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ABSTRACT
The study examined the issues and challenges of community development in Nigeria with a focus on the activities of the Gombe State Agency for Community and Social Development Project (GSA-CSDP), particularly on development intervention of the rural communities in Gombe State. The methodology applied included the use of secondary data using the content analysis approach while the primary data was extracted from the Outcome study report of the Gombe state Agency for Community and social development Project (GSA-CSDP). The study reveals that, despite successive Governments’ efforts to develop rural communities, the bane has remained pervasive GSA-CSDP. However, is rated high in the provision of micro-projects to the rural communities. Inclusive improvements are widespread in all sectors; particularly in increase access by community members (especially the poor) to improved social and natural infrastructure services with high hopes of capability sustenance. The study indicates that community members actively participated in the planning and implementation of micro-projects in their communities and that the projects had a positive impact on the lives of members of the community. The article therefore recommends for increased awareness and sensitization; there is also a need for women's participation and the need for security and maintenance of micro projects in rural communities.
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I. INTRODUCTION
Nigeria gained independence from the British colonial government in 1960. Since then, rural or community development has been declared a priority by successive civil or military governments. Nigeria's rural areas have the largest number of citizens, with at least 75 per cent of the country's population living in rural areas. It is the collective desire of this vast majority of the Nigerian population to have access to development, whatever their political, economic and social status. The basic development objectives of Nigeria include: Reducing rural poverty and unemployment in rural areas; Incorporating grassroots communities into national socio-economic and political development through effective participation in their own affairs; Improving incomes of rural people whose main activity is agriculture and non-agricultural activities such as handicrafts, wholesale and so on. Improving the quality of people's lives by providing basic products such as food, drinking water, electricity, health services, schools, etc. (Udo, 2014)
It is clear that successive regimes in Nigeria have at different times begun programs and approaches to combat poverty, rural development and food security and their associated effect on the country. These programs include: creation of more state-, local government, development centres, and mobilization of people for local participation in the planning and implementation of community development projects to establish new development centers, thereby reducing migration from rural to urban areas. A look at Nigeria's national development plans such as the nation's nutrition process and the Green Revolution programs of the military regime Olusegun Obasanjo and the civil regime Shehu Shagari (1975-1985), respectively. Others are the Directorate for Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI) by the Babangida military administration (1985 – 1993); the Better Life for Rural Women and Family Support programmes by the wives of Babangida and Sani Abacha respectively; and the Family Economic Advancement Programme (FEAP) coupled with the very recent Subsidy Re-investment Programme (Sure-P) programmes. Most of these programs are commendable, but the implementation strategies show that they are mere decorations and cosmetics because their impacts neither reduce poverty in the country nor increase the standard of living at the grass-roots level. Larry & Sunday (2016) In view of the fact that the Federal Government in cooperation with United Nations development programs introduced the UNDP microcredit program in the late 1990s to address the critical poverty problem and the social and economic development of its population.

II. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF CSDP IN NIGERIA

The Nigeria’s National Economic Empowerment Strategies (NEEDS) and the State Economic Empowerment Strategies (SEEDS), the need to involve beneficiaries in poverty reduction initiatives as key players and partners is well emphasized. Consequently, the Federal Government of Nigeria reformed some of its poverty reduction interventions and instituted new ones. Notable among such programmes/interventions are the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP), the Nigerian Agriculture, Cooperative and Rural Development Bank (NACRDB), and the National Health Insurance Scheme (NHIS). With the support of international agencies, the Federal and State Governments also instituted and implemented community-driven development (CDD)-based interventions as pilots in some selected States and communities. Such CDD type of projects includes the Community-based Poverty Reduction Project (CPRP), the Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project (LEEMP) and FADAMA supported by the World Bank and African Development Bank (AfDB). (MTR, 2011)

The federal government and the World Bank agree on the effectiveness of the CDD approach in the overall strategy of growth and poverty reduction in the nation, and thus continue to use this approach in subsequent interventions. The CDD approach was seen as an important mechanism to ensure the participation of poor rural people in reducing poverty and growth in the country. The partnership strategy adopted in CDD for community development projects has been particularly successful, particularly in improving poor people's access to social and economic services at the grass-roots level. (MTR, 2011)

