



ENHANCING STATES' AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES' EFFICIENCY THROUGH INNOVATIVE RESULTS-BASED AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM - A CASE OF FEDERAL CAPITAL TERRITORY ADP, NIGERIA

¹Coker, A. A. A.; ²Ahmed, A. A.; ¹Adebayo, C.O. and ³Alabi, O.O.

¹Department of Agricultural Economics & Extension Technology, School of Agriculture and Agricultural Technology, Federal University of Technology, Minna, P.M.B. 65, Minna, Niger State, Nigeria

²Principal Associate, SUSMAN & Associates Limited, Nigeria

³Department of Agricultural Economics & Extension, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Abuja, P.M.B. 117, Gwagwalada, Abuja, FCTA

E-mail and Phone-no of corresponding Author: ayodejicoker@futminna.edu.ng; +2348034091353

ABSTRACT

The dismay performance of the States' Agricultural Development Programmes (ADPs) since the withdrawal of the World Bank finance and epileptic funding support by the States' Governments necessitated the need for an alternative innovative solution for re-invigorating the performance of the ailing ADP System in Nigeria. Thus, it is against the backdrop and the need to enhance efficiency, service delivery and accountability in the face of dwindling and competing public sector resources that this study was conceived. The study therefore (i) assessed the strategic and operational planning activities within the ADP; (ii) ascertained the status of monitoring and evaluation system within the programme; (iii) identified issues surrounding the Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) system in the ADP and those critical to the implementation of results-based system; and (iii) made recommendations for effective implementation of the results-based and performance management system in the ADP. The methodology involved the use of e-questionnaire to elicit responses from senior staff of the ADP and a Focused Group Discussion which covered all categories of staff. The analytical approach entailed a diagnostic assessment, stakeholder perception analyses, descriptive analysis, strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) and policy, economic, social, technological, legal and environmental (PESTLE) analyses. The study concluded that the existing system has been unable to support effective programme implementation, in view of the obvious inadequacies. Thus, the study recommended: the need for political will and a legislation mandating the use of the results-based management and performance system; urgent capacity building for PME staff of the ADP; adequate funding support for the Programme and the need to make the strategic plan of the ADP more visible and accessible to staff. Adoption of these recommendations is expected to enhance operational efficiency, service delivery, transparency, accountability and achievement of more tangible results within the ADP system.

Key-words: Agricultural Development Programmes, Results-based Monitoring & Evaluation System, Performance Management, Strategic planning, Efficiency, Transparency, Accountability, Service delivery.

INTRODUCTION

Background

World over, results-based management (RBM) system is being triggered by the growing expectations of the citizens towards results and the need for concrete evidence regarding improvements in their livelihoods. These concerns prompted the push for governments to demonstrate value for money through their policies, programmes and projects. Kusek and Rist (2004) noted that with the advent of globalization, there are growing pressures on governments and organizations around the world to be more responsive to the demands of internal and external stakeholders for good governance, accountability and transparency, greater development

effectiveness, and delivery of tangible results. Similarly, World Bank (1997) noted that the clamor for greater government effectiveness has reached crisis proportions in many developing countries where the state has failed to deliver even such fundamental public goods as property rights, roads, and basic health and education." In short, government performance has now become a global phenomenon. According to Madhekeni (2012), countries across the globe are under pressure to reform the policies and practices of their public sector through a results-based management (RBM) system, which is seen as a powerful tool that can be used to help policy-makers and decision makers track progress and demonstrate the impact of their interventions.

Madhekeni (2012) further noted that the RBM is departure from the "business as usual" syndrome in the traditional implementation-focused systems. The RBM system calls for institutions to take responsibility and demonstrate the impact of their actions. It requires that organizations articulate how public funds will be spent on services and products that have an impact on people's lives, monitor how effectively and efficiently these programmes work, and take action to improve programme results. It was thus revealed that the success of the RBM system in developed nations led to growing pressures for developing countries to adopt the new system as a way of improving performance and upholding accountability.

