Document of The World Bank

Report No: ICR00001477

IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION AND RESULTS REPORT (Credit No. IDA 38180; GEF Grant No. TF51428)

ON A CREDIT

IN THE AMOUNT OF SDR 52.8 MILLION (US\$70.0 MILLION EQUIVALENT)

AND

A GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY TRUST FUND GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF

US\$8.0 MILLION

TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA

FOR A

LOCAL EMPOWERMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROJECT

November 30, 2010

AFTEN Country Department 12 Africa Regional Office

CURRENCY EQUIVALENTS

(Exchange Rate Effective February 2010)

Currency Unit = Naira (\mathbb{N}) Naira 1.00 = US0.69US1.00 = Naira 1.45

FISCAL YEAR

January 1 - December 31

ACRONYMS

CDD	Community-driven development
CDP	Community Development Plan
CPMC	Community Project Management Committee
CPRP	Community Poverty Reduction Project
CPS	Country Partnership Strategy
CSDP	Community and Social Development Project
FPSU	Federal Project Support Unit
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEO	Global Environmental Objective
ICR	Implementation Completion and Results report
IDA	International Development Association
ISR	Implementation Status Report
LEEMP	Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project
LGA	Local Government Authority
LGRC	Local Government Review Committee Chairmen
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MIT	Multidisciplinary Implementation Team
MTR	Mid-term Review
NEEDS	National Economic Empowerment Development Strategy
NPS	National Parks Service
00	Operational Officer
PA	Protected Area
PAD	Project Appraisal Document
PDO	Project Development Objective
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
SLP	Sustainable Livelihood Plans
SPSU	State Project Support Unit
TTL	Task Team Leader

Vice President:	Obiageli Katryn Ezekwesili
Country Director:	Onno Ruhl
Sector Manager:	Idah Pswarayi-Riddihough
Project Team Leader:	Foluso Okunmadewa/Africa Olojoba
ICR Team Leader:	Foluso Okunmadewa

Nigeria Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project Implementation Completion Report

Table of Contents

1. Project Context, Development Objectives, and Design	14
1.1 Context at Appraisal	14
1.2 Original Project Development Objectives (PDOs), GEOs and Key Indicators (As the PAD)	stated in 14
1.3 Revised PDO and Key Indicators (if applicable), and Reasons/Justifications	15
1.4 Main Beneficiaries	15
1.5 Original Components	16
1.6 Revised Components	16
1.7 Other Significant Changes	16
2. Key Factors Affecting Implementation and Outcomes	
2.1 Project Preparation, Design and Quality at Entry	
2.2 Implementation	
2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Design, Implementation, and Utilization	
2.4 Safeguard and Fiduciary Compliance	
2.5 Post-completion Operation/Next Phase	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	
3.1 Relevance of Objectives, Design, and Implementation	
3.2 Achievement of Project Development Objectives	25 29
3.4 Justification of Overall Outcome Rating	
3.5 Overarching Themes, Other Outcomes and Impacts	
3.6 Summary of Findings of Beneficiary Survey and/or Stakeholder Workshops	
4. Assessment of Risk to Development and GEO Outcome	
5. Assessment of Bank and Borrower Performance	
5.1 Bank Performance	
5.2 Borrower Performance	
6. Lessons Learned	
7. Comments on Issues Raised by Borrower/Implementing Agencies/Partners	

Annexes	
Annex A: Project Costs and Financing	A-1
Annex B: Outputs by Component	A-3
Annex C: Economic and Financial Analysis	A-7
Annex D: Bank Lending and Implementation Support/Supervision Process	A-9
Annex E: Beneficiary Survey Results (IDA Component)	A-10
Annex F: Stakeholder Workshop Report and Results (if any)	A-19
Annex G: Summary of Borrower's ICR and/or Comments on Draft ICR	A-19
Annex H: List of Supporting Documents	A-35
Мар	A-37

A. Basic Information				
Country:	Nigeria	Project Name:	Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project	
Project ID:	P069892, P071817	L/C/TF Number(s):	IDA-38180, TF-51428	
ICR Date:	03/12/2010	ICR Type:	Core ICR	
Lending Instrument:	SIL	Borrower:	Federal Government of Nigeria	
Original Total Commitment:	XDR 52.8M, USD 8.0M	Disbursed Amount:	XDR 51.9M, USD 6.9M	
Environmental Categor	ry: FI	Focal Area: B		

Implementing Agencies: (1) Federal Project Support Unit (FPSU) – Designated unit in the Federal Ministry of Environment; (2) State Project Support Units (SPSUs) – Designated ministries in the following states: Adamawa, Bauchi, Bayelsa, Benue, Enugu, Imo, Katsina, Niger and Oyo. Designated ministries included the Ministries of: Local Government, Community Development and Chieftancy Affairs, Poverty Alleviation, Economic Planning, and Environment. (3) Additional for the GEF Component – Nigeria National Park Service (NPS)

Cofinanciers and Other External Partners: Not applicable.

B. Key Dates

Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project - P069892 (IDA)					
Process Date Process Original Date Revised / Actu Date(s)					
Concept Review:	06/08/2000	Effectiveness:	04/30/2004	04/30/2004	
Appraisal:	04/24/2002	Mid-term Review:	03/29/2007	05/18/2007	
Approval:	07/31/2003	Closing:	06/30/2009	06/30/2009	

Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project - P071817 (GEF)					
Process	ProcessDateProcessOriginal DateRevised / a Date				
Concept Review:	11/30/2000	Effectiveness:	04/01/2004	04/30/2004	
Appraisal:	04/24/2002	Mid-term Review:	01/31/2007	05/11/2007	
Approval:	07/31/2003	Closing:	06/30/2009	12/31/2009	

C. Ratings Summary				
C.1 Performance Rating by ICR				
PDO Outcomes:	Satisfactory			
GEO Outcomes:	Moderately Satisfactory			
Risk to Development Outcome:	Negligible to Low			
Risk to GEO Outcome:	Moderate			

Bank Performance:	Satisfactory
Borrower Performance:	Satisfactory

C.2 Detailed Ratings of Bank and Borrower Performance (by ICR)				
Bank	Ratings	Borrower	Ratings	
Quality at Entry:	Moderately Satisfactory	Government:	Satisfactory	
Quality of Supervision:	Satisfactory	Implementing Agency/Agencies:	Satisfactory	
Overall Bank Performance:	Satisfactory	Overall Borrower Performance:	Satisfactory	

C.3 Quality at Entry and Implementation Performance Indicators					
Local Empowerment and	Environmental Manag	gement Project - P06989	2		
Implementation Performance	Indicators QAG Assessments (if any) Rating				
Potential Problem Project at any time (Yes/No):	Yes	Quality at Entry (QEA)	None		
Problem Project at any time (Yes/No):	No	Quality of Supervision (QSA)	None		
DO rating before Closing/Inactive Status	Satisfactory				

Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project - P071817				
Implementation Performance	Indicators	QAG Assessments (if any)	Rating	
Potential Problem Project at any time (Yes/No):	Yes	Quality at Entry (QEA)	None	
Problem Project at any time (Yes/No):	No	Quality of Supervision (QSA)	None	
GEO rating before Closing/Inactive Status	Satisfactory			

D. Sector and Theme Codes

Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project - P069892			
	Original	Actual	
Sector Code (as % of total Bank financing)			
General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector	20	10	
General education sector	15	20	
General water, sanitation and flood protection sector	20	20	
Other social services	40	40	
Roads and highways	5	10	

Theme Code (as % of total Bank financing)		
Decentralization	23	23
Environmental policies and institutions	11	11

Participation and civic engagement	22	22
Rural services and infrastructure	22	22
Water resource management	22	22

Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project - P071817		
	Original	Actual
Sector Code (as % of total Bank financing)		
General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector	100	100

Bank financing)			
Biodiversity		40	
institutions	40	40	
ral resources management	20	20	
Environmental Management Pro	ject - P069892		
At ICR	At A _I	oproval	
Obiageli Katryn Ezekwesili	Callisto E. Madav	0	
Onno Ruhl	Mark D. Tomlinso	on	
Idah Pswarayi-Riddihough	Joseph Baah-Dwo	Joseph Baah-Dwomoh	
Foluso Okunmadewa	Talib B.K. Esmail	Talib B.K. Esmail	
Foluso Okunmadewa			
Sati Achath/Paula Posas			
Environmental Management Proj	ect - P071817 (GEF I	FUNDED ONLY)	
At ICR	At A _I	oproval	
Obiageli Katryn Ezekwesili	Callisto E. Madav	0	
Onno Ruhl	Mark D. Tomlinso	on	
Idah Pswarayi-Riddihough	RiddihoughJoseph Baah-Dwomoh		
Africa Eshogba Olojoba	Talib B.K. Esmail		
Nyaneba Nkrumah			
Nyaneba Nkrumah			
	Bank financing) institutions ral resources management Environmental Management Pro At ICR Obiageli Katryn Ezekwesili Onno Ruhl Idah Pswarayi-Riddihough Foluso Okunmadewa Foluso Okunmadewa Sati Achath/Paula Posas Environmental Management Proj At ICR Obiageli Katryn Ezekwesili Onno Ruhl Idah Pswarayi-Riddihough Africa Eshogba Olojoba Nyaneba Nkrumah Nyaneba Nkrumah	Bank financing)40institutions40institutions40aral resources management20Environmental Management Project - P069892At ICRAt AjObiageli Katryn EzekwesiliCallisto E. MadavOnno RuhlMark D. TomlinsonIdah Pswarayi-RiddihoughJoseph Baah-DwoFoluso OkunmadewaTalib B.K. EsmailFoluso OkunmadewaTalib B.K. EsmailFoluso OkunmadewaCallisto E. MadavObiageli Katryn EzekwesiliCallisto E. MadavObiageli Katryn EzekwesiliCallisto E. MadavOnno RuhlMark D. TomlinsonIdah Pswarayi-RiddihoughJoseph Baah-DwoAt ICRAt AjObiageli Katryn EzekwesiliCallisto E. MadavOnno RuhlMark D. TomlinsonIdah Pswarayi-RiddihoughJoseph Baah-DwoAfrica Eshogba OlojobaTalib B.K. EsmailNyaneba NkrumahNyaneba NkrumahNyaneba Nkrumah	

F. Results Framework Analysis

Project Development Objectives (from Project Appraisal Document)

The project has two interrelated project development objectives: (1) the institutional framework at all three levels-federal, state and, particularly, local government - to support environmentally sustainable and socially inclusive development will have been strengthened; and (2) beneficiaries in the participating states will have planned, cofinanced, and implemented, and will continue to operate and maintain, environmentally sustainable and socially inclusive multisectoral micro-projects.

Revised Project Development Objectives (as approved by original approving authority) Not revised.

Global Environment Objectives (from Project Appraisal Document)

Beneficiaries within the support zones around targeted Protected Areas in two of the participating states will have planned, co-financed, and implemented, and are continuing to operate and maintain, environmentally sustainable and socially inclusive alternative livelihood micro-projects.

The grant agreement stated an additional aspect of the objective related to "promoting and implementing an integrated approach to the sustainable use of resources" but this was not explained or elaborated in the PAD except for one single statement on page 48 which referred to "an integrated approach to land use planning at the local level." Given this lack of information, it was not surprising that this element was not picked up in the ISRs. While the ICR review team mainly assessed the project against the stated objectives in the PAD, the team also examined the attainment of this additional aspect.

Revised Global Environment Objectives (as approved by original approving authority) Not revised.

		Original Target Values	Formally	Actual Value Achieved		
Indicator	Baseline Value	(from approval	Revised Target	at Completion or Target		
		documents)	Values	Years		
Indicator 1:	By year 5, legisl authority to carry	By year 5, legislative and regulatory framework, providing states and local government authority to carry out EAs for some types of projects, is in place				
Value (quantitative or Qualitative)	None	Effective environmental assessment capacity and institutional arrangements in 9 states	ts Environmental assessment (EA) ca is place in the 9 star Institutional arrange have been strengther for more effective environmental management. The National Environm Policy and National Environmental Management Bill h also been revised.			
Date achieved	05/17/2005	06/30/2009		06/30/2009		
Comments (incl. % achievement)	The project financed improved EA capacity and strengthened institutional arrangements. There is effective EA capacity and related institutional capacity in the 9 project states and in the 90 participating LGAs. For example, in each state there is a team in the Agency as well as Desk officers in each of the LGAs who have been trained to carry out environmental assessments of community implemented micro-projects. In addition, the project financed a revision of the National Environmental Policy and National Environment Management Bill. The policy and bill are undergoing executive and legislative review prior to promulgation.					
Indicator 2:	By year 5, 5% of inputs from the p formulation proc	ar 5, 5% of LGAs, that have received training and/or other capacity building from the project, are consulting communities as part of their annual budget lation process.				
Value (Quantitative or	None	5% of LGAs to consult communities in their		33% of LGAs are consulting communities		

(a). PDO Indicator(s)

Qualitative)		annual budget process.	in the budget process.	
Date achieved	05/17/2005 06/30/2009		06/30/2009	
Comments (incl. % achievement)	LGAs are directly involved in the project, and staff from all 90 LGAs has received training. The training plan for LGA staff in all 9 states has been implemented since 2007. As a result, about 30 LGAs across all 9 states have started to make budgetary provisions to community plans after due consultations with their community members or groups. In 2008, 9 of these LGAs received awards for best performing LGAs in a contest organized by the Federal Project Support Unit. The target for this indicator was surpassed.			
Indicator 3:	By year 5, 40% the initial states investments as	By year 5, 40% of communities (targeted by the project during the first 2 years within the initial states) are operating and maintaining at least 50% of micro-project investments as part of their CDPs.		
Value (Quantitative or Qualitative)	None	Not less than 50% of the micro-projects are in use and being maintained	Over 90% of micro- projects are in use and being maintained.	
Date achieved	05/17/2005	06/30/2009	06/30/2009	
Comments (incl. % achievement)	At project close, 965 CDPs were approved for implementation and 3220 micro-projects initiated. 3003 micro-projects were completed and are functional. Communities have started using these micro-projects. 217 micro-projects are in various stages of completion. However the communities have received support from their LGAs and are now completing the outstanding micro-projects as at ICR report. Thus, 3003/3220 =93% of initiated projects were completed			
Indicator 4:	Increased number of people in poor communities with access to social and natural resource services. ¹			
Value (Quantitative or Qualitative)	r None 2 million poor people accessing social and environmental services in benefiting communities over 900 ber communities		Approximately 6.4 million poor people are accessing social and environmental services in over 900 benefiting communities.	
Date achieved	03/17/2005	06/30/2009	06/30/2009	
Comments (incl. % achievement)	6.4 million people in more than 900 poor communities are accessing education, health, water, transport, rural electrification, etc., from 3003 micro-projects. Water supply and utilization is the most prominent social service benefiting over 1.8million people, followed by health, 1.4m people and education about 1 million people.			

 $^{^{1}}$ This indicator was not in the PAD but added after an Africa Region quality review of the portfolio. The objective was to strengthen the PAD indicators.

(b) GEO Indicator(s)

Indicator	Baseline Value	Original Target Values (from approval documents)	Formally Revised Target Values	Actual Value Achieved at Completion or Target Years
GEO Indicator	By year 5, a 5% increase in population i	n species ident	ified as being	threatened.
Value (Quantitative	According to a 2003/2004 baseline study for the parks, threatened species	5% increase in	Not revised	The project's end of survey
or Qualitative)	in Yankari National Park included the Hippopotomos (pop=85), Oribit (pop=78), Bushbuck (pop=205), Hartebeast (pop=437) and Warthog (pop=837). Relative densities were respectively 0.23, 0.05, 0.05, 0.22 and 0.70 density per km2. In Lame Dumba , threatened species included Oribi (pop=61), Hartebeast (pop=182), and Warthog (pop=364) with densities of 0.03, 0.09 and 0.18 per km2. In Kainji National Park , threatened species included the Duiker (pop=30), Bushbuck (pop83) and Hippo (pop=56). In Mala Dumba the only data available was the species biomass 0.92kg/km2 and the mean frequency of species- 0.1 ind/ km2.	population of species identified as being threatened		report (e-report) did not survey threatened species. However, in hindsight, this data would not have been useful in determining if the GEO was attained or not (see comments)
Date achieved	05/17/2005	06/30/2009		12/31/2009

Comments	The ICR team noted that the GEO outcome indicator on page 3 of the PAD (40% of
(incl. %	communities will have adopted livelihoods) differed from the one listed in Annex 1's
achievement)	(page 43) project outcome indicators (by year 5, a 5% increase in population of
	threatened species. While the indicator in Annex 1 is what normally takes precedence,
	the ICR team further noted that this indicator could not accurately assess whether the
	GEO objective was achieved because the objective, as stated, was not to impact species
	numbers in protected areas or improve the Protected Area but rather to establish
	alternative livelihoods. The appropriate indicator that was within the control of the
	project given its scope and scale was that by year 5, 40% of communities (targeted by
	the project during the first 2 years in the support zones of the Protected Areas) have
	adopted alternative and biologically sustainable livelihoods. This target was fully met.
	See section on quality at entry for more detail.

(c) Intermediate Outcome Indicator(s) for the GEF component

Indicator	Baseline Value	Original Target Values (from approval documents)	Formally Revised Target Values	Actual Value Achieved at Completion or Target Years
Indicator 1:	By year 5, 40% of communisupport zones of the Protect sustainable livelihoods	ities (targeted by the ped Areas) have adopt	project during the ted alternative and	first 2 years in the d biologically
Value	None of the communities have adopted livelihoods	40% of targeted communities have adopted sustainable micro- projects	These were not revised	69% of targeted communities have adopted sustainable micro-projects
Date achieved	05/17/2005	06/30/2009		12/31/2009
Comments (incl. % achievement)	Sixty nine percent of the communities targeted under the GEF component have adopted at least one or more micro-project that can be defined as environmentally sustainable. Environmentally sustainable ² micro-projects include, for example, community woodlots, bee-keeping, water production, and agroforestry.			

 $[\]frac{1}{2}$ Environmentally sustainable micro-projects were defined in the Project Implementation Manual (PIM)

G. Ratings of Project Performance in ISRs

No.	Date ISR	DO	DO GEO I	O IP	Actual Dis (USD n	bursements nillions)
	Archived				Project 1	Project 2
1	10/16/2003	S	S	S	0.00	0.00
2	04/21/2004	S	S	U	0.00	0.00
3	11/19/2004	S	S	U	3.37	0.25
4	05/26/2005	S	S	U	4.61	0.76
5	12/02/2005	S	S	U	9.63	1.53
6	01/19/2006	S	S	U	11.38	1.62
7	06/09/2006	S	S	MU	21.85	2.18
8	09/12/2006	S	S	MS	26.36	2.74
9	02/08/2007	S	S	S	38.33	3.72
10	08/02/2007	S	S	S	49.94	4.62
11	11/20/2007	S	S	S	57.00	4.92
12	06/01/2008	S	S	S	65.50	5.21
13	11/30/2008	S	S	S	75.49	6.35
14	12/15/2008	S	S	S	76.58	6.53
15	05/28/2009	S	S	S	78.31	6.91
16	08/12/2009	S	S	S	78.39	7.05
17	02/27/2010	S	S	S	78.62	7.17

H. Restructuring

There was no restructuring of the DO or the indicators.

