COMMUNITY DRIVEN DEVELOPMENT IN THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT SYSTEM: A NEW STRATEGY

Prof. Nnanta N. Elekwa
Eme, Okechukwu Innocent

Department of Public Administration and Local Government
University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

Abstract

Governments and the World Bank have very few tools to reach large numbers of the poor directly, particularly in the context of weak or fragile states, in post-conflict and post disaster environments, or in areas with poor track records of service delivery within the bureaucracy. Community driven development (CDD) potentially constitutes an important approach in the repertoire of development interventions because it is designed to place less stress on government line agencies by optimizing the use of community actors, yet at the same time reach very large numbers of poor people. Determining whether this approach is worth supporting requires rigorous evaluation to assess CDD's effectiveness in various settings. And if it does work, how can we strengthen its ability to deliver results as a second generation of CDD programs begins to emerge? This study aims to explore these issues. Social services provisioning are failing poor urban and rural people in the developing world, and poverty remains concentrated in rural areas and urban slums. This state of affairs prevails despite prolonged efforts by many governments to improve rural and urban services and development programs. This paper focuses on how local governments in Nigeria can be empowered to contribute to their own development and, in the process, improve infrastructure, governance, services, and economic and social development, that is, ultimately, the broad range of activities for sustainable poverty reduction. Central to thesis is that local governments within a clearly defined decentralized framework that devolves real power and resources to local governments and communities will do better. The paper concludes by positing that capacity support, technical institutions and nongovernmental institutions are key to Local Government support which is central to Community Driven Development.

Keywords: Social Development ,Community Development and Empowerment, Communities and Human Settlements, - Housing & Human Habitats, Finance and Financial Sector Development, Local Government and Rural Development and Community Driven Development.

INTRODUCTION

Since the mid-1990s, Community Driven Development (CDD) has emerged as one of the fastest growing investments by NGOs, aid organizations and multilateral developments banks. This continued investment in CDD has been driven mostly by a demand from donor agencies and developing countries for large-scale, bottom-up and demand-driven, poverty reduction subprojects

that can increase the institutional capacity of small communities for self-development. The success and scale of some CDD projects in the World Bank are especially notable. The World Bank supported approximately 190 lending projects amounting to $9.3 billion in 2000–2005 (World Bank, 2007a). Initiated by the International Development Association (IDA) at the World Bank, CDD projects have been instrumental in harnessing the energy and capacity of communities for poverty reduction. Since the start of this decade, IDA lending for CDD has averaged annually just over 50 operations, for an average total of US$1.3 billion per year (World Bank, 2010).

ADB (2011) recognizes the importance of CDD in promoting economic and social development. ADB's Long Term Strategic Agenda or Strategy 2020, which reiterates its commitment to promoting inclusive growth in Asia and the Pacific, places CDD at its core. As Strategy 2020 is anchored on inclusive growth, the CDD approach is highly relevant by ensuring that poor communities benefit from and participate in development efforts. Even before Strategy 2020 was launched in 2008, ADB had been implementing projects with CDD components. Between 2001 and 2008, ADB funded 72 projects with CDD elements, valued at nearly $4 billion, translating to about 10% of the total number of ADB-financed projects approved during this period. These projects, spanning from Southeast to Central Asia, were mostly for water supply and sanitation, water management, education, health, and agriculture and natural resources. Although ADB funds projects with strong CDD components mostly in the rural areas, it also uses the CDD approach to support urban development projects, such as the Indonesia's Neighborhood Upgrading and Shelter Sector Project, Mongolia's Community-Driven Development for Urban Poor in Ger Areas, and Bangladesh's Second Urban Governance and Infrastructure Improvement Project

In the last few years the International Fund for Agricultural Development has been working with the Agence Française de Développement (AFD), the African Development Bank (AfDB), the European Union (EU), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the UN Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) and the World Bank to create a platform for learning and sharing knowledge on Community Driven Development (International Fund for Agricultural Development, 2010). Intensive forms of community participation have been attempted in projects of several donors for many years. Bilateral donors, such as the Department for International Development (DFID) of the United Kingdom and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), have used CDD-type approaches for a long time as part of their sustainable livelihoods and integrated basic needs development assistance in developing countries. The Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) and Danish International Development Agency have used CDD principles in the mandate of a rights-based approach to the development projects they fund (FAO, 2010).