There is evidence of contributions to reducing maternal and infant mortality through the construction and furnishing of primary health centers in several municipalities; improving school performance through the construction and furnishing of primary and secondary education courses in many municipalities; improving access to drinking water through the construction and operation of wells and automatic water pumps in several municipalities. There are good results and outcomes on rural access roads, rural electrification, rural markets, natural resource management and improved economic livelihoods for micro projects, such as crop processing, fisheries and agroforestry. The success of the approach of the CCD on Sustainable Development has led to
pressure to expand similar interventions to other States. This is the motivation for community and social
development project (CSDP). (MTR, 2011)
The CSDP is designed to backup: (i) the empowerment of communities to develop, implement and monitor micro
projects; and (ii) strengthening the skills and capacity of LGAs and public agencies to support communities and as
well as build a partnership between them. The design of CSDP is in line with development of priorities of
government and other development partners, particularly as it relates to poverty reduction, employment creation
and wealth generation. It is also in line with the World Bank’s commitment to poverty reduction by permitting the
rural poor of Nigeria to access improved social infrastructure. To support the implementation of the CSDP, the
Federal Government of Nigeria sought and obtained financial assistance from the International Development
Association (IDA) of the World Bank Group. The Project is planned to be implemented from 2009 to 2013. Based
on dialogue between the Federal Ministry of Finance and the States Governments prior to implementation of the
CSDP, the following categories of States were identified by the Federal Government as States where CSDP would
be implemented: (MTR, 2011)
1. CPRP States that are willing to continue in a scaled-up model (including States funded by (AfDB). They are
   Abia, Rivers, Ebonyi, Edo, Ekiti, Gombe, Kebbi, Kogi, Kwara, Osun, Yobe, and Zamfara.
2. LEEMP States who would automatically join the project after exhausting resources under their current
   allocations in LEEMP. The States are Adamawa, Bauchi, Benue, Katsina, Niger, Bayelsa, Imo, Enugu, and Oyo.
3. New States that have requested to join the project and are part of the project preparation. These include
   Plateau, Ogun, Ondo, Anambra, Kaduna, Akwa-Ibom, Nasarawa, Taraba and Jigawa.
According to the MTR (mid-term review) 2011, the following twenty-five States are actively participating in
CSDP: Abia, Adamawa, Bauchi, Bayelsa, Benue, Cross River, Edo, Ebonyi, Ekiti, Enugu, Gombe, Imo, Katsina,
Kebbi, Kogi, Kwara, Nasarawa, Niger, Ondo, Osun, Oyo, Plateau, Taraba, Yobe and Zamfara.
The Community and Social Development Project is a World Bank assisted programme aimed at accelerating
poverty alleviation at the grassroots. According to Demoa (2012), the programme which took off in Nigeria
officially in 2009 is an officially of the Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project (LEEMP)
and the Community-based Poverty Reduction Project (CPRP). It is collaboration between the World Bank and the
federal government of Nigeria to promote poverty alleviation and grassroots development. This scheme places
beneficiaries of poverty alleviation projects on the seat of stakeholders, who participate in the planning, execution
and monitoring of the projects. This is clearly articulated in their principle which serves as a guiding principle for
the implementation of micro projects. The principle reads thus: (MTR, 2011)
1. Goal: Poverty reduction
2. Mission: Community empowerment
3. Strategy: Learning by doing
4. How: Go to the people, live with them, learn from them, plan with them, work with them, start with what they
   know, build on what they know, teach by showing, learn by doing, not showcase but a pattern, not odds and ends
   but a system, not to conform but transform, not relief but release.
III. CSDP IN GOMBE STATE

