

Constraints to Community-Driven Development Projects in Rural Communities Surrounding Kainji Lake National Park, Niger State, Nigeria

A.O. IBRAHIM, T.A. AMPITAN, O.A. ADEBAYO,
M.O. UMUNNA, O.B. OYEDIRAN, J.O. ADIGUN

Federal College of Wildlife Management, Forestry Research Institute of Nigeria, New Bussa Niger State

Abstract. This study was carried out to examine the constraints facing community-driven development projects in rural communities surrounding Kainji Lake National Park, Niger state, Nigeria. Focus group discussion was used comprising of sixty respondents from ten communities around Kainji Lake National Park which was purposively selected. Data were collected using interview guide with the focus group. The data were analyzed using frequency table, percentage, mean and charts. The findings revealed that processing centres (31) construction/maintenance of feeder roads (31), construction/renovation of school buildings (26), boreholes (25), and maintenance/construction of bridges were the major community-driven development projects embarked upon in the study area. Major sources of fund for community-driven development projects were sharing of total cost among community members (73.3%), voluntary donations (66.7%), collections from gate pass (65%), donations from influential people (63.3%) and community heads donation (61.7%). Promotion of community felt needs, (85%), development of local initiatives (78.3%) and improved standard of living (75%) were the major benefits derived by communities on the projects executed. Finance, (3.82) lack of sustainability (3.59), political instability (3.57), unfaithfulness/ corruption (3.51), poor monitoring and evaluation (3.34), land factor (3.29) and religious crisis within the communities (3.24) were the major constraints faced by the communities members in planning and executing community-driven development projects in the study area. Therefore, it is imperative that extension should work with community leaders and members in their efforts to execute developmental projects in their communities. Charity and non-governmental

organizations should come to the aid of community members in securing enough funds to execute projects.

Keywords: Communities, Community-Driven Development, Participation, Constraints, Cooperation, Planning, Execution

1. Introduction

The idea of community development grew in large part of the activities of colonial administrators. Community development is used to describe those approaches which use a mix of informal education, collective action, organizational development and focus on cultivating social justice, mutual aid, local networks and communal coherence. The concern with community development was, in part a response to the growth of nationalism and in part an outcome of a desire to increase the rate of industrial and economic development. However, three important elements were embedded in community development – a concern with social and economic development, the fostering and capacity of local co-operation and self-help and the use of expertise and methods drawn from outside the local community (Mathie and Cunningham, 2010).

The United Nations defines community development as” a process where community members come together to take collective action and solutions to common problems”. It involves the action taken by civic leaders, activists, involved citizens and professionals to improve various aspects of communities which is aimed at building a stronger and more resilient local government communities. In addition, community development is also understood

as a professional discipline which is defined by the International Association for Community Development as “a practice- based profession and an academic discipline that promote participative democracy, sustainable development, right, economic opportunity, equality and social justice, through the organisation, education and empowerment of people within their communities be it locality, identity or interest in urban and rural settings”. Hence, it seeks to empower individual and groups of people with the skills they need to effect change within their communities (Isreal, *et al*; 2008).

Community–Driven Development (CDD) is a developmental initiative that provides control of the development process, resources and decision making authority directly to groups in the community. The underlying assumption of CDD project are that communities are the best judges of how their lives and livelihoods can be improved, therefore, the communities are best in the position to plan and build the project and take responsibility for monitoring its progress. It advocates people changing their own environment as a powerful force for development. Studies have shown that Community-Driven development is responsive to local demand and more cost effective compared to centrally-led Non-government organization programmes. It 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 (Lessambo, 2015).

Community-Driven Development projects are characterized by the following according to Bazbauers, (2018):

- It is carried out by a representative local council of a community and normally targets small scale sub-projects in the community.
- The locally based representation is responsible for designing and planning the sub-projects in a participatory manner.
- The community generates and controls the resources needed for the CDD projects
- The community is directly involved in the implementation of the project. Often the participation of the community comes directly in the form of labour or funds; it can be indirectly in the form of management and supervision of contractors or the operation and maintenance of the infrastructure when completed.
- It entails community-based monitoring and evaluation.