More than 80 countries have now implemented CDD projects. The breadth and activities funded by the CDD programs at the World Bank can be explained by providing a brief overview of a few of them. The Second National Fadama Development Project II (NFDP-II) for instance targets the development of small scale irrigation, especially in the low-lying alluvial floodplains or "Fadama. NFDP-II increased the productivity, living standards and development capacity of the economically active rural communities while increasing the efficiency in delivering implementation services to an

estimated four million rural beneficiary households and raising the real incomes of households by 45 percent (Gbenga, 2007). The Social Fund for Development in Yemen provided support 7 million people of which 49 percent were female and generated 8,000 permanent jobs. It also increased the number of girls' schools from 502 to 554 and basic education enrollment rates from 63 percent to 68 percent. The program focuses on helping the poor to help themselves through providing income-generating activities and building community infrastructure rather than making cash transfers (El-Gammal, 2004). The Social Investment Fund Project V in Honduras benefited 2.5 million people with the implementation of 2,888 projects (1,446 rehabilitated schools, about 700 new schools, 163 new health centers, 347 small water/sanitation systems, and 461 latrines) resulting in all children in the targeted areas attending primary school.

In addition the project communities were provided with better access to health care assistance and access to running water (Perez de Castillo, 1998). The Andhra Pradesh Rural Poverty Reduction Project (APRPRP) in India has help to organize 10.1 million rural poor women into community based organizations that collectively save over US$770 million and leverage credit over $2.7 billion from commercial banks (World Bank, 2003). The Kecamatan Development Program (KDP) in Indonesia which is what the National Solidarity Program in Afghanistan is based on has benefited 18 million people by providing better services which include more than 37,000 kilometers of local roads and 8,500 bridges, 9,200 clean water supply units, and 3,000 new or improved health posts. In addition, more than 1.3 million people obtained loans to start or complement local businesses through micro-financing (Guggenheim, 2004).

Developed countries and their development partners have been trying to involve communities and local governments in their own development since the end of Second World War, when the first colonies gained independence in South Asia. Pioneers in both India and Bangladesh (then a part of Pakistan) developed a clear vision of how it will be done: local development should be planned and managed by local citizens, their communities.

Nigeria is aggressively implementing rural development programs aimed at significantly reducing poverty. The objective of the country's development strategy, the 20:2020 Vision, for example, is to make Nigeria one of the 20 largest economies in the world by the year 2020. These efforts have produced promising results in the past ten years, when the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) grew by an annual average of 7 percent—more than double the 2.6–3.0 percent growth rate the country achieved from 1990 to 1999. The agricultural sector contributed about 47 percent of the GDP growth between 1990 and 2007, the largest contribution from a single sector. Despite this impressive growth, however, poverty in Nigeria remains entrenched. An estimated 54 percent of the Nigerian population lives below the poverty line, suggesting that the majority of the poor are being bypassed by these impressive achievements. What must policymakers do to target the poor? Government initiatives such as the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategies (NEEDS and NEEDS II) are currently being designed to empower the poor and vulnerable to escape from poverty and to participate in designing new publicly funded development programs.

It is against this background that this paper focuses on constructing an integrated framework for Community-Driven Development. There are challenges to Community Driven Development in

the local government system. The objectives of this paper are therefore to identify, analyze and suggest how best the framework of Community Driven Development should be set up.

Contextualizing Local Government and Community-Driven Development

Local Government

No commonly accepted definition exists of what a local government unit is. While scholars have difficulty in defining a local government the matter is a simple one for most citizens. They know that there exists National, State and Local Government. Thus it follows that a local government is the government of some particular local community. Local government definition includes three general criteria which a local unit must meet to quality as a government (Blair, 1977 & Elekwa, 1985).

The first holds that a unit must have existence as an organized entity with essential corporate powers. Second, a unit must possess governmental character. Third, a unit must enjoy substantial autonomy as evidence by local and administrative independence subject only to requirements of state law and supervision.

