misalignment of the NAIP with the APP (including a strong focus on nutrition), the programmes are weak in addressing food security and nutrition. Attention to food security is focused on staple crops. These are of value for energy and carbohydrate intake but not contributing much to improving the dietary diversity and nutritional value of food intake in general. While tomatoes are targeted for export markets but along with other nutritious fruit and vegetables, such crops could have significant income potential for households and improve nutrition.

The objectives of improving productivity and reducing post-harvest losses are well aligned with CAADP Malabo objectives and essential for reducing food insecurity and improving nutrition. The focus on increasing exports could be balanced in terms of ensuring that some of the most nutritious food products (such as horticultural crops) are available at affordable process in local markets across the country.

The lever on storage systems focus on the storage of grains. While this is essential for national food security in terms of the provision of adequate energy, broader attention is needed at the community level to ensure local availability of grain and finding ways of helping communities take responsible actions for food security. In addition, a broader perspective on storage solutions across the range of value chains and across the food system is recommended.

The section focusing on Level 2.1 – youth and women (termed gender mainstreaming) is poorly drafted and requires significant attention to make sure that the intent and the outcome is indeed gender mainstreaming to support the country’s delivery on commitments related to the Beijing Platform for Action. Indeed, the section focusses on women and not on gender mainstreaming. Targeting women does not constitute actions on gender mainstreaming. Gender mainstreaming focuses on actions that bring about greater equity and inclusion where past policies have led to exclusion and marginalization. Given that Nigeria has a policy on gender mainstreaming, this needs to be consulted and appropriate actions included in the NAIP.

Addressing issues related to youth and women will require system-wide reform and programming that addresses their multiple needs. For example, one way of empowering women’s engagement in lucrative agricultural enterprises is to address the labour burdens and child care responsibilities that limit their time and drain energy. There are many technologies that can reduce the demands on women such as the availability of water, affordable and clean energy supplies, mechanization, and services such as child care facilities.

Lever 6 on food, consumption, and nutrition is the very last lever presented in the NAIP2. While this section acknowledges the challenges facing Nigeria in terms of under nutrition, micronutrient deficiencies and overweight, obesity and diabetes, the NAIP2 does not adequately address these issues. Yet, the Agriculture FSN Strategy provides a clear plan for these elements.

For example, the section on research and innovation misses a strategic opportunity to focus on more nutritious crops and some of the crucial bottlenecks to unlocking the potential of agriculture and food system transformation to improve food security. Incentivizing research and innovation to unlock this potential could have significant benefits for the country.

Section on lever 6 does not provide the details of how the trust will be achieved. For example, how will the enhancing of quality of foods by proper use of agrochemicals, quality control and testing be implemented? How will encouraging tighter linkages in the supply chain policies of supermarkets and regional farm centers’ be implemented, incentivized, and measured?

It is important for the quality of food provided in feeding schemes (schools, etc.) to be managed and strict standards for the composition, nutritional value, and

safety of such meals to be provided and enforced. Simply counting how many children participate in meal programmes will not disclose the diversity, quality, or quantity of these meals. If these are not adequate, they will not contribute to the health and well-being of the children and may possibly only stave off hunger without providing essential nutrients.

No mention is made of the fourth element of the Agriculture FNS Strategy, namely building resilience and social protection nets through food and nutrition systems for vulnerable groups - households without resilience to shocks periodically lack access to food and do not have stability of food supply. This is an essential consideration for protecting those most at risk of food insecurity and those marginalized by society as well as in the conflict zones in the country.

Given the solid framework for action in the Agriculture FSN Strategy and the NPFN, this section is particularly weak and presents a simple list of things to 'encourage'. Given the pressing need to address nutritional issues in Nigeria, it is strongly recommended that the Agriculture FSN Strategy be integrated into the NAIP as a vital part of the APP.

Governance and Implementation Modalities

The governance and manage structure of the NAIP is excessively complicated and divorced from the management and accountability structures of the Agriculture FSN Strategy. While the FMARD will coordinate the NAIP, the Agriculture FSN Strategy is governed through multiple institutional avenues for the coordination of nutrition interventions. No indication of how the APP will be managed and administrated is found in the June 2016 document.

FMARD will coordinate the State ministries and other stakeholders. The zero draft of the NAIP2 acknowledges that the coordination and delivery on agriculture activities has not always been smooth nor have the desired results been attained. Therefore, these arrangements will need to be agreed on at the annual meetings of the National Council on Agriculture (NCA). The role of the NCA is not elaborated in the NAIP.

A detailed discussion of governance, leadership, and institutional architecture is set out in the NAIP, including the role of the:

- The President will provide leadership for the subsector and take far reaching decisions based on the recommendation of the Governing Board when required.