It was reported by Asian Development Bank, (2008) that the World Bank launched Community Development programs to alleviate the problems of over-reliance on central government and improve the accountability and services in the communities. Non-Governmental organisations also learned that well designed and implemented CDD projects promote equity, efficiency and good governance in the local communities. Hence, the success and scale of some community-Driven Development projects in the World Bank are especially notable, and it was made known that the World Bank supported approximately 190 lending projects amounting to \$9.3 billion in 2000-2005 (Waeyenberge, E.V., 2009). Community-Driven Development project is a bottom-up approach to rural development whereby programmes /activities or felt needs are identified by the community members and work towards the actualization and sustainability of such programmes in order to improve the standard of living of the people. This study therefore examines the constraints to Community-Driven Development Projects in communities surrounding Kainji Lake National Park, Niger State through the following objectives:

- To describe the socio- economic characteristics of respondents in the study area
- Identify and describe Community-Driven Development projects in the study areas.
- Examine sources of fund for Community-Driven Development projects.
- Examine the importance inherent in CDD projects.
- Describe the constraints facing Community Driven Development projects in the study areas.

2. Methodology

2.1 The Study Area

Kainji Lake National Park (KLNP) was the first park to be established among the eight that are currently present in Nigeria. It is a National park in Niger and Kwara State, Nigeria, covering a total area of 5340.82km² and composed of two non-contiguous sectors-Borgu and Zugurma sectors. The park includes three distinct sectors: a part of the Kainji Lake in which fishing is restricted, the Borgu Game Reserve to the West of the Lake and Zugurma Game Reserve to the Southeast. The two main parts of the Park are separated by Kainji Lake, a 136km long reservoir, impounded on the Niger River for hydroelectric power generation. The KLNP lies between Latitudes 9^o40’N and 10^o23’N and

longitudes 3⁰30' and 5⁰50'E (Ogunjobi and Adeola, 2016).

Majority of the communities around KLNP can be regarded as rural area with subsistence farming of common food crops such as soyabeans, rice, maize, wheat, sorghum, yam and beans.

2.2 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

A reconnaissance survey of the communities around Kainji Lake National Park was first done with the help of local youth leaders who are familiar with the Area. During this period thirty communities were identified and ten were purposively selected. The selected communities are: Luma, Shagunu, Malale, Woro, Kali, kamberi, Gada Oli, Kemenji, Awuru and Babanna. Focus Group Discussion was used for data collection whereby six respondents were drawn from each community through the community leaders. A total of 60 respondents were interviewed. The interview guide includes respondents' socio-economic characteristics, list of community-Driven development projects, sources of fund for community-Driven development projects, benefits derived from CDP and the constraints facing community-Driven development projects in the study areas.

Data collected were subjected to descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, mean and bar charts.

3. Results and Discussions

Table 1 below reveals that majority (75%) of the respondents were male while 25% were female. This indicates that the participants in the focus group discussion were predominantly males who can take firm decision on developmental issues concerning the

community. This may also be connected with gender disparity found in the Northern society. It also agrees with Adedoyin *et al* (1999) who reported that males dominated the agricultural workforce in Nigeria. 38.3% of the respondents were within the ages of 41-50, 33.3% within 61 and above, 16.7% within 51-60 years, 8.3% within 31- 40 years and 3.3% within the ages of 20-30. The mean age was 44 years. This indicates that respondents were still much agile and active to participate in developmental projects and make impact on rural life. Sheik *et al* (2003) reported that the age of individuals affects their mental attitude toward new ideas and hence influence adoption in several ways. Table 1 also reveals that 45% had tertiary education, 25% had secondary education, 13.3% had Quranic education, 11.7% had primary education and 5% had no formal education. This result implies that majority of the respondents were averagely educated. They can use their experience to facilitate community-driven development projects in their communities. Literacy level affects participation, when respondents are moderately educated it is capable of enhancing their understanding of the initiatives and technologies involved in executing projects (Ojo *et al*, 2016). Literacy level also enhances acceptance of new innovations than illiteracy thereby increasing productivity and greater developmental projects (Oni *et al*, 2005).

However, 33.3% of the respondents were civil servants; this could be attributed to the presence of State and Federal Government Ministry and agencies in the study area (Ogunjobi and Adeola, 2016). 26.7% were artisans, 23.3% were traders and 16.7% farmers. This result means that the respondents were gainfully employed and can use their wealth of experience and capital to plan and execute developmental projects in their communities.