In Nigeria, the RBM system took prominence in the 90s and is associated with the Development partners such as the, World Bank, International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), United States Agency for Agricultural Development (USAID), African Development Bank (AfDB), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), amongst others. The focus on results was pushed through their various closed and on-going operations in the country. These included programmes and projects like the WB assisted Fadama and Commercial Agriculture projects, IFAD Community Based and Value Chain Development Programmes, USAID MARKETS, AfDB Supported Community Based and Food Security projects, FAO Supported National Programme for Food Security, among others. Real efforts directed at implementing the performance management, an aspect of RBM in the public sector in Nigeria was initiated in 2012, with the institutionalization of Performance Management System (PMS) in the public service, through the National Planning Commission (NPC). The presentation on this initiative led to series of activities, which included the Development of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to track delivery of Ministerial mandates, Development of Performance Agreements, Signing of Performance Agreements between Honourable Ministers and the President, Cascading of the Performance Agreements between Ministers and Permanent Secretaries, Permanent Secretaries with Directors and Heads of Parastatals and Agencies, Developing reporting templates for MDAs and presentation of the 2012 performance reports by the Ministers to Federal Executive Council (FEC).

At the State level, particularly in States like Lagos and Ekiti, the institutionalization of the RBM system is already in transition with heavy influence by donors, such as the Department for International Development (DFID) and World Bank. RBM system at this level is mainly within the gamut of the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) and Medium Term Sector Strategy (MTSS) and a complementary results-based M&E to track and demonstrate results (process of linking expenditures to output and outcomes). The heavy influence of the donor supported operations at the State and Local Government Areas cannot also be precluded.

The Agricultural Development Programmes (ADPs) in Nigeria were established as enclave initiative in the three agricultural hubs of Gusau, Funtua and Gombe in 1975 to promote agricultural extension, technology transfer and infrastructural development. This World Bank Assisted Initiative was conceived to redress the decline in agricultural production occasioned by the oil boom, high public expenditure, and overvaluation of the local currency, amongst others. Following the successes recorded under the enclave projects the ADP concept was up-scaled to cover more enclaves such as Lafia (1977), Ayangba (1979), Ilorin (1979), Bida (1980), Ekiti (1981), and Oyo North (1982) and was further scaled-up to cover the 37 states, including the FCT (1990), as states were created. The first inclination of results (output) capture under the ADPs' system was traceable to the adoption of an output oriented planning and budgeting system, known as the "Programme Budgeting Monitoring System (PBMS) in the 80s". However, real focus on results manifested with the influence of the donor supported operations which were implemented within the framework of the ADPs and which accommodated many ADPs' personnel as well. The argument here however is the extent to which this innovative best practice was adopted and accommodated within the main stream of the ADP system. As the old saying goes, it is one thing to take the horse to the river side, but it will be a herculean task to force it to drink water.

Sufianu (2014) argued that the Governments' and Ministries Department and Agencies (MDAs') ability to institute results-based management will be dependent on the provision of conducive environment in terms of

capacity, willingness and support of senior leaderships at all levels, and most importantly, imbuing result-focused organization culture and management practices and then careful management of the change process this entails.

The researcher however expressed concern for most developing countries including Nigeria, where, accountability for results is improbable and cronyism is prevalent. It was further argued that efforts at enthroning results-based public sector management in Nigeria at all levels of government needs a massive performance culture re-orientation, changing hearts and minds of public servants and building internal capacities. This is noted to be the way to go if the country must attain the much desired sustainable economic development.

Against this backdrop, it has become imperative to ascertain the status of the PME system and the level of adoption of the RBM system in the ADP System in Nigeria, in spite of the several donor interventions and the high involvement of the ADPs' staff in the implementation of these projects. The need for a results-based RBM system within the ADP system therefore stems from the desire for continued sustainability of the system, proper resource allocation, optimal funding support and service delivery in the face of dwindling public resources. Madhekeni (2012) revealed that the adoption of RBM has led to improved funding opportunities in many countries since the system can be used as a demonstration of commitment towards accountability and the welfare of the people.

