

Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) and Poverty Alleviation in Enugu State, 2009 – 2012.

ASOMBA, IFEYINWA U.

ifeyinwa.asomba@esut.edu.ng

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

ENUGU STATE UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (ESUT), ENUGU

Abstract: *Poverty alleviation is the fundamental objective of economic development. Decades after independence Nigerian government has initiated and implemented policies and programmes that aimed at improving the life and wellbeing of its citizens. Although some of these programmes were not accompanied with specific objectives targeted at poverty alleviation, it is expected that the poor will benefit from their spillover effects. A critical evaluation of the programmes shows that they were constrained by many challenges. Consequently, they contributed less to justify their existence. In 2009 Nigerian government with the assistance of the World Bank launched another programme, Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) aimed at providing development projects to rural communities for economic empowerment and poverty alleviation. In order to achieve its objectives CSDP adopted Community Driven Development (CDD) approach which involves rural dwellers as stakeholder and drivers of their socio-economic development. This study examines the activities of CSDP in three years of its existence. The study reveals that CSDP has executed many projects in benefiting communities such as schools, health centres, bridge, etc. These projects have positively affected the life and welfare of communities as individuals and groups. It also identified some challenges affecting CSDP's poverty alleviation projects which includes funding, sustainability, intra communal conflicts and lack of field offices. The study recommended adequate and timely release of funds to projects committees, effective internal conflict resolution for intra communal conflicts, establishment of field offices and establishing a ministry for poverty alleviation at national and state levels to be in charge of poverty alleviation programmes to ensure sustainability.*

Keywords: Poverty Alleviation, Poverty, Community Driven Development, Community and Social Development Project.

Introduction

Poverty alleviation in rural communities in Nigeria has been an uphill task for rural dwellers, government and other agencies. Before the coming of the Europeans, groups in Nigeria had used communal efforts as a means of mobilizing resources to provide services to improve their social, political and economic wellbeing. This is to say that the pre colonial Nigeria societies were independence, energetic industrious and committed to improving their standard of living. For example, labour was employed in the states and empires of Bornu, Hausa, Benin and Igbo communities to construct kings' palaces, city walls, clearing and cultivation of farm lands, roads, and path ways, market square etc. The social and public services need at the time was simple. The age grade system was a social frame work that mobilized resources and galvanized action towards improvement of the pre-colonial communities (Ezenwaji 2002).

The intervention of the British marked another phase in political affair of Nigeria. British system of administration affected the commitment of the natives to the socio-economic development of their communities. The new system of government took a compulsive and coercive dimension taxes were extorted and labour was forced on the natives. This development dampened the dogged and undaunted approach of the natives to economic and social empowerment of their societies. The way and manner adult males and youths were recruited to work for the British affected the socio-economic life and activities of the communities. Thus the colonial masters exploited their labour, time, energy, land and resources leaving the natives deprived, sapped, degraded and subjected to a conditions in which they cannot help themselves economically, socially and politically.

Nigeria political independent of 1960 was not accompanied with appreciable degree of formal government commitment and involvement in poverty alleviation of rural communities, while the period after the war was marked by massive reconstruction of war ravaged facilities. However, problems of poverty in rural communities became glaring in the 1980s, and worsened by the adoption of Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP). Consequently, Nigeria government initiated and implemented many programmes, policies and measures aimed at improving the living condition of the masses. Most of these measures were directed at various sectors of the economy, while the final impact was expected to alleviate poverty. Examples of these programmes are Better Life for Rural Women Programme (BLP) National Directorate of Employment (NDE), Family Support Programme (FSP), National Economic Reconstruction Fund (NERFUND) and National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) (Chikeleze at el 2003).

A critical appraisal of these programme shows that some of them did not achieve the objectives for which they were established. Some of these programmes consumed much resources than envisaged yet contributed little to justify their existence. Aba (2000) bemoans the cumulative effect of inefficient implementation of the programmes which includes severe lack of infrastructure and social amenities, lack of industry, markets, financial institutions, storage facilities, poor health care, malnutrition, poor sanitation, educational backwardness among others.