I. Disbursement Profile:



ii. P071817 (GEF)



i. P069892 (IDA)

1. Project Context, Development Objectives, and Design

1.1. Context at Appraisal

Country and Sector Background. At the time of project appraisal, Nigeria was the most populous country in Sub-Saharan Africa, with a population of around 102 million people. It accounted for 52% of West Africa's population. Analyses by the Federal Office of Statistics in Nigeria showed that while the country's poverty levels stood at 27% in 1980, they rose to 46% by 1985. After a modest decline to 43% by 1992, poverty again rose sharply to 66% by 1996. Extreme poverty had also increased significantly: between 1980 and 1996, the proportion in extreme poverty rose from 6% to 29%. In other words, 67 million Nigerians remained below the poverty line and 30 million were extremely poor. These trends were reflected throughout the country: while poverty was more prevalent in rural areas (69%), it had also become a significant problem in urban areas (58%).

In the past, the government had attempted to address its poverty challenges by allocating resources to a range of programs that had poverty alleviation as one of their objectives. However, most of these programs had little impact on the poor. They were sectoral in nature, with little attention to targeting, and had often been imposed with little, if any, commitment/involvement of the communities they were ostensibly attempting to help. Further challenges arose due to weaknesses in government institutional capacity and weak civil service capacity for policy implementation. Despite Nigeria's dependence on the oil sector, the majority of its people are involved in and dependent on the agricultural sector, and thus the poverty issues have been difficult to address.

Rationale for Bank assistance. The Nigeria Joint Interim Strategy Update identified three sets of actors contributing to development in Nigeria: government, private sector, and local communities. Accordingly, the Joint Interim Strategy Update was structured along three pillars, each designed to increase the capacity of one of these sets of actors to contribute more effectively to Nigeria's development. The three pillars were to: (a) improve economic governance; (b) create conditions for rapid private sector-led and poverty-reducing economic growth, especially in the non-oil economy; and (c) enable local communities to take charge of their own development. Consistent with the third pillar, the overall objective of the Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project (LEEMP) was to reduce poverty by empowering communities and local governments to take charge of their own development plans (and their needs, to the extent that doing so lies within their capabilities) through an approach based on the principles of community-driven development (CDD).

1.2. Original Project Development Objectives (PDOs), GEOs and Key Indicators (As stated in the PAD)

The two interrelated **Project Development Objectives** (PDOs) were to:

- 1. strengthen institutional framework at all three levels federal, state and particularly at local government to support communities on environmentally sustainable and socially inclusive development; and
- 2. empower community groups to plan, co-finance, implement and continue to maintain environmentally sustainable and socially inclusive multisectoral micro-projects.

The **Global Environmental Objective** (GEO) was that:

Beneficiaries within the support zones around targeted Protected Areas in two of the participating states will have planned, co-financed, and implemented, and are continuing to operate and maintain, environmentally sustainable and socially inclusive alternative livelihood micro-projects.

Project key indicators, relating to the PDOs were:

- i. by year five, legislative and regulatory framework, providing states and local governments authority to perform environmental assessments for some types of projects, is being applied;
- ii. by year five, 5 percent of Local Government Authorities (LGAs) that have received training and/or other capacity building inputs from the project are consulting communities as part of their annual budget formulation process; and
- iii. by year five, 40 percent of communities (targeted by the project during the first two years within the initial states) are continuing to operate and maintain at least 50 percent of micro-project investments as part of their Community Development Plans (CDPs).
- iv. Increased number of people in poor communities with access to social and natural resource services.

Key indicators specific to the GEF component were:

- i. by year five, a 5 percent increase in population of species identified as being threatened (see Annex 1); and
- ii. by year five, 40 percent of the communities (targeted by the project during the first two years in the support zones of the Protected Areas) will have adopted ecologically sustainable livelihoods.³
 - 1.3 Revised PDO and Key Indicators (if applicable), and Reasons/Justifications

Neither the objectives (PDO and GEO) nor indicators were revised.

1.4 Main Beneficiaries

The expected beneficiaries of the project included:

Communities in the selected states. The project was expected to benefit 900 communities (i.e. 10 communities from 10 LGAs in each of 9 participating states). The selected pilot states were: Adamawa, Bauchi, Bayelsa, Benue, Enugu, Imo, Katsina, Niger and Oyo. Under Component 1, it was expected that community-selected micro-project investments in seven sectors – education, health, water, transport, socio-economic, environment and natural resources, and electricity – would improve the lives of millions of beneficiaries in the participating communities. There was special emphasis on women and vulnerable groups.

Rural local governments. Under Component 2, capacity of rural local government planning, budgeting, implementation, and reporting capacity would be strengthened. This would be achieved by establishing an incentive framework for LGAs to improve their performance in these key areas and by providing targeted training to all rural local governments in participating states to enable them to improve their administrative capacity for more responsive service delivery. Beneficiaries would thus be the rural local governments and the populations they serve.

Participating states and the Nigerian population. Activities financed under Component 4 were to benefit both the participating states and the Nigerian population. These activities included clarifying and

 $^{^{3}}$ The ISRs use this indicator as the intermediate outcome indicator. In the PAD it is stated as the output indicator. The ICR review used this as a more logical indicator for achievement of the GEO.

harmonizing the environmental legislative and regulatory framework; decentralizing some responsibilities for environmental protection and natural resources management to state and local institutions; and strengthening state and local capacity to contract out environmental impact assessments and compliance monitoring.

National Parks/Reserves and Communities around the National Parks/Reserves. Component 3 was to support activities financed by the GEF funds in the Kainji National Park, Lame Burra Game Reserve, Mala-Dumba Lake and Forest Reserve (all in Bauchi state) and the Yankari National Park in Niger State. This funding also benefited park-fringe communities and the National Parks Service (NPS). A total of 100 park communities were identified to participate in the micro-project investments.

1.5 Original Components

The project consisted of five components as follows:

Component 1. Multisectoral Community-Driven Investments (US\$46.02 million)

About 60% of the credit would fund (on a grant basis) direct investments at the community level for multisectoral public infrastructure establishment and/or rehabilitation micro-projects.

Component 2. Local Government Assessment and Capacity Building (US\$4.96 million)

This component would finance a comprehensive and universal local government capacity assessment that was designed as a scorecard. All rural LGAs in the participating states, regardless of assessment score, would be eligible for training and capacity building provided under this component. However, Management Implementation Teams (MITs) (financed under the Project Management component) would be placed in only the top three scoring LGAs in a given state in the first year and in an additional three LGAs in the second year (the "green light" LGAs).

Component 3. Protected Area and Biodiversity Management Component (GEF US\$9.81 million)

Under this component, GEF would finance capacity building of the national parks service, improved protected area management as well as the establishment of alternative livelihoods (1.87 million of the Grant) in park fringe communities.

Component 4. Strengthening the Environmental Institutional Framework (US\$0.87 million)

This component aimed to improve the legal framework and enforcement capacity for environmental protection and enhancement of the natural resources management regime and state and local government officials in environmental assessment and management.

Component 5. Project Management (US\$28.72 million)

This component was to ensure effective coordination of the project's activities by all concerned parties.

1.6 Revised Components

The components were not revised.

1.7 Other Significant Changes

Changes were made to the project structure, schedule, and funding allocations as described briefly below.

Operational and Institutional Changes during Implementation (IDA)

Project implementation faced a number of challenges, including: initial approval delays from the World Bank due to a reduction in Nigeria's financial envelope; limited counterpart implementation capacity particularly for procurement; a lack of adequate counterpart funding, and delays in the approval process in the project management units. There were also institutional and operational challenges, especially political interference at the State project unit level. The project units were embedded in line Ministries and parastatals at the State level, and all the officers were seconded civil servants, so higher level officers including Permanent Secretaries and Commissioners were regularly interfering with the operations of the SPSUs. In addition, the Bank's 2005-2009 Country Partnership Strategy (CPS) indicated an agreement that the Bank projects should be harmonized around Nigeria's newly established Country Financing Parameters to rationalize the financing of the total country program. In view of this, the Bank and Federal Government of Nigeria agreed that changes should be made to address the institutional and operation issues as well as to respond to the harmonization principle of the CPS. Accordingly, some changes were made as a result of the MTR mission (March, 2007) were as follows:

- SPSUs were recognized and treated as program units, with some level of autonomy, and structured along functional departments with clear roles and responsibilities.
- The LEEMP project cycle was simplified with steps, responsibilities, and documentation (including at field level) clearly delineated. The role of MITs was redefined and they were reconstructed into multi-sectoral facilitation teams and became part of the Operations Department of the SPSU. A functional linkage between Local Government Review Committees (LGRC) and the LGA planning process was established. The SPSU Operations Department had final responsibility and accountability for the technical soundness of approved CDPs and for supporting CPMCs in the implementation (supervision). The roles, responsibilities, and modalities of monitoring and evaluation on the project were clarified.
- Counterpart funds were waived for the IDA aspects of the project in line with the new Country Financing Parameters, and the Special Account threshold for the SPSU was increased from \$400,000 to \$750,000.

For the GEF component, (i.e., component 3), Government counterpart funding was still a requirement. The only significant operational change came in 2007, when the contract with MITs were not renewed and instead Operational Officers (OOs), recent university graduates, were recruited to work at the grassroots level with communities. This change occurred because a Bank GEF supervision mission noted that the MITs were higher level technical specialists, whereas the particular phase of implementation required a more grassroots approach.

Project Schedule

Although the IDA-funded project was essentially completed by the original closing date of the project June 30, 2009, the GEF component of the project (which was less than 10% of the total outlay) was extended by six months to December 31, 2009 to enable completion of activities that had faced season-related implementation challenges and delays.

Funding Reallocations

During implementation, two reallocations among expenditure categories were made in the Credit Agreement for IDA funds. An additional reallocation was made for the GEF funds.

For the IDA funds, the *first reallocation* of funds (October 2007) was done to provide additional resources to the states. The additional funding came from the unallocated budget of US\$ 4,212,835.2. The

number of project beneficiaries and the scope of the project remained unchanged by this reallocation. The allocations to the following categories were however increased: training and workshops (by US\$100,000); consultant services (by US\$100,000); micro-projects (by US\$500,000); and operational costs (by US\$450,000).

The *second reallocation* (October 2008) was done to adjust the amount in each category based on the observed rates of expenditure, as the project was a year to closure. While the budget for operating costs was increased by US\$3,608,201 to account for cost overruns, the budget for goods was decreased by US\$1,843,419 since this category had a budget surplus. The allocation to micro-projects remained largely unchanged. The reallocated increase came from the unallocated budget and from the savings from the goods budget. Both reallocations were approved by the Nigeria Country Director.

On June 6th, 2008, a reallocation request was approved for the GEF funds. The following allocations were increased:

- training- by US\$100,000
- consultancy services by US\$100,000
- micro-projects by US\$ 500,000 and
- operational costs by US\$450,000

The additional funding came from the unallocated budget of US\$ 1,150,000. The reallocations better aligned the grant financing with the evolving program's funding needs, particularly in light of: (i) the increased pace of implementation of sustainable micro-projects; and (ii) the additional funds that were needed to recruit Operational Officers to carry out a much needed grassroots implementation strategy. The reallocations allowed the significant scale-up of environmentally sustainable micro-projects in the park fringe communities.

2. Key Factors Affecting Implementation and Outcomes

2.1 Project Preparation, Design and Quality at Entry

Project Preparation

Project preparation proceeded satisfactorily. A nine month delay occurred between negotiations and Board approval when Nigeria's financial envelope was lowered due to poor performance of the existing portfolio. As a result, the LEEMP project was held back until the following fiscal year. This action prompted the Country Director to write a letter offering the government a Supplementary Project Preparation Advance in the amount of US\$450,000 to maintain progress towards implementation readiness prior to the Board date. During this period, the Government showed continued commitment by constituting the project team and continuing to advance preparation activities, including the completion of several studies.

Project Design Overall

In general, the design process was highly participatory with regular consultations with key stakeholders, including the states, private sector, elected officials and international donors. LEEMP was focused on community empowerment and local development as a key element of the overall strategy for poverty reduction and development in the country, in line with the aspirations of the Country Partnership Strategy (CPS), National Economic Empowerment Development Strategy (NEEDS), as well as that of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). Previous poverty reduction projects have used a supply driven/administrative approach. This had not worked, so the major focus of the LEEMP project was to focus on community groups not only as beneficiaries, but also as drivers of the process; particularly with

emphasis on their priorities of education, natural resources management, health and soil conservation matters.

The project design integrated lessons learnt from Social Funds and community-driven development projects (see section on lessons on page 20). In terms of poverty targeting, the 10 poorest communities in the 10 poorest LGAs of each state were selected for participation in LEEMP. To select the 10 LGAs, a rapid assessment of LGAs in each state was done at the beginning of the project using a scorecard. The rating system assessed average household income, social infrastructure, and distance from urban centers. The exercise was conducted by an external firm contracted by the FPSU. However, the final choice of the poorest LGAs was made in each state in consultation with the Office of the Governor and the State Planning Commission.

At the QER, the panel considered the project relevant, and important in meeting an urgent need for improved watershed management in Nigeria. The panel particularly liked the innovative application of the CDD, and the combination of Bank and GEF activities to meet their complementary concerns.

The project design for the GEF component was weakened by the choice of outcome indicators: Page 3, of the PAD states that the outcome indicator for the GEO is that "by year 5, 40% of communities will have adopted ecologically sustainable livelihoods." However, in the PAD's Annex 1, the outcome indicator is that "by year 5, a 5% increase in population of threatened species should occur." During supervision, the page 3 indicator was monitored as an intermediate outcome and Annex 1 indicator as the outcome indicator. The ICR team determined that the appropriate indicator should have been the intermediate outcome indicator. This is because academic literature (Lockwood, Worboys, Kothari, 2008⁴) suggests that increasing the population of threatened species in a protected area is more complex since an increase in the number of threatened species is often attributed to a number of factors that were beyond the GEF project's influence such as the species ability to recover if numbers reach unsustainable levels, the effectiveness of park management including park financing, strong enforcement and surveillance activities, the level of conservation education of the park population.

Another shortcoming of the design was that the GEO was only concerned with the sustainable livelihoods (micro-projects) subcomponent of the GEF component (less than 2 million of the 9.81 million for the GEF), and not the content of component 3 as a whole, which also includes the strengthening of protected area (PA) management and institutional strengthening of the PA system more generally (see output section in Annex B). This had both positive and negative ramifications: On the one hand, GEO did not push the project to have a greater impact on the parks, but on the other hand, the objective, set relatively low, could be realistically achieved.

Finally, the M&E system was described but could have been designed more fully prior to implementation. This could have more strongly guided the GEF M&E team during implementation.

Lessons Incorporated into Project Design from Earlier Operations

A number of important lessons learned from Social Funds, community-driven development projects, watershed development and PA and biodiversity management projects in Africa and South/Southeast Asia were taken into account in the preparation of LEEMP. The principle lessons relevant to this project, exemplified in the LEEMP's multisectoral CDD micro-project approach with local government involvement in poor communities were the following:

• Adopt a participatory multisectoral development approach. To catalyze collective action, ensure ownership of investments and encourage sustainable operation and maintenance of investments,

⁴ M. Lockwood, G. Worboys, A. Kothari. 2006. Managing Protected Areas

communities need to prioritize their own investments through a participatory process that involves all stakeholders

- *Benefits must accrue quickly.* Successful community development is greatly dependent on community commitment, participation, operation and maintenance of assets created.
- *Community planning must be truly participatory.* It is essential to assign sufficient time and support at the initiation of micro-projects to ensure that an interactive planning process is established
- *Target the poor and vulnerable.* Social organization must address the needs of each interest group (farmers, landless, women, nomads, different age groups and other vulnerable groups) to give them an integral stake in the success of the micro-project and to avoid tendencies to free-ride on the collective action of other members of the community
- Involve community-based organizations and local governments to sustain investments and facilitate scaling up. Establishing community-based organizations and making them responsible for identification, planning, implementation and post-micro-project operation and maintenance is the only way to ensure sustainability
- *Establish systematic monitoring and evaluation.* Systematic monitoring and evaluation are needed to assess performance and remove bottlenecks. This procedure requires clear monitorable indicators of project performance and achievement of development objectives. While this was recognized as important, M&E remained a project weakness.

Earlier operations also informed the perception of risks to the project and resulting mitigation measures (elaborated in the PAD) adopted in project design.

2.2 Implementation

The Bank conducted a *Mid-term Review (MTR)* between 12 March and 18 May 2007, and assessed progress on all project components, the implementation issues, and the actions to be taken to ensure the successful completion of the project. The MTR mission's main objective was to undertake a comprehensive performance review of the project in line with the set development and implementation objectives with a view to: (i) accelerating the pace of project implementation; (ii) ensuring more focus on community empowerment and local level institution building; (iii) ensuring effectiveness and sustainability; and (iv) examining possible options for project scale-up in the future. Based on the performance of the project, the mission also proposed a credit reallocation.

Two main factors affected project implementation positively. First, the familiarity of the beneficiaries and stakeholders with the Bank's approach to community-led activities of the project facilitated project implementation. The availability of a clear implementation manual also helped smooth implementation. Secondly, the presence of a strong and dedicated implementation team, especially at the federal level, facilitated in moving the project forward without major distractions.

Prior to the MTR, implementation was negatively affected by the following factors: (a) seemingly complex project design; (b) cumbersome implementation arrangements at the state level; (c) lack of independence on the part of SPSU to make decisions for approving proposals from communities; (d) baseline study was not conducted on time and the M&E framework agreed during preparation of the project was not fully operationalized at the start of project, as substantial effort was concentrated on training of staff and assessment and selection of eligible LGAs. Also, after the first two years of the project, less than 10% of the funding was disbursed. Initially, for IDA funds, there tended to be a preference for private livelihood activities, such as rice mills, poultry, farming and pottery. It was difficult to make communities agree on public good micro-projects such as schools, health centers, water supply or environment/conservation infrastructure. After telling communities that these types of investments were only eligible through the FADAMA project, there was a great deal more interest by communities in these types of public goods.

Some political and institutional factors also affected implementation negatively, including: the influence of politics on stakeholders especially on the location of projects and the unstable nature of local government administration in Nigeria. While political office holders had little or no control on their tenure or local government resources, civil servants were subject to frequent transfer from their posts. Lack of autonomy of local councils on financial management (as they were being controlled by the state government) was also sometimes a problem. Complicating matters, Local Government Review Committee Chairmen (LGRC), who are the heads of local government administration and who are responsible for overseeing the implementation of projects at the local level, were also frequently changed. Finally, weak coordination among departments of the SPSUs also slowed down project implementation to some extent.