Evolution of RBM System

Literature revealed that the concept of results began 5,000 years ago, when Egyptians measured their country' output in grain and livestock production (Kusek and Rist, 2004). On the contrary, Rassapan (2003) posited that the concept may have began with Peter Drucker in his ground breaking work on Management by Objectives (MBO) and Program Performance Budgeting System (PPBS) in the 1960s, which later evolved into the use of logical framework for the public sector in the 1970s and that, since then, it has been adopted by different countries in the 1980s and 1990s under various names. Worthy of note too, is that international initiatives such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Highly Indebted Poor Country (HIPC), International Development Association (IDA), World Trade Organization (WTO) membership, European

Union (EU) enlargement and accession, European Union Structural Funds, Transparency International, including the recently introduced Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), have incorporated the RBM System within their frameworks. Developed countries like Australia, United States, Canada and South Korea have made impressive progress in implementing the system through varied reforms from the 60s to the present, while Brazil, Chile and Turkey made progress with respect to linking expenditures to output and outcome targets, largely through their planning and budgeting frameworks. In Africa, countries like Uganda and Botswana have also made some advancement using the system. Kenya for instance introduced Results Based Management (RBM) in the Public Service in 2004, as a deliberate policy to improve performance, service delivery and governance (Government of Kenya (GOK), 2004). Zimbabwe embraced the system in 2005 (Madhekeni, 2012), while in Nigeria, it was introduced by the National Planning Commission to the public sector in 2012 (NPC, 2013), though, without prejudice to the interventions of development partners through their programmes and projects since the 80s and 90s.

Conceptual Issues

Swiss and Straus (2005) affirmed that performance driven management systems have (confusingly) been given various names, including "performance-based management," "strategic management," and "results-based management." Thus, the researcher categorized all such systems as results-based management RBM systems. According to the researchers, results-based management involves agencies' setting clear outcome-oriented objectives that include targets-expected performance levels. Most often, targets are based on negotiations between managers and frontline workers, or on past performance or even on bench marking by comparison with comparative projects which could serve as a reference point. Canadian International Development Agency (2000) posited that RBM system is aimed at reaching defined results, focused on improving planning, programming, management efficiency, effectiveness, accountability and transparency. On the other hand, "Performance Management" is viewed from the angle of New Public Management (NPM) and is believed to be key in the delivery of improved services, which is also one of the cardinal focus of

the RBM System. Obong'o (2009) noted that measuring and reporting on organization performance shifts attention on the benefits of interventions to the public, and that the strategic use of performance management is thus intended to help drive change efforts from process to results orientation in the public service. Thus, it was reiterated that the strategic use of performance management is intended to help drive change efforts from process to results orientation in the public service. The researcher further noted that in New-Zealand and Britain, systemic and radical reform measures have been adopted, utilizing the new managerialism inclination of the New Public Management to the full, to re-orient the public service and to decentralize its functions. In other settings such as Singapore and Malaysia, new approaches have been added to the existing administrative tool-kit available to government. Meanwhile, Nteyoho (2014) views performance management as all activities relating to employee management, including target setting, performance measures and goals. The key elements of RBM highlighted included performance target setting, performance planning, performance monitoring and reporting and performance appraisal. Mbua (2013) in the review of the concept of performance contract noted that the terminology is a central element of a new public management, which is a global movement reflecting liberation and market-driven management. Monye (2011) defined performance contract as an agreement between government and a public agency which establishes general goals for the agency, sets targets for measuring performance and provides incentives for achieving the targets. He noted that the instrument serves for controlling the outcome of the work of public agencies, rather than the process.

Generally two forms of M&E systems have been identified; the traditional based implementation focused M&E system and the results-based system. While the former is directed at compliance, the latter provides feed-back on actual outcomes and goals of government actions. Kusek and Jody noted that RBM&E answers three key basic questions, namely; what are the goals of the organization? Are they being achieved? How can they be proven?

