

Impact of Fadama III on Poverty Reduction among in Sabon-Gari Local Government Area, Kaduna State

Lawal Yusuf Birisan

Department of Local Government and Development Studies,

ABU, Zaria.

08165555521

danjuma1986@gmail.com

And

Sanusi Gambo Adamu

Department of Local Government and Development Studies,

ABU, Zaria.

08035899615

Sanusigambo63@gmail.com

Abstract

The study assessed the impact of Fadama III on poverty reduction in Sabon Gari Local Government Area, Kaduna State. The beauty of Fadama implementation strategies (capacity building and empowerment) would have been its sustenance; but the strategies were not sustained in Sabon-Gari Local Government Area. The target population for the study comprised Fadama III facilitators and members of Fadama User Groups. The instruments of data collections were both primary (interview) and secondary sources of data and thematic analysis was adopted for the study. The theory of Community Driven Development (CDD) was adopted to give credence to the study. Needless to state here that most studies looked at the impact of Fadama on income and wealth of beneficiary farmers or on the performance of farms. This study assessed the impact of Fadama III Project on poverty reduction. The study found out that the Fadama III project is hijacked by elites who could raise the counterpart fund of 30 percent. It is obvious that the Fadama project did not do a feasibility study to underscore a baseline assessment of the target beneficiaries before releasing the fund; they study also discovered that capacity building and empowerment to beneficiaries recorded better result in Sabon-Gari North District than in Sabon-Gari South District. The reason is that there were more crop farmers in Sabon-Gari North District than we could find in Sabon-Gari South District. The study recommended among others the need for feasibility studies to avoid elite capture and the need for emphasis to be placed on the key factors that would enhance sustainability.

Keywords: *Fadama, capacity building, empowerment, implementation strategies and poverty reduction,*

Introduction

The goal of every government is to provide services to its people that would enhance the standard of living and social wellbeing of the people. Many of these

services focus on poverty reduction by providing basic human needs to the poor. In recent times, the global focus has been on poverty reduction. In Nigeria for instance, the incidence of poverty is growing by the day as evidenced in the figures released by the National Bureau of Statistics; that about 100 million Nigerians are said to be living below one dollar a day (NBS, 2017).

In response to the growing rate of poverty, the Federal Government of Nigeria evolved and implemented many poverty reduction programmes. Some of the multi-sectoral programmes implemented by the Federal Government included the National Directorate of Employment (NDE); Better Life for Rural Women Programme (BLP), Family Support Programme (FSP); Family Economic Advancement Programme (FEAP) and the mass education policy were geared towards poverty reduction. Despite the huge human and material resources devoted to reducing poverty in Nigeria, the situation has worsened with no substantial success achieved as the poverty level continued to deteriorate far below the poverty line (Rural Poverty Report, 1998 cited in Kamal, 2017).

As an interim measure, the Federal Government in 1999 established the Poverty Alleviation Programme (PAP). The programme, however failed to make any appreciable impact on poverty reduction in the country, due to "State capture" and leakages, among other reasons. In its place, the Federal Government came up with the National Poverty Eradicate Programme (NAPEP) in 2003. With this programme, tricycles were given to beneficiaries to enable them become players in the local transport sector. All these point to the fact that poverty, more than anything else, is a serious problem in Nigeria. However, while many of these programmes have gone moribund, some were short lived, and others have made remarkable impact, though not without challenges or limitations.

The National Fadama Development Programmes (NFDP) came on board as a result of the success recorded by the small scale irrigation projects carried out by the Agricultural Development Programmes (ADPs) in Fadama areas. However, the operationalization of the word "Fadama" in the context of World Bank assisted project (especially Fadama III) is more like an agricultural diversification programme. It is on this basis that the study assessed the impact of Fadama III on poverty reduction in Sabon Gari Local Government Area of Kaduna State. The rationale behind the choice of Sabon-Gari Local Government as the study area lies on the high number of Fadama User Groups leading to high number of beneficiaries (Compendium of Project Implementation, 2013). The study covers a

period of eight (8) years. This period is selected to cover the implementation period plus the Additional Financing I & II between 2008 to 2019.

