



How well do NEEDS and NPIRD Hang together? – An Essay on Policy Coherence

Ihebuzor, A. Noel

UNICEF Tanzania, Oyster bay, PO Box 4076, Oyster Bay, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

Ukaejiofo, U. Rex

Department of Rural Development & Management, China Agricultural University, Beijing

Introduction

Nigeria is awash with sector development policies. Virtually every sector of national life – culture, arts, language, environment, education, agriculture, water and sanitation – has its own policy document. A rural development policy, The Nigeria Policy on Integrated Rural Development (NPIRD, for short) also exists. Standing at the apex of all of these, is the national Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP), the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS, for short), which ideally, should integrate the broad strategic thrusts and orientations of these policies into one coherent national development policy. This study seeks to examine the level of

coherence that exists between this apex policy NEEDS and NPIRD, Nigeria rural development policy.

The paper looks at how well these two policies (NEEDS and NPIRD) hang together. The specific study objectives are as follows:

1. To examine the areas and extent of coherence between NEEDS and NPIRD;
2. To identify those instances, if any, where NEEDS and NPIRD diverge and attempt to explain why this has happened; and
3. To draw out lessons for the policy coherence on the basis of the findings in 1 and 2 above.

Such a study into policy coherence is important since finding from it could lead to a better understanding of why and how policies align and the contributory factors to such a felicitous condition. In the case of divergence the study could also shed some light on the causes of such

Corresponding author details:

R.U. Ukaejiofo

Email: rukaejiofo@gmail.com

misalignment/incoherence and thus provide some basis for corrective measures for achieving greater harmony, consistency and coherence across development policies. The essay is predicated on the framework that coherence and alignment lead to synergies and policy effectiveness.

The essay is structured as follows: Section 1 gives an overall study, presenting its aims and objectives. Section 2 presents a review of the relevant literature and will demonstrate theoretical support for policy coherence and a research 'gap' in the area. Section 3 introduces NEEDS and NIRPD and highlights their contexts and features. Section 4 then builds on this and reviews the two policies for coherence and alignment in the areas of goals, objectives, assumptions, strategies and implementation arrangements and discusses findings. Section 5, the concluding section brings together all the observations from the study and ends with recommendations on ways to improve policy coherence

Literature Review

Scholarship on the policy process is an area rich with debate and continues to grow given the centrality of public policy in shaping governance and affecting lives. The core elements of literature in this area centre on the following issues – how are policy decisions made (Smith & May, 1980), what factors impinge on and dominate the policy making process (Kingdom, 1984), the role of constituencies and networks in policy formulation, the contexts in which policies

are borrowed and/or adapted to fit new environments or time periods, the factors that determine the implementation of policies (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1999) and finally criteria for evaluating policies (Parsons, 1995; Hudson & Lowe, 2004). Concepts such as incrementalism, rationalism, muddling through, models of policy formulation, agenda setting, policy implementation, policy coalition networks and constituencies, problem/policy and political streams continue to animate the debate and scholarship in this field. Noticeable by its relative neglect is the issue of policy coherence, an issue that one would have expected to engage the attention policy scholars given the need for different policies within and across sectors to cohere in the interest of policy effectiveness and efficiency. It is instructive to note that policy coherence is not mentioned in any of Parsons (1995), Hudson & Lowe (2004), Dolowitz & Marsh (2000), Rose (2001) nor in Sabatier (1991) where he sketches the essentials of a better understanding of the policy process. May *et al.* 2006 regret that this area of policy scholarship is under-theorized and has also received very little empirical attention. It may be useful to speculate why this is so. Can one infer from this relative neglect that policy coherence is not seen as a veritable problem for policy scholars? Or could this be due to conceptual and definitional difficulties that have delayed the take off of scholarship in this area?