In 2009, the Federal Government launched another programme as part of its effort to alleviate poverty in rural communities which Enugu State keyed into. Enugu State Community and Social Development Project Law was signed into operation in 2009 by Governor Sullivan Chime. Enugu state government in collaboration with the Federal Government obtained financial assistance from International Development Association (IDA) of World Bank to help implement Community and Social Development Project (CSDP). CSDP is anchored on Community Driven Development (CDD) initiative, where community members have both the right and authority to select, prioritize, co-finance, implement and maintain their projects (Enugu State CSDP, 2012).

The projects CSDP is to implement in benefitting communities include community resource and skill acquisition centres, construction and renovation of primary and secondary school blocks as well as providing learning facilities, extension of rural electrification, construction and rehabilitation of access roads, bridges and culverts, health centres, construction of market stalls, water and civic centres. The arrangement is that benefitting communities are entitled to a maximum budget envelop of N10 million from CSDP to embark on their priority project, which is subject to the ability of communities to pay their own counterpart fund (Ugwuoke 2013). The initiators of CSDP aimed at using it as a strategy to address the challenges encountered in poverty alleviation, especially in rural communities. It is expected that CSDP is able to address the issue and will be judged successful by increase number of communities and poor people which have been empowered through access to social and infrastructures services.

Objectives of the study:

The broad objective of this study is to find out the contribution of CSDP to poverty alleviation in Enugu State.

The specific objectives of the research are to;

1. Find out the projects CSDP established for poverty alleviation in Enugu State, 2009 – 2012.
2. Ascertain the effects of CSDP's projects on poverty alleviation in Enugu state, 2009 – 2012.
3. Identify the challenges of CSDP's poverty alleviation in Enugu State, 2009 – 2012.

Research Questions

These questions are raised for the study;

1. What are the projects CSDP established for poverty alleviation in Enugu State, 2009 – 2012.
2. What are the effects of CSDP's project on poverty alleviation in Enugu State, 2009 to 2012.
3. What are the challenges of CSDP's poverty alleviation in Enugu State, 2009 to 2012.

Literature Review

Literature is reviewed under the following sub-themes;

- i. Poverty in Rural Communities in Nigeria
- ii. Poverty Alleviation: How rural dwellers count.
- iii. World Bank assisted CSDP and Poverty Alleviation.

Poverty in Rural communities in Nigeria

In World Bank Development Report (WDR) of 1990 any person whose income falls below \$370 (three hundred and seventy dollars) per month is poor (Atojoko, 2000). The poor is ranked according to their level of income vis-à-vis their ability to meet their base needs. Therefore, any individual whose income is below the accepted level of income is poor. Accordingly, Koye (1994:45) describes poverty as a term which is usually employ to describe the much more frequent situation of insufficiency in possession of wealth or in the flow of income.

In Nigeria majority of the poor are found in rural communities these poor members of the society depends on proceeds from the soil for living and hardly make enough to satisfy their basic needs. Accordingly Anele (2013) opines that vast majority of the poor people struggle every day to survive in an increasing in-human environment while the government is far away from the people alienated and discounted from ordinary masses of the country. Invariably, the rural dwellers have come to accept this condition of alienation, insufficient and under developed resources and income as normal for their type of society.

Poverty in the context of rural communities can be described in terms of relative deprivation. Thus, Valentine in Bradshaw (2006) says that the essence of poverty is inequality. Poverty describes a condition were one possesses less of some desired attributes such as income, wealth, power, influence and opportunities than the people or group with which comparison is made. Simply put, individuals, families or groups within a society are considered poor if they lack the wherewithal to obtain food, materials, living conditions, amenities and or basic necessities which are easily obtained or approved in their society. The resources of these groups or individuals drastically fall below that of the average group or individual in their society (Chikeleze et al, 2003). Rural dwellers are highly deprived when compared with their urban counterparts. The rural dwellers are affected by low income, lack of basic infrastructure, underdeveloped resources, lack of access to modern technology etc. Consequently, they are relegated to the background and are removed from the mainstream of social, economic and political activities in their society (Chikeleze et al 2003).