Statement of the Problem

The description of Nigeria as a paradox by the World Bank (2006) has continued to be confirmed by events and official statistics in the country. The paradox is that the poverty level in Nigeria contradicts the country's immense wealth. Among other things, the country is enormously endowed with human, agricultural, petroleum, gas, and large untapped solid mineral resources. In line with this, the National Bureau of statistics (2017) observed that the poverty level in Nigeria was climbing higher on the poverty ladder rather than declining. Agu and Ichoku (2018) also stressed that latest statistics on poverty signals a continued spiral downwards in the welfare indicators. They further added that between 2010 and 2014/5 (a period of less than 5 years), the proportion of Nigerians living in absolute poverty jumped from 68 percent to 82 percent.

However, the same period when absolute poverty jumped tremendously was the same period when FADAMA III was initiated by the Federal Government of Nigeria in collaboration with World Bank. The programme was aimed at reducing poverty by improving the living standards of rural poor; contribute to food security and to increase access to rural infrastructure. Importantly, the project represented a shift from public sector domination to a Community- Driven Development (CDD) approach. The goal was to promote rural economy and thereby reduce rural poverty by half. The NFDP, (2004) supported the implementation of Fadama programme by stating thus:

The stakes are even brighter in Nigeria where smallholder agriculture, which is the dominant occupation of rural Nigerians is mainly rain-fed and characterized by low land and labour productivity. Nigeria has a potential comparative advantage in the production of a variety of fresh and processed high-valued crops, especially vegetables during the dry season and livestock products (meat and milk) and fisheries product throughout the year. This is because the country is endowed in underground and surface water reserves, rich pastures and favourable agro-ecological conditions in the country's low planes, alluvial deposits called Fadama (p. 12).

Although, Fadama III project implementation has made available myriads economic opportunities and investment potentials as well as infrastructural facilities. Yet, the income capacity and standard of living of most rural

communities have failed to significantly improve – remained the same or even worsened. It is against these stated problems that the study assessed the impact of the Fadama III project on poverty reduction in Sabon-Gari Local Government, Kaduna State.

Research Questions

From the research problem, the following research questions are pertinent:

- i. What strategies were adopted to implement Fadama III project in Sabon-Gari Local Government, Kaduna State?
- ii. How has Fadama management determine the success of Fadama III Programme in terms of poverty reduction?

Research Propositions

- P₁** The implementation strategies adopted by Fadama III Programme has not yielded success in Fadama projects of Sabon-Gari Local Government, Kaduna State.
- P₂** The level of success of Fadama III Programme in terms of poverty reduction is a function of Fadama management

Conceptual Review

Brief on Third National Fadama Development Project (NFDP III)

The Third National Fadama Development Project (NFDP III) is a follow up to the second National Fadama Development Project (NFDP II) which was initiated to address some of the lessons learnt under NFDP I Implemented (1993-1999) (NFDP III Mid-Term Review, 2011). According to the review, the NFDP III is an international Development Association (IDA) credit facility represented by the World Bank. It is co-financed by the Federal Government of Nigeria, State Governments, Local Government and Communities in terms of their counterpart contributions. The NFDP III is to be implemented in 36 states of the federation and FCT. The NFDP III was declared effective in March, 2009 and to be implemented in five years' period (2009-2013).

The project development objective was to sustainably increase the incomes of Fadama land and water users on a sustainable basis. The project was also expected to contribute to poverty reduction in rural areas, increase food security, create employment and contribute to achieving the objectives of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The project was to also directly deliver resources to the rural communities efficiently and effectively. The project was to empower

them to collectively decide on how resources are allocated and managed for their livelihood activities and to participate in the design and execution of their sub-projects. The NFDP III approach according to the review is through Community Driven Development (CCD), which is bottom-up approach that empowers other government entities and communities to take responsibility for designing, implementing, operating and maintaining as well as monitoring and evaluating sub-projects and to contact their own advisory services (Compendium of Fadama Implementation, 2013).

The project beneficiaries are the recognized Economic Interest Groups (EIGs) of crop and livestock farmers, pastoralist, fisher folks, hunters, gatherers and service providers as well as vulnerable and marginalized groups (e.g. widows, elderly, unemployed youth, HIV/AIDs positive individuals). The Economic Interest Groups called Fadama User Groups (FUGs) are the primary beneficiaries of the project with a size of between twenty to thirty households. These Fadama User Groups within a community (10-15 number) forms an apex organization called Fadama Community Association (FCA) (Compendium of Fadama Implementation, 2013).