Table 1: Socio- Economic Characteristics of Respondents.

Variables	Frequency (n=60)	Percentages	Mean
Gender			
Male	45	75	
Female	15	25	
Age			
20-30	2	3.3	
31-40	5	8.3	
41-50	23	38.3	44
51-60	10	16.7	
61 & above	20	33.3	
Marital status			
Single	7	11.7	
Married	43	71.7	
Widowed	10	16.7	
Educational status			
No formal education	3	5	
Primary education	7	11.7	
Secondary education	15	25	
Tertiary education	27	45	

Quranic education	8	13.3
Occupation		
Farming	10	16.7
Trading	14	23.3
Civil servants	20	33.3
Artisans	16	26.7
Religion		
Christianity	22	36.7
Islamic	29	48.3
Traditional	9	15

Source: Field Survey, 2019

Community- Driven Development Projects in the Study Area

Table 2 presents the executed Community-Driven Development projects in the study area as reported by the participants of the focus group discussion (FGD). A total of fourteen different projects were being executed in the study area at different levels in the different communities. 31 feeder roads were constructed and maintained in the study area. This might have been done for easy accessibility to their farms and linkages to nearby communities and urban centres. 31 processing centres were put in place with different grinding machines for processing different food crops such as Maize, Millet, Sorghum, Rice, Yam flour and Wheat. This is a source of empowerment for mostly women in the communities. 25 bridges were constructed and maintained. This would ease transportation and improve the commercial activities. 25 water supplies were constructed in the form of Borehole and Well with Tap and Hand pumps to improve health and infrastructural facilities in the communities. 16 school buildings were renovated and 10 new school buildings were constructed in the study area. This was done to bring about social change, infrastructural development and educational advancement of the ruralites. 16 Cooperative societies were formed to grant loan and credit to community members in order to boost their economic activities. 15 market centres were constructed, 14 abattoir, 12 feed mill industry (e.g. fish and poultry) 10 literacy centres (classes) and 7 health centres. All these were constructed in order to enhance rural employment, empowerment and infrastructural development of rural communities which would in turn improve the standard of living of the people. This result was similar to global environmental facility projects (GEF) identified by Halidu, *et al* (2017) among beneficiary communities of Kainji Lake National Park. The result was also in line with the community Development. Reports of Chigbu, (2015) in his study on women and development in a Nigerian rural community.

Table 2: List of Community-Driven Development Projects.

CDP	Communities											
		Babanna	Luma	Shagunu	Malale	Woro	Kali	Kamberi	Gada oli	Kemenji	Awuru	
1	Construction of new school building	3	1	-	2	2	1	-	1	-	-	10
2	Renovation of school building	2	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	1	16
3	Health Centre	1	1	1	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	7
4	Feeder roads construction/Maintenance	5	4	3	3	2	3	2	4	2	3	31
5	Boreholes /wells with tap or hand pump	4	2	2	2	1	4	3	3	2	2	25
6	Market centre	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	15
7	Abattoir establishment	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	14
8	Shear butter processing unit	2	1	-	1	-	1	-	2	-	-	7
9	Soap making industry	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	4
10	Feed mill industry e.g. Fish, Poultry	2	2	1	2	1	2	-	1	1	-	12
11	Cooperative societies	3	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	16
12	Processing centres (Grinding Machine)	6	3	2	4	2	3	2	4	2	3	31
13	Maintenance/construction of Bridges	3	2	1	4	3	2	3	4	1	2	25
14	Literacy centres	2	-	-	2	1	1	1	2	-	1	10

Source: Field Survey, 2019.

Sources of Fund for Community-Driven Development Projects

It was revealed in table 3 below that the following are major sources of fund to community-driven development projects in the study area. Sharing of total cost among community members (73.3%), voluntary donation by

individuals (66.7%), collections from gate pass (65%), Donations by very important people (63.3%), community leaders donation (61.7%), assistance from cooperative societies (58.3%) and Non-governmental organisations (56.7%). This result indicates the level of readiness of the community members to execute projects meant for their growth and development. This level of commitment to community-driven development projects by the communities in the study area was also in line with the submission of Henderson and Thomas (2012) in their book skills in neighbourhood work and Hickey and Mohan (2004) in their book participation: from Tyranny to transformation. The minor sources of fund are penalties\ fines (58.3%), money collected from land lease (55%) and Donations from local government authority (33.3%). Finances from these are not much but still contribute to the execution of projects as reported by the participants of the focus group discussion.