With respect to the GEF component, implementation was initially slow before the midterm review because of the high learning curve involved in developing participatory community development plans (CDPs). Implementation was also delayed by the Bank team's realization that they had focused largely on implementing public infrastructures (schools, clinics) instead of environmentally sustainable projects. For example, of the first 50 CDPs developed for Phase I communities only 17 contained any elements of environment sustainability. The Bank supervision team proactively determined that new environmentally sustainable livelihood plans (SLPs) had to be developed in the rest of the communities. This slowed down implementation, ultimately necessitating a project extension, because it meant: (i) preparing 50 new SLPs with these Phase II communities; (ii) convincing communities to plant woodlots as part of the effort to "green" the micro-projects; and (iii) recruiting new staff who were better suited to work at a grassroots level. Delays were also caused by lack of government counterpart funding. The funding was 265 million Naira (approximately US\$275,862) had been released.

By May 2007 (MTR), 50 new phase II SLPs had been developed and the pace and quality of implementation significantly improved, bolstered by the reallocation of funds and the new grassroots approach (and in 2009 the release of the rest of government counterpart funding). There is clear quantitative evidence of this improvement in implementation. At MTR there were 172 micro-projects implemented and by project closure this number had almost tripled. In addition, the number of micro-projects that qualified as "environmentally sustainable" also increased significantly, from 34% at MTR to 50% at project closure.

2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Design, Implementation, and Utilization

M&E Design

Overall, the LEEMP project's M&E system was not fully designed during project preparation. The indicators and the roles and responsibilities of agencies for collecting and reporting data were not clearly spelled out. There was also no baseline survey or data. The plan was for each state to prepare its own template for M&E, but that made it difficult for the federal team to summarize the indicators for the monitoring report.

M&E Implementation

With respect to the IDA funded components, after shortcomings in the M&E system were realized, the task team worked with the counterpart officials to put a robust M&E system in place in 2006. Thereafter state-level M&E officers started collecting data on a regular basis, collating and sending to the FPSU for preparation of quarterly and annual progress reports. As a result, project was closely monitored during the implementation. It was also possible for SPSUs to carry out an evaluation of the achievements of the interim outcomes of the project and to do Beneficiary assessments. The impact evaluation was also conducted by a recognized and competent consulting firm.

With the GEF component, in 2005, an M&E specialist was seconded from the National Parks Service. That same year, a Bank supervision mission recommended the recruitment of a consultant to develop an M&E manual. Terms of reference were developed in February 2006 and in December 2007 a draft M&E manual was finally delivered. Despite this, M&E implementation for the GEF component was uneven. At the *community level*, monitoring was nothing short of stellar. Each micro-project group encountered had record books with careful elaboration of expenditures, income and profits. In addition, OOs had excellent records which tracked each micro-project and associated costs. *At the PIU level* however, monitoring and evaluation was weaker, particularly toward the end of the project where there was no follow-up to the baseline studies on threatened species. The initial baseline studies had a dedicated budget but there was no line item budget for a study of similar scale towards the end of the project. The PIU did generate an e-report at the end of the project, but it focused largely on alternative livelihood micro-project accomplishments, without reference to threatened species. A beneficiary survey (n=80) was done at the mid-term which showed that project beneficiaries, except for those around Mala Dumba, were less likely to encroach into the park. However, the end of project e-report did not assess whether the behavior in Mala Dumba or the other communities changed by year 5.

M&E Utilization

With respect to the IDA funded activities, data collected from quarterly and annual reports of indicators was evaluated and used for decision making. For example, based on the collected data: (i) In Enugu, as water projects were more favored by communities, the state governments decided to support more water projects; and (ii) State governments allocated more resources to state agencies that performed better, so that they could cover more Local governments and more communities hence the achievement of 965 CDPs instead of 900 CDPs. In addition, the M&E system for the IDA funds was used to draw up reports that were shared with state governments, the federal government, the World Bank and the general public. Based on the excellent reporting it was also possible to document the project implementation and results which culminated in a World Bank annual Award in 2008.

With respect to the GEF component, M&E utilization was satisfactory, particularly in the field. The community monitoring and evaluation system was well utilized and operated by both the OOs and the communities.

The rating for the IDA aspect of the project is highly satisfactory for M&E and moderately satisfactory for the GEF because despite the excellent field reporting system, the high level of involvement of the community in financial monitoring and reporting, and the proactive measures during implementation to elaborate the M&E system, M&E at the PIU level could have been stronger.

In terms of assessing a relative weighting of IDA and GEF, two aspects were considered: the relative importance of the GEF component in achieving the overall project objectives and the financial attribution of the IDA and GEF. The GEF component had a relatively low impact on the overall project objective beyond contributing to the attainment of objective 2 in two states. In addition, given the relative financial contribution of IDA and GEF (\$ 80.57 IDA and \$9.81 GEF), the GEF's lower rating only impacts the overall project slightly. M&E is therefore rated **Satisfactory** for the overall project.

2.4 Safeguard and Fiduciary Compliance

Safeguards

LEEMP, a Financial Intermediary (FI) project, triggered the Bank's Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01) requirement, and thus an Environmental and Social Management Framework was prepared and disclosed country wide and in the World Bank InfoShop. In particular, all subcomponents and executed micro-projects were screened using the safeguards checklist to ensure conformity to the rules and social and environmental soundness. The environmental and social management plans were budgeted for, well

implemented, and closely monitored to ensure compliance. For the GEF component, the team was proactive in ensuring compliance. A procedures manual for micro-projects was published in November 2006 and revised in October 2008. A follow up Bank supervision mission noted that although the procedures were clear, monitoring of the mitigation measures for micro-projects required better follow-up by the counterpart to ensure their effective implementation. A natural resources management specialist was put on the project team and subsequent missions reported the consistent use of the environmental and social screening checklists. As part of safeguards due diligence, an environmental audit was conducted with a view to evaluating the project's safeguards performance. The report of the environmental audit rated the project's overall safeguards compliance to be Satisfactory.

Fiduciary

For the IDA part of the project, there were no significant failures to maintain acceptable financial management arrangements during project implementation. Changes in thresholds of Special Accounts (dedicated domiciliary accounts to receive the proceeds of the IDA credit) occurred to accommodate increase in the tempo of activities. There were instances of delays in the rendition of the quarterly Financial Monitoring Report and cases of inadequate documentation for incurred eligible expenditures. In Niger State and Bayelsa State, external audit and Bank supervision once observed irregularities in expenditures which were subsequently rectified. All through the period of project implementation the annual financial statements were submitted on time. Also there were no significant deviations or waivers from the Bank procurement policies and guidelines during the implementation of the project.

Equally, for the GEF component, no significant failure to maintain acceptable financial management arrangements was recorded. The Bank's supervision mission observed that though internal audit were done, follow up to the internal audit report results was largely inadequate as issues highlighted were left to linger unresolved for a long time. Budgets were not prepared from the annual work plan. The fixed assets register was not regularly updated and some essential information expected therein was not captured. The 2008 and 2009 Internal Control Report suggested that there were several improvements in the accounting skills of staff, updating of cash books, and classification of financial transactions. However, noted weaknesses were that the fixed assets register and stock ledger were not being used, and there was weak supervision of accounting duties by senior staff. Remittance of government counterpart fund was not timely, and a delay of about two years was experienced. The procurement process was smooth, with no deviation from policy and guidelines during implementation.

Fiduciary risk, that is Procurement and Financial management risk at project preparation, was assessed as High however, by the end of the project is rated as *Moderately Satisfactory*.

2.5 Post-completion Operation/Next Phase

The follow-on project, Community and Social Development Project (CSDP), which became effective in April 2009, has ensured the project's future operation. All nine states from the LEEMP have moved into the follow-on project, and additional states have joined. State governments will be putting their budget resources into community-driven interventions, and the skills and knowledge gained from the first project will be built upon.

Adaptations in the design of the CSDP have been made based on the experience gained during implementation of the Community Poverty Reduction Project (CPRP) and LEEMP. For example, some design elements have been adopted to minimize financial risks and ensure sustainability. This includes setting up an autonomous agency to prevent substantial government interference in project implementation, allowing for private sector participation in oversight functions, attracting high quality staff through the payment of competitive salaries, and ensuring project implementation using the CDD approach. The FPSU is supporting an overall results-based monitoring and evaluation framework for the CSDP in all participating states and across all levels of activities. A participatory M&E scheme used in

CPRP has been adopted and strengthened. The baseline survey will be conducted in all participating communities, and a more functional Management Information System will be established in partnership with the state agencies. Periodic project performance reviews coordinated by the FPSU and with active participation of the state agencies will be carried out to feed into the M&E and MIS.

A final impact evaluation will be conducted on the LEEMP activities three years after project closure, in order to assess the sustainability of the project's achievements. This evaluation will dovetail into the MTR of the CSDP, providing good comparators and data.

Regarding the GEF component, there were some planned (but unrealized) transitional arrangements of the LEEMP project, including putting in place a \$550,000 livelihood fund. Such a fund would have continued to fund and give technical support particularly to the newer micro-projects in the project area. However, the fund was not able to be established before the project ended despite the government's enthusiasm for setting up the fund. The failure to establish the fund was largely because the team underestimated the time required to set up such a fund. The process required inputs from legal and conservation finance specialists as well as a series of reviews. The GEF funds are no longer available after closing. However, at the time of the ICR field mission, the government team was discussing whether they could go ahead with this fund using the government's counterpart funding.

The last supervision mission prior to project closure stressed the need to anchor an exit strategy that included building synergies with existing World Bank projects for continued technical and other support even after project closure. With the new CSDP project, an opportunity has been created for the possible follow-up of this work in GEF areas. Niger and Bauchi States have established a Community and Social Development Agency and the activities of the CSDP would cover the protected areas.

3. Assessment of Outcomes

3.1 Relevance of Objectives, Design, and Implementation

Project Development Objectives

The PDOs are still relevant and important to Nigeria's social and economic development. In particular, as the state based/decentralized structure of the project proved to be successful, this approach is very relevant, timely, and appropriate to the current needs of the country's social sector. Nigeria still faces considerable human development challenges with very poor human development indicators and high regional disparities. The Country's National Economic Empowerment Development Strategy (NEEDS) and CPS have identified the need to continue to focus on community empowerment and local level development as a key element of the overall strategy for poverty reduction and development in the country. The Empowerment and Human Development pillars of both the NEEDS and the CPS recognize the efficacy of using the CDD approach as a vehicle for financing social infrastructure across the country and for community groups. The CDD-type interventions are therefore envisaged to include activities that will enhance the voice of communities and their participation in resource allocation decision making and service planning at the local level. In light of the above, the PDOs are rated as having *High Overall Relevance*.

Global Environmental Objective

The GEO of the project is consistence with guidance from the Conference of Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity which Nigeria ratified in 1994 regarding conservation, sustainable use of biological diversity, and support for active involvement of communities in biodiversity protection. The project's GEO is relevant in the Nigerian context, where encroachment into Protected Areas is high, largely because the parks offer a free and readily available source of wildlife that can be used for both income and food. As a result, numerous species that were prevalent several years ago in the Savannah, Sudan and Sahelian regions of Nigeria have virtually disappeared. Protection and conservation of biodiversity in these areas is particularly important since the degradation of habitat and ecosystems and the disappearance of indigenous species increase the potential for desertification of these areas. In addition, the degradation of these ecosystems has marginalized communities living in them, reducing their options to earn a livelihood, which in turn increases the pressure on PAs as well as on fragile ecosystems. The GEF support works with these park periphery communities to provide them with alternative livelihoods, thus gradually reducing their dependence on the parks. Despite this relevance, the GEO did not to encompass the complexity of the relationship between communities and biodiversity protection. As indicated earlier, there are many other factors which influence biodiversity. While some of these aspects are addressed in the GEF subcomponents, the stated GEO was somewhat simplistic by focusing only the sustainable alternative livelihood (micro-projects). In light of the above, the GEO is rated as having *Moderate Overall Relevance*.

3.2 Achievement of Project Development Objectives

The LEEMP project's development objectives were to:

- **i.** strengthen institutional framework at all three levels federal, state and particularly at local government to support communities on environmentally sustainable and socially inclusive development; and
- **ii.** empower community groups to plan, co-finance, implement and continue to maintain environmentally sustainable and socially inclusive multisectoral micro-projects.

Fulfillment of these two objectives was *Satisfactory*, based on the explanation below.

Objective 1. Strengthening the federal, state, and local institutional framework

The project has succeeded in creating functional institutional arrangements at the federal, state and local government level in the 90 LGAs, 9 participating states, and the FPSU for supporting CDD initiatives. The institutional mechanism has been tested for more than four years and the state and local governments have now integrated the arrangement into their budget process. The SPSUs are well resourced by the state governments for the IDA component, and 2 state-level institutions in Bauchi and Niger were also resourced for the GEF components. These state-level institutions are now transformed into the legally created agencies for the follow-on project (Community and Social Development Agencies). At the LGA level, most of the LGAs established a LEEMP desk in their Secretariat, with Community Development Officers as the desk officers. The LGA LEEMP desk has also transformed into the legally established unit in the LGAs under the follow-on project (CSDP). These units are now called Local Government Review Committees (LGRC). The units review community proposals and endorse Government or donor agencies support. They also integrate these proposals into the LGA budget stream-especially for recurrent expenditures. Through the project, the LGRCs have become an entry point for a partnership between LGAs and communities.

The project also supported the revision of a policy document entitled the National Environmental Policy and the National Environmental Management Bill. The policy document and bill are currently undergoing executive and legislative review. The law, when promulgated, will enhance environmental management at all levels. The box below provides details of the project's achievement in environment institution and policy building. This sub-objective is rated as Satisfactory.

Project achievements on strengthening the environmental institutional framework are described I the table below:

Area	Achievements
------	--------------

Area	Achievements
Policy and legislative	Revised National Environmental Policy
review	• Revised EIA sectoral guidelines/ACT and formulation of new guidelines
	 Revised draft National Environmental Management Bill
Improved environmental	• Established environmental Geographic Information Systems (GIS)
awareness/capacity for	• Supported GIS setup for poverty and environmental information
monitoring	management in all participating states
	• Established and stocked the e-library
Training awareness	• Strengthened capacity of staff for environmental information management at Federal Ministry of Environment
	• Developed training material and trained LGA and state level officers on
	use of environmental checklist for mainstreaming
	• Environmental health and sanitation training for LGA health officers
	• CPMC training on environmental mainstreaming
	• Environmental management awareness at all levels

Objective 2. Empower community groups to plan, co-finance, implement, and maintain sustainable and socially inclusive development (micro-projects)

The project exceeded the target for the number of micro-projects and the population of poor people that were expected to benefit from the social and natural resources management project. Over 6.4 million people are benefiting from health, education, safe water, rural electrification and mobility as well as natural resource management services in the rural and poor communities. The impact assessment studies showed a high impact on school enrolment (a 15% increase on average) and a reduction in the distance to schools from 2.5 kilometers (km) to 0.5km on average. There was also a reduction in the number of reported cases of malaria, and increase in health center attendance. The distance traveled for access to safe drinking water has also been reduced to less than 1km from the previous 5km (Annex E provides more details).

Originally, the project was expected to have one CDP per community, with a total of 900 CDPs. However, LGAs and the state governments showed commitment when they added more resources so that an additional 65 communities could participate in the project. In all, nine hundred sixty five CDPs were prepared and funded in the nine LEEMP participating states as shown in Annex B. A total of 3,220 micro-projects were implemented, and 3,003 of them (93.2%) were completed and are in use. The water sector topped the list with 1,005 micro-projects while the rural electrification sector had the least with 74 micro-projects completed and in use. In LEEMP communities, 91.5% of households indicate that their total household incomes are considerably better now compared to six years ago, prior to the LEEMP intervention. This has led to improved livelihoods in LEEMP communities, resulting in improved perceived social status by households. The households' own assessment of their social status indicate that 94.8% report that they are either better-off or about average in terms of their social status, and only 5.2% reported that they are poorer than average.

Other project's achievements with poverty reduction impacts are as follows:

- 463 communities provided with primary school infrastructure, serving over a million children
- 278 health centres constructed or rehabilitated serving about 839,000 people directly
- Average distance to health facility reduced to 1.8km compared to previous 5-20km
- Breaking gender barriers (25% female composition of project management committees)

- 31% increase in female student enrolment between 2005-2007
- Revision of National Policy on Environment and EIA ACT with its sectoral guidelines
- 636 sources of potable, affordable water benefiting about 1.5 million people

With regards to environmental sustainability, environmental concerns have been integrated into all microprojects e.g., toilet in schools/centers, drainages, water points, tree planting to shelter schools and health centers, pitching of bridges/culverts against erosion, sanitary conditions for agro-processing facilities, integrating solar system to power water supply, soil and water conservation techniques, and training on the environmental checklist. With regard to social sustainability, women in rural areas are engaged in activities e.g., skills acquisition, agro-processing etc. Vulnerable groups have been integrated e.g., targeted orphanage in Imo State, wheelchairs and learning materials for handicapped people in Niger State. Overall achievement of this sub-objective is rated as **Highly Satisfactory**.

Global Environmental Objective (GEO)

Environmentally micro-projects have been successfully established although the long term sustainability of some is questionable

In terms of achievement of the stated GEO objective, the GEF component surpassed its expected value achieved by year 5 by implementing 69 out of the 100 prepared community development (phase I) and sustainable livelihood (phase II) plans. According to PIU end of project reports, approximately 595 micro-projects were established. Of these, 60% of the micro-projects around each reserve/park could be classified as environmentally sustainable, with 69 communities adopting at least one or more micro-projects that could be defined as environmentally sustainable. In the remaining 31 communities, plans were developed but not yet implemented because the project closed before they could be funded. Sustainable micro-projects included community woodlots, bee-keeping, fish farming, water production, and agroforestry. In terms of the number of people directly impacted by these micro-projects, the number varies because many of the projects benefited the entire community (water projects, orchards) while some benefited member groups. The number of individual beneficiaries is 3553.

The sustainability of some of the newer phase II projects remains unclear with the inability of the project to establish the sustainable livelihoods fund (SLF) and because these newer projects just started up in 2008 and 2009. The SLF fund would have allowed the national park service to recruit staff to follow up on the projects as well as continue the educational outreach aspects of the project. There is one opportunity for continuity that has been discussed and which seems very possible: many of these park communities fall within the CPMC project beneficiary area and it is expected that these newer phase II projects and the 31 communities with unimplemented plans will be supported under the new project.

The micro-projects have been socially inclusive and communities have taken ownership

The project used effective social targeting in a process that selected women, youth, artisans, farmers and hunters into groups for easier targeting. Of particular interest was the hunter group, who were self-identified poachers. Approximately 64 micro-projects were managed by the hunter groups.

Although the two states were slow in cofinancing, communities were enthusiastic. In terms of ownership, the beneficiaries fully planned and managed the micro-project accounts as well as collected community co-financing and monitored disbursement. Their level of commitment is perhaps best highlighted by the level of community contributions – approximately US\$1.3 million was disbursed from GEF for the micro-projects with an additional US\$138,092 provided by the beneficiary communities, approximately 10% of the overall cost of the micro-projects. On the other hand, the government's co-financing, was sporadic, with most of the funds released in the project's final year.