In August 2011, the Gombe State Agency for Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) with support from the World Bank and Gombe State Government joined other participating states of the federation in the program. Although the implementation took off in 2011, it is apparent that the Gombe State CSDP has performed creditably in the execution of the project activities in line with the CDD concept. The Gombe CSDA annual (2012) progress review indicates that an overall 85.8% has been achieved by the agency on the six-point deliverables. The achievements cuts across the six-point areas comprising of the section of sensitization/mobilization and capacity building (98.9%), office accommodation, furniture and equipment (100%), poverty mapping (100%), state project launch (100%), twenty two CDPs brought forward and completed (62.2%) and the twenty new CDPs approved and funded (54%) accordingly. In addition, the budget summary for 2012 shows a Gombe CSDA budget performance of up to 73.3% in which 84.3% was achieved on goods, 89.8% on consultancy, 77.2% on operating cost and 68% on grants. (OSR, 2012)

IV. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Until recently, most Nigerian communities felt that it was the responsibility of the Government and its authorities to respond to the needs of their communities. In other words, the government must develop society by providing all necessary infrastructure and social and physical facilities (Onibokun, 1976). Consequently, social services are absent in most communities. However, the degree or level of poor infrastructure faced by communities varies from place to place. It is now clear that most communities are reluctant to adopt and expect the government to do what is required in other to promote an enabling environment and facilities for community development. The government must provide essential amenities such as drinking water, good roads, health services, improved education in agriculture and literacy, as well as operational protection of lives and property. This has not been obtainable. Therefore, people must meet as a social unit to develop their society by eliminating their differences which is the main factors affecting community under-development in community development. Obayelu (2007) says poor infrastructure, such as inadequate electricity, good roads, pipelines, markets and hospitals, reveals high underdevelopment in the country. According to Ofoh as cited in Okereke et al. (2016) reported that many development programs that had been tried in the past in Nigeria had failed. Their failure can be linked to corrupt practices in the country. Although corruption has been identified as one of the most important delinquent in the economic, social and political process in Nigeria, there is still much to do about the problems and challenges facing community development in Nigeria. Accordingly, the study attempts to examine the issues and challenges of community development in Nigeria with special importance on the activities of the Gombe State Agency for Community and Social Development Project (GSA-CSDP), particularly on the intervention on development of the rural communities of Gombe State.

V. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to examine the issues and challenges of community development in Nigeria with special emphasis on the activities of the Gombe State Agency for Community and Social Development Project (GSA-CSDP), particularly on the intervention on development of the rural communities of Gombe State. Specifically, the objectives pursued in this study are:

i. To assess the issues and challenges of community development in Nigeria
ii. To deepen knowledge of CSDP particularly on Gombe state, Nigeria

iii. To estimate the number of people with access to social services in terms of water, health, transport and electricity in Gombe state.

iv. To Ascertain the Number of People with Access to Natural Resources Infrastructure in Gombe state.

VI. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The institutional approach was adopted as a framework for this study. The basic argument of this theory is that the institutional framework for the planning and implementation of rural development programs should be placed elsewhere permanently, not temporally in other to obtain significant development. Olisa and Obiuku (1992) proposed the institutional approach. According to this theory, there should be an institutional framework for the planning and implementation of existing rural and non-strategic rural development programs, where agencies are created to deal with certain situations and later they became dilapidated when such programmes they were created to handle ends, or are scrapped by succeeding administrations. Under this approach, rural people need food, electricity, good health care, communications, social interaction facilities, and so forth. Rural electrification, an improved sanitation, According to La-Anyene (2006) as quoted in Larry & Sunday (2016), the basic institutions in rural development argue that the latter is a sign to improve the standard of living, while the former will prevent youth migrating to cities because of urban events in rural areas. They can use electrical equipment and can run treatment plants. They can also be stored, heated and cooled better and provide more attractive conditions for agriculture. The institutional approach therefore calls for the establishment of a permanent institution to be established permanently at the local level as a standing body responsible for monitoring and coordinating activities at the grass-roots level. The institutional approach ensures that development strategies are progressive so that efforts are improved upon progressively and outcomes are sustained and maintained by successive Governments and development agencies.