Concept of Results (Output, Outcomes and Goals)

Swiss and Straus (2005) argued that the most important results are outcomes, though they noted that agencies must track a few inputs and processes as well. According to the researchers, "outcomes" are the effects of processes on stakeholders outside the agency, such as citizens or customers. Outcomes are the reasons that public agencies exist. They do not exist to work hard or stay within their budget, although doing so is commendable. They exist to produce effects on the outside world. Further on outcomes, the researchers noted that outcome measures are also useful for improving efficiency-that is, achievement of the most important results without wasting time, money, or other resources. It was noted that outcome-oriented efficiency measures often are neglected because most traditional efficiency measures focus on processes and are expressed as cost per process. They however noted that, as it applies to all process measures; it can lead to goal displacement. A situation where organization pursue goals that fail to provide benefits to the public. In differentiating between goals and outcome, Kusek and Rist, (2004) stated that goals are of long term, such as the closed MDG, while outcomes are of the intermediate term.

Benefits of the RBM System

In the article on implementing the RBM system in the Local Government, Swiss and Straus (2005), highlighted the key benefits of the RBM to include: helping organization members to stay focused on outcomes; building a stronger, results-oriented organizational culture; encouraging managers to think ahead, proactively choosing new ways of reaching higher levels of performance, while helping to empower frontline staff through morale boosting, greater organizational agility, increased customer satisfaction and making them accountable. Kusek and Gist (2004) noted that when the RBME is implemented properly, they provide a continuous flow of information feed back into the system which helps policy makers in achieving results. Madhekeni (2012) revealed that the RMB System has been operational since 2005 in Zimbabwe and that it comprises 4 elements, namely the; Results-based Budgeting (RBB) System, Results-based Personnel Performance System (RBPPS), E-Governance, and a Results-based Monitoring and Evaluation System (RBME), complemented with a Management Information System.

Status of Monitoring and Evaluation Activities

The study revealed that there were no concrete M&E strategies, policy, knowledge management and communication strategies guiding the ADP M&E activities, even though, some respondents affirmed their existence (Table 2.0). The state of data quality assessment is also in doubt; though without prejudice to the Annual Agricultural Production Survey Validation Exercises (APS) facilitated at the National Level by the closed National Programme for Food Security cum Department of Rural Development. Monitoring visits and review meeting are undertaken as affirmed by 89% and 100% of the respondents respectively, the regularity and follow-up actions after these critical M&E instrument were noted to be below par, given the funding constraints. Preparation of progress reports has become an annual ritual even when the quality and timeliness of these reports are still of great concern. The reports were also not that results focused as there were no linkage between the M&E instruments (largely not in existence) and the strategic plan and objectives. Key instruments like the Log-frame, M&E Plan were not in operation. Worthy of mention too is the fact that there were no specific capacity building plans for training of M&E staff in this stage of global dynamics, though, with fairness to the fact that most of the ADP personnel on board have benefitted from the capacity building sessions of the donor projects implemented within the framework of the ADP system.

Further assessment of the M&E system with respect to resources (Table 3) revealed that the M&E Department had no full complement

of staff, not well funded and without a functional web-site to disseminate information to stakeholders and elicit feedback. Though 100% of respondents affirmed the availability of tools for data collection, these were found to be inadequate with little chance of capturing relevant results of the ADP system. About 70% of the respondents indicated that the ADP has a well managed data-base.

Perception of Monitoring and Evaluation System by Staff

Respondents indicated varying degrees of perception about the M&E system operational in the ADP. Table 4.0 indicated that the mandate of providing information for Management's use by the M&E Department, with mean of 4.78 ranked first, while reflection of anticipated results in M&E reports ranked 8, with mean of 3.89. Generally, from the assessment, staff positively perceives the roles of the M&E system within the ADP system. The ensuing result is viewed from the position of strength and thus presents a window for the implementation of a comprehensive results-based and performance management system in FCT ADP.