The above definition is given full meaning by the constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999) in section 7(1) where it states that:

> The system of local government by democratically elected local government councils is under this constitution guaranteed, and accordingly the government of every state shall, subject to section 8 of this constitution ensure their existence under a law which provides for the establishment, structure, composition finance and functions of such councils

Define such area as clearly as practicable and ensure, to the extent to which it may be reasonably justifiable, that in defining such area regard is paid to:

  i.   The common interest of the community in the area
  ii.   Traditional association of the community and
  iii. Administrative convenience and

It shall be the duty of the local government council within the state to participate in economic planning and development of the area referred to in sub section (2) above and to this end an establishment of economic planning board by the status of the State House of Assembly.

Inspite of the existence of local government and most importantly the economic planning and development board, social conditions in Nigeria present a startling paradox: despite a rich endowment of natural and human resources still most of the country is poor. For decades the country has struggled to improve socio-economic conditions, which have declined despite increasing revenue from crude oil.

The growing incidence and dynamics of poverty in Nigeria have stratified and polarized Nigerian society between the haves and have nots. Poverty reduction is the most difficult challenge facing Nigeria and its people and the greatest obstacle to the pursuit of sustainable socio-economic growth. The poverty rate in Nigeria, increased from 27 percent in 1980 to 66 percent in 1996. By 1999 it was estimated that more than 70 percent of Nigerian's lived in poverty National Planning Commission (2004). Life expectancy is a mere 54 years and infant mortality (77 per 1000) and

maternal mortality 704 per 100, 000 live births are among the highest in the World (National Planning Commission, 2004).

Community-Driven Development

CDD has only been in existence since the 1990s when two senior vice presidents of the Bank first agreed to support "popular participation" in development projects (Bhatnagar and Williams, 1992:1). World Bank support for community participation, which later paved the way for CDD, first came about from a global survey published in Voices of the Poor. The study was conducted by interviewing over 60,000 people in 60 countries. The Voices of the Poor survey concludes that poor people want the following:

> (a) organizations of their own so they can negotiate with government, traders, and NGOs; (b) direct assistance through community-driven programs so they can shape their own destinies; and (c) local ownership of funds, so they can end corruption. They want NGOs and governments to be accountable to them and a development process driven by their own communities (Voices of the Poor 2000).

These three suggestions, made on behalf of people in developing countries, characterize the very framework of CDD. While listening to the voices of underserved populations may not seem like a radical method to adopt in the fight against poverty, communicating and working directly with local communities is a relatively new strategy for the World Bank. Since taking the position of World Bank in 1995, has advocated for more community involvement in development projects. The Bank has called for the use of community participation in project development as part of the World Bank's CDD initiative. The BBC published an article which claims the CDD initiative is the "culmination of a major switch in [World Bank] strategy engineered by Mr. Wolfensohn" (BBC News Online 2000). In many respects, the CDD initiative is an admission of previous policy failures on the part of the World Bank. In particular, CDD is significant to the development of water supply systems in Central Asia because the use of community participation appears to be the most effective where water supply system sustainability is concerned (Bhatnagar and Williams, 1992).

Community driven development (CDD) is,therefore a development initiative that provides control of the development process, resources and decision making authority directly to community groups. The underlying assumption of CDD projects are that communities are the best judges of how their lives and livelihoods can be improved and, if provided with adequate resources and information, they can organize themselves to provide for their immediate needs. Moreover, CDD programmes are motivated by their trust in people (Naidoo and Finn, 2001) and hence it advocates people changing their own environment as a powerful force for development. By treating poor people as assets and partners in the development process, previous studies have shown that CDD is responsive to local demands, inclusive, and more cost-effective compared to centrally-led NGO-based programmes. CDD can also be supported by strengthening and financing community groups, facilitating community access to information, and promoting an enabling environment through policy and institutional reform (Dongier, 2002). CDD projects work by providing poor communities with direct funding for development with the communities then deciding how to spend the money. Lastly, the community plans and builds the project and takes responsibility for monitoring its progress

Community-Driven Development does not imply an exclusive focus on community-level action, but is best considered as a framework for linking community management of resources and empowerment for broader policy and institutional reform.