VII. CONCEPTUAL Framework

The concept "community" has a diversity of meanings such as geographic location (the most common) identity and a sense of belonging (Gilchrist, 2004). In addition, community means a group of individuals living in the same place and under the same administration. (American Heritage Dictionary) It comprises of parents/guardians, residents, corporate organizations etc. Community is defined in various ways by different authors Ferrinho (1980) describes community as a exact organization that arises when human populace settle in a certain territory, have shared common characteristics and interests and build mutual relations for common benefits. However, Garcia, Giulioni and Wiesenfeld (1999) note that individuals and community are connected together with features that is both exceptional and diverse. For De Beer, Swanepoel and Hennie (1998), a community is a specific geographic area with shared interests and needs of its members. A community is a specific geographic area with shared interests and needs of its members. A common thread for these definitions is that there is a grouping of people who reside in a specific locality with a full range of daily felt needs. In this regard a community is a socially, culturally and ecologically limited group of people who are capable of making a difference in their lives. Community development is defined as the ability of people to work together to achieve their common interests (Maser, 1997). Moreover, it’s a process for the marginalized and excluded to gain self-confidence in joining
others and to contribute in activities to change their situation and tackle the issues that face their community (CPA, 2000). According to Maimunah Ismail (1999) Community development as a process of community activities planned and organized in order to increase the standard of living in a social, cultural, spiritual and the setting through creativities and active participation of the individuals in the community with minimum help from outside. De Beer and Swanepoel (2001), traced the origins to the experiences of community improvement and social welfare in the US and UK in the 1930s. In the US in the 1930s, community development focused on improving the welfare of rural communities. On the other hand, social welfare packages in the US and UK was for poverty relief and dedicated mostly on urban areas.

VIII. ISSUES OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA

It should be noted that the rural or community development initiatives of the Government have created a culture of dependence on people rather than people themselves embarking on development initiatives. While it is the responsibility of the government to create an enabling environment for community and rural development, corruption, greed and mismanagement associated with these institutions and authorities, do not allow them to achieve their desired goals. In this context, Okpaga (2004) said: "Instead of using these institutions for rural transformation, they become channels where public funds are emptied into private pockets." In addition, the British colonial administration did not deal with planning for the development of rural areas. Indeed, development is the opposite of colonialism. The few infrastructure and infrastructure available in the few urban cities, especially in the European neighbourhoods or areas reserved for whites, have been concentrated only to their merit. The rural areas, accounting for more than 70% of Nigerians and produces most of the colonial wealth, only saw the effects of government in the form of tax and occasional visits by colonial officials and their clients. Thus, Onimode (1981: 33) rightly said: The rural persons who were underprivileged by multiple taxation shattered by colonial police and court suppression and submerged in a culture of silence through illiteracy, were certainly amongst the most cruelly oppressed by the British colonialism.

It is discouraging to note that in the area of investment and government provision of amenities, the urban areas are more favoured than rural areas. Studies conducted by Diejomaoh (1973:100-103) show that public expenditure on education, health, water, electricity, industry, and road construction is mainly favoured by urban dwellers, and that less than 30% of total public expenditure is devoted to rural communities, despite the significance and prospective of the rural sector. Where employment and its contribution to GDP, private sector investments in the second national development period are estimated at € 612 million (1970-1974), only € 246 million, or 15 per cent in rural areas, essentially the same proportion in the third and fourth quarters of development, 1975-1985 (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1970-74) (Enyi, 2014)According to Enyi (2014), it is also regrettable that the various aids and assistance to Nigeria by international organizations and institutions such as UNO, USAID, DFID, WHO, and others have not been utilized to the benefit of rural development in Nigeria. This is due to the acceleration of corruption and serious mismanagement at all levels of government in Nigeria. The net effect of the above analysis is that rural Nigerians are highly neglected in various areas of human activity. They do not have the basic needs of life, they are deprived and exploited, and therefore rural development in Nigeria remains an illusion.
IX. CHALLENGES OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA

The state of development in rural Nigeria is unsatisfactorily with slow economic growth and development. The indices of this condition include poor agricultural productivity; gross infrastructural deficit; rapid population increase; unemployment; lack of social amenities; among others, which had finished in dehumanizing rural poverty and underdevelopment in all effects. The people live on the fringe of hunger, poverty and ignorance, which undermined their protection and natural resistance to diseases; such that epidemic continued to kill thousands every year (Ekpe, 2006)

Developments in the Community in Nigeria relate to a number of problems that tend to undermine its capacity and ability to achieve development goals. Numerous reasons have been put forward for the poor development of rural communities, including the followings:

**Politicians and Party politics:** Most politicians are often selfish, and after the elections tend to be more on the selfish agenda than in development. This calibre of people lacks the political will to initiate and formulate development policies and programs that will change their communities. Party politics at the local level tends to promote narrow interests rather than the general interests of society. It divides instead of uniting different rural communities, which had made modest progress at the local level difficult. (Udo, 2014)

**Corruption:** There is corruption in public and private life. Most Nigerians see official positions within or outside government as a means of self-enrichment, an opportunity to become rich overnight. Corruption has deprived communities that needed resources to develop. Corruption occurs at the local level by over-inflating contracts, creating of projects that cannot be implemented or abandoned if the contractor gets a huge percentage of the total contract as a mobilization fee. Corruption is also committed at the local level through dubious spending in the form of duty tour claims, hospitality allowances, and financial assistance among others. Through these means, huge government resources are tapped by both elected and career officials of the government. (Odo, 2014)

**Community Participation:** Development is about people and if it is to be meaningful, the people must be its active agent and not just passive beneficiaries (Odo, 2012) Many development projects in the local governments failed due to non-involvement of the local communities in the conception, design and implementation of such projects. As Odo (2012) noted any development programme, which marginalizes the contributions of the primary beneficiaries, could hardly make serious impact on the lives of the people including lack of sustainability. This is because the local communities, which could have owned the programme and continued from where the government stopped, are from the levels of conception, design and implementation, excluded.

**Top-down approach:** The top-down model has a significant philosophical and practice history. The top-down model is structured around the use of professional leadership provided by external resources that plan, implement, and evaluate development programs. The top-down approach is a strategy adopted in which community development planning activities are carried out at the top hierarchy of government. The choice of what problems to address, what priority project to execute how the project will be executed and those to be involved in the execution will all be decided by the top government personnel or the central government. People at the community level will only be involved during implementation as directed by the top government.

**Misplacement of Priorities:** This is a fall-out of non-involvement of the people in the decisionson matters that affect them directly. On this premise, many development projects executed by governments do not reflect the basic needs of the individuals in the communities. Many white elephant projects with huge capital costs are undertaken to the neglect of the basic needs of the rural people. This is a negation of community development, which ought to
address the critical areas of rural development such as construction and maintenance of rural feeder-roads; provision of potable water; electricity; primary healthcare services; basic education; agricultural extension services; amongst others. (Odo, 2014)

**Local Governments:** Lack of dependable revenue base is a critical factor that has constrained the efforts of most local governments in grassroots development. As Odo (2014) observed, even though one of the criteria for creating local governments as provided by the 1976 local government reforms guidelines was the issue of viability, most local governments created since then have come to be solely dependent on their statutory allocations from the federation account to run their affairs. Although the revenue accruing to the local governments from the federation account has been increasing over time, the cash flow has not been correspondingly constant. This is because the federal government revenue is exclusively dependent on the sales of crude oil at the international market. Since most local governments depend entirely on federal allocations to run their affairs, the fluctuations in the country’s earning from oil has adversely affected their performance in services delivery to the people at the community level. (Odo, 2014)

**Manpower:** Most government’s ministries in Nigeria suffer from poor and inadequate staffing. The scarcity of executive capacity in the government service undermines the effective performance of the councils in grassroots development. This underscores the centrality of human resources in the development process. The available staffs in most government’s offices across the country are dominated by the generalists such as administrative/executive officers; clerks; artisans; office assistants (messengers); typists; amongst others. Most state and local governments are lacking in qualified and skilled personnel to offer professional and expertise services designed to transform rural communities. (Odo, 2014)