For over six decades of political independence rural communities in Nigeria are still in dare need of radical changes. The pattern of distribution of public goods created inequality and social injustice for rural communities in Nigeria (Chikeleze et al, 2003). Existing urban areas benefit more from public expenditure allocation than rural communities. Government pays more attention to the development of existing urban areas than rural areas. Even poverty alleviation programmes benefit urban areas more than their

rural counterparts in that the programmes are often domiciled in cities instead of rural communities where target beneficiaries are located. Most of the programmes have no field offices for easy access and contact for the poor. All inquiries, complaints and problems are addressed from the headquarters far away from rural communities. This is to say that rural sector in Nigeria is characterized by and suffers from urban-centred public policies.

Agreeably, Todaro (1999:151) views the above situation as resulting from a combination of low per capita income and highly unequal distribution of income. He further explains poverty as resulting from the method income earning factors of production within a society is distributed among various groups of people. The concentration of these assets in the hands of a small percentage of the society to utter exclusion of the majority of the people results to poverty. Wide inequality in the distribution of income in a society is often not limited to the economic status of members of the society but also manifested in political and social dimensions (Chikeleze et al 2003).

Poverty is multi-dimensional and multi-faceted. Poverty is deprivation. It is inequality. Poverty is denial of opportunities, choices, rights, human dignity and basic necessities of life. Poverty means hunger, starvation, malnutrition, sickness, squalid environment and death from preventable diseases. Poverty is equal to hopelessness, helplessness, powerlessness, frustration, violence and insecurity. It means denial of effective participation in social, economic and political activities. Consequently, the poor in the rural areas do not constitute any political force and so policy formulations have generally ignored them largely because of deprivation. They are not politically organized to articulate their demands and channel them to government as their urban counterpart do. This is compounded by the widely held idea that rural dwellers are reactionary and antagonistic to modern ideas (Aba, 2000).

However, Mmamel (2012:3) attributed the persistence of rural poverty in Nigeria to;

- i. Greater number of people depends on rural and natural resources and environment.
- ii. Inefficient and unregulated access to natural resources
- iii. Poverty targeting mechanism not being strategic.
- iv. Institutional failure in effective delivery of services to citizenry.
- v. Development and poverty reduction mainly government driven have been used without result.

Poverty Alleviation: How Rural Dwellers Count

Poverty alleviation is explained by Alfa et al (2014) as the creation of general conditions which allow man to live in dignity, where people are free to take their own decision in life, where the poor get increasingly empowered enough to participate in social, political and economic decision making. All-round empowerment is the key to poverty alleviation; granting political, social, economic power to the poor transforms both individuals and societies.

Over the years, Nigeria government has initiated and implemented many development programmes in different sectors of the economy which indirectly aim at improving the living condition of poor. A look at these programmes shows that they have not been realistic therefore did not impact on poverty. Alfa et al (2013) explain that poverty persists in spite of these efforts because negligible capital amasses the wealth of the country for their selfish interest. It therefore becomes factual that what has prevented the programmes from achieving objectives have been insincerity, completion and lack of political will by political leaders.

As a corollary, these programmes were initiated and carried out by elites who are far removed from the rural areas and target beneficiaries. These elites are not poor and most of them have not experienced poverty. Little wonder Ogbu (2012) is of the view that the proponents of the programmes did not address the actual felt needs of target beneficiaries. The fact remains that externally fashioned, imposed and implemented programme cannot provide the solution to poverty. Externally induced programmes often distance themselves from local needs and local ways of solving problems. The initiators of such programmes alienate the beneficiaries by not consulting and not involving them in issues concerning their lives and that of their communities.

However, Fung (2004) opines that the key element to the achievement of goals in such programmes is empowered participation of community members in such programmes that address their felt needs. In line with the above, Dorsner (2008) advises government to support programmes that allow collective participation of beneficiaries at all level of decision making as it strengthens the capacity building of all relevant stakeholders and actors in the development programmes. The reverse is the case when rural dwellers remain passive beneficiaries to development programmes aimed at their empowerment. When rural dwellers move from passive beneficiaries to active participants Hoddinott (2002) notes that community participation has the potential to lower cost of providing the interventions and ensures that interventions reflect the preferences of the target population.