A NAIP Governing Board responsible for coordinating the affairs of various MDA's (Ministries, Departments and Agencies) in relation to agriculture as well as development partners, NGO's, CBO's, Farmers Group/Associations and the private sectors. This Board is headed by FMARD HMA and HMS. The acronyms for HMA and HMS are not defined in the document. The members include the HMA of finance, Minister of Budget and National Planning, Minister of Water Resources, Minister of Trade and Investment.

- A NAIP Advisory Council that advises the Governing Council on policies that can strengthen the sector through the National Council on Agriculture and Rural Development. This includes the HMA, HMS, Permanent Secretary and the State Commissioners for Agriculture as well as the Federal Capital Territory Secretary of Agriculture.
- A Central Coordinating Committee responsible for the implementation of the NAIP framework. This includes the Permanent Secretary, the Federal and Regional and State Directors of FMARD and the Heads of FMARD Parastatals and Agencies They also advise the Advisory Committee as appropriate.
- An Independent Committee that monitor and evaluate the implementation of the NAIP process, comprising members of the National Assembly, Development Partners, NGO's, CBO's, Farmers Group/Associations and the private sectors.

The Agriculture FSN Strategy, reportedly the nutrition component of the APP, has the following governance structure:

- i. A National Council on Nutrition (NCN) was established in May 2007. The NCFN (see ii below) is recognized as the technical arm of the NCN (MBNP 2016). This is the highest decision-making body on food security and nutrition in Nigeria and is chaired by the Vice-President. The MBNP serves at the secretariat for this Council as well as the NCFN (see ii below).
- ii. The National Committee on Food and Nutrition (NCFN) coordinates cross-sectoral activities from MBNP. The NCFN is situated in the Ministry of Budget and National Planning² (MBNP) and is responsible for policies, programmes and coordination of the NPFN (MBNP 2016). It has multisectoral membership.
- iii. This structure is replicated at State and Local Government.
- iv. The FMARD has established an inter-ministerial Agriculture Nutrition Working Group to support

² Formerly the National Planning Commission

the newly established Nutrition and Food Safety Division of FMARD. This group coordinates nutrition actions through the agricultural sector through the Nutrition and Food Safety Division (FMARD 2017c)

Yet, as the national agency responsible for programme implementation, the FMARD is responsible for the management and delivery of the NAIP2.

Some serious deliberation is necessary to integrate the objectives of the Agriculture FSN Strategy into the NAIP2 as envisaged in the NPFN and the governance structures simplified and streamlined. Appropriate Ministries should be responsible for implementation and accountability structures needs to be streamlined within existing structures rather than duplicating efforts.

No mention is made at all of the role and responsibilities of the Ministry of Health that should assume direct responsibility for health-related actions within the Agriculture FSN Strategy and the NAIP.

Assessment of the Monitoring and Evaluation Elements

The list of indicators for the NAIP2 does not go beyond outcomes and outputs to include impact indicators. Their focus is on staple crops and self-sufficiency rather than achieving the admirable goals of the NPFN and the Agriculture FSN Strategy that are more nutrition-focused.

While addressing the issues of the right to food and ensuring national food reserves are able to stabilize food prices and provide food in times of need, food security goes beyond merely ensuring adequate supply of staple grains and tubers. The nutrition issues outlined in the Agriculture FSN Strategy will only be addressed by diversifying the food system and ensuring adequate access to year-round supplies of diverse foods to meet individual food requirements throughout the human life cycle. The monitoring and evaluation frameworks of NAIPs need to reiterate this by including appropriate indicators that align with international commitments, the CAADP Results Framework, and national goals.

Likewise, the Agriculture FSN Strategy contains a results framework (page 26) with appropriate objectives, the indicators and targets are primarily outcome and output level and do not stretch the achievements to deliver an impact. The targets are detailed in the tables in the Agriculture FSN Strategy presented from page 37 ff. The targets do not include indicators that align with the Malabo CAADP targets and the indicators contained in

the Biennial Review. This is a missed opportunity and consideration should be given to adjusting the indicators to align with the country's commitments to Malabo, Agenda 2063 and the SGD goals.

The Malabo Declaration on Nutrition Security through Inclusive Economic Growth and Sustainable Development in Africa targets align with the World Health Assembly commitments of 2011 and have been adopted by the CAADP Malabo. These include:

- i. Ending hunger by 2025;
- ii. Ending child stunting and bringing down stunting to 10 % and underweight to 5% by 2025; and
- iii. Continuing dialogue and strengthening advocacy in support of improved nutrition.

Both the 2014 CAADP Malabo commitments and the 2016 CAADP Results Framework include these targets for wasting and underweight, as well as the Minimum Adequate Diet for Infants and the Women's Dietary Diversity Score as indicators and targets. The CAADP Results Framework also includes indicators for the proportion of population that is undernourished. The only direct food security indicator included in the SDGs is the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)—a composite indicator of food security.