X. CHALLENGES OF CSDP IN NIGERIA

In spite of the remarkable performance of CSDP in Nigeria and the significant impact it is making in several communities across the country, a few constraints and challenges need to be tackled if the project is to generate more impact in the future. The degree of commitment of the Federal and some State Governments in terms of timely payment of their counterpart funds is still very low. This could negatively affect the timely disbursement of funds for project activities. The CDD approach has not been institutionalized at Federal, State and Local Government levels. This poses some challenge for sustainability. In some communities where the literacy level of community members is very low, there is a possible problem of poor disclosure. The issues of elite capture, where the elite propose project without the prior knowledge of the local members and sometimes hijack the micro projects to their advantage. Finally, issues of counterpart funding from the communities which delays in project completion. (MTR 2011)

XI. METHODOLOGY

The study was carried out in the eleven Local Government Areas of Gombe State, which is located in the north-eastern part of Nigeria, it is located on latitude 10° 15’ N and longitude 11°10 E, its capital is Gombe. The State was created in October 1996 from part of the old Bauchi State by the then Abacha military government and located in the north eastern zone, right within the expansive savannah which allows the state to share common borders with the states of Borno and Yobe to the north and east, Taraba and Adamawa to the south, and Bauchi to the west. The state has an area of 20,265 km² and a population of around 2,982,599 people as of 2013 (UNFPA).
Gombe state has two distinct climates, the dry season (November–March) and the rainy season (April–October) with an average rainfall of 850mm. The methodology adopted was the use of secondary data with the aid of content analysis approach while the primary data was extracted from the Outcome study report of the Gombe state Agency for Community and social development Project (GSA-CSDP), to supplement the primary data. These sources are very reliable and therefore, make them very attractive to a study of this kind. The study adopted the institutional approach as the theoretical framework of the study while content analysis was also accepted to test the qualitative data. This method favours the nature of data in the study.