Performance Indicators of Third National Fadama Development Project (NFDP III)

- i. 75% participating household income shall have increased by 40% in 2013.
- ii. Yields of primary agricultural products of participating households shall have increased by 20%.
- iii. 10% replacement value of assets for generating income must have been saved by participating groups.
- iv. 75% of Fadama users must show some level of satisfaction over the operation, maintenance and utilization of community owned infrastructure (National Fadama Development Programme Implementation and Completion Report, 2013).

Poverty

Poverty has become a key area of focus for governments, development agencies and international organizations over the past decade. Greater attention to the problem of poverty has not yet resulted in dramatic changes to the economic status of the world's poor. In fact, some commentators suggest that the poorest are getting poorer and that the gap between the rich and the poor is widening. Statistics from the World Development Report 2000/2001 (World Bank 2001)

indicate that actual numbers of people classified as poor are rising in most areas of the world. But what exactly is meant by poverty is the confrontation of the study here?

Sen (1992) has suggested that a number of forms of poverty may be identified as well as the obvious one of economic or financial poverty. Poverty of opportunity is the most widely accepted alternative formulation of the poverty problem. Of course, many economically poor people are also denied opportunities but people who are well above the poverty datum line may suffer various types of comparative poverty. But the most common perception of poverty is that incorporated in the idea of a lack or deficiency which is deep-rooted and debilitating. Prime amongst these lacks or deficiencies is that of material poverty. Yet Sen (1992) argues: 'There is an irreducible core of absolute deprivation in our idea of poverty which translates reports of starvation, malnutrition and visible hardship into a diagnosis of poverty'. In its World Development Report 2000/2001 the World Bank notes that:

To be poor is to be hungry, to lack shelter and clothing, to be sick and not cared for, to be illiterate and not schooled. But for poor people, living in poverty is more than this. Poor people are particularly vulnerable to adverse events outside their control. They are often treated badly by the institutions of state and society and excluded from voice and power in these institutions (p. 15).

However, as noted above, the key concepts in use always carries notions of scarcity of the means for survival (Bracho, 2000). Sen (1992) suggests that at least three ways of categorizing or analyzing poverty are currently in use. First is the concept of the *poverty datum line*, based on the minimum requirements for survival, a basic nutritional basket and the means to purchase it or living conditions and access to public services, like education. The second approach focuses on *inequality*, defining the differences between different sectors in society according to income. More sociologically-based analyses emphasize *relative deprivation*, defining levels of poverty in relation to other groups or individuals (Sen, 1996).

The World Bank (2012) ask two major questions: How do poor people view poverty and well-being? What are their problems and priorities? The poor stated that:

Poverty is multidimensional. ... Six dimensions featured prominently in poor people's definition of poverty. First, poverty is always about hunger – the lack of food. Second, poverty has important psychological dimensions such as powerlessness, voicelessness, dependency, and humiliation. Third, poor people lack access to basic infrastructure (particularly in rural areas) e.g. transportation, and clean water. Fourth, while there is a widespread thirst for literacy, schooling receives little mention or mixed reviews. Fifth, poor health and illness are dreaded almost everywhere as a source of destitution. Finally, the poor rarely speak of income, but focus instead on managing assets – physical, human, social, and environmental – as a way to cope with their vulnerability.

Poverty Reduction

There is a healthy debate about how to achieve poverty reduction in developing countries, but not enough discussion of what we mean by “poverty reduction.” “Poverty reduction” is often used as a short-hand for promoting economic growth that will permanently lift as many people as possible over a poverty line. But there are many different objectives that are consistent with “poverty reduction,” and we have to make choices between them e.g. the trade-offs between tackling current and future poverty, between helping as many poor people as possible and focusing on those in chronic poverty, and between measures that tackle the causes of poverty and those which deal with the symptoms (Barder, 2009).

Poverty reduction or alleviation is a set of measures designed locally (i.e. by government, civil society or private sectors), or internationally by (i.e. multilateral agencies, bilateral agencies or NGOs) for both economic and humanitarian, that are intended to permanently lift people out of poverty. In other words, they are ways of enabling the poor to create wealth for themselves as a means of ending poverty forever or minimizing it to a barest minimum. The immediate result of poverty reduction programme is to lead to, empowerment, pro-poor growth and or better resource distribution with its end result being people centred sustainable development (United Nations, 2018).