Table 3: Sources of Fund for Community-Driven Development Projects

Source	Major F (%)	Minor F (%)
1 Voluntary donation by individuals	40(66.7)	20(33.3)
2 Sharing of total cost among community members	44(73.3)	16(26.7)
3 Donations by very important people	38(63.3)	22(36.7)
4 Community leaders donation	37(61.7)	23(38.3)
5 Penalties/Fines	25(41.7)	35(58.3)
6 Assistance from cooperative societies	35(58.3)	25(41.7)
7 Donations from local government authority	20(33.3)	40(66.7)
8 N.G.O support	34(56.7)	26(43.3)
9 Money collected from land lease	27(45)	33(55)
10 Collections from gate pass	39(65)	21(35)

Source: Field Survey, 2019

Importance of Community-Driven Development Projects

The major importance of community-driven development projects to the communities as shown in table 4 are promotion of local initiatives (78.3%), improved standard of living (75%) promotes sustainability (58.3%) and promotes rural employment (53.3%). This means that the initiation of community-driven development projects has greatly benefitted the initiators in different ways. It has encouraged participation, initiative and self-help by the local communities for empowerment and capacity building of their locality geared towards improving the standard of living. (Israel *et al*, 2008). The above result also similar to the report of Adejuwon and Oyesola (2018) in their studies on the benefits derived from Millennium development goals supported boreholes on rural areas of Ondo State, Nigeria.

Table 4:- Importance of Community-Driven Development Projects

Importance	Major F (%)	Minor F (%)
1 Improved standard of living of ruralites	45(75)	15(25)
2 Promotion of community felt needs	51(85)	9(15)
3 Encourages team spirit co-operation	28(46.7)	32(53.3)
4 Social change	25(41.7)	35(58.3)
5 Promotion of commercial activities	38(63.3)	22(36.7)
6 Rural employment	32(53.3)	28(46.7)
7 Development of local initiatives	47(78.3)	13(21.7)
8 Promotes sustainability	35(58.3)	25(41.7)

Source: Field survey, 2019.

Constraints Facing Community-Driven Development Projects

Table 5 shows the mean ranking of constraints facing community-driven development projects in the study area. Finance (3.82, 1st), lack of sustainability (3.59, 2nd), political instability (3.57, 3rd), unfaithfulness\corruption (3.51, 4th), poor monitoring and evaluation (3.34, 5th), land factor (3.29, 6th) and Religious crisis/differences (3.24, 7th). These major constraints have a chain link to each other and the effect would lead to poor planning and execution of projects, lack of cooperation, and difficulty in identifying community felt needs and even non-execution of projects. Planning and execution of community-driven development projects requires adequate funding for a sustained project. Inadequate funding could be due to low income of the ruralites since majority are producing at subsistence level. Most community development projects in rural Nigeria have always been enjoying the financial and technical assistance of government in one way or the other. This happens when the project embarked upon by a community is in line with the current government rural communities efforts. If not such a community project may not enjoy any assistance as a matter of fundamental principle (Baba *et al* 2016). The problem of finance in community-driven

development projects is linked to individual differences i.e. non-challant attitude of some members, unfaithfulness/corruption, Government policy, political instability, non-fulfillment of promised fund and inadequate extension services. Ugboh (2007) reported that extension services can play a key role in guiding the communities' leaders in sourcing for fund for community development projects. Lack of fund was also as a result of lack of access to credit facilities. Respondents relied mainly on personal contributions and other local internal generated funds which were too meagre to effectively execute community projects.

However, lack of sustainability could be as a result of lack of technical know-how, poor funding, human resources/labour factors, religion crisis, poor monitoring and evaluation. Political instability as a constraint in the community could lead to religions crisis, religions differences could also lead to political instability in the community, poor community cooperation and dialogue. Individual differences also lead to political instability, all these causes civil unrest in the community. Nobody will think of developmental project in an unrest society. Hence, political instability breeds different ideology, violence and disunity in the community leading to backwardness (FGD, 2019). Respondents noted that unfaithfulness/corruption is another serious constraint in project execution. When projects are poorly executed or implemented due to mismanagement, the grass root get discouraged in further participating in other projects initiated by the leaders. Platteau and Gas- part (2003) reported that to control or check corruption, local leaders must be disciplined through appropriate mechanism in case of embezzlement. Non-fulfillment of promised fund could also be as a result of the members fearing corruption among their community leaders.