XII. DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS
In each sector across the communities, the sampling procedure was based on proportion of completed micro-projects across the communities. A sample of 350 respondents was drawn. The sample size and selection of respondents were determined based on the number of completed MPs in each sector. The two sectors of water and health with more MPs than any other sector has more respondents accordingly. The purposive sampling procedure also facilitated the conduct of 20 Focus group discussions (FGDs) and key informants interviews (KIIs) across the sectors within the various communities. In selecting the respondents, diversity of MPs was considered and the sampling was done in such a way that all sectors of the micro-projects were captured. In addition, purposive sampling technique was used in the selection of the key informants who were interviewed and the FGD participants in each community. Key informants and/or discussants were selected from various strata of the community including adults, youth, men, women and the vulnerable groups. Overall, the Table 1 below shows the distribution of the sample sizes accordingly, while figure 1 shows the distribution of completed MP by sector.

```
Number of Completed MPs By Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Eco</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Figure 1: Distribution of Completed MPs By Sector
Table 1: Distribution of Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Sectors</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Transport</th>
<th>Rural Electricity</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Gender &amp; Vulnerable Groups</th>
<th>Eco. Socio-econo. Activities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGDs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIIIs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Number of Poor People with Access to Social Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Services</th>
<th>Before Project Intervention</th>
<th>After Project Intervention</th>
<th>After – Before Project Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Facilities</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Facilities</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>27,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Facilities</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>7,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>35,058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results on Table 2 above show the distribution of the number of people with access to social services across the education, water and health sector facilities. The data on the three major sectors of the social services show improvements over what was obtained before intervention. Specifically, increase of up to 79% and 55% in the number of males and females with access to education facilities was recorded respectively. A remarkable increase of 27,011 and 20,853 female and male beneficiaries of water facilities was recorded as against the 1,500 and 1,350
female and male beneficiaries captured during the baseline survey. Likewise, the number of people (both males and females) with access to health facilities had increased from a total of 1,860 before intervention to 11,876 after intervention. Overall, the number of people with access to the education, water and health facilities had overwhelmingly increased from 5,540 before intervention to 61,143 after intervention. The findings therefore imply significant improvements with regard to access to social services due to the project.

Table 3: Number of People with Access to Natural Resources Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Before Project Interventions</th>
<th>After Project Interventions</th>
<th>After – Before Project Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental &amp; Natural Resources</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>139,875</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table above presents the overall number of people with access to the environmental and natural resources infrastructure. The results show that up to one hundred and thirty nine thousand, eight hundred and seventy five (139, 875) people had access to the natural resources infrastructure as beneficiaries. The benefits in this sector include the significant proportions of land reclaimed which has reduced erosions and other environmental degradation hazards. Up to 800 and 850 square meters of land were protected in Lambara and Nyuwar communities.

Table 4: Access of the People to Natural Resources Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental &amp; Natural Resources</th>
<th>Before Project Intervention</th>
<th>After Project Intervention</th>
<th>After – Before Project Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households that Established Agro-forestry Farms</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of land reclaimed or protected from erosion, flood, etc (sq meters)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,650sq meters</td>
<td>1,650sq meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people using the VIP toilet constructed/rehabilitated</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>24,500 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion of households about change in waste disposal</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly improved</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Gombe CSDA intervention in the environment and natural resources sector evident in Lambara and Nyuwar communities of Kaltungo and Balanga LGAs respectively has positive impacts. Although the results indicated that households within the communities were yet to adopt agro-forestry practices, significant portions (of 800sq and 850sq meters each) of lands were protected and/or reclaimed from erosion in both communities making a total of 1,650sq meters. Specifically before the intervention, cases involving loss of lives were reported (particularly in Nyuwar) where victims fall into ditches of the affected areas. Houses were destroyed as a result of flood. But after the intervention, as the menace of erosion was curtailed, lives became more secure and houses more protected thereby preventing social accidents and environmental degradation.

Table 5: Access of the people to water facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Sector</th>
<th>Before MPs</th>
<th>After MPs</th>
<th>After – Before MPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (M)</td>
<td>F (M)</td>
<td>F (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people fetching water from water facilities per week</td>
<td>1,500 (1,350)</td>
<td>27,011 (20,853)</td>
<td>25,511 (19,503)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of the community being served by the water facility (%)</td>
<td>35% (35%)</td>
<td>78% (78%)</td>
<td>43% (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average amount spent by household on water on monthly basis (N)</td>
<td>N5,000</td>
<td>N2,000</td>