Table 2.0: Availability M &E Strategies and Processes

INSTRUMENTS	AVAILABILITY	
	Frequency	%
M&E Strategy	5	55.6
Policy on M&E	2	22.2
Know. Mgt & Comm. Strategy	-	0.0
Data Quality Assessment	-	0.0
Full Documented Data Mgt Process	7	77.8
Conduct of Monitoring Visits	8	88.9
Conduct of review meetings based on KPIs Reporting	-	0.0
Source: FCT ADP, 2015	9	100.0

Table 3: Monitoring & Evaluation Resources

RESOURCES	AVAILABILITY	
	Frequency	%
Full Complement of M&E Staff	0	0.0
M&E Budget Head	9	100.0
M & E well Funded	0	0.0
Tools for Data Collection	9	100.0
Well Managed Data-Base	6	66.7
Functional Web-Site	0	0.0
Data & Reports on Web-Site	0	0.0

Source: FCT ADP, 2015

Table 4.0: Perception of Monitoring and Evaluation Department by Staff

Perception of M&E	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Indifferent	Agree	Strongly Agree	Weighted Sum	Weighted Mean	Perception	Rank
Planning and Review Meetings basis for planning			1(1.1)	2(22.2)	6(66.7)	41	4.56	Agree	2nd
M&E well linked to other Department				(44.4)	5(55.6)	36	4.00	Agree	6th
M&E Staff Well qualified				(88.9)	1(11.1)	37	4.11	Agree	4th
M&E Information provided for Management's Use			1(11.1)		8(88.9)	43	4.78	Agree	1st
M&E Database Linked to Other Government Agencies			3(33.3)	3(33.3)	3(33.3)	36	4.00	Agree	6th
M&E Reports Reflect Anticipated Results	1(11.1)		2(22.2)	2(22.2)	4(44.4)	35	3.89	Agree	8th
ADP Regularly Analyze Report		1(11.1)	1(11.1)	(33.3)	4(44.4)	37	4.10	Agree	5th
M&E Tailored to Different Audience			1(11.1)	(22.2)	6(66.7)	41	4.56	Agree	2nd

Source: FCT ADP, 2015

SWOT and PESTLE Analyses of ADP's M&E System

The SWOT and PESTLE analyses were undertaken to facilitate understanding of issues surrounding the M&E system and those bordering on the establishment of the results-based M&E system in FCT ADP.

SWOT Analysis:

This analysis covers the review of existing M&E systems in relation to resource capacity, tools and instruments, institutional setting, linkage of M&E to strategic planning, information exchanges, among others. The analysis covers the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats as it applies to these variables (Templates 1-4).

Template 1-Strengths:

- Influence of donor operations will facilitate adoption of results-based system
- Results-based M&E recognized in policy documents
- M&E positioned to capture results and enhance service delivery
- Sector MTSS provided for M&E strategy and Performance measures available
- Recognition of results-based system by staff of ADP

Template 2 - Weaknesses:

- M&E system still traditional
- Absence of key Strategic planning/M&E instruments
- Capacity to implement full results-based M&E system may be lacking
- Differential learning curve across ADP Departments

Template 3- Opportunities:

- High potential of providing reliable data for informing decision
- High possibility of embracing results-based M&E
- High potential of benefitting from the well developed M&E Components

under the donor projects like the World Bank Assisted Fadama

Template 4 -Threats:

- Inadequate recognition of M&E within FCT Agriculture Secretariat
- High turnover of M&E staff
- Misconception of the purpose of results-based M&E system
- Inadequate funding

PESTLE ANALYSIS:

PESTLE Analysis was undertaken to strengthen the SWOT analysis and facilitate identification of issues bordering the ADP's PME system. Emphasis under this review were on the political, economic, social, technological, legal and environmental factor related to the current system and the envisaged results-based M&E system in the ADP. The output of the exercise is detailed in Templates 5-10 below:

Template 5 -Political Factors:

i. Positive:

- Political stability in the FCT will sustain ADP strategic planning and relevance of the results-based M&E system.
- Favourable internal and external diplomacy will sustain the confidence of stakeholders in FCT agriculture sector.

ii. Negative:

- Policy Instability may likely distort strategic planning and create a disjoint between FCDA Strategic planning and the ADP M&E System.