"Promoting and implementing an integrated approach to land use planning at the local level"

Although the PAD GEO objective does not mention promoting an integrated approach as part of the project's objectives, as mentioned earlier, the Grant Agreement has this additional element. The ICR team interpreted this aspect as the process of integrated land use planning, which culminates in the community development plans (CDPs) and the sustainable livelihood plans (SLPs). In terms of implementation, the project was highly successful in establishing a land use planning process where members of the community, including the most poor and disenfranchised (youth, women), discussed and agreed on the development goals and alternative livelihoods for their communities. The PIM was instrumental in establishing the guidelines for this process during the preparation stage and this is clearly a factor in its success. The PIM set out the guidelines for the information needed and the timeline for the elaboration of the CDP and endorsements. In addition, over time, learning improved and the PIU indicates that the planning process improved from Phase I to Phase II. In total, 100 CDPs and SLPs were completed and 69 implemented.

Success of Phase I Projects

The project was successful in ensuring that Phase I beneficiaries continued to operate their micro-projects after implementation. Of the Phase I micro-projects visited on the ICR mission, all were in full operation and several were already beginning to show longer-term profitability. There are several projects that were particularly successful in terms of ownership and profitability: The dual powered (electric and diesel) rice processing machine and housing for Wawa Women's Association. This group was the only processing group for miles and they were innovative enough to accept payment in unprocessed rice, which they then processed and resold after adding value to the product. Another group, formerly an animal fattening group, had fattened and sold their animals and invested the profits into purchasing motorcycles which they initially leased. With the profits from leasing, they moved into selling motorcycles, making a profit of about \$70 on each motorcycle sold. A third group, the Unique Business/Computer Center for the Wawa Youths Association, established in 2006, focused on printing (brochures, photocopies, funeral announcements) as well as serving as a computer center.

There was a clear link between the micro-projects and encroachment in the parks. At the midterm, a beneficiary survey asked 80 participants (20 per park) if they would encroach in the park. In 3 of 4 parks a majority of participants responded they would not (96% in Yankari, 89% in Lame Burra and 64% in Kainji). Only in one park, Mala Dumba, did the survey show that these participants would continue to encroach (70%). This is likely because there were fewer micro-projects in that reserve because it was so small (47km2), and there was less focused involvement of participants by the MTR. As mentioned in the M&E section, this was one area that the PIU could have monitored to assess changes in attitudes over time.

Other subcomponents

Because the other subcomponents were not part of the GEO, there were no scorecards or methods established in the design to rate these other aspects. For example, it is not possible to quantitatively tell whether management of the National Parks has been improved or whether institutional strengthening has occurred. However, there are clear, undeniable outputs from these components: training was completed, eco-centers were built, roads were repaired and the studies were completed (see Annex B for details).

Conclusion

For the GEO, the project satisfactorily established micro-projects and this can be measured. In addition, the tendency towards encroachment was on a declining trend in 3 of 4 parks, signifying that over the longer term, the species health of the parks could improve. As a result of the M&E issues, and lower sustainability of Phase II projects, the outcome rating of the *GEO rating is lowered to moderately satisfactory*.

3.3 Efficiency

Efficiency in terms of the LEEMP project's IDA components has been examined in three major areas: allocative efficiency, efficiency of procurement approach, and cost efficiency analysis (unit cost comparison). In terms of allocative efficiency, the community participation and demand resulted in investments with a very high rate of return and sustainability, such as water supply and rehabilitation of schools and roads. The project also secured greater efficiencies through its procurement approach of transferring responsibility for procurement of small-scale infrastructure to local actors under participatory and transparent community contracting systems. This approach has been shown to lower unit costs of infrastructure between 25-40% in numerous studies in developing countries, contributing to improved cost efficiency of investments. A cost-efficiency analysis (unit cost comparison) undertaken for the ICR indicate that in comparison to other methods of intervention and service delivery through LGA and the state, federal agencies such as UBE, MDG Projects, and even individual and private-sector led efforts the LEEMP micro-projects were more efficient (Annex E). For example LEEMP boreholes were drilled and installed at an average cost of 700,000 naira (approximately US\$ 4652⁵) while that provided by LGA on contract basis were at a cost 1,200,000 naira (approximately US\$ 7976) i.e., 45% higher. The capacity building activity of the LEEMP project coupled with the practice of efficient resource management at the community level is clearly attested to by the community leaders (box 1).

BOX 1: Efficient Capacity Development alters a Village Head's Status

The Village Head of Husamawa in Baure LGA, Katsina State has recently been promoted in the Chiefdom hierarchy and he is currently besieged by contemporaries for help with contacting government and/or assisting in the formation of project committees in surrounding communities. He attested that all has been influenced by his involvement with the LEEMP, and the requests are made in recognition of his enhanced relationship with government officials. He also added that the transformation in his personality and abilities are to a large extent a result of the extent of development achieved (via the CDD approach) in his community over a five-year period.

The cost of the project's **GEF component** was US\$9.81 million, however national benefits are estimated to be greater, and global biodiversity benefits of the project are estimated to be at least US\$22.5 million. These benefits are associated with the protection and management of 965,100 hectares of land area during the life of the project. In the communities around the 4 reserve areas targeted by the GEF component, 595 micro-projects were carried out with a total of over 3,553 individuals benefiting. In terms of how

 $^{^{5}}$ All naira to dollar conversions are using the rate of 11/17/2010

effectively project funds were used, the micro-projects generally cost approximately \$2184 per project is a reasonable expenditure of resources based on a comparison with other Bank projects. The GEF efficiency assessment has been done based on the incremental costs principle and the cost effectiveness analysis as per the GEF procedures. More details on cost-benefit and efficiency for both IDA and GEF components can be found in Annex C.

3.4 Justification of Overall Outcome Rating

Overall outcome rating for PDOs (and GEOs) comes from combining the relevance of objectives/design, achievement of objectives, and efficiency. The PDOs, as discussed earlier, continue to have high relevance. Nigeria still faces considerable human development challenges with very poor human development indicators and high regional disparities. The Country's NEEDS and CPS have identified the need to continue to focus on community empowerment and local level development as a key element of the overall strategy for poverty reduction and development in the country. The project exceeded the PDO targets for the number of micro-projects and the population of poor people that would benefit from the social and natural resources management project. With relatively modest funds, significant positive outcomes were seen, including poverty alleviation and empowerment of local communities to take charge of their own development in 9 states. In light of all this, the PDO outcome is rated *Satisfactory*.

The achievement of the GEO is rated as moderately satisfactory. The project performed satisfactorily in terms of establishment of the micro-projects, and with its emphasis on community-led planning, reporting and financial management. The latter has: (i) helped ensure financial accountability between the NPS and community beneficiaries; and (ii) put full ownership of the projects into the hands of the beneficiaries. The GEO rating is however tempered by mixed results on M&E and lower sustainability of Phase II projects.

The relative weights of the GEF and IDA with a stronger than satisfactory performance of the IDA components, justifies the overall rating for the project as *Satisfactory*. Successful implementation of LEEMP was regionally recognized in 2008 with an award of excellence (*Africa Region Award for Excellence*).

3.5 Overarching Themes, Other Outcomes and Impacts

i. Poverty Impacts, Gender Aspects, and Social Development

Poverty Impacts. The beneficiaries and stakeholders are in agreement that, increase in awareness, participation, skills, productivity and value addition have contributed substantially to income generation and jobs creation in all the project areas. For example, the project has positively contributed to increased household incomes, and diversification of livelihood sources in the target communities due to the various skills acquired through project intervention. Income diversification by households is seen as a key survival strategy in areas where exposure to risk, such as climatic variability, is high. The impact of diversification of livelihood sources is employment and wealth creation opportunities. This is because of new skills acquired during the project, enabling environment provided by the developed infrastructure, and presence of employees and skilled workers in the communities.

The women in Achough Community in Benue State used to work on the farms only and the money from the sales of farm produce belonged to the men. With the borehole water, women and widows now engage in burukutu (wine) production and locust beans. The process of producing burukutu requires a lot of water, the lack of which hampered the commercial production before. The women, especially widows, now have independent sources of income. The presence of workers in the community has given them an assured market. The women's priority area of intervention was water and due to the importance of water to the entire community, it was not surprising that water micro-projects constituted the highest number of LEEMP interventions in the nine states. It helped to reduce time spent fetching water– a great economic and social gain.

BOX 3: Time Spent by Women to Fetch Water

With the boreholes in place, the women in the Mamsirme community in Larmurde LGA in Adamawa State no longer had to wake up very early in the morning to go in search of water. Subsequently, the women claimed that LEEMP had a tremendous impact in allowing them to have more satisfying marital relationships. Homes that were hitherto fraught with conflict now benefit from peaceful co-existence. By extension, the reduction of marital squabbles made the community much more peaceful.

The GEF component contributed significantly to the livelihood of the local communities through the promotion of income generating activities that have resulted, in a few cases, in substantial increases in income. To ensure the distribution of wealth, the community groups were asked to put in place their own mechanism for revolving the profits of the micro-projects through lending or other schemes. All the groups devised their own methods for sharing the funds among their 20-30 members, thus alleviating poverty within their group. An innovative example of this revolving mechanism was seen in the rice dehusker group in Wawa where women distributed their funds among their members but asked for repayment in rice, which they then de-husked and sold. Other groups required repayment in cash.

Gender Aspects and Social Development. The LEEMP followed the tenets of gender inclusiveness throughout its design, as one of its primary objectives was to give voice to the under privileged and disadvantaged groups in the country, of which women are the largest. There was no discrimination in the consideration of women, youth, or the disabled in appointments for posts in the executive or other areas of responsibility in the project. Women were involved in the project selection and implementation of all projects for which women were the direct beneficiaries. They also participated actively in micro-projects for water supply, health, and education, tracking changes and keeping the projects on course.

The road and water projects impacted positively on women and children in time savings and reduced workload. By reducing the time and fatigue of this heavy daily workload, LEEMP projects have increased the capacity of the women's productivity and income. Observations from the field showed that women were able to attend market days more often since transportation was more available and more time was available. Health and social well-being was also observed to be better in the benefiting communities. Regarding health, the reduced time needed to get to health centres on good roads led to a higher attendance rate. Regarding social well-being, female respondents spoke of the ability to take some time out from work to participate in community activities and contribute to debate on matters concerning their welfare. They also spoke of increased output from their farms and reduced losses on perishable farm products such as tomatoes and other fruits which they are able to get to markets faster than before.

ii . Institutional Change/Strengthening

Over the course of the project, federal, state and local institutions have had the opportunity to develop and maintain good project management skills. They have received training and support in management, budgeting, planning, monitoring, evaluating, project supervision, community mobilization and sensitization. They have learned about, practiced, and seen the benefits of the principles of openness,

transparency, and accountability in project implementation. The results can be seen through the following:

- Improved efficiency in project management at the levels of community, LGA, and Ministries, Departments and Agencies
- Use of the project concept by some LGAs on their own
- Execution of similar projects by many communities on their own
- Partnering of Ministries, Departments and Agencies with the state agencies, using a similar approach to start their own projects, especially in water supply

The capacity building did not ideally translate in all areas, for example there remained shortcomings and challenges in financial management.

The specific aim of the GEF component was to increase the local capacity (NPS, Local government, etc) to administer natural resources, as well as to strengthen partner institutions including local communities. The project (see Annex B) partially achieved these aims. The project improved the operational capacity of NPS by providing equipment, a boat, vehicles, computers, and 5 much appreciated ranger quarters within the parks. It also improved the technical capacity of staff through international tours, ranger training, fisheries training and training on community building. The project also provided the NPS with tools to improve forestry/ wildlife management by funding 4 management plans for the parks/reserves. There was some partnership between the NPS and the local government agencies (LGAs), who are responsible for community development in 3 of the 4 parks/reserves (Kainji is an exception because the NPS intervenes in these communities). This resulted in the LGAs assisting, to a small extent, in the GEF component implementation.

iii Other Unintended Outcomes and Impacts

There have been many positive unintended outcomes, impacts, and spin-off effects. Eight of these are mentioned in the bullets below.

- Some states and LGAs are already utilizing the CDD approach in delivering developmental projects, and some states are releasing state funds to the accounts of LEEMP in their states in order to expand micro-projects to non-LEEMP communities in their states.
- As a result of the project, data are being made available to monitor real progress at the local level.
- The project has opened a new chapter in project implementation practice, giving voice to the voiceless through the involvement of the poor in identifying and implementing micro-projects on their own, a practice which hitherto has been alien to them.
- Some communities are using proceeds realized from their income generating projects for buying chalk, exercise books for adult learning classes, and uniforms in support for HIV/AIDS orphans.
- School blocks constructed for regular schools are used for adult classes especially for women (as is the case at Tse Atim community).
- In some instances, LEEMP became the mechanism for resolving age-long traditional conflicts in some communities.
- Several neighboring communities from boundary states are now benefiting from health facilities provided.
- Due to high awareness about the micro-projects in communities and LGAs, there is an increasing demand for interventions.

One unintended negative impact of the project was that at project closure, there were a small number of community projects that were unfinished. This was because, in a few cases, state agencies had raised

expectations of communities to start micro-projects, but did not have the resources to complete them. As a result, by the time the project closed, some of the micro-projects were still not completed. It is, however, envisioned that in case communities are not able to complete them with their own resources, CSDP will be assisting them to complete these micro-projects.

3.6. Summary of Findings of Beneficiary Survey and/or Stakeholder Workshops

This information has been presented as part of the recommendations in Section 6 and in Annex E. In brief, however, some of the recurring themes in beneficiary communities were: enthusiasm for the CDD approach and a desire for more capacity building of project operators and LGAs. A number of the beneficiaries highlighted the need for better monitoring, evaluation, and data collection on the micro-projects and their real impacts. There was also a sense that community contributions and user fees should be mandatory to ensure the sustainability and maintenance of micro-projects. Lastly, some also raised concerns about capture by elites of the decision-making process for selecting micro-projects.

4. Assessment of Risk to Development and GEO Outcome

i Risk to Development Outcome

The completed micro-projects are being maintained by the communities through special levies and user charges. In some cases, the projects have been handed over to LGAs for operations and maintenance. Partnerships between LGAs and communities for operations and maintenance of the micro-projects have also been worked out in a few cases. Sustainability of micro-projects is now vested in the trained community management teams supported by their local governments and relevant state government agencies. The follow-on CSDP project has made it mandatory for local governments to include recurrent costs in their budget so that they can support micro-projects on a sustainable basis. For example, it is now compulsory for LGAs to provide teachers and books to their schools. The rating for risk to development outcome is *Negligible to Low*.

ii Risk to Global Environmental Outcome

The micro-projects established in Phase I are likely to continue given that several are currently profitable and already completely managed by the community. However, Phase II projects are at greater risk, partly because the SLF was not established and therefore the National Parks and LGSA will need additional funding to continue to support these communities. There was substantial Government counterpart financing at the end of the project which arrived too late to be used. If properly channeled into a livelihood fund, this could continue to support the newer Phase II projects. It is also expected that the unfinished SLPs and Phase II projects will be supported through the new CSDP project. With these aspects still to be put into action, the current risk to the GEO rating is *Moderate*.

5. Assessment of Bank and Borrower Performance

5.1 Bank Performance

i Bank Performance in Ensuring Quality at Entry

During preparation and appraisal, the Bank took into account the adequacy of project design, technical, financial, economic, and institutional aspects, and procurement and financial management schemes. A number of alternatives were considered for the project design. In addition, major risk factors and lessons learned from earlier projects in the social sector were considered and incorporated into the project design.

Project preparation was carried out with an adequate number of specialists who provided the technical skills mix necessary to address sector concerns and a good project design. The Bank provided adequate

resources in terms of staff weeks and dollar amounts to ensure quality preparation and appraisal work. Furthermore, the project was consistent with the government priorities in the sector at the time, and the Bank had a consistently good working relationship with the Borrower during preparation and appraisal.

The project document was found to be satisfactory at the Quality Enhancement Review. The Quality Enhancement Review panel was impressed with the thorough preparation of the project materials, the smooth logistics, and the focused terms of reference provided for the panel. The panel considered the project relevant, and important in meeting an urgent need for improved watershed management in Nigeria. The panel particularly liked the innovative application of CDD practice to multisectoral watershed management, and the combination of Bank and GEF activities to meet their complementary concerns. Thus, for the IDA component, the Bank's performance in the identification, preparation, and appraisal stages of the project was *Satisfactory*.

Regarding the GEF component, as mentioned earlier, there were weaknesses in the project's design related to the formulation of the GEO but especially in the choice of an outcome indicator for the GEO. Quality at entry for the GEF is therefore *unsatisfactory* although the overall rating for the project, at the QER, was satisfactory.

Thus, given the weighted rating for the GEF component vis a vis the IDA component, the overall quality at entry is *Moderately Satisfactory*.

ii Quality of Bank Supervision

The project (IDA components) was adequately supervised and closely monitored. The task team prepared Aide-Memoires regularly, prepared and alerted the government and FPSU and SPSUs to problems with project execution, and facilitated remedies in a timely manner. The Implementation Status Reports (ISRs) realistically rated the performance of the project both in terms of achievement of development objectives and project implementation. The task team also monitored safeguard and fiduciary compliance. The task team carried out a MTR between March-May 2007, in partnership with FPSU, Federal Ministry of Environment and the Federal Ministry of Finance. Prior to the mission, a MTR Issues Paper was discussed with the Government Project Team and approved by Bank Management.

The Bank's procurement and financial management staff worked continuously with the implementing agency staff to explain the rules and procedures applicable to project implementation with regard to procurement of goods and works, accounts and audits, and selection of consultants, based on the Credit Agreement. Through its follow-on project, CSDP, the Bank has ensured that adequate transition arrangements are made for regular operations.

The project had four Task Team Leaders (TTLs) during its five year implementation period. However, as the fourth TTL had been in the team from preparation to finalization, and further, as he was the co-TTL for most of the period, these changes in task leadership did not adversely affect the implementation. The project received a 2008 *Africa Region Award for Excellence* in recognition of its exemplary performance (particularly focusing on the IDA activities), including the excellent partnership of the Bank's task team and Government of Nigeria's project team. Thus, with regard to the IDA components, the Bank's performance during the implementation of the project was *Highly Satisfactory*.

For the GEF component, on the positive front, the team was proactive in recognizing project problems, and putting in place steps to improve implementation. This strategy helped speed up the rate of implementation though it decreased the time that newer projects had to fully establish themselves. However, the IDA supervision reports focused mainly on the IDA funded components and did not systematically report on the GEF component so the problem with the GEO indicators was resolved at the ICR stage. Had the issue been flagged earlier, the team could have considered a limited restructuring. The quality of Bank supervision for the GEF component is therefore rated *Moderately satisfactory*.

The combined overall rating, given the GEF's lower weighting, for quality of supervision of the IDA (Highly *Satisfactory*) and GEF (*Moderately satisfactory*) components is therefore *Satisfactory*.

iii. Justification of Rating for Overall Bank Performance

The Bank's performance was strong overall and excellent in many respects, although the process of having two different task teams and team leaders for the IDA and GEF component affected the overall Bank performance especially on the relatively small GEF component.. Increased proactivity with regard to the M&E and mutual IDA-GEF team support would have resulted in a Highly Satisfactory rating. However, because of the sporadic coordination of GEF and IDA components during supervision and quality at entry issues, the Bank's overall performance is rated as *Satisfactory*.