However, Chambers (1994) in Takyi, et al (2014) identifies the key concepts which influence the growth and spread of participation of beneficiaries as decentralization and empowerment. Decentralization is the act of distributing authority and resources to the people at the grassroots while empowerment is the power to control their lives and secure their resources. Community participation has the tendency of creating awareness in the beneficiaries of their right to influence government decisions concerning their welfare, in contrast to the sense of powerlessness usually felt by the public with regard to government decisions and programmes. Community participation confers to the rural dwellers whose existence is previously taken for granted and whose right to be part of the system was denied, the right to be an integral part of the system and process of development. Hence Iddi et al (2018) agree that community participation provides the previous disadvantaged group with the space and responsibilities to be involved in development programmes concerning their lives and welfare. Hence Nour (2011) sees beneficiary participation as a system of programme and project management which calls for active cooperation between government agencies and the beneficiaries.

Collective responsibility of the community, and collaboration of the providers of intervention (government and other organizations) with the beneficiaries is of utmost importance in community participation.

However, Olisa et al (1991) opine that the problems of development of rural areas are as multifarious as the numerous traditional communities of the country and that the same approach and solution cannot be applied to all the areas of the country. Therefore, they posit that community development should have its root fully entrenched within the socio-cultural and economic milieu within which it is to be practiced. Community participation from the above point of view is a cultural process which has to conform, with values, social practices, patterns of thinking and knowledge of the community. It is the internal dynamics of these socio-cultural and political practices that galvanize and strengthen motivation to achieve development goals. An improper articulation of these propensities may ultimately weaken group cohesion and hence the ability to achieve development targets (Olisa et al 1991).

The dynamics of a particular structure are determined by the culture(s) of a group and their beliefs, norms, values and power relationships (Omunu, 2008). In essence, people need to understand the social reality in which they live and the issues which shape their lives before they venture to act on it to change it. Besides, communities are deemed to have better knowledge of the prevailing local conditions such as the characteristics of the local micro-environment and a better ability to enforce rules, monitor behaviours and verify actions related to intervention. Consequently, Leautier (2004) observes that when communities are consulted, and are involved in development projects they are quick to identify solutions to development problems. Therefore, she posits that studying, understanding and building on the knowledge of communities will substantially reduce the risks of failure of development approach and the investment of government, and multi-lateral donors.

Effective participation gives beneficiaries voice and choice such that it did not ignore the social and cultural context within which these beneficiaries lived and organized, the focus according to Takyi et al (2014) is to incorporate local knowledge into project decision. Hence Hugo et al in Omunu (2008) contend that it is not enough for development experts to summarize and interpret the view of others – the others must be allowed to speak for themselves. Njo in Akpune et al 2010) therefore justifies the need for community participation in development by identifying that it promotes better decision making, enables project to be built on the strength, tradition, belief and values of the community. According to Akpune et al (2010) this gives a sense of project ownership and sustainability because of psychological motivation that participation brings.

World Bank Assisted CSDP and Poverty Alleviation

Analytical work at the World Bank and United Nations Development Programmes in 1992 shaped a view of poverty as multifaceted. Poverty is a serious socio-economic and political problem with various dimensions and features. It is not just about insufficient income and inability to obtain basic needs, but complete deprivation of life enhancing conditions and opportunities. Development they envisioned as a means to empowerment of the poor by increasing their access to social and infrastructural services such as health care, education, skills acquisition, employment, socio-economic activities etc (World Bank Development Indicator 2010).

The mid 1990s research and survey of World Bank economist and development experts for better approach to community development was of immense benefit. A study for the a better option that will make greater impact on poverty alleviation was carried out by the VOICE OF THE POOR, where the poor were asked to suggest an approach that can better impact on their lives. Their suggestions are; having organization of their own which can negotiate with government and other donor agencies for assistance to embark on their own chosen development project; a project chosen by them according to their needs so that it can impact on their lives; and the right to control the fund to avoid corruption (Ogbu, 2002). This means that the community wants development process that is driven by them and a process where stakeholder are accountable to them. Hence a parading shift from top-bottom to bottom-top approach to community development where the communities are drivers of their development an approach known as Community Driven Development (CDD).