Poverty reduction according to Mudi (2015), means decrease in the level of lack of or want of basic necessities of life of an individual or community. For instance, the provision of basic infrastructure, such as roads, agro-processing instruments, and storage facilities, which if effectively utilized can lead to increase of the

individual income and by so doing, reducing the level of need or want of basic necessities of life.

Review of Related Empirical Studies

Adegbite (2008), examined the impact of Fadama II project on the income of small scale farmers in Ogun State in terms of Agricultural financing; they came up with the results that more income being earned by the beneficiaries of the project than the non-beneficiaries. They went further to explain that there were constraints and limitations on production because of poor rural infrastructures, lack of empowerment of farmers through capacity building on integrated pest management, poor cultural practices that has affected cost of production, and above all, lack of markets. The study the impact of Fadama on income and wealth of beneficiary farmers but failed to look at the strategies adopted.

Ukoha, et al (2012) conducted a study on; Effect of World Bank Assisted Fadama II project on the performance of fish farming in Imo State; the study simply compared the productivity differences between the Fadama II fish farmers and the non-Fadama II fish farmers. The main objective of Fadama II was to increase the income of Fadama users. What is expected of the study was to uncover the sustainability of the efforts achieved by Fadama II. Fadama II ended in 2010 and the study was conducted in 2011. The researchers would have found out what the beneficiaries have done in terms of expansion after the project instead of comparing beneficiaries with non-beneficiaries. Performing better than non-Fadama beneficiaries does not explain how they can be better economically, socially or politically either now or hereafter.

Yunana, Abubakar and Francis (2013), evaluate the impact of Fadama III project on income and wealth of beneficiary farmers in FCT. The methodology adopted includes descriptive and analytical methods using primary data. Data were obtained from two hundred (200) Fadama users and non-Fadama users' farmers respectively. The findings of the study showed that the value of productive assets of Fadama beneficiaries increases from N81, 240.97 before Fadama III to N84, 9577.5 after Fadama III project. Conversely, there was a decrease in the net farm income of Fadama beneficiaries from N198261.5 to N170180.4 during Fadama III project. The reduction in income despite the acquisition of productive assets according to the study was due to limitations encountered by the farmers. Also, some of the beneficiaries were said to be acquiring the productive assets and the payment of the beneficiary contribution (30%) for pilot asset acquisition could

have crowded out investment in short-term activities that could have increase income. It was expected that the increase in income will come significantly after starting to benefit from their investment in productive assets.

Abang (2015) carried a study on the impact of Fadama II Project on poverty reduction in Nigeria with emphasis on Imo State, Ogun State and Kaduna State. The study made use of interviews, observations and questionnaire to obtain primary data necessary for the study. Secondary data was derived from Fadama II documents obtained from Federal, State and Local Fadama desk offices between. The study found out that Fadama project recorded successes in increased income, increased food production and group dynamics. But the project was hindered by some challenges like the requisition for counterpart fund from the poor and lack of feasibility studies on the characteristics of the beneficiaries. The study recommended among other things; an alternative to counterpart funding, the need for feasibility studies and emphasis on sustainability of poverty reduction efforts.

Abada, Ezeibe and Nwaze (2016) assessed the implementation of Fadama III project and its impact on rural agriculture in Abakaliki Local Government Area of Ebonyi State,. The study argued that the Fadama III project is successful because of the robust funding it receives from the all levels of Government of Nigeria and the World Bank. The findings of the study showed that the value of funding to Fadama projects increased by 42% of the previous amount allocated to the project. However, the study did not take into consideration the level of infrastructural provision by Fadama and how it has benefited the communities and finding the challenges been face by the beneficiaries of the Project in order to finding means of improving them. The study the impact of Fadama on the performance of farms but failed to look at the strategies adopted.

Study Gap

Gap in Methodology: Most of the studies conducted on Fadama project and poverty reduction are either quantitative in nature or a mixed research with the qualitative playing second fiddle role in the studies. The uniqueness of the current study lies in its total dependence on qualitative instruments of data collection and analysis.