The land factor could be traced to land tenure system by inheritance in the rural communities. The owner of the land may not be willing to release his\her land for community projects due to individual and religion differences. Government policy may also affect land usage, for instance the community may wanted to use a parcel of land for town hall or market while Government survey plan is to use it for school or health centres. It should be noted that land use act of 1978 vested the ownership to land on Government (Adebayo *et al*, 2019).

More so, human resources/labour could hinder execution of projects in the communities if not readily available. Human resources/labour could be inform of volunteers, paid staff/employees and workers or even technological such as modern technology and equipments. To achieve all or part of these resources, community leaders need to make a well workable strategy that defines projects missions' vision and objectives well in advance. (Ullah *et al*, 2012). The constraints discussed above are similar to those identified by Halidu, *et al* (2017) in status of Global Environmental Facility (GEF) projects in the beneficiary communities of Kainji Lake National Park.

Table 5:- Constraints Facing Community-Driven Development Projects

	Constraints	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
1	Finance	3.82	1.16	1 st
2	Lack of technical know-how	1.70	1.10	14 th
3	Individual differences	2.47	1.13	10 th
4	Poor infrastructure	1.43	0.90	15 th
5	Unfaithfulness/corruption	3.51	1.06	4 th
6	Government policy	1.83	1.21	13 th
7	Land factor	3.29	1.19	6 th
8	Poor community cooperation and dialogue	2.48	1.20	9 th
9	Lack of sustainability	3.59	1.28	2 nd
10	Poor monitoring and evaluation	3.34	1.12	5 th
11	Human resources/labour	2.39	1.22	11 th
12	Non-fulfillment of promised fund	2.58	1.11	8 th
13	Political Instability	3.57	1.24	3 rd
14	Inadequate extension services	2.37	1.17	12 th
15	Religions crisis differences	3.24	1.15	7 th

Source: Field Survey, 2019.

4. Conclusion

It could be concluded from the findings of the study that the common Community- Driven Development Projects are establishment of processing centres, construction/maintenance of feeder roads and bridges, construction/renovation of school buildings

and boreholes construction to improve the standard of living of the rural people. The major sources of fund for projects planning and execution are sharing of total cost among community members, voluntary donations, collections from gate pass among others. It was gathered that community-driven development projects has encouraged participation, initiatives and

self-help among local communities for empowerment and capacity building. However, finance, lack of sustainability, political instability, unfaithfulness or corruption and poor monitoring and evaluation among others were identified as major constraints that limits them from achieving greater success in community-driven development projects in the study area.

5. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that role of extension services should be improved so as to guide the community leaders in the proper planning and execution of identified projects, particularly in the area of finance, technical know-how, monitoring and evaluation. The identified constraints need integrated approach by all stakeholders in providing solutions to community development projects. Members with nonchalant attitude should have a re-think and cooperate, influential people in the community should help, non-governmental organizations and charity organizations are needed in providing a sustained community-driven development projects in the study area.