Over the last decade the World Bank has recognized that CDD approaches and actions are important elements for effective community development and poverty alleviation. Consequently, the Bank has continued to focus on lending CDD programmes in order to directly reach local communities. World Bank has used this approach in many countries to assist local communities in wide range of priority needs such as water supply, schools, health centres, sanitation, nutrition programmes, roads and micro-enterprises (Community Development in Nigeria, 2008).

The World Bank definition of Community Driven Development (CDD) according to Mansuri et al (2004) is an approach where communities have decision making power over projects and resources at project level. In CDD, the communities choose the preferred projects, controls key decisions concerning the projects and manage the project funds by themselves. CDD authorized the community to control the resources and decision pertaining their preferred development project. CDD approach debunks the idea that government alone can be in charge and initiate development at local communities. The approach has very much played down the statist approach to development where state thinks for the people, see for them and act for them where communities are passengers in their own vehicles.

Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) is a World Bank assisted Community Driven Development Project in Nigeria. The stake holders in CSDP are the World Bank, the Federal Governance Support Unit (FPSU) the state Government through the state Agency for Community and Social Development (CSDA), the Local Government through the Local Government Review

Committee (LGRC) and lastly the Community through the Community Project Management Committee (CPMC) and other sub-committees (Owoh, 2012).

The core principles of CSDP is community empowerment, community participation, community sustainability, community knowledge and community ownership (Ugwodo, 2012). This is no doubt the need of the poor when they indicated that the best way for them to feel the positive impact of development is when they have organization of their own and are able to negotiate with development partners and control the resources. CSDP shall primarily finance Community Development Plans (CDPs) which focus on projects chosen by communities, and for which they are expected to make at least ten percent (10%) resource contributions (Ugwuoke, 2012).

The development objective of CSDP is to sustainably increase access of poor people to social and natural resource infrastructure service. The key performance indicators are; increased number of people (of which 70% are women) with access to natural resources infrastructure service and increased percentage of participating local government budgets that incorporate community development plans (Owoh 2012). CSDP is democratic in the sense that Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) gives many groups and individuals in the community opportunities to identify priority projects. These identified projects are collated and ranged according to the pressing needs of the community. The projects for execution are through this process chosen. Thus the community becomes an integral part of their development and has sense of ownership of the project, its execution and sustainability (Onah, 2012). Monitoring of projects is of much importance, participatory approach is accepted in CSDP project monitoring. It means that all the stakeholders are in one way or the other involved in project monitoring at all levels (Owoh, 2012).

Theoretical Framework

The study adopted Community Driven Development (CDD) theory as propounded by Glenn Bowen. Community driven development according to Glenn (2005:78) represents a people centred approach to social change, whereby local actors take the lead in conceptualizing projects and programmes that address their social and economic needs. Local actors (Community or target beneficiaries) are fully involved in implementing the project they conceived in collaboration and partnership with other stakeholders. Collaboration and partnership with other stakeholders in development is the key factor for the achievement of desired goals. Glenn (2005:78) posits that a major hypothesis embodied in this stakeholder involvement theory is that the greater the collaboration, the greater the productivity of the resources and the more favorable the condition for Community-Driven Development.

CDD helps community that received fund assistance for development projects to be the major stakeholders or drivers of the intervention. CDD approach aims at empowering local poor by giving them the responsibility for investment resources and decision making. By so doing giving them opportunity and strengthening their voice to demand accountability from relevant stakeholders and also promote sustainability of development projects (available at <https://www.community.com>unicef>contents>community-Driven...>). Five principles of CDD are empowering communities, empowering local authorities, realigning the centre to support CDD, promoting accountability and capacity building (Everatt et al, 2005). Likewise the cores of CSDP are community empowerment, community participation, community sustainability, community knowledge and community ownership (Ugwodo, 2012).

Under CSDP, communities choose their preferred and priority projects, undertake the implementation through elected committee members known as Community Project Management Committee (CPMC) and other three subcommittees (Procurement, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Operation and Maintenance sub-committees). Local committees and subcommittees participate in implementation and monitoring of project at every level, they are involved from planning to maintenance and assessment of projects otherwise called Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) (Owoh, 2012).

Discussion of Findings

The findings of each research question are discussed and presented in tables.

Research Question: What are the projects CSDP established for poverty alleviation in Enugu State from 2009 to 2012?