The indicators for food processing are inadequate to drive accountability of the public and private sector to ensuring impact. The indicators for this should include elements to monitor the engagement of local communities in enterprises in this part of the food system as well as job creation capacities. Food safety standards and achieving these should be included in this section. The number of energy sources and alternatives will not monitor whether the solutions are reaching local communities and facilitating value chain development and job creation. Likewise, the marketing and trade indicators should reflect the affordability of nutritious foods at the community level and shifts in diet to more nutritious foods.

The only indicator provided to monitor mechanization is the number of tractors. More thought is needed to shift these input indicators to impact indicators aligned with the aspirations of the CAADP Malabo Declaration. How the efficiency and safety in the use of agrochemicals will be determined and measured is not clear. Simply counting the number of youth and women trained annually and the increase in entrepreneurs will not indicate changes in inclusive societies and gender mainstreaming. Unless deliberate policy and programme steps are taken to address past inequalities and the deliberate exclusion of

women in particular. Indicators are necessary that align with the gender mainstreaming policy.

Likewise, the indicators for lever 6 on food security and nutrition are inadequate. The section does not provide baselines from which to measure progress and does not set specific targets to achieve. The target for food reserves is reported as a percentage of stored food for emergencies. Having food is one element, having efficient systems to monitor food insecurity and emergencies, identifying those at risk and responding in a timely way to avert disaster are all elements that need to be monitored and evaluated. So too, the quality of grain stored and compliance with safety measures is essential.

A comment is made above regarding the indicator for school feeding programmes. The indicators of monitoring the delivery of health diet initiatives is not adequate. No mention is made of how the reduction in unhealthy diets will be measured and monitored and how attribution will be determined. A target is not provided for other essential nutrition indicators except for obesity. This is necessary to comply with the Malabo commitments.

The Nigerian NAIP should include at least the core CAADP indicators and interim targets for the year 2020 (the period of the APP). In addition, the nutrition related indicators from the Agriculture FSN Strategy could be considered to create synergy and conserve resources in collecting, monitoring and evaluating progress on various initiatives.

Conclusions and Recommendations

While stronger in terms of the agricultural elements of the plan, the zero draft of the Nigerian NAIP2 misses essential elements related to the achievement of food security and nutrition goals set out in the domestic policies of the country and the CAADP Malabo commitments. If, as intended, the Agriculture Food and Nutrition Security Strategy is integrated into the NAIP2 along with a streamlined and coordinated oversight system, the plan would be far stronger.

This research is made possible by the generous support of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) under the Feed the Future initiative. The contents are the responsibility of the study authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government or the University of Pretoria.

Copyright © 2018 University of Pretoria and Michigan State University and the International Food Policy Research Institute. All rights reserved. This material may be reproduced for personal and not-for-profit use without permission from but with acknowledgement to the University of Pretoria and Michigan State University.

Published by the Department of Agricultural, Food, and Resource Economics, Michigan State University, Justin S. Morrill Hall of Agriculture, 446 West Circle Dr., Room 202, East Lansing, Michigan 48824.

REFERENCES

- AU (African Union). 2003. Maputo Declaration on Agriculture and Food Security in Africa” (Assembly/AU/Decl. 7(II)). AU, Addis Ababa.
- AU (African Union). 2014. Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods. AU, Addis Ababa, 2014.
http://pages.au.int/sites/default/files/Malabo%20Declaration%202014_11%2026-.pdf.
- FMARD (Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development). 2010. National Agricultural Investment Plan (NAIP) 2011-2014. FMARD, Abuja. MBNP (Ministry of Budget and National Planning). 2016. National Policy on Food and Nutrition in Nigeria. MBNP: Abuja.
- FMARD (Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development). 2017a. National Agriculture Investment Plan (NAIP)-2 for the Implementation of the Nigerian Agriculture Promotion Policy (APP) *The Green Alternative*, 2017-2020. Zero Draft. Abuja: FMARD.
- FMARD (Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development). 2017b. The Agriculture Promotion Policy (2016 – 2020): Building on the Successes of the ATA, Closing Key Gaps. Policy and Strategy Document. Abuja: FMARD.
- FMARD (Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development). 2017c. Agricultural Sector Food Security and Nutrition Strategy 2016 – 2025. (Nutrition Component of Agricultural Policy; Agricultural Sector Component of National Policy on Food and Nutrition). Abuja: FMARD.

Sheryl L Hendriks is Director of IFNuW and Professor in the Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development, University of Pretoria.
E-mail: sheryl.hendriks@up.ac.za.

Also published by the Institute for Food, Nutrition and Well-being, PBagX20, Hatfield, 0028, Pretoria, South Africa.