Community-Driven Development consists of

(1)   the clarification of the core principle guide decentralized, participatory and development programmes;

(2)   identifying a body of knowledge and practice that contribute to more effective strengthening of institutions of local government; and

(3)   outline the conceptual framework of a more integrated inventions and development around local territorial units such as districts, municipalities and wards. It builds on and strengthens existing organizational capacities within the local space (which generally corresponds to the scale of government jurisdiction) to develop more synchronized institutional arrangement and process linking community-based organizations local governments deconcentrated sectoral agencies as well as private organizations such as NGOs and CBOs and firms (World Bank, 2003).

Following from this description, field practitioners at the World Bank have denoted five key characteristics of CDD projects.

1. A CDD operation primarily targets a community-based organization or a representative local council of a community. This community focus means that the essential defining characteristic of a CDD project is that the beneficiaries or grantees of implementations are agents of the community. Since the focus on small communities is so large the CDD normally targets small scale subprojects in the community.

2. In CDD operations, community or locally based representation is responsible for designing and planning the subprojects in a participatory manner. Since the concentration on participatory planning is considerable in CDD operations, often the possible types of subproject investment options are very large with only a small list of subprojects that cannot be carried out.

3. The defining characteristic of CDD projects is that a transfer of resources to the community occurs and control of the resources is delegated to the community. The amount of transfer and control of resources will depend on the CDD implementations.

4. The community is directly involved in the implementation of the subproject. Often the participation of the community comes directly in the form of labour or funds. However, the community may also contribute to the subproject indirectly in the form of management and supervision of contractors or the operation and maintenance of the infrastructure when complete.

5. An element of community based monitoring and evaluation has become a characteristic of CDD subprojects. Most often it is social accountability tools such as participatory monitoring, community scorecards and grievance redress systems which allow for the community to ensure accountability of the CDD implementation ().

Local Government and Decentralized Participation in Development Programs: The Synergy

Decentralization involves the wide allocation of authority within an given unit of rule so that an increased number of individuals or groups may have easier access to and more influence on the process of policy formulation and implementation.

Trends toward decentralization frequently reflect popular sentiment that "bit government" is not representative of the people unable to fulfill individual human needs. With this view decentralization is defined (Nordinger and Hardy, 1972)

- Giving affected residents more power to provide for diverse governmental responses to particular and differing localized needs;
- Over coming the pervasive and deep disillusionment with state and local government that sense of political alienation and governmental disaffection by sharply mitigating the redistribution of power and influence toward concomitantly bringing government and bureaucratic officials closer to citizens served;
- Expanding opportunities for residents political involvement and deepened sense of community and
- Remedying bureaucratic insensitivities, unresponsiveness toward the delivery of municipal services, thereby improving the quality of such services.

In a suitable democratic system of government all segments of the society will have ample opportunities of participating in decision making that affect their lives while at the same time ensuring the masses of the people are not left out in contention. This aspect of democratic governance was ushered in since 1976 local government reform. Ever since then decentralization has therefore been a topic of renewed interest in part because of the focus of government program and citizen participation and community action and demands by residents for greater control. It can also be seen as a return to earlier traditional values of community associations and grassroots democracy. While there has been growing advocacy for community control and increased citizen participation, persons who fail to exercise their right to vote and participate in civic affairs of their community get larger and appear to be increasing (Elekwa, 2003).

Civic illiteracy and political apathy is revealed in such typical statement as government does not work any more "its unresponsive" and local officials don't care what the people think" it may be that the structure and process of government itself contributes to public apathy and alienation (Alexis De Tocqueville, 1956).

But perhaps, new and more innovative ways of providing for citizen participation in local affairs can increase communication and understanding between public officials and their constituents.

In order to create sustainable cities, wards and local governments in this rapidly urbanizing world, there is need to make changes in the organizational structure of local government. This brings to the fore the need to further break the local governments into municipalities, development areas/districts and wards to further decentralized. There is a general acceptance that a centralized and hierarchical bureaucratic system does not work well in today's fast changing, information rich,

knowledge based society and economy and that there is need for a more effective and efficient management. According to Sheng and Mohit, 1997:18

> It has become imperative to make urban organizations and institutions more flexible and to changing circumstances, committed to the delivery of high quality and non standard gods and services to meet he demands of an ever more critical populations, more efficient to be able "to squeeze ever more bang our of every buck" lead to persuasion and incentives and aimed at empowering citizens.