According to “May *et al.* (2006), Policy coherence is an elusive concept that is easily understood but difficult to measure. In

common parlance, coherence implies that various policies go together because they share a set of ideas or objectives. This commonality in provisions and goals illustrates a high degree of coherence". They however observe that "policy coherence is a relative term for which there can be differing degrees of the attribute" p382. Matters are not helped by the polysemy in the term "policy coherence". As Duraiappah & Bhardwaj (2007) observe, policy coherence is often "synonymous with terms such as coherent policy-making, policy co-ordination, policy integration, holistic government and joined-up government coherence" pp2-3. However the definition below offers an initial opportunity for clarity. "Policy coherence for development is a process whereby a government, in pursuing its domestic policy objectives, makes an effort to design policies that, at a minimum, avoid a negative spill over which would adversely affect the development prospects of poor countries and, more positively, seek to maximize synergies" (Matthews and Giblin, 2006, p3). The OECD offers a working definition of coherence as efforts 'to ensure that the objectives and results of a government's development policies are not undermined by other policies of that same government which impact on the development countries, and that these other policies support development objectives, where feasible' (EU 2006, p15). These two definitions of policy coherence have tended to see it from the point of view of external development assistance targeted at developing countries. Such a conception of coherence is too narrow. There is also the

notion of coherence which focuses on how well policies within and across a sector are in harmony and are mutually reinforcing. Forster and Stokke (1999; 23) observe that "a coherent policy as one whose objectives, within a given policy framework, are internally consistent and attuned to objectives pursued in other policy frameworks of the system". Its objectives should also be in harmony with the goals, intentions or motives of other related policies. This definition of policy coherence stress synergies, mutual consistency, mutual reinforcement and minimization of negative spill-overs (GDI, 2002). May *et al.* (2006) underscores the important role of commonality of issues, interest and shared integrative properties in furthering policy coherence observing that it is weakened when the variety of interests and issues which make up a policy area are dissonant and acting in opposing directions. Conversely coherence is more likely to occur when they act in harmonious fashions. As they also correctly note, consistency of policy goals can be a strong factor framing policy coherence at downstream levels. Policy incoherence has the reverse effect and its sources are rooted in four related causes (GDI, 2002). These are divergent political interests, different areas of responsibility at national and international levels, deficiencies in the organization of decision-making on policy, information deficits, and complexity of the development process. Sometimes too, policy incoherence is not always the product of a clash or divergence of interests. Rather it could also reflect failures to link policies during the stage of formulation or failure to

fully anticipate all potential policy outcomes at this stage (Muskens *et al.* 2007). Such a view suggests that incoherence could result from piece-meal incrementalism that did not have an eye on the larger societal and macro picture. The same document makes a distinction between intended incoherence and unintended incoherence. It observes that “unintentional incoherence is mainly an issue of imperfect management of the civil service or ignorance of other actors”. Solutions for this would be largely technocratic and would involve putting in place measures to share information and incentives for cooperation within departments (Muskens *et al.*, 2007). They argue that intentional incoherence results basically from political decisions and solving problems of intentional policy incoherence would essentially involve political and not technocratic processes since the underlying political motives and interests of the various constituencies would need to be recognized, carried on board and pragmatic trade-offs reached. Even when this last bit has been achieved, it would also be critical to get buy-in from civil servants to minimize principal agent problems (Muskens *et al.* 2007). The interest of the present study is on unintentional coherence within national policies, that is, intra-governmental coherence, and is borne from the need to examine the degree of compatibility and consistency across policies within one country, given the beneficial effects of coherence which is now examined in the next paragraph.