<td>N3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average distance to water point from different sections of the community (km)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average time taken to fetch water from the water facility from different sections of the community (mins)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of cases of water borne diseases reported before and after the provision of the water facility</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of community members on personal hygiene (%)</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly Improved</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tale 5 above: The evaluation also shows increase in numbers of people fetching water from facilities across the beneficiary communities. The data on access to water show great improvement over what was obtained before intervention. For instance, a remarkable increase of 27,011 female beneficiaries was recorded as against the 1,500 beneficiaries captured during baseline. The proportion of communities being served by the water facilities has increased to 78% compared to 35% recorded at baseline. The evaluation indicated a 60% reduction in cost of water while a N3, 000 difference was recorded in the average amount spent by household on water on monthly basis after the provision of water facility by the project.

Table 6 below: The findings indicated a remarkable reduction in average distance to the health centers from different sections of the community. The evaluation revealed an average distance of 1km after intervention as against an average of 4.5km recorded before intervention. Similarly, an average of 25 minutes as at the time to get to health centers from different sections of the community was identified as against an average of 96 minutes time taken to reach the facilities before the projects. Therefore, a reduction of up to 3.5km (85%) and 71 minutes (58%) were recorded as a result of the intervention.

Table 6: Access of the People to health facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Sector</th>
<th>Before MPs</th>
<th>After MPs</th>
<th>After – Before MPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average distance to the health centre from sections of the community (km)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average time to the health centre from sections of the community (mins.)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Access of the People to Transport Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transport Sector</th>
<th>Before Road Construction</th>
<th>After Road Construction</th>
<th>After – Before Road Construction (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average number of vehicles plying the roads constructed/rehabilitated per week</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>328 (56%) (Increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average travel time on the roads constructed/rehabilitated</td>
<td>120mins.</td>
<td>87mins.</td>
<td>33mins (38%) (Reduction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N200</td>
<td>N60</td>
<td>N140 (70%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tale 7: The CSDP intervention in the state in the transport sector shows positive impacts as established in the communities of intervention. Up to 584 vehicles use the constructed roads on weekly basis signifying an increase of 328 vehicles (63%) over the recorded number of 256 recorded during baseline survey. Overall, an average of 73% and 70% reduction in travel time and cost were recorded after intervention accordingly. The difference in the cost of transport shows that a significant majority (80%) indicated much difference; this demonstrates high level of impact due to intervention. Across the communities, N60 was found to be the average cost of transportation after roads construction compared to the N200 average cost before construction. This indicates a N140 difference of the average cost of transportation on the roads constructed.

Table 8 below: The completed MPs related to rural electrification were constructed in three communities. In these communities, electricity extension activities were executed accordingly. The findings indicate that up to 1,085 households are connected and are using electrical gadgets to electricity the communities respectively. The results therefore show that all households have acquired and use electrical appliances and use electronic/electrical gadgets as a result of the provision/expansion of electrification. There is an increase of 482 households compared to the 603 households captured before the electrification. The increase in the number of households connected to electricity and using electrical/electronic gadgets as a result of electrification is demonstrated in the practical levels of utilization. A part from the day-to-day utilization of common household appliances like TV and radio, a summary of additional benefits identified include the following:

- a) GSM charging
- b) Sales of drinks using refrigerators
- c) Barbing salon operations
- d) Proliferation of grinding and milling machines
- e) Welding activities
- f) Use of light as source to fish pond and poultry business

**Table 8: Access of the People to Electricity Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural Electricity</th>
<th>Before Electrification</th>
<th>After Electrification</th>
<th>After – Before Electrification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of households using electrical gadgets as a result of electrification</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>482 (44%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**XIII. CONCLUSION**

Based on the outcomes and understanding of the fact that the Gombe State Agency for CSDP implementation only took off in 2011, the outcome study conclude that there is wide improvements in the outcomes with a clear indication that the Gombe CSDP will record more success. The wide improvements cut across all sectors
particularly the increase in access of community members (mainly the poor) to improved social and natural resource infrastructure services with high hopes of the capability of sustenance. The study concludes that the interventions, taking the Community driven development approach, have translated into a success in the State for all sectors.

XIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

There is the need for CSDAs to increase the public enlightenment efforts of the State Agency, to ensure that all communities in the State are aware of the objective, roles and duties of CSDA, and the modalities for sourcing the project funds. In addition to the current Radio and TV programmes, the State Agencies should organize a town hall meeting in each local government, in which town union leaders, traditional rulers, women leaders and youth leaders are invited.

As the project is purely developmental and non-political, efforts should be made by the Agency to ensure that political interference is totally eliminated to give all communities equal opportunity of development, irrespective of their political leaning. The agency should also employ the services of professionals in carrying out the Micro projects in all sectors to ensure that standards are followed so that the MPs can relatively last long.

More awareness creation targeting the community members on gender participation to boost women participation is crucial. This can be achieved if the community members can allow their wives, sisters and daughters to participate in the community projects. There is need for emphasis on sustainability of Micro Projects by the CSDP to the communities. Security and maintenance of MPs cannot be overemphasized. The LGAs should assist in providing maintenance for the already constructed MPs (boreholes) whenever they require regular maintenance and provide security to some of the MPs e.g. health facilities.

REFERENCES


[14] MTR (2011) mid-term review of the Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) national report conducted during the 2012-2013