In their book *"Re-inventing Government"* Osborne and Gaebler (1993) say that the right kind of government redefines its traditional role to be a catalyst and facilitator. It will more and more define problems and then assemble resources for others to use in addressing those problems (Sheng and Mohit, 1997). They refer to a reinvented government as one that separates its function of policy decision making (Steering) from its function of service delivery rowing; in order words today's governments have to do less and lead more. Governments preoccupied with service delivery often have no time for their steering function, while those which focus on steering will be able to actively shape their towns, cities, Districts and wards. They will make more policy decisions, they may even do more regulating; they will make sure those institutions in the decentralized local government, private sector, CBOs and NGOs and third sector deliver the services and meet community needs.

In view of this write-up, authority is at the centre of local political systems, that is, all the activities in the system are seen as related to the authority, which has been vested in the system. The effort of participants may be to maintain existing authority, destroy it, enlarge it, reduce it, acquire it or simply direct its exercise. It is the concept of authority so defined that gives coherence to local political systems (Flinn, 1970).

The legal basis of local government authority in Nigeria is very important. When issuing their commands whether in the form of edicts, ordinances or administrative decision, local officials, look unceasingly for legal support. Their edicts or administrative decision cannot conflict with those of higher levels of government. Also, in Nigeria, the law establishing local government emphasized uniformity in form of government and prescribed its internal arrangement and process (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1988). Local government authority has been known to be controlled excessively by the higher levels of government in form of state administrative, legislative and financial controls. Additional political problems faced by local government are that the boundaries and nature of towns are undefined and these create overlapping jurisdictional problems that have administrative implication. In these circumstances, accountability, good governance and transparency become problem. A person who is accountable can be called to account for that he is responsible for whatever is entrusted to his care, whether it is property, duties or authority. Political accountability is the responsibility of persons with authority for the use of their authority.

In formally with authority democratic systems accountability is a two-step process, the accountability of administrators to elected officials and the accountability of elected authorities to the electorate (Flinn, 1970).

A New Strategy for Community Driven Development in the Local Government System in Nigeria

This section outlines the conceptual framework for a more integrated approach to local development.

Models of Neighborhood Councils

In this respect Hallman distinguishes between five major types of neighborhood councils (Hallman, 1977).

- The first is council, which have been specifically authorized by local government or city charter;
- The second are those which have been created by the local government or city ordinance and organized in all neighborhoods of the city or communities wards within the local government area;
- The third type of councils have been set up as part of the city's or local government's effort to involve neighbourhood or communities in the planning process and have been phased in over several months or a year;
- A fourth type exists in cities or local governments which instead of creating new neighbourhood councils or community have recognized existing private neighbourhood/community associations and provided them with staff assistance and modest financial aid and
- The final type by Hallman, is privately organized neighbourhood councils or independent citizens organizations which have a special relationship with the local government or city council, ward committees etc.

In Nigeria, for example, recognizing community organization is a way of using existing community organization to fulfill the advisory functions. Organizations are recognized by council, ordinance or resolution. The strategy is often politically popular; it can be a way to reward communities that have been active in local affairs. Working with experienced groups also may be less cumbersome than forming new boards, and creating new coalitions. An example of this arrangement is provided in Anambra State. To encourage the formation of organization in all communities within Anambra State, Anambra State Government passed a resolution in the blue print form rural development in the state regarding criteria for recognition of community organizations and defining their relationship to the local and state governments (Anambra State Blue Print for Rural Development, 1986).

The recognized community organizations became the area's official representatives within the local government and their roles are advisory to the local government departments engaged in community development and delivery and provision of other essential public services. There are a variety of approaches, which can be adopted to ensure that neighbourhoods or community concerns are well represented in city and local government decision making. A great deal can be learned by reviewing the rich experience of decentralization effort in other local governments or cities in other parts of the world.

City-wide Neighbourhood Planning Boards

The most comprehensive method for incorporating neighbourhoods into local government involves dividing up the city into neighbourhood boards, districts and enacting a local ordinance or charter amendments to give official recognition to neighbourhood boards and to spell out their powers. Boards usually act in an advisory capacity but may have policy making authority (Nordlinger & Hardy, 1972).

An example of this arrangement is found in New York City. New York City has the longest history of city wide neighbourhoods boards in five boroughs, members are appointed by the local borough resident. Neighbourhood boundaries, established after consultation with local residents and organizations are based on such factors as community encompassing such areas as the Capital Square, German Village, Italian Village and Ohio State University neighbourhoods.