5.2 Borrower Performance

i. Government Performance

As mentioned in Section 2.1, the federal government had shown its commitment to the objectives of the project at the time of project preparation. The federal government and the participating states maintained their commitment throughout implementation. The Federal Ministry of Finance, in particular, was very supportive of the project. The government officials worked closely with the Bank's project team on a continual basis and with full cooperation. They were highly committed, responsive, and qualified.

Appropriate levels of reviews and approvals were usually in place; financial accountability and follow-up was observed and expenditures were duly authorized before they were incurred. Documentation was maintained properly for periodic review. Counterpart funding problems in the initial stages of implementation were resolved when the Bank and the government agreed to waive the need for counterpart funding.

In the two states, Bauchi and Niger, where the GEF was implemented, the government was well engaged in the project. During preparation, there were several missions and workshops held for the GEF component with widespread participation by state officials including the Commissioner for Housing and the Environment, Bauchi State Government, non-governmental organizations, community leaders, Niger State core teams, and many state and local government authorities. At these workshops, the participants were strongly engaged in preparation, identifying issues faced by communities within the support zones, assessing appropriate interventions, and bringing-up possible projects that could be supported by the GEF component. The key challenges faced during implementation with regard to the government's involvement was the lack of counterpart funding which, unlike the IDA part of the project, was not waived. This counterpart issue was not resolved till 2009 when the government paid the remainder of the counterpart. Thus, taken as a whole, government performance for the GEF part of the project is rated moderately satisfactory with the government performance rated as *Satisfactory* for the overall project.

ii. Implementing Agency or Agencies Performance

<u>FPSU.</u> At the federal level, project management was the responsibility of the Federal Project Support Unit (FPSU) – a designated unit of the Federal Ministry of Environment – with assistance and support from a Federal Advisory Committee. The FPSU team offered technical support to the SPSUs. The FPSU also successfully conducted all activities in terms of agreed CDPs and micro-projects. Moreover, the financial management system including accounting, controls, auditing and reporting was adequate and satisfied the Bank's financial management requirements. All financial monitoring reports reviewed were

submitted on a timely basis and found to be very well compiled. Thus, FPSU performance was *Highly Satisfactory*.

SPSUs. State Project Support Units (SPSUs) were responsible for all activities at the state level. Each of the nine participating states had an SPSU based in a designated ministry. Designated ministries included Ministries of: Local Government, Community Development and Chieftaincy Affairs, Poverty Alleviation, Economic Planning, and Environment. Each SPSU had its own financial management specialist and procurement specialist. The *Financial Management Performance Review* showed that the performance was moderately satisfactory. This rating was informed by poor payment validation, unretired advances, manual record keeping and weak internal controls including inadequate internal audit function. With regard to *procurement arrangements*, procurement of all works, goods and technical services under the project followed the Procurement Guidelines "*Procurement under IBRD Loans and IDA Credits.*" Performance of the SPSUs in terms of procurement was satisfactory. With regard to *reporting arrangements*, the SPSUs submitted all required quarterly and annual reports in a timely manner. These reports were informative and provided valuable feedback on how the micro-projects were progressing covering all project activities. The status of performance indicators was incorporated in all progress reports and served as valuable input to Bank supervision mission reports. The performance of SPSUs was thus, on the whole, *Moderately Satisfactory*.

On the GEF side, the project faced considerable obstacles in the first few years, and yet the implementation team managed to turn the project around and meet most of its set objectives regarding the establishment of the micro-projects, establishment of eco-centers, training of the national park service and community public awareness (see Annex B for full output details). However, this positive aspect is weighted against poorer M&E at the PIU level. Finally, despite the initiation of legal studies to set up the livelihood fund, and a number of completed steps in the process, the team was still not able to establish the fund before project closure. The GEF implementing agency performance is rated *Moderately Satisfactory*.

iii . Justification of Rating for Overall Borrower Performance

In light of the performance of the government, FPSU, and SPSUs as discussed above, the overall performance of the Borrower is rated *Satisfactory*.

6. Lessons Learned

- 1. LEEMP showed the importance of building capacity of LGA personnel for participatory planning. The value of CDD projects lies beyond their direct impact on human development indicators. Community empowerment under these projects has already created pressure on local governments to respond to community needs and to use public resources more effectively. Strengthening local government in this context is a complementary effort, so that local government can improve responsiveness towards community demands and citizens will have increased trust in state actors. In this regard, institutional strengthening needs to go beyond training to assessing institutional strengths and weaknesses and undertake activities to more holistically build capacity (e.g., staffing, technical capacity, incentive framework etc.,). In the follow up project, CSDP, there is an investment in building up LGA capacity to institutionalize the CDD approach, as well as basic planning, budgeting, and financial management capacity to improve effectiveness, transparency and accountability of resources managed by LGAs.
- 2. On social interventions, it is important to move from community projects to development plans. The experience of LEEMP showed the advantages of comprehensive community development planning in order to ensure a single, harmonized development process at the community level. That way, different sources of funds can make use of the same community development plans. This lesson has been taken into consideration in the follow-up project
- 3. Blending GEF with IDA requires a design that is truly integrated and can leverage the additional GEF funds to produce an environmental benefit. Without a deliberate design that capitalizes on synergies, the GEF project can become its own stand alone project, operating in parallel to the IDA. Particular emphasis must also be placed on complementary implementation and supervision arrangements as well as an M&E system that monitors the entire project progress and achievements.
- 4. A strong M&E system to track key project performance indicators is essential and also useful for adaptive management. Quantitative validation of project achievements can only be secured when there is a strong results framework and monitoring and evaluation system. Such a system requires prioritization in the cost estimates. A budget line for these tasks and reinforcement of M&E and results studies in the grant agreement helps to impress on the Borrower the importance of carrying them out. Also, it was learned that completing the baseline survey within the first year of the project is important to provide quantitative estimates of outcome and impact, and it is equally important to develop simple but effective monitoring and evaluation indicators.

7. Comments on Issues Raised by Borrower/Implementing Agencies/Partners

The Borrower, in its final project evaluation report (Annex G), regarded the LEEMP project as a success overall. Three items in the report will be highlighted relating to: (i) the change in communities undertaking LEEMP-supported micro-projects; (ii) the evidence of improvements in governance and transparency; and (iii) environmental advances.

On *community changes*, the report states: "It is of interest to note that the behaviour of LEEMP communities at baseline are not the same ones today as they have been tremendously empowered to take responsibility and authority, to be transparent and accountable, plan, design, implement and manage projects and put in place effective opertaion and maintenance plans. Another lesson here is that neighbouring communities outside LEEMP intervention are now benefitting from the LEEMP communities either through direct access to micro-projects or through knowledge transfer approach. In order to keep the spirit alive, there is need for sustained sensitisation and training of the communities."

With respect to *governance and transparency*, the report notes that: "There is some degree of improved governance in the communities as they have become more cohesive and pro-active in addressing community problems. This is evident in the case of: (i) some elected leaders sacked and/or disciplined on account fraudulent practices; (ii) communities prosecuting defaulting service providers and compelling completion of micro projects; and (iii) some defaulting service providers have been charged in the law courts and made to make refunds." Further, on transparency and accountability, "the CPMCs and the buying committees as the case may be are made accountable for every kobo spent on behalf of the communities. For instance, the buying committees must give reports on purchases to receiving committees amidst witnesses."

Regarding *environmental advances*, the report observes *inter alia* that: "(i) States and Local Government have assisted in service delivery at some levels and through the promulgation of edicts and laws prohibiting bush burning, tree felling and hunting; (ii) both biodiversity conservation and people's livelihoods are winning and communities feel they are part of the wider conservation community; (iii) collaborative management of the PAs has reduced encroachment and the people now report culprits to the PAs authorities, and more varieties of animals, birds are beginning to migrate into the PAs."

Annexes

Annex A: Project Costs and Financing

Annex B: Outputs by Component

Annex C: Economic and Financial Analysis

Annex D: Bank Lending and Implementation Support/Supervision Process

Annex E: Beneficiary Survey Results (if any)

Annex F: Stakeholder Workshop Report and Results (if any)

Annex G: Summary of Borrower's ICR and/or Comments on Draft ICR

Annex H: List of Supporting Documents

Map

Annex A: Project Costs and Financing

Components	Appraisal Estimate (USD millions)	Actual/Latest Estimate (USD millions)	Percentage of Appraisal
1. Multisectoral Community Driven Investment	46.02	40.21	87%
2. Local Government Assessment and Capacity Building	4.96	4.23	85%
3. Protected Area and Biodiversity Management	9.81	7.44 ⁶	76%
4. Strengthening Environmental Institutions	0.87	0.70	80%
5. Project Management	28.72	29.76	103%
Total Baseline Cost	90.38		
Physical Contingencies	1.33	Nil	
Price Contingencies	1.50	Nil	
Total Project Costs	93.21	82.34	88%
PPF	0.60	0.6	
Front-end fee IBRD	0.00		
Total Financing Required	93.81	82.94	88%

Project Cost by Component (in USD Million equivalent)

Financing

P069892 – Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project				
Source of Funds	Type of Financing	Appraisal Estimate (USD millions)	Actual/Latest Estimate (USD millions)	Percentage of Appraisal
Borrower		6.89	8.23	119%
Local Communities		4.28	6.37	149%
International Development Association (IDA)		70.00	78.62 ⁷	112%

P071817 – Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project

Source of Funds	Type of Financing	Appraisal Estimate (USD millions)	Actual/Latest Estimate (USD millions)	Percentage of Appraisal
Borrower		1.81	1.81 (provided and 0.275,862 used)	100 (provided 15.2 used)
Local Communities			0.138	
Global Environment Facility (GEF)		8.00	7.17	90

⁷ The project spent more than allocated because of the rate conversion- the US 70 million was given in SDR and converted each year using the prevailing interest rate. At end of project the dollar equivalent was higher than the initial amount given.

Annex B: Outputs by Component

Component 1. Multisectoral Community-Driven Investments

State	Total no. of CDPs	Total no. of micro-	No. of micro-projects	% of micro-projects
	approved for	projects initiated	completed and in-use	completed and in use
	implementation	(all sectors)	(all sectors)	(June 2009)
Adamawa	93	388	378	97
Bauchi	123	625	610	98
Bayelsa	108	234	189	81
Benue	106	454	438	96
Enugu	99	144	135	94
Imo	153	225	118	52
Katsina	90	370	364	98
Niger	103	448	442	99
Оуо	90	332	329	99
Total	965	3220	3003	93

 Table 1

 Summary of LEEMP CDPs and micro-projects implemented, completed, and in use

Table 2Summary of micro-project status by sector

Sector	No. of micro-projects	No. of micro-projects	% of micro-projects completed
	completed and in use	not completed	and in use
Education	545	33	94
Health	503	27	95
Water	1005	74	93
Transport	212	13	94
Electricity	74	12	86
Socio-economic	363	44	89
Environment and	301	14	95
Natural Resources			
Total	3003	217	93

 Table 3

 Total population accessing facilities, summary of outcomes as at June 2009, PIE Final Report

State	Education	Health	Water	Transport	Rural Electrifi- cation	Socio- Economic	Environment and Natural Resources	Total
Adamawa	137,250	67,500	130,500	20,250	6,750	45,000	54,100	45,100
Bauchi	185,208	94,500	210,420	98,251	12,000	18,000	32,624	651,003
Bayelsa	114,856	79,013	31,585	32,135	14,829	51,420	74,040	397,878
Benue	25,285	389,900	285,276	100,286	0	8,270	5,860	814,877
Enugu	57,000	65,000	100,000	73,000	114,000	43,750	38,000	490,750
Imo	207,000	131,570	453,998	62,275	270,514	203,750	210,619	1,540,291
Katsina	12,464	127,264	371,023	54,000	12,000	264,635	49,632	879,018
Niger	210,000	224,000	266,000	56,000	3,500	175,000	122,150	1,056,650
Оуо	68,898	110,890	129,829	31,500	33,690	34,190	5,000	413,997
TOTAL	1,010,961	1,149,406	1,858,576	518,711	465,395	830,595	555,583	6,379,542

Component 2. Local Government Assessment and Capacity Building

Two major outputs were achieved under this component, as captured in various monitoring and evaluation reports, and shown in the table below.

Interventions/Outputs	Intermediate Outcomes			
1. Scorecard assessment of	• Improved relationship between LGAs and participating communities			
rural local governments	• Improved LGA confidence in communities			
	• Increased demand for project in non-benefiting LGAs			
	• Increased number of LGAs providing support to communities or copying			
	CDD approach			
	• Improved governance (accountability)			
2. Local government	• Increased capacity of LGA staff to undertake participatory planning			
capacity assessment and training	• Improved ability of LGA desk officers to provide back-up support to communities			
	• LGA plans and budget now revolving around community identified priorities			
	• Mobilization and sensitization techniques of LGA offices now improved			
	• Improved performance of Local Government Review Committee			

Component 3. Protected Area and Biodiversity Management Component – Assessment of Outputs

Subcomponent A: Improving Protected Area (PA) Management: Conduct comprehensive inventories of selected protected areas to assess ecological, bio-physical, geological and socio-economic characteristics of both protected areas and their support zone to establish baseline data to guide participatory development of management plan. This objective was achieved. Four studies were completed for each of the protected areas/reserves and their support zone that provided both quantitative and qualitative data on flora and fauna, including threatened species, communities, their socio-economic profile, livelihoods, ethnicity, etc. Household surveys and focus groups were used as a key means of obtaining primary data.

Subcomponent B: Institutional Strengthening: Technical assistance, capacity building including training and tours for the NPS and assessment of the current policy and regulatory framework to *identify options for collaboration with the private sector and local communities.* The subcomponent funded direct investments in the PAs (roads, culverts, watering points, etc). This output was achieved successfully. There were several trainings and international study tours to build capacity in the National Parks. In 2003, a study tour of South African national parks was completed for the conservator general and 8 directors of the National Parks Service. In 2004, project staff was trained to improve project management and in 2005, 23 participants went on a study tour to Zimbabwe to tour (CAMPFIRE) and the National Parks. Other training included ranger/guard training, a 3-month training course, training on fisheries, community building and procurement training. In terms of investments in the parks, the following was completed: 12 ranger posts, 2 bird viewing platforms, 5 watering points for animals and 5 ecotourism outreach centers. Construction of PA infrastructure such as eco-centers, bird viewing platforms, watering points, and ranger posts was delayed. The contracts were terminated due to nonperformance of the contractors and a new process had to be launched. The eco- centers were supposed to have been constructed earlier in the project (2008) to serve the communities, but the delays meant that they were only just constructed and equipped towards the end of the project. Roads were also rehabilitated in 3 of the PAs although the project did not have data on the miles of road rehabilitated.

The ICR visit confirmed that the project had developed an effective means of working with communities through the use of Operational Officers and a clear Project Implementation Manual which highlighted clear cut procedures for developing community development plans (CDPs) and sustainable development plans (SLPs) and selecting beneficiaries. The change from CDPs to SLPs was a significant one because it improved the environmental relevance of the micro-projects.

Subcomponent C: Sustainable Community Livelihoods (Micro-projects): Identify and implement sustainable livelihood activities with facilitation from non-governmental organizations, MITs and other stakeholders. This subcomponent objective was satisfactorily achieved and is described more fully in the section of the ICR related to the GEO rating. As indicated in the preceding pages, MITs were hired that were largely non-governmental organizations in each PA/Reserve with the first contract signed in 2005 to develop Community Development Plans and later Sustainable Livelihood Plans. A total of 100 CDPs and SLPs were formulated and 69 were finally implemented before the project closed. Apart from the implementation of micro-projects, there were several special projects. A consultancy on "turning waste to wealth" was awarded and 80 participants from the 4 PAs trained on the art of converting maize husks to craft materials. An important aspect of the sub-component, the Sustainable Livelihoods and Outreach Fund was never achieved. At mid-term, this process seemed to be on track with the mission noting the enthusiasm of the government team and other stakeholders to operationalize the Livelihood Fund. It was agreed that a technical team would ask to be appointed to provide further inputs and clarifications before submittal for review by a conservation finance specialist, followed by a legal assessment to develop the regulatory framework for setting up the fund. There were substantial delays in getting the reviews, inputs and legal assessments completed and the project closed before the fund could be established.

Component 4. Strengthening the Environmental Institutional Framework.

Area	Achievements
Policy and legislative	Revised National Environmental Policy
review	• Revised EIA sectoral guidelines/ACT and formulation of new guidelines
	 Revised draft National Environmental Management Bill
Improved environmental	• Established environmental Geographic Information Systems (GIS)
awareness/capacity for	• Supported GIS setup for poverty and environmental information
monitoring	management in all participating states
	• Established and stocked the e-library
Training awareness	• Strengthen capacity of staff for environmental information management at
	Federal Ministry of Environment
	• Developed and trained LGA and state-level officers on use of
	environmental checklist for mainstreaming
	• Environmental health and sanitation training for LGA health officers
	• CPMC training on environmental mainstreaming
	• Environmental management awareness at all levels

The major outputs under Component 4 are as follows:

Component 5. Project Management.

Under Component 5, the following was achieved:

Interventions/Outputs	Intermediate Outcomes
1. Baseline data and monitorable indicators established	• Tracking input, output, outcomes and performance
2. Developed result based monitoring and evaluation system	• Strengthened transparency and accountability
3. Development of management information system (web-based)	• Improved information management and disclosure
4. Project quarterly/annual review meetings and supervision	 Improved quality of implementation across participating states Standardize process and procedure
	• Mobilize political support at the state, LGA, and community levels, rousing them to their responsibilities

Annex C: Economic and Financial Analysis

Efficiency relates to whether the costs involved in achieving project objectives were reasonable in comparison with both the benefits and value for money. The project involved approximately \$70 million in IDA funds, \$8 million in GEF funds, and a further \$8.7 million in Borrower funds. The local communities also made contributions. The LEEMP project began in 2003 and closed in 2009, and 6.4 million people are now benefiting from the over 3,000 micro-projects initiated and completed in the poor communities in nine Nigerian states. Against the above-mentioned monetary costs, major benefits include that: (1) the institutional framework at federal, state and, particularly, targeted local government levels has been strengthened to support environmentally sustainable and socially inclusive development; and (2) beneficiaries in the participating states planned, co-financed, and implemented environmentally sustainable and socially inclusive multisectoral micro-projects and will continue to operate and maintain them. Diverse benefits to hundreds of communities and millions of people in seven sectors were also seen, although monetary benefits are difficult to quantify. By way of illustration, benefits by sector for just one of the nine participating states are presented below.