Arguments for policy coherence essentially appeal to the need for efficiency,

effectiveness, credibility, quality outcomes and good governance. At the international level, the EU document (EU 2006) on policy coherence associates coherence with effectiveness and quality in international action. It argues that coherence leads to effectiveness by creating the conditions for maximizing the impact of development funds. Policy incoherence is associated with ineffectiveness (failure to achieve objectives), inefficiency (waste of scarce resources) and loss of policy credibility (GDI, 2002; EU, 2006; Duraiappah & Bhardwaj, 2007)). On this last issue, May *et al.* (2006) argue that lack of policy coherence sends confusing messages to potential policy targets and could therefore undermine policy politics and acceptability. It could also create tensions and provoke conflicts in beneficiary communities. The study on coherence between a peace building policy and anti-narcotics policies in one country by Rubin & Guaqueta (2007) brings out the tensions that policy incoherence could create. The researchers identify the divergence between the goals of the two policies as a potential source of incoherence and potential conflict in policy outcomes. They note divergences in the objectives, sanctions and incentives of two policies – a peace building policy and crop eradication anti-narcotics policy – which are being concurrently in the same polity and point out the conflict and tensions that ensue as result of these divergences. As they illustrate, anti-narcotics crop eradication immediately affects livelihoods, which then alienates the peasants which then has a perverse effect on the peace building policy. So here we have

an example of policies producing contradictory effects because of incoherence.

Given the recognized beneficial effects of policy coherence, some suggestions have been put forward on ways to maximize this, even where it is recognized that total policy coherence is an ideal that is difficult to attain. The following have been identified as important for ensuring policy coherence -

- Strong political commitment to coherence on the part of government(s), with leadership and clearly defined policy objectives, priorities and criteria for assessing progress.
- Institutional coordination, through an adequate institutional architecture, transparency and flexibility, including rapid adaptation to a changing environment, early warning of any incoherence, mechanisms for dialogue and resolving disputes and an administrative culture that promotes inter-sector cooperation and systematic dialogue among different political communities; and finally,
- Adequate analytical capacity and effective systems for generating, transmitting and processing relevant information. (EU, 2006:17).

In summary, the literature reveals the following as being central to policy coherence - consistency, complementarities, coordination, congruence, compatibility, alignment, improved focus, interdependence and reduction of waste. Policy incoherence is associated with conflict, tensions, antagonisms, interference and contradictions which are subtractive and divisive in effect (EU, 2006; GDI, 2002). In the next sections,

we shall be examining two policy documents in Nigeria to see to what extent some of the issues raised in this section would apply to them.

NEEDS and NPIRD: *context and intentions*

NEEDS, as stated earlier, is Nigeria's PRSP. Standard orthodoxy on PRSPs has it that they are country driven; involve broad participation, results oriented, growth focused, pro-poor, and comprehensive in scope and addressing all the multiple ramifications and causes of poverty and long term in focus (Bretton Woods Project, 2003). These stated qualities notwithstanding, it is now common knowledge that most PRSPs are driven by the need to meet one of the conditionality for accessing external funding assistance. The process of external validation and approval of any PRSP by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (the joint staff assessment), and the insistence of juridical and macro-economic reforms reinforces the view of PRSPs as indeed more externally guided and outward looking in intended readership than internal. When closely examined most PRSPs, NEEDS inclusive, betray a tendency towards macro-economic reforms of a neo-liberal bent with the standard prescription for the progressive reduction of the role of the state, the supremacy of market principles, an enlargement of the leadership role for the private sector and trade liberalization. Incidentally, recent developments on the global scene call sharply to question the continued soundness of these principles.

NEEDS was designed with extensive support and guidance by WB and IMF even as it also involved a broad range of national stakeholders. NEEDS was launched on May 29, 2004 (Akpobasah, 2004). The objective of NEEDS is to enable Nigeria achieve a turn around and grow a broad based market oriented economy that is private sector - led and in which people can be empowered so that they can, as a minimum, afford the basic needs of life. It is a pro-poor development strategy focusing on economic empowerment, gainful employment and the provision of social safety nets for vulnerable groups. The fixing of these objectives was influenced by an analysis of the obstacles to national development. The following obstacles were identified - inequities in life chances and opportunities for prosperity, the overburdening role and hence inefficiencies of previous administrations, corruption in the public service and the hostility of the Nigerian environment to private enterprise identified as the creator of wealth and job creation. NEEDS represents a national reform agenda that seeks to eliminate poverty and inequality, revitalize the public service along the lines of new public management, address governance failures and midwife the emergence of sound economic management and the thriving of an internationally competitive private sector. The next paragraph looks at the rural economy with a view to pointing its salient features and how these influenced the design of the NPIRD.