Their duties vary. Some commissions merely study local economies social and physical problems and recommend action to the planning commission and council, others act in advisory capacity on specific issues, review city reports and administrative action involving their areas, recommend area residents for boards and commission concerning properties located in their areas. Some commissions have more advisory authority, three commissions issue certificate of appropriateness for new construction or rehabilitation before zoning clearance is granted. Columbus has assigned seven full-time planners to neighbourhood planning. They provide technical assistance to commissions and serve as Liaison between the commission and other city agencies.

Recognized Neighbourhood Organization

Recognizing neighbourhood organization is a way of using existing community organization to fulfill the advisory functions. Organizations are recognized by city council ordinance or resolution. This strategy is often politically popular; it can be a way to reward groups that have been active in local affairs. Working with experience groups also may be less cumbersome than forming new boards and creating new coalitions. Eugene, Oregon, provides an example of this arrangement. To encourage the formation of organization in al neighbourhoood, the city council passed a resolution in August, 1976 establishing criteria for recognition of neighbourhood organizations and defining their relationship to the city government (Nordlinger & Hardy, 1972).

To be recognized, the neighbourhood organization must submit to the city council a proposal for neighbourhood governance and a petition signed by local residents. The organization must agree to hold open meetings and to when they were based on improvements within the rural areas.

Thus, it is apparently impossible to remove the evil at the roots and the authorities are consequently forced to tackle the problems within the urban areas. A successful attempt in handling the enormity of this problem requires transparency, accountability and efficient governance of towns, cities and metropolitan areas. In order to realize objectives of the Habitat Agenda in Nigeria in respect to the provision of housing and infrastructural support systems, employment opportunities, etc., there are several requirements for new settlements which must be given serious consideration before large schemes are developed (Knauerand Streenfos, 1983).

Firstly, a human dwelling must comply with local family patterns and customs. Time and again, governments have neglected this basic requirement. Industrialized building methods have been introduced based on European practice. The results have often been that the layouts do not provide for the local family life or the rents are so high that heavy government subsidies are required which just add another problem to the other burdens of the governments.

There must be job opportunities in sufficient numbers within or near new settlements. If the inhabitants of the squatter settlements/shanty towns are simply relocated to the opposite side of the city, inhabitants will have to travel between their new home and their job. This further overloads the public transportations system and imposes heavy extra-financial burdens upon the individual families.

New settlements must be sufficiently serviced by infrastructure and public facilities such as schools, places of religious worship, recreational centres and all essential community and public facilities. One of the major problems is, to prevent urbanization from encroaching on arable or prime agricultural lands.

The damage to prime agricultural land is irreversible. If such main requirements are not met, new settlements deteriorate, become slums and eventually nourish political unrest or extremism. Thus the study, planning, and development of new settlements, rehabilitation of existing facilities, redevelopment projects and the overall concept of gentrification of cities are complex process and represent areas of extreme difficulty and require the availability of experts of diversified skills and experience. This complex process has been simplified through involvement of the citizens, private sector, third sector, relevant government institutions and international donor agencies.

Institutional and Capacity Arrangements for the new CDD Strategy: The Way Forward

This section of the paper emphasizes the important of tailoring local institutional arrangement and capacities to the specific local context. The proposed framework will enable higher levels of government and local government to employ context-appropriate strategies from improving empowerment, governance and service provision through a participatory, decentralized sectoral approach to local development. In Nigeria where traditional local government follows a top down control system there is usually an erosion of trust in the political system. This has developed as a consequence of the lack of transparent use and the unpredictability in flows of fund, widespread corruption and inability to meet community needs. Under this circumstance the role of the higher levels of governments and local government will be to enhance facilitating negotiations among citizens, who had been empowered by this process which relied on community participation, transparency and participatory planning to engage in various socio-economic and physical development problems of their communities.

Care should be taken to ensure sustainable intervention of funds and resources to communities. Local government should account for not only those who can organize for development but must include the unorganized and the poor who are known to be lacking on organizational skills for resource disbursement.