Sector	Examples of positive project impacts in Benue State
Education	62 communities benefitted from 102 education sector micro-projects, with 8443 seats
	provided, 195 classrooms constructed and 10 classrooms rehabilitated, 50 teachers' offices
	constructed, 58 schools provided with furniture, and 50 toilets built in various schools.
	Pupil enrollment and attendance rates improved substantially between 2005 and 2007,
	with a 31% increase for female students relative to a 14% increase for male students.
Health	39 communities benefited from health sector micro-projects, with 36 health centers
	constructed, 39 residential units constructed, 1 health center rehabilitated, and 3 medical
	staff deployed for the centers. Access to health facilities improved and average distance to
	health facility became 1.8km in comparison to the baseline status of 5-20km.
Water	48 communities benefited from 82 water sector micro-projects, which included 10 hand-
	dug wells and 80 boreholes sunk and 2 rehabilitated. These resulted in improved
	accessibility to good sources of water, with the average distance to nearest water source
	being halved and average time spent fetching water being reduced by more than half.
Transport	28 communities benefited from 23 transport sector micro-projects, which included
	construction of 14.5km of road, 6 bridges, 26 culverts, 1 rail leveling, and procurement of
	5 ferry/speed boats. Due to improved road access, vehicle volume increased from less than
	10 vehicles/road per week to 18 vehicles/road per week.
Socio-	24 communities benefited from 19 socio-economic micro-projects, including construction
economic	of a town-hall and animal husbandry facility, one women's multipurpose centre, 17 agro-
	processing mills, and 1 irrigation pump. About 200 people were trained in the skills
	acquisition center, including milling, masonry, and carpentry. As a result, intermediate
	outcomes of the project included increased social activities, employment generation, and
	market environments conducive to improving food security and reducing poverty.
Environment	102 communities benefited from 138 environment and natural resource management
	sector micro-projects, including 136 ventilated toilets constructed, 23 local incinerators
	and 10 placenta pits.

Efficiency in terms of the LEEMP project's **IDA components** has been examined in three ways: allocative efficiency, efficiency of procurement approach, and cost efficiency analysis (unit cost comparison).

• Allocative efficiency: As noted in the project documents of a similar CDD-type project (in Burkina Faso), allocative efficiency is achieved based on the revealed consumer preferences and demand through the participatory community planning methodologies used to identify

investments. Experience with investment funds for decentralized rural development projects in Latin America and Asia has shown that communities generally choose investments which can be expected to have a very high rate of return, such as water supply and rehabilitation of schools and roads. This was the case in LEEMP, wherein 34% of the 3003 micro-project investments were in the water sector and 18% in the education sector.⁸

• Efficiency of procurement approach: The project secured greater efficiencies through its procurement approach. As was observed in the Burkina Faso project documents noted above, transferring responsibility for procurement of small-scale infrastructure to local actors under participatory and transparent community contracting systems has been shown to lower unit costs of infrastructure between 25-40% in numerous studies in developing countries, contributing to improved cost efficiency of investments.

Cost-efficiency analysis (unit cost comparison):

It is worth emphasizing that the kinds of investments supported by LEEMP have many positive externalities and multipliers that are difficult to quantify. For example:

- the LEEMP project assisted with 1,005 *water* micro-projects. Access to clean water improves the health of rural population and reduces time spent (especially by women) in collecting water. The benefits of improved water supplies (quantity and quality) on health outcomes are well documented. These health benefits in turn lead to labor productivity and income gains through a variety of direct and indirect pathways. Economic rates of return on water investments tend to be very high in Sub-Saharan Africa, and even still, they only quantify the benefits in time savings and value of additional water, not the health benefits.
- the LEEMP project assisted with 545 *education* sector micro-projects. Social rates of return of primary education in Sub-Saharan Africa are estimated at 25.4%; secondary and higher education have rates of 18.4% and 11.3% respectively (Patrinos and Psacharopoulos, *Returns to Investment in Education: A Further Update*, 2002). Private rates of return are higher still.
- the LEEMP project assisted with 503 *health* sector micro-projects. Investments in *health* clinics and services have direct impacts of increased labor productivity and avoidance of the health shocks, which are closely related to future poverty. Such investments also have indirect impacts in that better health results in fewer missed days of school, higher birth weights of newborns, etc.
- the LEEMP project assisted with 212 *transport* projects, both land and water-based. Improvement of roads and transport links increases access to markets and social services, such as health and education, while also reducing transport time and cost for villagers. These benefits, though not easily quantified are significant.
- The above-mentioned micro-projects and ones from the other sectors addressed by LEEMP also contributed to *employment and income generation* in rural areas: (i) *directly*, through job creation for local artisans and village workers in the construction of basic infrastructure funded

⁸ The percentages of micro-projects done in the remaining sectors are: health (17%), socio-economic (12%), environment and natural resources (10%), transport (7%), and electricity (2%).

under the LEEMP; and (b) *indirectly*, through the new and/or additional economic opportunities generated by transport improvement and improved capacity for economic activity due to better health and water supply.

For the **GEF component** (contribution GEF US\$8 million), the final assessment has been done based on both the incremental costs principle and the cost effectiveness analysis as per the GEF procedures, on the known understanding that quantifying the indirect benefits from improved environmental management is difficult. The GEF-supported activities were assessed in light of four areas to which support was provided: Yankari National Park, Kainji National Park, Lame Burra Game Reserve and the Mala-Dumba Lake and Forest Reserve area. In the communities around the reserve areas, 595 micro-projects were carried out with a total of over 3,553 individuals benefiting. Environment and natural resources, water, agriculture, and farmer micro-projects were undertaken in addition to income-generating activities specifically for women, youth, hunters, and artisans. Activities for vulnerable groups were also specifically undertaken in one reserve area (Mala-Dumba).

As estimated at project start, the incremental costs associated with the project were US\$18.7 million which is calculated as the difference between the cost of GEF alternative (with GEF support) activities and the baseline scenario activities (without GEF support). Following project completion, costs associated with incremental benefits were confirmed to be US\$10.7 million (as per the calculation methodology elaborated in the project document⁹). The costs for global environmental benefits supported with GEF financing are US\$8 million in line with the GEF grant, though as stated in the Project Appraisal Document the overall global biodiversity benefits of the project are estimated to be at least US\$22.5 million. These benefits are associated with the protection and management of 965,100 hectares (9,651 km^2) of land area during the life of the project. These costs for protected area management were analyzed on three accounts: (1) recurrent management costs for existing areas, (2) system-wide expenses needed to support a network of protected areas, and (3) costs of bringing new areas into the system. The resulting benefits include: enhanced protection and sustainable use of Nigeria's biodiversity, improved public awareness on the biodiversity value, more efficient monitoring and information exchange on the country's biodiversity, and increased capacity to preserve threatened species. This translates to an annualized cost of approximately US\$3,885/km²/year of effective protection which reflects the basic hypothesis that improved protective measures will ensure protection of a wider range of species and habitats.

⁹ Incremental domestic benefits include incremental local sustainable direct uses, distributional benefits, and incremental protection of ecological functions and preservation of domestically significant option values. Tentative estimates were only possible for benefits likely to be associated with sustainable direct uses associated with areas. Based on environmental economics literature survey estimates for such local benefits were found to be to the level of approximately \$4.42/ha/yr. It was assumed that about 10 percent of support zone incomes are associated with the Protected Areas, which was found consistent with findings in typical West African areas. This "10 percent income" assumption yields a benefit level of \$1.23/ha/yr, which is of the same order of magnitude as the benefit transfer estimate. As a result, these estimating bases placed domestic benefits at a level of US\$4.66 million to US\$16.74 million. For analytical purposes of calculating the incremental costs, the midpoint of this range – US\$ 10.7 million was taken as the expected value of the Incremental Domestic Benefit adjustment.

Annex D: Bank Lending and Implementation Support/Supervision Process

Names	Title	Unit
Abiodun O. Falusi	Consultant	AFTSP
Adenike Sherifat Oyeyiola	Senior Financial Management Specialist	AFTFM
Africa Eshogba Olojoba	Senior Environmental Specialist	AFTEN
Akinrinmola Oyenuga Akinyele	Financial Management Specialist	AFTFM
Amos Abu	Senior Environmental Specialist	AFTEN
Bayo Awosemusi	Lead Procurement Specialist	AFTPC
Chita Azuanuka Oje	Team Assistant	AFCW2
Chukwudi H. Okafor	Senior Social Development Specialist	ECSSD
Dirk Prevou	Senior Operations Specialist	AFTEN
Esther Usman Walabai	Senior Agriculturist	AFTS3
Foluso Okunmadewa	Lead Social Protection Specialist	AFTSP
Indumethia V. Howeween	Senior Environmental Specialist	AFTS4
	Consultant	AFTEN
Labayo Kolawola Kazeem	Consultant	AFTSP
Lucas Kolawole Akapa	Senior Operations Officer	AFTAR
Mary Asanato-Adiwu	Senior Procurement Specialist	AFTPC
Modupe Dayo Olorunfemi	Program Assistant	INT
Nina Chee	Senior Environmental Specialist	MIGEP
Olatunde Adetoyese Adekola	Senior Education Specialist	AFTED
Salimata D. Follea	Operations Analyst	AFTEN
Sunday Achile Acheneje	Procurement Specialist	AFTPC
Talib Esmail	Senior Rural Development Specialist	AFTS3

Task Team Members

Staff Time and Cost

	Staff Time and Cos	t (Bank Budget Only)
Stage of Project Cycle	No. of staff weeks	USD thousands (including travel and consultant costs)
Lending		
FY00	21	74,782.73
FY01	41	178,815.28
FY02	89	414,960.41
FY03	52	167,264.29
FY04	35	114,747.62
Total	238	950,570.33
Supervision		
FY05	44	107,302.05
FY06	43	127,917.87
FY07	40	172,873.25
FY08	35	195,180.08
FY09	22	127,136.92

Total	184	730,410.17

Annex E: Beneficiary Survey Results (IDA Component)

An intermediate evaluation of project impacts (in terms of benefits and beneficiaries) was done, and results by state are briefly summarized below. The figures given in the following pages are from an intermediate evaluation of the project and are thus lower than the totals in Annex B.

Adamawa State

Of the 230 micro-projects completed/in use in seven sectors, the education (26%), socio-economic (26%), water (22%), and health (11%) sectors had the highest proportion of projects. Education, water and health received the majority – 38%, 27% and 19% respectively – of the total N549,594,694.00 of investment spending. Available data indicated that 340,999 people were benefiting across the 7 sectors, and that education had the highest percentage of beneficiaries (43%), followed by water (30%) and health (14%). In the education sector, 64 communities benefited with a total population of 234,348. Data on the communities showed a total enrollment of 8,358 pupils. The gender gap was reduced substantially from 59% to 41% between the periods of 2004-2007. Further analysis on the access to education facilities revealed a pupil to classroom ratio of 44:1 and a pupil to teacher ratio of 29:1. In the *health sector*, 31 communities benefited with a total population of 134,319. Micro-projects included dispensaries, maternity clinics, staff housing, equipment and furniture, and medical staff housing. In the *transport* sector, 9 communities benefited with a total population of 34,920. The micro-projects consisted of 22.5km of feeder roads and 30 culverts. The effect was a reduction in transport cost from an average of ¥130 to an average of ¥80 between 2004 and 2007. In the water sector, 60 communities with a population of 255,701 benefitted. The micro-projects were predominantly hand boreholes with solar powered and open concrete wells. In terms of access to a tap, the population ratio is 1:900, and the average travel distance is 460 meters. Overall, the *sustainability* of micro-projects was measured as the ability and the willingness of the benefiting communities to levy and collect user fees for the maintenance and continuing functioning of projects. Health and socio-economic activities sectors had the highest cost recovery of 4% each.

With regard to project management, three areas are highlighted: organizational/institutional capacity, fiduciary management, and gender mainstreaming. With regard to the first area of *capacity building*, there were a multitude of capacity building activities whose beneficiaries cut across the program management staff and other stakeholders. Data submitted by the SPSU indicated that over 1,763,468 people benefited from some form of capacity building. Further analysis indicated that women were well represented in the capacity building activities (760,814 or 43%) of the total beneficiaries. The capacity building activities were focused on 10 thematic areas. In terms of number of beneficiaries, three thematic areas dominated, these were HIV AIDS awareness, environmental management, and establishment of community woodlots. With regard to *fiduciary management*, available data and subsequent analysis showed a micro-project average completion rate of 90% or above for education, water, health, transport, environment, and socio-economic subsectors, while the electricity sector recorded completion rate of less than 75%. Meetings were held with the benefiting communities on a weekly basis to ensure proper execution of the plans. Similarly each benefiting community had standing procurement and maintenance committees. As to gender mainstreaming, the evaluation study revealed that 43% of capacity building beneficiaries were women, and there was fair representation (22.73%) of women in the composition of OOs who assisted in facilitation and supervision.

Bauchi State

The CDD concept has generally been proven successful and very relevant in all participating communities. In Bauchi State, they found that the concept, especially of the income generation component, need be strengthened for desired-result continuity and sustainability. In particular, in the future they advise more care in the preparation and implementation of a poverty strategy, with focus on

animal husbandry and non-farming activities supported by relevant extension services and vocational training. It is noted that the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness can be further enhanced by broadening the package supplied to the communities, such as by identifying poor and vulnerable households and extending the services to these households. Some of those participating in Bauchi State CDDs recommend that the CDD successes be documented for the benefit of other communities in the future (in the form of booklets and video), and that there be learning events between communities that have participated and those to who will be participating. The project's management and implementation strategy was considered to have contributed to capacity building for implementation of rural development projects at all levels.



Figure 1. In Bauchi LGA, these two photos show the Jitar Community Road before LEEMP intervention and the Jitar Community Bridge during the LEEMP intervention.

Bayelsa State

Approximately 108 communities from 8 LGAs in Bayelsa State have benefited from LEEMP's development intervention. In total, 229 micro-projects were executed under LEEMP covering the education, health, water, environment, transportation, rural electrification, and socio-economic sectors. Of these, education received the highest attention while rural electrification received the least attention. Some examples of micro-projects include 6-classroom school buildings, foot bridges, town halls, water supply, and a health center. Lifestyles are changing for good. Inhabitants of the affected communities now have easier access to potable water, electricity, health-care delivery services, educational facilities, markets, etc. These would have been impossible without the intervention of the LEEMP. Participating communities have reportedly been sensitized and mobilized through training and capacity building to realize the import of sustainable natural resources management. Consequently, environmental considerations are reportedly given greater priority now than ever before in project design and implementation.

In addition to the micro-projects benefits, the LEEMP in Bayelsa State has improved the organizational and institutional capacities of Local Governments and communities involved, due to diverse training and capacity building programs associated with the Project. The affected communities and Local Governments, therefore, now have the required capacity and technical know-how to plan and implement sustainable community development projects using the CDD approach. Consequently, the LEEMP in Bayelsa State can be described as a positive intervention for the sustainable development of the affected communities and LGAs. This explains the clamor by some discerning elites in the state that the LEEMP

approach to community development should be adopted not only by local governments in the state but also by the Bayelsa State Government in their development efforts. Notwithstanding the success story of the LEEMP in Bayelsa State, there exists much room for improvement in terms of the need for more involvement of LGRCs and greater timeliness of State and Local Governments to pay their counterpart funds so as to avoid unnecessary delays in project execution.



Figure 2. On the left is the Amatolo classroom before the LEEMP intervention. The middle photo shows the 6-room classroom block with adjacent toilet facilities (right) after the LEEMP intervention.



Figure 3. The photos show the landing jetty before and after the LEEMP intervention. On the right is the concrete landing jetty, a transportation sector micro-project in Ukubie Community, Southern Ijaw LGA, Bayelsa State.



Figure 4. The photos show facilities before and after the LEEMP intervention. On the right is the community public toilet, an environment sector micro-project in Obololi Community, Southern Ijaw LGA, Bayelsa State.



Figure 5. The photos show market stalls before and after the LEEMP intervention. This was a socioeconomic sector micro-project in Bolou-orua Community, Sagbama LGA, Bayelsa State.

Benue State

Sixty-two communities benefitted from 102 education sector micro-projects, with 8443 seats provided, 195 classrooms constructed and 10 classrooms rehabilitated, 50 teachers' offices constructed, 58 schools provided with furniture, and 50 toilets built in various schools. Pupil enrollment and attendance rates improved substantially between 2005 and 2007, with a 31% increase for female students relative to a 14% increase for male students. Thirty-nine communities benefited from *health* sector micro-projects, with 36 health centers constructed, 39 residential units constructed, 1 health center rehabilitated, and 3 medical staff deployed for the centers. Access to health facilities improved over time; average distance to health facility became 1.8km in comparison to the baseline status of 5-20km. Forty-eight communities benefited from 82 water sector micro-projects, which included 10 hand-dug wells and 80 boreholes sunk and 2 rehabilitated. These resulted in improved accessibility to good sources of water, with the average distance to nearest water source reducing from 2km to 1km, and average time spent fetching water going from 2-5 hours to about 34 minutes. Twenty-eight communities benefited from 23 transport sector micro-projects, which included construction of 14.5km of road, 6 bridges, 26 culverts, 1 rail leveling, and procurement of 5 ferry/speed boats. Due to improved road access, vehicle volume increased from less than 10 vehicles/road per week to 18 vehicles/road per week. Twenty-four communities benefited from 19 socioeconomic micro-projects, including construction of 1 town hall and 1 animal husbandry facility,

establishment of one women's multipurpose centre, 17 agro-processing mills, and 1 irrigation pump. About 200 people were trained in the skills acquisition center. Many women gained skills related to mill grinding, but less than 20% of women were trained in the other skill areas. The number of people skilled in masonry and carpentry increased by 185% and 155% respectively. As a result, some of the intermediate outcomes of socio-economic micro-projects were increased social activities, employment generation, and conducive market environments that contributed to improving food security and reducing poverty. One hundred and two communities benefited from 138 *environment and natural resource management* sector micro-projects, including 136 ventilated toilets constructed, 23 local incinerators and 10 placenta pits.

Regarding *capacity for project management*, the overall capacity building of the staff of SPSU as well as community stakeholders improved tremendously within the period under review. About 50% of planned trainings were conducted in 2005, 60% in 2006, and 80% in 2007. Similarly, planned in-house capacity building workshops for OOs showed steady increase - from 75% in 2005 to 80% in 2006 and 90% in 2007. Regarding operations and maintenance, the project process ensured capacity building of stakeholders. Skill development for community members for effective participation and a culture of maintenance is gradually taking place along with a sense of ownership in local government staff towards improved service delivery. Similarly, the management strategies put in place are ensuring both in-kind and cash contribution by the communities and the LGAs. Along with these advances, there is a still need improved record keeping and for continued sensitization to ensure full utilization and maintenance of these projects with the assistance of the Local Government Review Committees. In summary, the microprojects have been demand-driven and generated active participation of communities and LGA support, thus showing the LEEMP project's overall relevance. Similarly, efficiency and cost effectiveness have improved over the implementation period. Community members have been empowered in terms of infrastructure development and capacity to participate in planning and implementing their own development goals.