In the period under study CSDP embarked on and completed many project in rural communities in Enugu state. In the first years of its existence CSDP was able to intervene in 90 communities in Enugu state. The projects it was able to execute include construction and renovation of primary and secondary school blocks, construction and rehabilitation of health centres, rural electrification, sinking motorized bore holes, culverts and rural road rehabilitation, construction of market stalls, civic centres and skill acquisition centres. The table below shows CSDP projects for poverty alleviation in Enugu State from 2019 - 2012.

Table 1: Distribution of projects completed and in use as at 31/05/2012.

S/N	Local Govt.	Education	Health	Water	Electricity	Transportation	Socio-economic
1	Aninri	2	3	-	3	2	2
2	Awgu	1	1	-	-	4	-
3	Enugu East	2	2	-	2	1	-
4	Enugu South	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	Ezeagu	-	-	1	1	-	-

6	Igbo Etiti	1	2	1	1	-	1
7	Igbo Eze North	1	2	5	5	-	-
8	Igbo Eze South	1	2	3	3	2	-
9	Isi Uzo	-	1	-	1	-	1
10	Nkanu East	1	-	-	-	1	-
11	Nkanu West	-	1	-	-	-	1
12	Nsukka	-	3	-	2	1	1
13	Oji River	-	1	1	-	-	1
14	Udenu	-	-	1	1	1	-
15	Udi	4	2	2	2	1	3
16	Uzowani	-	-	-	1	-	1

Source: Enugu CSDP, 2012

Research Question 11: What are the effects of CSDP's project on poverty alleviation in Enugu State from 2009 to 2012?

The study reveals that CSDP's projects have affected poverty in many rural communities that benefited from CSDP. Construction of health centres improved access to health care, local people no longer travel several kilometers to obtain health care. Ihenyi-Agarama Community benefited, CSDP construction a health centre for them. (Olinya, 2012). Rehabilitation and construction of administrative and classroom blocks in primary and secondary school in rural communities by CSDP improved learning and school enrolment. Ibute-Nze community benefited from school rehabilitation.

Transformers were installed in communities and electricity extended. UmuigboAmuri benefited. Orji Amokwe and Adani benefited in the construction of civic centres. The table below shows the effect of CSDP's project on poverty alleviation in Enugu State from 2009 to 2012.

Table II: Effects of CSDP's projects on Poverty Alleviation in Enugu state

S/N	Types of Project	Effects on poverty
1	Construction and rehabilitation of schools	i. School enrolment increased ii. Pupils and students have better learning condition iii. Literacy level increased
2	Construction and rehabilitation of health centre	i) Access to health facilities increased ii) Immunization increased (more children are immunized) iii) Pregnant women have access to ante-natal clinic. iv) Spread and death from common illnesses decreased
3	Provision of motorizes boreholes and water reticulation.	i. Increase access to clean water for domestic and personal use. ii. Improved personal and family hygiene. iii. Water borne disease reduced iv. Money used to buy water from vendors saved.
4	Provision of Transformer and extension of rural electrification	i. Individual households have increased access to electricity ii. Small scale business increased
5	Construction and rehabilitation of feeder roads, bridges and culverts.	i. Increased access to neighbouring communities ii. Socio-economic activities increased iii. Cost of transportation decreased iv. Evacuation of farm produce became easy
6	Socio-economic (markets, civic centres, skills acquisition)	i. Increased social and economic activities ii. Rural economy improved iii. Self employment opportunities increased.

Source: Field study and Enugu CSDP, 2012

Research Question 111: What are the challenges of CSDP in alleviating poverty in Enugu state from 2009 to 2012?

The study reveals that in the period 2009 to 2012, the challenges of CSDP in alleviating poverty in Enugu state include funding, intra community conflict, sustainability of projects, lack of field offices.

CSDP explain that inadequate funding is a problem the intervention is grappling with. CSDP officer further explained that in 2010, 2011, and 2012 project period Enugu State government approved the of three hundred million naira as its counterpart contribution to CSDP, while some communities that are to benefits from the intervention could not timely complete theirs. Nevertheless, CSDP equally did not meet their expected contribution.