The Nigeria rural landscape is characterized by high levels of poverty, dominance of

subsistence farming and vulnerability to economic shocks. Nigeria ranks very low on most indicators of human development. About 70% of Nigerians live below the poverty line, per capital GNI is below \$300, and urbanization is uncontrolled. Geographic disparities exist in access to basic services with 85% of the extreme poor living in rural areas. The marginalization of rural areas, characterized by the absence of infrastructure, low skill labour force, absence of industries, absence of government, has had an inhibiting effect on national development with severe negative externalities on urban areas, a point that De Janvry *et al.* (1999) underscore for rural areas in general. The progressive pauperization of the rural populace as a result of years of neglect has retarded holistic and inclusive national development. NPIRD was conceived to address such imbalances and catalyze coordinated and sustainable development of rural areas. Launched in 2001, NPIRD represents an attempt to break away from earlier rural development initiatives that were mainly cantered around government structures either in the form of River Basin Authorities or Government established parastatals such as the Directorate of Food, Road and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI). It was written up with the support of the World Bank, DFID and other development partners. The policy recognizes the underlying causes and dimensions of rural poverty and stresses the critical inter-connections between the social sector, infrastructure, governance, and the farm and non-farm economy. The overall objectives of the Policy are: developing the

rural areas, raising the quality of life of the rural people, alleviating rural poverty and using rural development to lay a solid foundation for national development. The intended outcomes include national food security, income generation and alleviation of rural poverty. It seeks to mainstream rural dwellers into national development and makes a special case for the right level of infrastructure investment to open rural areas (Nigeria National report, 2006). The policy goes beyond a focus on agriculture and recognizes the need for some rural industrialization and other productive activities to transform the rural sector using a blend of private sector led initiatives, participatory approaches and community mobilization.

The examination of context and assumptions allows an initial identification of some commonalities and convergence in assumptions and approaches between NEEDS and NPIRD. Both seek to move away from a monoculture, (oil and mineral resources for NEEDS: agriculture for NPIRD). Both recognize the critical role that the private sector can play in development. Finally, both recognize participatory and broad based involvement as sine qua non for any sustainable development. The recommendation in the Rural development sector strategy (RDSS) the accompanying document to NPIRD brings out these commonalities and convergence of philosophy and strategies when it lists the qualities of the rural development strategy as follows – non-interventionist, consistent, participatory, sustainable, equitable but with

limited role for the state (FMARD, 2001), qualities which also define NEEDS. The next section carries the analysis further by looking at the goals and policy thrusts of NEEDS and NPIRD in more detail.

Objectives

The Goals of NEEDS are wealth creation, employment generation, poverty reduction and value re-orientation. NEEDS supports the following policy thrusts: Sustain a rapid, broad-based GDP growth rate outside of the oil sector that is consistent with poverty reduction, employment generation, and a sustainable environment, diversify the production structure away from oil and mineral resources, make the productive sector internationally competitive, systematically reduce the role of government in the direct production of goods, and strengthen its facilitating and regulatory functions. The overall aims are sustained growth rates, employment generation, and wealth creation, diversification of the economy and poverty reduction. Before NEEDS, the Nigerian economy had been excessively dependent on the oil industry with the attendant neglect of other sectors, especially agriculture. This neglect of agriculture led to its demise and the attendant pauperization and the underdevelopment of the rural economy. By thus arguing for a diversification of the economic base and recognizing the vital contribution of agriculture to national development, NEEDS agrees with and reinforces provisions in the rural development policy. In line with the then dominant economic ideology, NEEDS