References

- Adebayo, A.S., Adedeji, M.S., Adams, O.T. and Majebi, O.E. (2019). Willingness to Establish Private Forest Plantation among Dwellers in Some Selected Local Government Area of Osun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Research in Forestry, Wildlife and Environment Vol. 11 (3): 146-153.*
- Adedoyin, S.F., Fapojuwu O.E. and Torimiro, D. (1999). Educational Communication Materials in Agricultural Technology Promotion: A Survey of Extension Agents in Ijebu Area of Ogun State. Proceeding of the fifth Annual National Conference of the Agricultural Extension Society of Nigeria (AESON) 12th-14th April.
- Adejuwon, O.T. and Oyesola, O.B. (2018). Benefits derived from Millennium Development Goals supported Boreholes in Rural Areas of Ondo State, Nigeria. Proceedings of the 27th Annual National Congress of the Rural Sociological Association of Nigeria (RUSAN) held at Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, 8th -11th October.
- Asian Development Bank (2008). Annual Report of the Board of Directors to the Board of Governors. Review 25p
- Baba, M.D., Manga, T.A., Dabai, J.S., Yakubu, G., Sanchi, I.D. and Hassan, S.U. (2016) Role of Local Leaders in Community Development Projects in Zuru Local Government Area of Kebbi State, Nigeria. Proceedings of the 21st Annual National Conference of Agricultural Extension Society of Nigeria (AESON). University of Ibadan 16th 21st April.
- Bazbauers A.R.. (2018) The World Bank and Transferring Development (Springer) 35p
- Chigbu, U.E. (2015). Repositioning Culture for Development: Women and Development in a Nigerian Rural community: community, work and family. 18p
- Haliku, S.K., Oyeleye, D.O., Adeola, A.J., Akande, O.A. (2017) Status of Global Environmental Facility (GEF) Projects in the Beneficiary Communities of Kainji Lake National Park, Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Wildlife Vol 1 (1): 48-53.* Wildlife Society of Nigeria
- Henderson, P. and Thomas, D.N. (2012). Skills in Neighbourhood Work, London: Routledge. 240 P.
- Hickey, S. and Mohan, G. (eds) (2005). Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation? – Exploring New Approaches to Participation in Development, London: Zed books. 304 P.
- Israel, B.A.; Schulz, A.J.; Parker, E.A.; Becker, A.B.; Allen, A. and Guzman, J.R. (2008). Critical Issues in Developing and Following Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) Principles. In Minkler, M. and Wallerstein, (Eds). CBPR for health: From Process to Outcomes (2nd ed). 47-66. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lessambo, F.I. (2015). The International Development Association, In: International Financial Institutions and their Challenges. Palgrave Macmillan, New York. 53-59
- Mathie, A., and Cunningham, G. (2010). “From clients to citizens: Asset-based Community Development as a Strategy for Community-Driven Development”. *Development in practice 13(5): 474-486*
- Ogunjobi; J.A. and Adeola, A.J. (2016). Wild Vertebrates Associated with Crop Raiding around Kainji Lake National Park, Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Tropical Agriculture. Volume 21 (3); 138-142*
- Ojo, O.A., Olujide M.G., Adelakun, O.E. and Omisope, E.T. (2016). Participation of Farmers in Adopted Villages’ Scheme Activities of Federal Agricultural Colleges in Oyo State. Proceedings of the 21st Annual National Conference of Agricultural Extension Society of Nigeria (AESON), 16th-21st April, University of Ibadan.

- Oni, O.A., Oladele, O.I., and Oyewole. I.K. (2005) Analysis of Factors Influencing Loan Default among Poultry Farmers in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Central Europe Agriculture* , 6(4): 619-624
- Platteau, J.P. and Gaspart, F. (2003). Disciplining Local Leaders in Community-Based Development. Centre for Research on the Economics of Development (CRED), Namur Belgium. Available online at: <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INT/PUBSERV/Resources/platteau3.pdf>. (Retrieved 20 August, 2012)
- Sheik, A.; Rahman. T. and Yates, C.M. (2003). Logit Models for Identifying the Factors that Influence the Uptake of New “No Tillage” Technologies by Farmers in the Rice- Wheat and Cotton-Wheat Farming Systems in Pakistan. *Agricultural systems* 75 (1) 75-95.
- Ugboh, O. (2007). Gender Differences in the Role of Local Leaders in Rural and Community Development in Delta State, Nigeria. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences* 4(4): 534-539.
- Ullah, S., Ahmad, A., and Khan, T.F. (2012). Fundraising for Sustainable Community Development and Role of Social Media: Case of Pakistan. *International Journal of Business Humanities and Technology* Vol. 2 (3): 73-79.
- United Nations Development Group. “United Nations Development System- A Collective Approach to Supporting Capacity Development” (PDF). Archived from the original (PDF) on February 9, 2014. Retrieved 7 July 2020.
- United Nations, Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/unite_Nations. November,8 2020
- Waeyenberge, E.V.; (2009) “Selectivity at work: Country Policy and Institution Assessments at the World Bank”. *European Journal of Development Research* Vo; 21 (5);792-801
- Yen, N.T.K.; and Luong, P.V (2008). “Participatory village and Commune Development Planning (VDP/CDP) and its Contribution to Local Community Development in Vietnam”. *Community Development Journal*. 43(3): 329-340