Finally, there is need for leadership and accumulation of political capital in local development. This is very much so because decentralization is not only about shifting resources to the local level, it also requires assigning new rules and capacities to local governments as well. The framework for local government demands that a strong local government should be the core of development and its responsibilities should also encompass own resource mobilization (to reed dependence on central transfers) and economic development.

Conclusion

The World Bank's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper Sourcebook (Dongier et al, 2002) views community-driven development as a mechanism for enhancing sustainability, improving efficiency and effectiveness, allowing poverty reduction efforts to be taken to scale, making development more inclusive, empowering poor people, building social capital, strengthening governance, and complementing market and public sector activities. Community-driven development is said to

achieve all this by reducing information problems (by eliciting development priorities directly from target communities and allowing communities to identify projects and eligible recipients of private benefits), expanding the resources available to the poor (through credit, social funds, capacity building, and occupational training), and strengthening the civic capacities of communities by nurturing organizations that represent them.

The potential gains from community-driven development are large. It has the explicit objective of reversing power relations in a manner that creates agency and voice for poor people, allowing them to have more control over development assistance. This is expected to make the allocation of development funds more responsive to their needs, improve the targeting of poverty programs, make government more responsive, improve the delivery of public goods and services, and strengthen the capabilities of the citizenry to undertake self-initiated development activities. This vision has become one of the cornerstones of the World Bank's Comprehensive Development Framework, with its increasing emphasis on empowerment (Dongier et al, 2002). This vision is not universally shared, however. Skeptics have misgivings about the basic precepts of the approach and more practical concerns with the challenges of implementing such projects. Summers (2001), for example, is concerned that local institutions promoted under the aegis of such projects could undermine democratically elected governments. Harriss (2001), Mosse (2001), Cooke and Kothari (2001), and others have focused on what happens when complex and contextual concepts like community, empowerment and capacity for collective action are applied to the needs of large development projects on tight timelines. Project implementers, whose incentives are often poorly aligned with the needs of the project, may choose to gloss over differences within target groups that underscore local power structures and to short-change the more difficult task of institution building in favor of more easily deliverable and measurable outcomes.

To achieve Community-Driven local development, all the suggestions given within our framework will encounter challenges such as lack of political will. For example decentralization process strips power from the central and state governments. The framework acknowledges the need for a coordinating body in local Community Driven Development framework to facilitate communication and avoid conflicts.

REFERENCES

African Development Bank, (2010), "Proceedings of the 2009 International Conference on Community Driven Development and Rural Poverty Alleviation" Beijing (with Cliff Burklye and Jacomina de Regt), http://www.adb.org/Documents/Events/2009/CDD-Rural-Poverty Alleviation/CDD-Summary-Proceedings.pdf,.

Anambra State Government (1986), *Anambra State Blue Print for Rural Development,* Enugu Government Printers.

Anonymous, (2000), "Work Bank: Listen to poor," BBC News Online Accessed: 30 November 2004. Available [Online]: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1 /low/business/677232.stm>.

Asian Development Bank (2011), *Community-Driven Development and Institutional Sustainability in Asia*, Bankok: Asian Development Bank.

Asian Pacific Policy Center. (2007), *Tracking Progress towards Community Empowerment and Welfare (Midterm Survey for the Impact Evaluation of the KalahiCIDSS),* Manila: Asian Pacific Policy Center.

Anthony, B., Guggenheim, S., Olson, E. and Woolcock, M. (2004), "Exploring Social Capital Debates at the World Bank," *Journal of Development Studies,* 29(1):25–49.

Bhatnagar, B.and Aubrey,C. W. (eds.) (1992), *Participatory Development and the Potential Directions for Change,* Washington D.C.: The World Bank.

Blair, G.S. (1977), *Government at the Grass Root 2nd* Edition, California: Palisade Publishers.

Cooke, B. and Kothari, U. (2001), *Participation: The New Tyranny,* London: Zed Books.

Dongier, P. and Van Domelen, J., Ostrom, E., Ryan, A., Wakeman, W. Bebbington, A. Alkire, S. Esmail, T., & Polski, M. (2002), "Community Driven Development" in: Klugman*, J. (*ed)*, Sourcebook for Poverty Reduction Strategies,* Washington DC.: World Bank.

Elekwa, N.N. (2003), *The Management of the people and their Environment,* Abakaliki: Willy Rose & Appleseed Publishing Coy.

Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999), *Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria,* Lagos: Federal Government Press.

Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004) (National Planning Commission), *National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy* (NEEDS), Abuja: Communications Development Incorporated.

Federal Republic of Nigeria (1988) (The Presidency), *The 1988 Guidelines,* Abuja: Department of Local Government Affairs.

Flinn, T. A, (1970), *Local Government Politics,* and Decision-making system, Glenview, Illionois: Scott Foresmaca and Company.

Gbenga, O. (2007), *Fadama II Beneficiary Assessment Terminal Report,* Abuja: National Fadama Development Office,

Harriss, J. (2001), *Depoliticizing Development: The World Bank and Social Capital*, New Delhi: Left Word Books.

International Development Association (IDA) (2010), *IDA at Work: Community Driven Development — Empowering People to Lead their Development*, Washington DC.: World Bank

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) (2002), *Managing for Impact in Rural Development: A Guide for Project M&E*, Rome: IFAD. Available at: http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/guide/index.htm.

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) (2004), *Community Development Funds in IFAD Projects: Some Emerging Lessons for Project Design,* Rome: International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) (2006), *Initiative on Community Driven Development Regional Workshop Report,* Accra, FIDAFRIQUE program, IFAD. Also available at: http://fidafrique.net/ rubrique282.html.

Jorgensen, S. (2005), *Framing the logic of CDD operations: Toward a project theory for CDD design and evaluation,* Washington, DC: World Bank.

Knauer, B. & Steenfos, H. (1983), "The Basic of Good Urban Development", *The Courier,* No. 81. Sept. – Oct., Pp.18-26.

Matous, P. (2013), "The making and unmaking of community-based water supplies in Manila," *Development in Practice, Volume 23, Issue 2,* Pp. 217-231.

Mosse, D. (1997), "Colonial and Contemporary Ideologies of Community Management: The Case of Tank Irrigation Development in South India," *Modern Asian Studies*, 33(2):303–38.

Nordurlinger, E., A. & Hardy, J. (1972), "Urban Decentralization. An Evaluation of Four Models," *Public Policy*, Vol. 2 Summer, Pp. 89-101.

Sheng, Y. & Mohit, R.S. (1997), Background Paper for International Export Group Meeting on capacity Building for Sustainable cities in Asia Human Settlements Development Programme, Asian Institute of Technology Bangkok Thailand.

Summers, L. (2001), "Speech at World Bank Country Director's Retreat", Washington D.C.:

Tocqueville Alexis De (1956), *Democracy in America* edition, New York: Haffner, R. D.

Perez, D.C. (1998), *Economic Analysis of Social Investment Fund Projects,* Washington, DC: World Bank.

Voices of the Poor (2000), "New Study Offers Unique Human Insight into Living With Poverty World Bank," Accessed: 1 December 2004. Available [Online]:<http://www3.sympatico .ca/truegrowth/worldbank1.html>

Wassenich, P. and Whiteside, C. (2003), *CDD Impact Assessments Study: Optimizing Evaluation Design under Constraints,* Washington, DC: World Bank.

Wong, S. (2003), "Indonesia Kecamatan Development Program: Building a Monitoring and Evaluation System for a Large-Scale Community-Driven Development Program,*" EASES Discussion Paper.* Washington, DC.: World Bank.

Wong, S. (2009), *Monitoring & Evaluation for CDD Operations: Lessons Learned,* Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Bank, FAO, and IFAD, (2010), *Gender in agriculture sourcebook*, Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Bank (2005a), *The Effectiveness of World Bank Support for Community-Based and -Driven Development: An OED Evaluation.* Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Bank (2005b), *The Results Chain in a Bank-Supported CDD Intervention,* Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Bank (2007a), *Enabling East Asian Communities to Drive Local Development: East Asia Region CDD Flagship Report*, Unpublished Mimeo. Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Bank (2011a), *Measuring Impact of Community- Driven Development Projects on Gender— Toolkit for the Poverty Reduction Fund, Lao PDR*, Washington, DC: World Bank

World Bank (2011b), *Making everyone Count: Gender sensitive Monitoring and Evaluation in a Community-Driven Development Program: The Case of the Philippines' KALAHI-CIDSS,* Washington, DC: World Bank.