emphasizes a systematic reduction in the role of Government in the direct production of goods and services stressing rather its regulatory role. NEEDS also stresses “macroeconomic viability and policy consistency”, the control of inflation, the stabilization of the exchange rate the adoption of a fiscal policy characterized by prudence and discipline (Akpobasah, 2004). NPIRD on the other hand focuses on Poverty reduction, mobilization and empowerment of rural population to create wealth, expansion of productive base of rural economy, provision of support to extension services, establishment of network of cottage and rural industries , improvement of human resources, mass literacy , formation and management of cooperatives, strengthening of capacity for autonomous democratic development, improvement in the quality of life of rural dwellers, create network for rural marketing, facilitate power and social relations and establish worthy life.

Priority Areas

This section examines the priority areas for NEEDS and NPIRD. NEEDS identifies some priority areas for intervention. These are - Job creation, provide affordable housing, improve health care, strengthen the skill base, protect the vulnerable, promote peace and security, improve infrastructure, promote industry, improve agriculture, rural communities (water, rural roads, electricity, health facilities and communication) instruments for targeting the vulnerable include access to credit, labour intensive public works, affirmative action for women as well as education and entrepreneurial

development for youths. NPIRD for its part focuses on four priority areas of intervention in rural development. These are - Promotion of rural productive activities, support human resources development, enhancement of enabling rural infrastructure, (too much government involvements), special programs for target groups and rural community organizations. A brief explanation of the intention of each of these four areas follows.

Enhancement of enabling rural

infrastructure: This is an initiative designed to open rural areas and to create the necessary environments that could attract industries. Focus is on building the much needed infrastructure such as access roads, rural water supply, housing, telecommunications infrastructure and electrification as ways to stimulate growth and also to make the rural areas more attractive to industries and to populations and thus stem the urban migration. The Rural Access and Mobility Project, with the overall objective of providing all season access to farming and fishing communities, is part of this initiative. A related component is the training of rural dwellers on the maintenance of the roads/riverine access and developing entrepreneurship of rural dwellers for income generation and poverty reduction.

Promotion of Rural Productive Activities:

Here the policy plans to support micro finance and business development initiatives in the rural areas as way to promoting employment creation and wealth generation in rural areas. Activities include agriculture, fisheries, animal husbandry and forestry;

Supportive Human Resource Development:

This activity area combines education, mass

literacy, awareness creation, sensitization and information sharing aimed at rural dwellers. It also covers interventions in the areas of culture and social development, health, communication and extension services.

Special programs for Target Groups: This last priority area appears to be designed to capture special populations who may have been missed out in development interventions spelt out under the first three first priority areas. It could thus be seen as an effective way to ensure that NPIRD recognizes and makes provisions for inclusiveness in its developmental projects with a specific focus on rural populations with specific needs. Included in this group are an unwieldy assemblage of women, youth, children, elderly retired, handicapped, emergencies and nature disaster (sic), disadvantaged area and border areas including beggars and destitute. The intention is to bring special interventions to respond to the special needs of the most marginalized and deprived of rural areas.

Each of these areas has its policy statement, objectives and strategies but this section of NPIRD suffers from the weakness that not much effort is put to make more visible the organic coherence across these four priority areas. Reference is made to extant policies (national health policy, national population policy, national cultural policy, social development policy) with the assurance that the NPIRD will be in harmony with these extant policies. The interventions in these four priority areas strongly cohere with the