Enugu State

Project performance assessment showed that overall, significant achievements were recorded by the various components. Under the Multi-sectional Community-Driven Investment, the education sector achieved the construction of 48 classrooms, rehabilitation of 12 classrooms as well as the construction of five teachers' offices and 28 school toilets. In the *health sector*, concrete achievements include the construction of 8 health centers and one health centre rehabilitated during the project period. In the *water* sector in Enugu State, 21 communities have benefited from LEEMP interventions, translating to a beneficiary population of about 65,000 people. A total number of 20 boreholes were successfully sunk and one borehole rehabilitated. In addition, 17 water tanks have been installed with a capacity of between 5,000 and 10,000 gallons. Only one water tank was renovated during project implementation. In the transport sector, 20 communities benefited from LEEMP interventions with a total of 12 micro-projects completed. A total of 40.5km roads were constructed and 74.7km rehabilitated. Three bridges, 10 drains of 2.25km, and 50 culverts were constructed during the project life. With reference to the *rural* electrification sector, a total of 21 micro-projects were completed benefitting 35 communities; 13 communities were connected to electricity. In the socio-economic sector, only 3 communities benefited from LEEMP. Micro-projects undertaken included 20 lock-up stalls, 40 open market stalls as well as 2 civic centres. In the *environment/natural resources management sector*, the recorded achievements were the construction of 29 ventilated toilets and 7 local incinerators. In addition, 16 flood/erosion sites were reclaimed. Under the project management component, 39 replenishments respectively were tendered and approved. Under the administration component, out of 94 community Development Plans (CDPs), the Bank approved 60 while the State Project Support Unit (SPSU) approved 34 of them.



Figure 6. A health centre in Nroho community, Uzo-Uwani LGA, Enugu State. Before the LEEMP intervention, there was no health clinic. The small inset photo is the clinic's first delivery.

Beyond these concrete achievements, the key project outcomes include increased literacy rate and better learning environments, increased number of women attending ante/post natal clinics and number of children immunized, and reduced distance to health centers. Other outcomes from LEEMP interventions were reduction in the prevalence of such water-borne diseases as malaria, typhoid, cholera, etc., reduction in travelling time to water points by rural women, reduction in transportation cost, and increase in volume of socio-economic activities as a result of accessibility to communities, among others. Key constraints that affected components in the implementation of activities were identified as inadequate funding and lack of mobility especially at the first year of the project life, poor understanding of training topics by CPMC members, logistic problems, and bad terrain as well as community conflicts, among others. Major problems that adversely affected the communities directly include internal friction/conflict, poor record keeping culture, low educational status of most of the CPMC members and dearth of skilled artisans in some communities. In addition, high cost of construction materials for micro-projects and lack of commitment among some of the CPMC and LGRC members was noted.

Imo State

In Imo State, the project increased level of awareness, participation, skills acquisition, and productivity of those involved, leading to income generation and employment opportunities in project areas. In particular, the capacity of CPMC members and Local Government desk officers was developed substantially. A total of 81% of the project funds for Multisectoral Community-Driven investment was used to finance projects in various sectors. However, direct support to the poor through funding of socio-economic activities received only 17% funding and may have been a result of the project excluding micro-projects in the income generating sector. Though the amount of direct support to the poor through the CDD projects should ideally have been higher, the LEEMP project in Imo State proved to be successful and very relevant in the benefiting communities. In addition to concrete contributions in the various sectors, it significantly boosted the skills of stakeholders to agree on projects and implement them using the CDD approach.

Katsina State

During the review period (2004-2007), 296 micro-projects were executed in the 9 local governments covering 90 communities. The total population of these 90 communities is 226,105 accounting for 15% of the targeted 9 LGAs and 4% of the State Population. The majority of the 296 micro-projects executed

were geared towards achieving the LEEMP mission and focused on three key MDG goals (health, poverty reduction, and education). Of the total 296 micro-projects, health (water included) had the highest proportion (39%), followed by socioeconomic activities (24%), and education (19%). At the time of evaluation, 58 communities had benefited from *education* micro-projects executed in the nine targeted LGAs. The male-female enrollment ratio was approximately 2:1 in 5 of the 9 benefiting Local Governments Areas, and the average number of pupils per class in the benefiting communities was 44. Four *electricity* micro-projects were executed in Batagarawa Local Government with a total cost of N22,945,700. Sixty-nine communities benefited from *environmental* micro-projects – 327 latrines and 37 incinerators were constructed. In addition, one slaughter facility was constructed in Malamawa community in Batsari LGA, 13 hectares of erosion control and wood lots, 847m drainage, and 2 drainage channels. In addition, 70 draining points were constructed where tap heads were located.

During the review period, 40 communities benefited from *health* micro-projects. In terms of access, the ratio of people to a health worker was 1,743:1. During the review period, 72 communities and 15,523 participants benefited from micro-projects in the *socio-economic* sector. Key trade/skill areas that dominated the socio-economic micro-projects were dyeing and soap and pomade making. On average, 9% of the communities' population benefited from the socio-economic sector, of which about 1% were vulnerable groups - physically challenged individuals. Thirty-seven communities benefited from *transport* sector micro-projects. Sixty-three kilometers of feeder roads and 15 culverts were constructed. During the review period, 68 communities benefited from *water* micro-projects – predominantly hand boreholes. The outcomes varied from one Local Government to another, depending on the nature of the water projects. One community (Kutubi) was connected to urban water supply in Batagarawa Local Government, but predominantly all the communities constructed boreholes.



Figure 7. From Katsina State, the left photo shows water retrieval from a well before the LEEMP intervention, with environment degradation. The photo on the right shows water collection from a borehole after LEEMP intervention.

Niger State

The findings from the data obtained from secondary sources on the micro-projects revealed that the projects are mostly relevant, efficacious, and efficient. The changes in mean distance covered from 2.5km to 0.5km, number of pupils per class from about 70 to 30 and significant change in attendance at school (t=0.6043), student enrolment (t=3.589) and improvement in student teacher ratio to the tune of 100% as

well as general improvement of the school environment are proxy to the measurements of the relevance, acceptability, efficiency and effectiveness of education-related projects. Available data on health microprojects revealed a significant change in number of health facilities (t=2.236), attendance at the health facilities (t=5.363), health staff (t=2.908), amount of health equipment available to the people (t=5.457) and the reduction in distance covered to access health care from about 15km to less than 1km. The waterrelated micro-projects were also judged relevant and efficient. An electricity-related micro-project was embarked upon by only one community, and the project is still ongoing as at the time of this evaluation. Socio-economic micro-projects, like mills, resulted in empowerment of the people, especially women, and the projects were effectively managed. There was reduction in poverty indices and increase in environmental management activities at the community level. With regard to management, the microprojects were mostly completed on schedule and often without exceeding their estimated cost and budget envelopes. The analysis of the finances showed that more than 60% of the funds were expended on the Multisectoral Community Driven Investment as proposed in the plan of work. One of the major challenges facing the Multisectoral Community Driven Investment was the understaffing and absenteeism of Local Government staff posted to the rural communities.

Oyo State

Although Oyo State experienced a lag initially in implementing activities in the target LGAs, due to a combination of factors, part of the overall achievement of LEEMP within the short period of the SPSU's performance is the beneficiaries and stakeholders involved agree that the increases in awareness, participation, skills, productivity and value addition have contributed substantially to income generation and job creation in project areas. The existing linkages with partner institutions and especially the LGAs are expected to help in sustaining project activities, since the capacity of LG staffs especially the desk officers have been developed. Major challenges were noted as: low literacy/education among stakeholders, limited technical capacity of stakeholders for maintenance of borehole equipment, high level of poverty that sometimes impair the ability of stakeholders to raise their contributions to projects especially when financial contribution is required. Significant challenges the project continues to face include influence of politics on stakeholders especially in the location of projects, poor rural infrastructure, and fewness of projects given the very high demand from stakeholder communities. Participants saw the need for some of the operation officers to be closer to the projects, especially when important decisions are to be made by the stakeholders, not to "usurp their decision making function, but to advise them at such meetings about options available and cost implications of various options."



Figure 8. Erosion gulleys for erosion control in Ayedade Community, Itesiwaju LGA, Oyo State.

Annex F: Stakeholder Workshop Report and Results (if any)

Many stakeholder workshops occurred under this project, but the records of them were kept at a more local level. The workshops that happened in the different states (i.e. as noted in the Benue State profile in Annex E) have resulted in recommendations reported in Section 6 of this ICR.

Annex G: Summary of Borrower's ICR and/or Comments on Draft ICR

Below is pasted the verbatim government ICR report (submitted on October 19, 2010) minus a few paragraphs of the introductory sections in the interest of ensuring the report pasted herein is about 10 pages as stipulated in the ICR guidelines.

BORROWER'S REPORT FOR THE LOCAL EMPOWERMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROJECT (LEEMP) IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION RESULTS

1.0 Introduction

The Federal Government of Nigeria received a credit from the International Development Association (IDA) and Global Environmental Facility (GEF) towards the implementation of Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project (LEEMP). The Project was designed to establish an institutional mechanism for transferring investment resources to communities in order to enable them finance their own development priorities. It also emphasized the sustainable management of the environment as a prerequisite to sustainable livelihood and development.

[The report then reviews project objectives and components.]

- 2.0 Assessment of Project Operation's Objective, Design, Implementation and Operational Experience
 - **2.1 Objective:** [The project objectives were stated.]
 - 2.2. Design

In general the Project design (both IDA & GEF), the implementation strategy and management have been very efficient and effective. Through the LEEMP intervention the two tiers of government in each state have been re-engineered to live up to their responsibilities in terms of supporting environmentally sustainable, socially & economically inclusive development as evidenced by their various supports in the areas of providing counterpart funds & technical support to communities during design and implementation of the micro-projects. Through sensitization the LGAs have formed committees as found in Bauchi State whose mandate was to check practices detrimental to the environment. Some LGAs have also revised their regulations in order to check indiscriminate felling of trees and other activities that are not in tune with sustainable environmental management.

The design was also very relevant for all of the participating communities across the nine states as they are all poverty driven and with similar environmental and socio-economic conditions. The Project design focused on the problems of low productivity of the poor and vulnerable families and identified them as the major target group for the income generation. The design was such that communities would take charge of their own development through multisectoral micro-project covering: Education, Health, Environment/Natural Resources, Rural Electrification, Water, Transport, Socio-economic.

The entire community was involved in the process of micro-project selection, implementation and monitoring. Various participatory tools (Participatory Rural Appraisal tools), were used to identify projects with the following four major groups participating in the exercise:

- The Elders/men
- Women

- Youths
- Vulnerable

The entire community was also involved in selecting the CPMCs which was responsible for managing the funds for project implementation and supervised by Community Development Associations/Committees. The State Project Support Unit provided coordination and technical support and was responsible for disbursement of funds to communities for micro-projects implementation.

2.3 The Implementation

The implementation strategy employed by the LEEMP is Community Driven Development (CDD). This is a strategy that empowers the community to take charge of their development programs, that is, from problem identification to implementation of projects that relieve them of such problems. Also, it has tremendously revived the culture of transparency and accountability in the supported communities. Similarly the CDD implementation strategy of the Project has further strengthened harmony within the communities. In a nutshell, the outcome of the intervention in the various sectors attests to the fact that the objectives have been fully met as exemplified by the neighboring LEEMP communities imbibing the CDD approach in their modest developmental projects. The choice of this strategy has some obvious advantages:

- It gives the communities a right to be treated as people and not object of pity
- It also gives the communities certain rights and obligations and these included
- The rights to command local bureaucrats
- The right to hold local administrations accountable
- The right to hire and fire service providers
- Community empowerment has led to greater awareness of the biodiversity values and economic benefits derivable through conservation

It is worthy of mention that a good percentage of communities supported by LEEMP are still operating and maintaining their micro-projects almost a year after the closure of LEEMP and this has been made possible by the operations and maintenance plans designed by each community during implementation. Part of this maintenance strategy which is key to the sustainability of the micro-projects is the user fees being charged. The implementation has been very efficient because it was achieved through the existing institutional and political structures at local government and community levels thus making it possible to identify and assist the poor in a cost-effective manner.

Initially, only a few LGAs were included in the project but later, this was scaled up as more LGAs met the requirements of eligibility through the score card assessment. The first three entrant LGAs and the participating communities were selected based on their level of poverty and lack of access to social infrastructures prior to the intervention projects. The LGAs were enabled through capacity building to facilitate the process at the community level.

The LGRC consisting the Secretary of the LGA who is the chairman, HOD works of LGA, CPMC chairmen and secretaries provided guidance through technical reviews and oversight in term of supervision and ensured that the Project is in harmony with LGA development plan and there is no duplication of efforts. It reviewed the Community Development Plans before they were finally approved by the State Project Support Unit.

Usually SPSU disburses funds to communities through the CPMC accounts in tranches. These tranche payments are agreed upon during the signing of the Funding Agreement between the Communities and the SPSU. The tranche payments are based on milestones. When an agreed-upon milestone is reached, the community forwards evidence of that and then the SPSU releases the next tranche. The practice of using milestones as opposed to using retirements of previously disbursed funds was found to be more productive as receipts could be obtained for items not procured and materials could be purchased and not used for project implementation. The actual level of work on the ground is used to judge whether or not the disbursed funds have actually been properly utilized.

2.3.1 Some implementation constraints:

The following are some of the implementation constraints identified during the Project:

Community (CPMC/CDA)

- Inability of communities to get LGAs to implement MOUs entered into
- Elements of some connivance between CPMCs and some service providers (esp. boreholes service providers)
- Instability of prices of commodities in the markets thereby eating deep in the community budget resulting into inadequate funds available to execute more micro projects
- Some CPMCs still expecting the project to compensate them for the work they are doing
- Insufficient budget envelope to cater for the most pressing needs of these communities which made many of them go for their 2nd or 3rd priority projects

Local Government

- Weak political support
- Embargo on employment Teachers/Health workers
- Inadequate capacity to review CDPs
- No utilization of enhanced capacity
- Weak financial support to LGRCs by some LGAs thereby making supervision difficult.
- Inadequate mobility on the part of the PIUs for effective supervision.

State

• Weak coordination among created departments of the PIUs slowed down project implementation to some extent.

Federal Government

• No counterpart funds

World Bank

• Frequent change of TTL – Five from inception

2.4 Operational Experiences

The operation's objectives, design implementation were commendable as were all based on the guiding principles and against the set objectives. In most of the states, the structures put on ground performed creditably well except for a few setbacks:

Community:

- Strengthened democratic process through CPMC elections
- Frequent training of CPMC/community leading to
 - Strengthened information management
 - Monitoring need systemized and effective
 - Strategic planning (work plan)
- CDA more definitive mandate of oversight
- Beneficiary Communities were generally happy to be provided with resources and treated as partners in the development process.
- There was massive participation by community members, in a socially inclusive decision making process.
- Some communities made contributions in cash and in kind that was far beyond what was expected from them.
- A lot of capacity building effort was required by CPMCs especially in the area of financial management, records keeping and retirement of advances.
- Mobilization of Counterpart fund was a problem in some communities, especially in communities that were not properly organized.
- Some communities failed to support their CPMCs hence community contribution in terms of materials and labor was not forthcoming.
- There were disclosure and operation and maintenance issues is some cases

Local Government:

- MoU needs reinforcement for effectiveness
- LGRC Capacity building, create incentives for good LGA
- Reform of LGA for effectiveness.
- Most micro-projects were not completed within the projected six months period due mainly to delays in retirement of tranches by CPMCs and subsequent delay in replenishment of community accounts.
- The Local Government Review Council in some states did not function adequately and played weak roles in the overall structure. Some LGAs had only LGRCs in name and did not support them. LGRCs hardly met and were never involved in project monitoring. They also played no role in CDP review nor in trying to ensure that LGAs fulfill their obligations of providing support to micro-projects as already agreed.
- LGAs failed to provide support to completed micro-projects especially for the health centers which resulted in them not being staffed appropriately.

3.0 Outcome of Project Operations against Agreed Objectives

In keeping with the Project objectives to enable communities to plan, co-finance, implement, and continue to operate and maintain environmentally sustainable and socially inclusive multisectoral microprojects in their locale, LEEMP to a large extent was a huge success in that communities, undertook the planning of CDPs and use of micro-projects, co-financing and implementation of environmentally sustainable and socially inclusive multisectoral micro-projects which are also being sustained by some communities to this day. To this extent project operations have substantially helped in the attainment of the project development objectives as summarized under the headings below: These are however not without challenges.

3.1 Strengthened Institutional Framework (Environmental Sustainability and Social Inclusiveness)

3.1.1. Environmental sustainability

- Formulation of Environmental Checklist and Procedure manual; trained CPMC and OOs
- Sustained awareness on environmental management
- Revised Environmental Impact Assessment and Sectoral Guidelines
- Integrated environmental concerns into all micro-projects
- Strengthen capacity Federal Ministry of Environment in Laboratory training; Established e-library
- Consciousness is created on impact of development activities on environment
- Incinerators in health centers to reduce infections
- Sharing of best practices

3.1.2. Social Inclusiveness

- At least 25% of women were members of CPMCs with at least one of them holding a key position. Also LGRC and SPSU were encouraged to involve females and designate them as gender officers
- All members participated in micro-projects selection
- There is a general integration of all groups in activities of the community
- 3.2. Beneficiaries design, co-finance, implements, operates and maintains micro-projects

3.2.1. Design

- Communities empowered to diagnose problems and provide interventions relevant to needs
- CDA/CPMCs were trained and in turn facilitated CDP formulation indicating that capacity for PRA and project design was established
- They were also trained on budgeting and material scheduling

• Micro-projects for sustainable livelihood at one year; no mechanism for recording and tracking of what eventually happened to wasted funds

3.2.2. Co-Financing

- Some community members contributed Land, labor, materials, food etc
- Cash contributions of representing 5% of total MP costs

3.2.3. Implementation

- Communities effectively and directly implemented MPs in all sectors
- Projects like Bridges/culverts were handled directly by communities
- Capacities of CPMCs are strengthened to implement various projects
- Micro-projects were completed and in record time complete cycle

 Table 3.1
 Micro-project Implementation Performance

State	Total no, of micro-projects initiated for IDA in all sectors	No. of micro- projects completed & in use (all sectors) (IDA0	No. of micro- projects ongoing in all sectors (IDA)	% Completion	Remarks
Adamawa	391	378	13	96.7	
Bauchi	635	601	27	94.6	
Bayelsa	253	207	46	81.8	
Benue	430	413	17	96.0	
Enugu	144	135	9	93.6	
Imo	231	115	116	49.8	Over-commitment, undue delays
Katsina	374	362	12 (8 closed)	97.0	
Niger	448	442	6	98.7	
Оуо	329	329	0	100	
Total	3,235	2,982	246	91.0	Very satisfactory

3.2.4. To Operate and maintain

- Ownership is a major driver of sustainability of micro-projects
- O&M strategy and guidelines are in place in majority of the communities
- Most communities are into collecting contributions for O&M
- User fees also in place in several communities for water micro projects
- Many LGAs provided support services for schools and health facilities (staff, equipments, drugs, etc)
- Some community members were trained to maintain some infrastructures put in place in their domains
- Patronage of these MPs is also an indicative factor for ensuring sustainability.
- Mainstreaming environmental concerns with MP implementation was also to ensure sustainability of these projects.
- Service delivery seems to be enhanced as LGAs/Community relationship has considerably improved.

• In conclusion CDD social and productive are the delineation of arrangement and not at best interest of the communities in terms of optimization of impacts; due cognizance of mechanism that would ensure integration of both as means of strengthening sustainability opportunities.