Template 6 - Economic Factors:

i. Positive:

- Continued implementation of donor projects will enhance donor support, increase the uptake of best practices and sustain the institutionalization of the results-based M&E system
- Increased awareness and emphasis on results based M&E

- ii. **Negative**
 - National downtrend may refocus strategic objectives
 - Inadequate funding of FCT ADP M&E Department
 - Shift in emphasis to economic challenges
 - Shift in focus away from agriculture

Template 7 -Social Factors:

- i. **Positive:**
- ii. - Positive perception of the ADP thereby enhancing emphasis on results-based M&E.
- iii. **Negative:**
 - Negative perception of FCT ADP

Template 8 -Legal Factors:

- i. **Positive:**
 - Legal obligations to policy by FCT ADP will enhance the sustainability of the results based M&E system.
 - Commitments to the Sustainable Development Goals may refocus the strategic direction of the FCDA Agric. Department/ADP through adoption of global best practices in the operation of the results based M&E system.
- ii. **Negative:-** Non adherence to legal commitment may negatively affect implementation of the results based M&E system.

Template 9 -Technological Factors:

- i. **Positive:**
 - ii. - Increased access to up to-date MIS facilities and accessories
 - Increase in the numbers of M&E information Stakeholders
- Negative:**
- Dynamic nature of innovation environment
 - Rising cost of technology acquisition for sust-nance of system.
 - Increased cyber crime and web-site breeches

Template 10 - Environmental Factors:

- Positive:**
- The new Sustainable Development Goals will likely impact on strategic planning in the ADP

- Institutional collaboration will impact on results-based M&E system proposed for the ADP.

Negative:

- Global environmental challenges and natural hazards will likely change the strategic focus of the FCT Agric. Secretariat and, thus changes in the results-based M&E System.

Conclusion

The study concluded that despite the positive perception of the roles of M&E in the FCT ADP system by ADP personnel, evidence on ground suggest that the existing planning framework and monitoring and evaluation system are not adequately placed to facilitate effective project implementation, monitor and evaluate outcomes, with the view to ensuring effective service delivery, accountability, realisation of tangible results.

Recommendations

To enhance the performance of the FCT ADP through innovative results based management and performance system, the following are recommended:

- i. There is the need for political will and a legislation in the FCT, mandating the adoption of the results-based performance management system by all the Secretariats and Agencies including the FCT ADP;
- ii. There is the need to make the ADPs strategic documents more visible and available to staff and other stakeholders. This will deepen knowledge and understanding of the strategic objectives and strategies to tailor;
- iii. There is urgent need for training of Staff on the current and full implementation of the comprehensive results-based and performance management systems;
- iv. It has become necessary to adequately fund the ADPs, especially the PME Department with the view to effectively capturing results and ensuring service delivery.

- v. ADP staff should fully embrace and adopt best practices on PME operational in projects mid-wifed by them in the core stream of ADP M&E activities.
- vi. For effective implementation of the RBM system in FCT ADP, there is

REFERENCES

Federal Capital Territory Administration. (2008). FCTA Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (FEEDS II).
Government of Kenya. (2003). *Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation*. Government Press, Nairobi, Kenya.
Kusek, J.Z. and Rist, R.C. (2004). A Handbook for Development Practitioners. *Ten Steps to a Results-based Monitoring and Evaluation System*. The World Bank, Washington, D.C.
Madhekeni, A. (2012). Implementing Results-based Management Systems in Zimbabwe: Context and Implications for the Public Sector. *International*

the need to adopt the "Ten Steps to a Results-based Monitoring and Evaluation System proposed by the World Bank and streamline its use to fit the programme's peculiarity.

Journal of Humanities and Social Science, vol.2, No.8, pp122-129.
Mbua, P. and Sarisar, J.O. (2013). Concept of Performance Contracting - Kenyan Scenario/experience. *Developing Country Studies*, Vol. 3, No.2.
Monye, S. (2011). FG Adopts Performance Contract Approach to Evaluate MDAs. <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2011/10/fg-adopts-performance-contract-approach-to-evaluate-mdas/#sthash.>
Nteyoho, T. (2014). *The Director*. Revised Edition. Cardoso Catholic Community Foundation. St Mary Catholic Church, Ajegunle, Lagos, Nigeria.
Obong'o, S.O. (2009). Implementing of Performance Contracting in Kenya. *International Public Management Review Electronic Journal*, Volume 10, Issue 2, 2009.