activities suggested in the agriculture and rural development component of NEEDS, unpacking these in more detail, and this is a plus for coherence. However, it needs to be indicated that most of the activities in NPIRD 's four priority areas would involve a lot of government led initiatives, an observation that then raises questions on the degree of internal consistency and coherence of NPIRD's verbalized strategic choice of private sector involvement in its implementation. By implication too, this strong role of government in the implementation of NPIRD is going to have some wash-back effect on the coherence integrity of NEEDS in the areas of private sector involvement in NEEDS' roll out. Perhaps this inconsistency reflects the constant trade-offs that development interventions involve. Governments even when they subscribe to an increasing non-interventionist neo-liberal ideology in development may, for the purposes of equity, be obliged intervene in some sectors, rural development in particular to correct for market failures. Given the paucity of infrastructure in rural areas and the high cost of investment in rural areas and thus the economic unattractiveness of rural settings for most private sector enterprises, some special measures to compensate for market failures may necessary in rural development strategies in the short and medium terms. It is these considerations that could justify the observed departure from private sector leadership in the recommended implementation measures in NPIRD. As we shall demonstrate further in the write-up, this rhetoric for private sector market leadership

is not reflected in the implementation arrangements suggested for NPIRD in RDSS.

Strategies, Implementation Arrangements, Approaches and Tools

NEEDS proposes the following steps to achieve its goals

- i. Privatize, deregulate, and liberalize key sectors of the economy.
- ii. Coordinate national sectoral development strategies for agriculture, industry, (especially small and medium-size enterprises), and services (especially tourism).
- iii. Develop infrastructure, especially electricity, transport, and water.
- iv. Address the problems of financing the real sector, and mobilize long-term savings and investment.
- v. Create effective regulatory regimes that include environmental standards.
- vi. Target programs to promote private sector growth and development.” (NEEDS, 2004, p16)

NEEDS also identifies opportunities, instruments and actions to meet the needs of the rural poor. These include access to credit and land; participation in decision making; agricultural extension services; improved seeds, farm inputs and implements. Recognizing agriculture as a neglected source of national wealth since the discovery and exploitation of Nigeria’s vast oil resources, NEEDS lays emphasis on the cultivation of improved, higher yielding crop

varieties and the provision of extra support to agricultural research and training as a means to give fresh fillip to this sector so vital for rural development. Schemes to encourage credit to rural farmers, strengthen traditional thrift and savings schemes and to supply and distribute agricultural inputs, such as seeds, improved yielding food varieties, fertilizers and machinery are also part of NEEDS implementation arrangements. NEEDS also envisages the provision of basic services such as water, rural roads, electricity, schools, health facilities and communications to rural communities and indicates that 4% of the national budget will be earmarked to the agriculture and rural development sector. The NPIRD on the other hand suggests the following implementation arrangements – a Community Driven Development approach and participatory rationalization and re-alignment of public sector rural development institutions, an emphasis on investments by the private sector, collaborative efforts between government and other stakeholders, promotion of even development. Interesting areas of convergence and coherence are there to see. The first area of convergence and coherence is the fact that in NEEDS, there is a clear policy provision to offer farmers improved irrigation, machinery, crop varieties all with the intention of implementing an integrated rural development program to stem the flow of migration from rural to urban areas. All of these are also in alignment with the provisions in the NPIRD. One can then correctly say that NEEDS and NPIRD clearly converge and overlap a good example

of coherence and a felicitous condition for synergies in policy implementation. A joint WB/IMA evaluation notes that NEEDS has prompted several measures to improve the performance of the agricultural sector, launch community based rural development projects aimed at improving agricultural productivity and efforts to improve rural finance (Ezekwesili *et al.*, 2007). Both also converge on the recognition of the role of the private sector, even though such a prescription may not too realistic for a rural policy given the realities of market failure. Investments in rural areas are cost intensive and such costs may be disincentives to private sector operators except there are some government incentives and government financed investment infrastructure. (The question is the degree and compatibility of such incentives with a market led ethos.) Yet ignoring rural development imposes negative externalities on national development and urban settings. Incidentally, RDSS identifies three key issue areas in NPIRD – Policy and Institutional reform, investment at federal, State LGA and community levels and investments at sub-sector levels and indicates focal points, actors and funding sources for each of these. One notes that the private sector gets scant mention and is assigned very minimal roles in this vital area of implementation. This also raises issues of internal coherence of NPIRD itself by reference to the critical role it had earlier claimed to assign to the private sector and by implication on the mismatch between the implementation strategies and the preferred implementation modality for NEEDS. One notices a stronger role for government than

the private sector driver rhetoric would have suggested. Here realism would appear to have triumphed over loyalty to a popular market ideology.