3.3 Local Government Assessment and Capacity Building:

Contributions to PDO include:

3.3.1 Transparency and accountability

- Budget
- Participatory planning
- Communication development system
- M&E trained

3.3.2 Desk Officers

- Community CDP formulation
- Participated in project monitoring and evaluation

3.3.3 Environmental Sustainability

- Staff of the benefiting LGAs were trained on environmental checklist, environmental health and sanitation
- Capacities of the appropriate officers were enhanced

3.3.4 Social inclusiveness

- Visible in the LGRC membership
- There is a better understanding of the need for social inclusiveness
- Some LGAs have started consulting communities on their annual physical development plans.
- Community LGA relationship
- LGAs are more responsive
- Adoption of CDD by some LGAs. E. g Oriire LGA in Oyo State.

3.4 Project Management

Contributions to PDO include:

M&E/MIS – Enhanced tracking of performance Accountability Stimulated competition among States resulting in similar levels of performance Environmental management strengthened

Implementation capacity strengthened at all levels.

3.4.1 Environmental Sustainability

- Environmental checklist and procedures were developed for micro projects
- State and LGA staff were trained on the above
- EMPs were included in all MPs
- SPSU and some LGA staff were trained on environmental health and sanitation
- Training of all relevant technical staff of SPSU was done.
- Environmental safeguards, guidelines and checklists were provided

3.4.2 Social Inclusiveness

• Women are in the management of SPSUs and part of the population of Operation Officers.

State	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	*2009	TOTAL
	117,648,						
Adamawa	04	462,364.30	1,718,690.48	3,273,349.78	513,984.39		5,968,388.95
Bauchi	35,170.69	598,028.12	2,134,453.55	1,787,672.32	-		4,555,324.68
Bayelsa	50,624.69	598,028.12	2,134,453.55	2,721,101.02	375,848.30		5,880,055.68
Benue	140,326.62	666,095.98	2,063,811.74	2,528,454.02	450,886.45		5,849,574.81
Enugu	18,424.40	678,574.52	1,663,105.32	2,648,471.85	732,908.22		5,741,484.31
Imo	-	668,751.14	2,659,235.25	2,390,071.89	532,477.55		6,250,535.83
Katsina	83,409.12	578,735.32	1,776,266.22	2,546,819.37	539,908.50		5,525,138.53
Niger	-	571,730.84	2,197,021.70	2,065,971.01	482,266.16		5,316,989.71
Оуо	46,900.00	-	1,060,206.58	1,065,971.01	482,266.16		2,655,343.75
FPSU	175,433.66	2,259,618.48	2,070,415.67	1,741,357.41	378,756.86		6,625,582.08
Total	550289.18	7,081,926.82	19,477,660.06	22,769,239.68	4,489,302.59		54,368,418.33

 Table 3.2: Disbursement Trend of Project Funds Between 2004 – 2008 (in US Dollars)

Source: PIE Final Report

Table 3.3: Total Population Accessing Facilities - Summary of Outcomes as at June 2009

State	Education	Health	Water	Transport	Rural Electrific.	Socio- Economic	Environment & Natural Resources	Total
Adamawa	137,250	67,500	130,500	20,250	6,750	45,000	54,100	45,100
Bauchi	185,208	94,500	210,420	98,251	12,000	18,000	32,624	651,003
Bayelsa	114,856	79,013	31,585	32,135	14,829	51,420	74,040	397,878
Benue	25,285	389,900	285,276	100,286	0	8,270	5,860	814,877
Enugu	57,000	65,000	100,000	73,000	114,000	43,750	38,000	490,750
Imo	207,000	131,570	453,998	62,275	270,514	203,750	210,619	1,540,291
Katsina	12,464	127,264	371,023	54,000	12,000	264,635	49,632	879,018
Niger	210,000	224,000	266,000	56,000	3,500	175,000	122,150	1,056,650
Оуо	68,898	110,890	129,829	31,500	33,690	34,190	5,000	413,997
TOTAL	1,010,961	1,149,406	1,858,576	518,711	465,395	830,595	555,583	6,379,542

Source: PIE Final Report

Table 3.4: Summary of GEF disbursements by protected areas & SLPs as at March 2009 (Naira)

SLPs Protected Area	Water projects	Environm ent & Nat. Resources	Women Income. Generating Activities	Youth Income Generatin g Activities	Hunters Income Generatin g Activities	Farmer s Micro project s	Artisans Income Generatin g Activities	Vulner- able Groups Activi- ties	Agricult ure projects	Total
Maladum ba Lake	4,674,195. 00	12,677,740. 00	6,231,350.0 0	5,662,332. 60	478,000.00	8,462,1 30.00	1,908,750. 00	404,450 .00	-	40,498,94 7.60
Kainji Lake	16,472,58 5.30	4,156,292.0 0	21,545,408. 50	12,857,830 .80	12,360,964 .00	19,539, 037	732,800.0 0	-	-	87,664,91 7.60
Yankari	13,426,00	5,879,000.0	6,827,800.0	1,120,500.	5,886,000.	7,195,2	2,780,000.	-	-	43,114,50

Game	0.00	0	0	00	00	00.00	00			0.00
Reserve										
Lame	9,163,665.	4,572,500.0	8,411,700.0	-	-		-	-	13,892,62	36,040,49
Bura G.R	00	0	0						5.00	0.00
Total	43,736,44	27,285,532.	43,016,258.	19,640,663	18,724,964	35,196,	5,421,550.	404,450	13,892,62	207,318,8
	5.30	00	50	.40	.00	367.00	00	.00	5.00	55.20

Table 3.5: Summary of Economic Micro-Projects Executed & & Number of Beneficiaries By PAs

Protected areas	No of micro-projects executed	No of beneficiares	Remarks
Yankari Game Reserve	177	875	The no of beneficiaries
Lame Burra	95	644	increases every 6 months as
Kainji Lake	200	1246	strategy adopted was
Mala-Dumba Lake	123	788	revolving for user groups
Total	595	3553	

4.0 Borrower's Own Performance and Lessons Learned

The success recorded by the Project can be largely attributed to the commitments of both the federal and state governments constituting LEEMP states.

Borrower's performance evaluation is at two levels - federal and state. The federal and state governments apart from being the borrowers also provided personnel and counterpart funds. FPSU was responsible for coordination and program support for the nine participating states.

- It provided technical support in the implementation process
- It also ensured timely replenishment of state accounts
- Conducted trainings and other forms of capacity building of federal and state officers
- Supervised implementation of micro-projects
- Carried out micro-projects and CDP audit to ensure compliance with implementation guidelines.
- Monitoring of overall project performance

The state governments among other things also provided personnel, office accommodation, office equipment and counterpart funds for the Project. The SPSUs were provided suitable office accommodation (either rented or permanent government-owned buildings). Some specific responsibilities of SPSU include:

- Provided technical supports in the implementation process
- Carried out sensitization, PRA of communities.
- Communities CDP facilitation
- Conducted trainings to build capacities of communities, Desk Officers, and LGRC.
- Timely release of funds in tranches to communities for micro-project implementation
- Supervision of micro-projects implementation.

4.1 Institutional strengthening

- The establishment of CPMCs sub committees to check excesses encouraged transparency and accountability. (eg: buying, receiving & store committees etc.)
- Formation of LGRCs with the inclusion of environmental officers and also building their capacities to assist in awareness creation to ensure compliance with state

environmental laws etc in the establishment of micro projects helped in the implementation and mainstreaming environmental issues

- Involvement of line ministries and agencies to assist in streamlining project operation in the state and building their capacities had proven to be useful especially in public enlightenment and education as well as project execution
- Formation of environmental youth clubs both in primary and secondary schools backed with trainings and awareness creation on environmental issues boosted knowledge and management of the environment among the youth of the society

4.2 Unintended Outcomes

- Improved capacity building: On the job trainings of community members emanating from their participation in construction works has enhanced their capacities in the areas of iron bending and testing techniques for identification of sharp sand among others.
- Urban rural migration resulting in springing up of cottage industries due to power
- Across national boundary benefits
- Non benefitting communities seeking guidance from LEEMP communities.
- Partnership with other developmental agencies in complementing efforts. E. g Wateraid in Benue State, PATH in Enugu State.
- Individuals now occupy higher political offices Councilor, LGA Chairman, etc/
- Some communities use proceeds realized from their income generating projects in buying chalk for adult learning classes and uniforms in support for HIV/AIDS orphans.
- Several neighboring communities from boundary states now benefit from project facilities.

4.3 Implementation Challenges

In spite of the laudable achievements recorded by the Project, some identified factors listed below still militated against its smooth implementation:

- Inability of communities to get LGAs to implement MOUs entered into between them
- Elements of some connivance between CPMCs and some service providers (especially borehole service providers)
- Instability of prices of commodities in the markets thereby eating deep in the community budget resulting into fewer funds available to execute more micro projects

- CPMCs still expecting the project to compensate them for the work they are doing
- Weak financial support to LGRCs by some LGAs thereby making supervision difficult
- Insufficient budget envelope to cater for the most pressing needs of these communities which made many of them go for their 2nd or 3rd priority projects
- Inadequate mobility on the part of the PIUs for effective supervision of micro projects
- Delay in the release of counterpart funds was a problem in meeting up expenditure contributions on time as contained in the grant agreement
- Seasonality of some of the micro-projects was a challenge to the implementation of Sustainable Livelihood Plans as it affected the timing of activities which was the reason for the extension of the Project by six months
- Other institutional issues

4.4 Lessons Learnt

- **Revelation of potentials of the local communities:-** It has been discovered that a lot of potentials abound in the communities which need to be discovered, harnessed and developed to drive developmental process.
- **Improved governance:** There is some degree of improved governance in the communities as they have become more cohesive and pro-active in addressing community problems. This is evident in the case of:-
- some elected leaders sacked and/or disciplined on account fraudulent practices.
- Communities prosecuting defaulting service providers and compelling completion of micro projects.
- some defaulting service providers who were charged to law court and made to make refunds.
- **Transparency and accountability:-** The CPMCs and the buying committees as the case may be are made accountable for every kobo spent on behalf of the communities. For instance, the buying committees must give reports on purchases to receiving committees amidst witnesses.
- There is some degree of ownership and sustainability prospect: Ownership has been found to be the key driver of success. Ownership and sustainability of micro-projects is enhanced by the CDD approach especially in communities where PRA/NEEDS assessment was thoroughly done. Communities now have sense of belongings by perceiving themselves as the owners of the micro-projects with high prospect of sustainability. This applies not only to projects but also to funds which are now managed in a more prudent manner

- Increased cooperation/partnership between LGAs and communities as theynow offer direct support to them which hitherto was never the case.
- Increased cooperation/partnership between states, parks and National Park Service.
- Enhanced skills to identify and prioritized needs:- Communities are now empowered to identify, assess and prioritize needs in their best interest.
- Environmental/Gender mainstreaming:- There is increased awareness on social inclusiveness with involvement of women and the vulnerable in community activities. There is also increased awareness on the best practices for sustainable environmental and natural resources management.
- Cheaper and high quality service delivery:- Projects implemented through the CDD approach have been found to be a lot cheaper than those executed through contracts
- Corporate organizations now identifying with CDD:- In recognition of outstanding performance of some CPMCs, corporate organizations such as Shell Petroleum Development Corporation (SPDC) had offered financial support to Ukubie community in Southern Ijaw LGA in Bayelsa State to execute projects using CDD blueprint and three other communities for good performance in community project implementation.
- Elite Capture:- The delivery mechanism (CDD) is prone to manipulationcapture by the elites in the communities.
- More stakeholders (NGOs and other organizations) are getting interested in the approach adopted by the LEEMP-GEF Project in the identification and implementation of the SLPs. Income realised from sustainable livelihood activities is now being revolved amongst members through a Revolving Credit Scheme although this was not part of the original design of the project.
- States and local government have assisted in service delivery at some levels and through the promulgation of edicts and laws prohibiting bush burning, tree felling and hunting.
- Both biodiversity conservation and people's livelihoods are winning for the external support was a form of an incentive to make the communities feel they are part of the wider conservation community.
- Collaborative management of the PAs has reduced encroachment and the people now report culprits to the PAs authorities, and more varieties of animals, birds are beginning to migrate into the PAs.

5.0 Bank Performance

The Bank has performed so well in terms of timely replenishment of accounts and provision of technical back-up and also for making institutional and operational changes that allowed LEEMP to become the best performing Bank Project in Africa. In all, LEEMP had a total of four Task Team Leaders, during the five year period. The last Task Team Leader, Prof. Foluso Okunmadewa played an outstanding role in the

Project success especially by introducing some good measures which include increasing of the threshold to states that saw to the success of the project and developing the M&E Framework. Through his guidance and support, the M&E department transformed from a department which was involved in only monitoring outputs to that which tracks intermediate outcomes. The Bank staffs were regular in their supervision missions and never compromised quality.

Funds disbursements for project implementation were done timely. This is commendable as a good number of withdrawal applications presented by states to the Bank received instant replenishments. The states recorded over 60% average rate of disbursements for micro projects which covered critical concerns of MDGS such as education, health, socio – economic, water, environmental and natural resource management.

Supervision missions undertaken by the Bank have greatly helped in providing technical guidance and clear direction and in ensuring strict adherence to implementation guiding principles. It also served as checks and balances in the course of implementation. No objection approvals were timely given as appropriate as well as Aide memoirs after the supervision missions.

6.0 Technical, Institutional, and Financial Sustainability of Activities Initiated Under the Project after Project Closure

The inter-related technical, institutional and financial sustainability framework for the continuity of activities initiated under the project after closure is in no doubt assuring as the implementation is already beginning to record some good success across the Project states. This is made possible by the zeal of the communities to continue to embrace CDD and the partnerships developed amongst them and the two levels of governments (state and LGAs). However, the sustainability framework can be assessed from the following perspectives:

6.1 Technical Framework

6.1.1 Capacity Building

- Communities have been empowered through provision of training in relevant areas such as financial management, record keeping, community contracting, procurement, operation and maintenance, etc. In addition to these trainings, they have also been empowered through on-the-job training method improving their skills on daily basis and thus giving some of them opportunity to handle most of aspects of construction, borehole repairs, flying boats repairs, and so on. In addition, Desk Officers and LGRC members had also been trained on their roles and responsibilities in the CDD implementation process.
- Training and study tours have been very beneficial in raising awareness in the GEF communities who in turn sensitized other members on the sustainable livelihood programs. Conflict resolution strategies are being utilized and communities are organizing themselves to make requests to local councils and local governments. It was reported that the water level of the Mala Dumba lake has increased and the forest is regenerating due to better management drive from the communities.

6.1.2 Operation and Maintenance Plan

Effective Operations and maintenance plans towards ensuring sustainability have been put in place in all the project communities across the nine LEEMP states. Part of the plan is O&M standing committees which were constituted in most of the communities and sensitized on their roles and because they are standing committees, a good number have continued to play their roles effectively even though the committees seem not to be functioning as expected in some communities partly due to inadequate arrangement for funding of their activities as well as lack of commensurate appreciation of their roles by the affected communities. Another aspect of O&M plan is the user fees being charged and the opening of O&M accounts for safe keeping of proceeds. This has actually assisted substantially in empowering the communities as they do not have to go cap in hand before maintenance works are carried out.

6.2 Institutional Framework

6.2.1 State, LGAs and Corporate Organisations embrace of CDD

LEEMP has greatly helped in fostering relationship between states and LGAs on the one hand and LGAs and the communities on the other. Some states and LGAs are now embracing CDD as an effective means of service delivery. An example is Niger State where the CDD is being replicated by the state government in the fashion of Ward Development Programme and Oriire LGA in Oyo State where the Chairman had also adopted the approach in LGAs outside LEEMP intervention. Benue State is another example where Ministries of Works, Health, Education & Water Resources are involved in the provision of technical assistance as at when required. Local Governments are providing supports in the running of these facilities especially education and health with provision of staff to the clinics as well as drugs and vaccines on regular basis. [Removed reference to interest being shown by corporate organizations in also supporting CDD.]

6.2.2 Stakeholders maintain their roles

All stakeholders at the state, LGAs and the community levels continue to maintain the roles they played before project closure and this has sent a good signal for sustainability in many states especially Benue State. For instance:

- The structures created in the LGAs i.e. LGRCs, DOs are still maintained.
- CDAs are now checkmating and supervising the various micro projects in various Communities, e.g. Niger State.
- Rendition of progress reports on established micro-projects to the SA by the desk Officers continues.
- Visits to projects sites by the SA/LGA and other stakeholders also continue.
- General community meetings continue to be held where financial issues are discussed and appropriate community contributions/actions made.
- States and LGAs are already willingly adopting CDD approach.

6.2.3 Transparency and Good Governance

Generally, the institutionalization of transparency and good governance in the management of resources is one of the key sustainability strategies initiated.

6.3 Financial Framework

As earlier mentioned, the institutionalization of the CDD has greatly encouraged its voluntary adoption by some states and LGAs and with keen desire to entrench the concept in their development programs. These commitments would definitely translate to financial and technical supports by the affected governments to the communities who are the implementers. While at the community level, funds are being generated through the establishment of drug revolving schemes in clinics, introduction of user fees, PTA levies and community contributions.

7.0 Conclusion and Recommendations

From LEEMP experience, it is abundantly clear that:

- CDD is a veritable tool for poverty reduction. It helps build capacities at all levels. It allows exponential growth in demand from communities for minimum level support to meet basic needs. On the basis of investment, electricity, education, health, water and access roads are top priorities. State and Local Governments, as well as development partners to consider and encourage development best practices such as CDD.
- Scaling up demands for projects to cover entire current LEEMP LGA/Communities and new LGAs and Communities. Without support for economic activities, overall impact of CDD social on poverty reduction, in the short term, is limited. Sustainable livelihood projects are the best income generating strategy & are critical to improved economic well being of communities. Need for LGA and state to set aside own resources for CDD implementation in their states. LEEMP generally was able to achieve its developmental objectives.
Annex H: List of Supporting Documents

- Project Implementation Plan
- Project Appraisal Document for Federal Republic of Nigeria: Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project (LEEMP) dated July 7, 2003 (Report No: 24507)
- GEF Component Programme Implementation Manual (May, 2004)
- Report on Ecological Survey for Yankari National Park by Development Research Bureau (DRB) Ibadan, November, 2004
- Report on Ecological Survey for Mala-Dumba Lake Forest Reserve by Development Research Bureau (DRB) Ibadan, November, 2004
- Report on Ecological Survey for Yankari Game Reserve by Development Research Bureau (DRB) Ibadan, November, 2004
- Report on Ecological Survey for Kainji Game Reserve by Development Research Bureau (DRB) Ibadan, November, 2004
- Aide Memoires, Back-to-Office Reports, and Implementation Status Reports
- Project Progress Reports
- Cost-Tab (for Project)
- Project Documents in the Portal including Financial Quarterly Reporting and other Financial Documents provided by the project implementing team
- Mid-Term Review Final Report by Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research, June, 2007
- Community Profiles and Status of Micro Project Implementation, November 2009 for Mala-Dumba Lake Forest Reserve
- Community Profiles and Status of Micro Project Implementation, November 2009 for Lame Burra Game Reserve
- Community Profiles and Status of Micro Project Implementation, November 2009 for Yankari Game Reserve
- Community Profiles and Status of Micro Project Implementation, November 2009 for Kainji Game Reserve
- Implementation Status Reports (ISRs) 2004-2010
- Borrower's Evaluation Report from October 19, 2010 (Annex G)



A-37