Table 111: Sector Contribution and Disbursements as at 31 December, 2012.

S/N	SECTOR	NO PROJECTS	TOTAL PROJECT COST	EXPECTED CSDP CONTRIBUTION (90%)	EXPECTED COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION (10%)	ACTUAL COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTION	ACTUAL CSDP CONTRIBUTION
1	Water	15	107,241,878.00	96,517,690.20	10,724,187.80	10,728,071.00	81,427,215.00
2	Electricity	21	123,990,120.20	111,591,107.98	12,787,568.22	12,420,584.00	98,326,414.21
3	Health	18	77,791,798.00	70,012,619.10	7,779,179.90	8,070,418.00	54,088,533.80
4	Education	10	35,506,920.98	32,039,800.88	3,467,120.00	3,436,170.00	31,758,914.66
5	Transport/Roads, Bridges, culverts	12	60,934,166.00	54,840,749.40	6,093,416.60	5,887,864.34	40,364,005.00
6	Socio-Economic	18	78,751,028.80	71,751,318.72	7,975,702.08	6,824,535.00	51,110,300.00
	Total	94	485,221,903.98	436,753,286.28	48,827,174.70	47,367,642.34	357,075,382.67

Source: Enugu CSDP, 2012

Intra community conflict is another challenge to successful implementation of CSDP's poverty alleviation project in Enugu state. Many communities could not benefit because of internal problems between and among different groups within the communities. Some of these communities had chieftaincy tussles, while some had internal rivalry between the Igwe (and his council) and town union executives as a result of these conflicts, no group or leader to spearheaded or initiated the move to demand for CSDP's project. For example, Eke, and Umuabi in Udi local government area and Umuatogbuoma in Nkanu West local government area were affected by intra community conflict.

Another challenge is that of sustainability of the programme and of the projects. Evidence abound of many poverty alleviation programmes that do not achieve the aim of their establishment because they did not last beyond the administration that initiated then, neither did projects last beyond implementation period. The mechanism for sustainability becomes a challenge because Nigeria in general lacks maintenance culture and communities in particular lack commitment to projects that government initiates.

Urban based and urban biased development programmes and policies is a major challenge to poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Poverty alleviation programmes are based in urban areas without field offices at the local government and community levels. CSDP towed the same line, its offices are at state capitals, no field office for effective monitoring and supervision of activities in rural areas.

Recommendations and Conclusion

Based on the discussion of findings, the following recommendations were made.

- There is need for adequate funding to ensure timely intervention and completion of projects. Counterpart funding should be paid by relevant state holders to avoid delays and non completion of project. Therefore, fund for completion of projects should be available before commencement of CSDP projects.
- Communities should ensure peaceful and harmonious co-existence. They should adopt effective conflict resolution strategy to resolve internal problems, to avoid fractionalization and any divisive tendencies that threaten community's peace. Conflict delays, deters and often destroys community development and should be avoided.
- Poverty alleviation such as CSDP that is beneficial should not end with the government that initiated it, continuity and follow-up programmes are recommended. Government can achieve these by having a ministry for poverty alleviation to be responsible for programmes within this sphere to ensure related programmes live beyond their initiators.
- CSDP should have field offices within the environment of target beneficiaries, especially at local government headquarters for easy access. Field offices create the feeling of closeness to government for rural dwellers and for the government channel of identifying with grassroots.

It is a fact that one of the fundamental objectives of economic development is poverty alleviation. The World Bank recognizes this and came up with a poverty alleviation and sustainable development strategy CDD. As a world bank assisted government transformational agency for rural development and poverty alleviation, CSDP at its inception has benefited some rural communities in Enugu state. Many rural communities now feel the impact of government through CSDP's poverty alleviation and community development projects. Suffice it to say that from 2009 to 2012 CSDP's projects positively affected benefiting communities, but more is needed. It is hoped that the adoption and implementation of the above recommendations will go a long way in sustaining the achievements of CSDP in poverty alleviation.

Reference

- Akpune, C.B., and Ojokheta, K.O. (2010) Sustainable community development programme in socially divers Nigeria communities, Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences 7(3) 254 – 301.
- Alfa, P.I., Otaida, E., and Audu, E. (2014) Poverty alleviation strategies in Nigeria, International Journal of Public Administration and Management 2(2) 98-105.