Recommendations & Conclusions

We have seen that coherence in policies can be at the level of objectives, targets, and strategies. It can also be seen in the degree of coherence which can be gauged by the extent to which one policy reinforces the other, unpacks its provisions, enhances and extends its orientations. We have seen in respect of NEEDS and NPIRD that there are interesting coherences between these two deriving from the fact that they are targeted at overlapping constituencies, and pursue mutually reinforcing goals and objectives. This is so since the rural is but a sub set of the larger national set. In a way therefore, NPIRD is NEEDS targeted at rural areas with the aim of promoting their development. (PRSPs are national and cut across all sectors. Rural development policies are more focused but also inherently multi-sectoral, even where for reasons of competitive advantage, they tend to dwell more on reviving and revitalizing sustainable agriculture). The happy conditions of coherence we have noted in policy thrusts, goals and implementation arrangements mean that NEEDS and NPIRD create conditions for their reciprocal success. Hanging together implies mutual reinforcement and we see that on the areas of objectives, policy thrusts and implementation arrangements NEEDS tends to complement NPIRD in inclusive and additive ways. The explanations for the

observed coherence must be sought in the fact that both documents were written by persons drawn from broadly identical policy constituencies and networks and were also produced around the same time period, two conditions which make for coherence. These findings agree with the earlier views on shared objectives, interests as determinant of policy coherence (Muskens *et al.*, 2007; Forster and Stokke, 1999) By implication, we are saying that when there is a separation in time of formulation or when policies are drawn up by persons from different policy constituencies, policy incoherence may arise because issues and agendas may have evolved, or that perceptions of issues may be different or that different tools and instruments for policy analysis may have become available. It is also important to point out the role of dominant ideologies held by influential external players in ensuring policy coherence. We see this clearly in NEEDS and NPIRD which received considerable steer and guidance from the WB, CIDA, USAID and DFID, all of which agencies subscribe in the main to a neo-liberal economic philosophy and this economic view is reflected in both policies even where its market driven ideology may not exactly be the most appropriate for a rural development policy areas in the current context of Nigeria. This observation also brings up the issue of external influence in policy formulation and the dangers of uncritical policy transfers. This last observation notwithstanding, the examinations of NEEDS and NPIRD have revealed interesting areas of coherence and some of the reasons for it. The observed

coherences inspire hope and confidence that appropriate implementation structures will be put in place and that all stakeholders at the federal, state and local government levels will work harmoniously together to deliver the results envisaged in these policy instruments. The hope is therefore is that coherence and harmony at policy level will be matched by the same at the implementation level.

References

- Akpobasah, M. (2004).** Development strategy for Nigeria. Paper read at the Overseas Development Institute /Nigeria Economic Summit group, London.
- Bretton Woods Project (2003).** Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs): A Rough Guide, Action Aid, London, UK
- De Janvry, A., R. Murgai & E. Sadoulet (1999).** Rural development and rural policy (unpublished mimeograph)
- Diakosavvas D (Ed.) (2006).** Coherence of agriculture and rural development policies, Paris, OECD.
- Dolowitz, D. and Marsh D. (2000).** Learning from abroad: the role of policy transfer in contemporary policy-making Governance. *An international journal of policy and administration*, 13(1): 5-21.
- Duraiappah, A. K. and Bhardwaj, A. (2007).** Measuring Policy Coherence among the MEAs and MDGs, International Institute for Sustainable Development, Winnipeg
- EU (2006).** EU mechanisms that promote policy coherence for development, Studies in European Development Co-operation

Evaluation No 2, European Union, Maastricht

Ezekwesili, O. K., S. Tiwari & C. Cottarelli (2007). Joint Staff Advisory Note on the progress for the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS), Washington, IMF/IDA

Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources (2006). National Report International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development, Porto Alegre, 7-10 March 2006 unpublished mimeograph, Abuja, Federal Government of Nigeria.

Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (2001). National Policy on Integrated Rural development Abuja, FMARD, FGN

Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (2001). Nigeria Rural Development sector Strategy, Main report, Abuja, FMARD, FGN

Forster, J. and O. Stokke (eds) (1999). Policy coherence in development Cooperation, EADI, Book Series 22, Frank Cass, London.

German Development Institute (2002). Improving coherence between development policy and other policies – the case of Germany, Berlin, ODI Briefing paper 1

Hudson, J. & Lowe, S. (2004). Understanding the Policy Process: analyzing welfare policy and practice, Bristol, Policy Press.

Kingdon, J. W. (1984). Agendas, alternatives and public policies, Boston, MA: Little Brown.

Matthew, A. & Giblin, T. (2006). Policy coherence, agriculture and development.

Dublin, Institute for international Integration studies discussion paper, No. 112: 1-15.

May, P. J., Sapotichne, J. & Workman, S. (2006). Policy Coherence and Policy Domains. *The Policy Studies Journal*, 34(3): 381-403.

Mazmanian, D. A. & Sabatier, P. A. (1999). A framework for analysis implementation in T. Miyakawa (ed), pp 97-128.

Mazmanian, D. A. & Sabatier, P. A. (1983). Implementation and Public policy, Scott, Foresman and Co., Glenview.

Muskens, R., Heres, M. & Hopkins, R. Eds (2007). Quick Scan on Policy Coherence for Development-Worldconnectors thematic background document. Version: 24 October 2007, Discussed at the Round Table of Worldconnectors on 12 October 2007 in Rotterdam

Nigerian National Planning Commission (2004). Meeting Everyone's Needs, National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) Abuja, NPC, FGN.

Okuneye, P. B. (2006). A Review of Nigerian Agricultural Policies. University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Nigeria (unpublished)

Parsons, W. (1995). Public policy: an introduction to the theory and practice of policy analysis, Aldershot, Edward Edgar

Peters, B. G. (2005). The Search for Coordination and Coherence in Public Policy: - Return to the Center?, Pittsburgh, the University of Pittsburgh Department of Political Science, (mimeograph)

Richardson, J. (2000). Government, Interest Groups and Policy Change. *Political Studies*, 48(5): 1006–1025.

Rose, R. (2001). Ten steps in learning lessons from abroad, Future Governance: lessons from comparative public policy, ESRC

Rubin, B. R. & Guaqueta, A. (2007). Fighting drugs and building peace – towards policy coherence between counter-narcotics and peace building, Berlin, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung

Sabatier, P. (1991). Toward Better Theories of the Policy Process. *Political Science and Politics*, 24(2): 144-147.

Smith, G. & May, D. (1980). The artificial debate between rationalist and incremental models of decision making. *Politics and Policy*, 8: 147-161

Van Der Ploeg, J. D., H. Renting, G., Brunori, K., Knickel, J., Mannion, T., Marsden, K. de Roest, E., Sevilla, G. & Ventura, F. (2000). Rural development: from practices and policies towards theory. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 40(4): 391-408.

[http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPRS1/Resources/Nigeria_PRSP\(Dec2005\).pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPRS1/Resources/Nigeria_PRSP(Dec2005).pdf)

[http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPRS1/Resources/Nigeria_APR2-JSAN\(June13-2007\).pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPRS1/Resources/Nigeria_APR2-JSAN(June13-2007).pdf)

[http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPRS1/Resources/Nigeria-PRSPR\(August2007\).pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPRS1/Resources/Nigeria-PRSPR(August2007).pdf)