- Anele, D. (2013) The spiritual poverty in Nigeria ruling elite. Retrieved from <http://www.vanguard.com/2013/06the-spiritual-poverty-in-nigeria-ruling-elite>
- Atojoko, S. (2000) Politics of saving the poor, New Watch August,7.
- Bradshaw, T.K. (2006) Theories of poverty and anti-poverty programmes in Community Development, Rural Poverty Research Centre (RPRC).Working paper No 06-05 February <http://www.rprconline.org>.
- Chambers, R. (1998). Rural Development: Putting the last first, London; Longman Group.
- Chikeleze, F.O.and Ezenwaji, I.U. (2003) Government and the economy: The Nigeria experience, Enugu; Academic Publishing Company
- Community Development in Nigeria (2008) Retrieved from <http://www.statoil.com/ammal-report2008/on/sustainability/society/pages/5-6-3-3/community-development-in-nigeria.aspx>
- Dorsner, C (2008) Implementing Yaunde declaration: Practical issues on participation process in Community Development, Community Journal <http://cdj.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/scontent/full143/4/413#65mo12TB>.
- Everatt, P. and Gwagwa, L. (2015) Community driven development in South Africa, Regional Working paper series, October <http://www.worldbank.org/afr/wps/index.htm>
- Ezenwaji, I.U. (2002). Traditional administrative system in Nigeria: A study of selected Nigeria societies, Enugu; IDS – UNEC.
- Glenn, A.B. (2005). Local stakeholder collaboration: A substantive theory of community driven development, Journal of Community Development Society 36(2) 73-88.
- Hoddinot, J. (2002). Participation and poverty reduction: An analytical framework and overview of the issues, Oxford Journal of social science <http://jac.oxfordjournal.org/ogi/contents/11/1/146>.
- Iddi, B. and Nuhu, S (2018) challenges and opportunities for community participation in monitoring and evaluation of government project in Tanzania: Case of TASAF II Bagamoyo District, Journal of Public Policy and Administration 2(2) 2-20.
- Koye, J. (1994). Poverty alleviation through agricultural project, The Bullion 10(3).
- Leautier, F (2004). Indigenous capacity enhancement: Developing community knowledge <http://worldbank.org/afr/ik/default.html>.
- Mansuri, V and Rao, Y (2004) Community based and driven development: A critical review, Washington D.C; World Bank Working Paper.
- Mmamel, J (2012) A new vision in Enugu state, Enugu; CSDP News 1(1) May.
- Nour, A.M (2011) Challenges and advantages of community participation as an approach for sustainable urban development in Egypt, Journal of Sustainable Development 4(1) 79-91.
- Ogbu, B (2012) Poverty reduction effort in Nigeria and the advent of CSDP, Enugu; CSDP News 1(1) May.
- Olisa, M.S.O and Obiukwu, J.I. (1991) Rural development in Nigeria: Dynamics and strategies, Nsukka.
- Omunu, F (2008). The challenges of community participation in developing project: A case study of community management project of Plan International – LUWERO program, Masterr of Arts Social Sector Planning and Management (MASSPM), Makerere; University of Makerere.
- Onah, R. (2012) Pace setter in poverty reduction effort, Enugu; CSDP News 1(2) November.
- Owoh, G.C. (2012). Project monitoring and evaluation in CSDP why community members participate, Enugu; CSDP News 1(1) May.
- Takyi, H., Anin, E.K. and Asuo, Y.K (2014) The challenges of effective community participation in district education strategic planning and implementation process in the Salaga town council of Ghana, International Journal of Business and Social Research (IJBSR) 4(2) 40-49.
- Todaro, M.P (1998) Economics for developing world, London; Longman Group.
- Ugwuodo, H. (2012) A panacea for rural development, Enugu; CSDP News 1(2) November.
- Ugwuoke, J.O. (2012) Enugu State CSDP: The journey so far, Enugu; CSDP News 1(1) May.
- World Bank Development Indicator (2010) World Bank in Nigeria 1998 – 2007, Nigeria Country Assistance, Washington D.C; IBRD/World Bank