Content Gap: The content also differs in the sense that most studies looked at the impact of Fadama on income and wealth of beneficiary farmers or on the performance of farms. For example, Yunana, Abubakar and Francis (2013), evaluate the impact of Fadama III project on income and wealth of beneficiary farmers in FCT, Adegbite (2008), examined the impact of Fadama II project on

the income of small scale farmers in Ogun State in terms of Agricultural financing and Ukoha, (2012) conducted a study on; Effect of World Bank Assisted Fadama II project on the performance of fish farming in Imo State while Abang (2015) carried out a study on the impact of Fadama II Project on poverty reduction in Nigeria was on 2nd Fadama project. The current study assessed the impact of Fadama III Project on poverty reduction in Sabon-Gari Local Government of Kaduna State.

Theoretical Framework: Theory of Community Driven Development (CDD)

CDD is a new vision of enabling people to take their destiny into their hands. It is an approach that put the community in the driver's seat of development. Communities set their agenda for their own development (Odoh, 2014). The World Bank (2002) added that with CDD, communities can take control of investment decisions. It was launched by the World Bank to alleviate the problems of over-reliance on central government as the main service provider in order to ensure responsiveness to local demands and inclusiveness. The World Bank defines CDD as 'a development approach that gives control over planning decisions and investment resources to community groups (Dongier, 2003). Community Driven Approach is a development strategy (initiatives) that provides control of the development process, resources and decision making authority directly to community groups (Adamu 2015). In addition, CDD is: a mechanism for enhancing sustainability, improve efficiency and effectiveness and targets poverty reduction. CDD also encourages partnership with service providers (Odoh, 2014).

The Application of CDD to this Study

From the definition and elements of CDD, it could be stated here that CDD is presumed to be an effective mechanism for reducing poverty at the grassroots level. Experience has shown that CDD can enhance sustainability and make poverty reduction efforts more responsive to demand (Gillespie 2004). CDD has been shown to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of welfare improvement effort because it works at the community level; it has the potential to occur simultaneously in a very large number of communities, thus achieving far-reaching development. Given the operational guidelines of CDD against the backdrop of its objectives, it is rather pertinent to apply the CDD approach to this study.

Methodology

Research Design: This study was entirely qualitative in nature. Qualitative research is a systematic scientific inquiry which seeks to build a holistic, largely narrative, description to inform the researcher's understanding of a social or cultural phenomenon. The target population for the study comprised Fadama III facilitators and members of Fadama User Groups. The participating FCAs for Fadama III in the Local Government and their corresponding number of FUGs is depicted in the table hereunder:

Table 1 Participating FCAs in Sabon-Gari Local Government and their Corresponding Number of FUGs

Name of Fadama Community Association	Number of FUGs	Number of Beneficiaries
Sabon-Gari North FCA	22	90
Hanwa District FCA	15	60
Samaru District FCA	15	65
Sabon-Gari South FCA	16	65
Total	69	280

Source: Compendium of Project Implementation: 2009-2013.

As depicted in table 1, four FUGs were selected from four districts with the highest number of FUGs in the Local Government of study (Compendium of Fadama III Implementation, 2013).

Sampling Technique: Purposive and snowball sampling techniques were used in the course of this study. The purposive sampling technique was used to select Fadama staff. However, because we also interviewed Fadama III non-beneficiaries, the study made use of snowball sampling technique (i.e. chain referral sampling) to select non-beneficiaries. Therefore, we identified them in the community and requested for their permission to answer a few questions. Table 2 is a summary of the respondents identified according to districts.

Table 2 Participating FCAs in Sabon-Gari Local Government and their Corresponding Number of FUGs

District	Rank	Respondents	Cumm. Total
Sabon-Gari North District	Sabon-Gari farmers' cooperative society	15	15
Hanwa District	Hanwa Rice Farmers	12	27
Samaru District	Shika Farmers Association	13	40
Sabon-Gari South District	Anguwar-Malamai-Dam Farmers Association	8	48
	Non-Beneficiaries	5	53
Local Government	Desk Officers	2	55

Source: Compendium of Project Implementation: 2009-2013.

Sources of Data Collection

- i. **Face-to-Face Interview:** This is one of the sources of primary data for the study. In the Local Government, some members with insight knowledge of Fadama III project were consulted. They include District Heads and opinion leaders of Hanwa, Shika and Anguwar-Malamai-Dam Districts, the Local Government Chairman, Vice Chairman, Head of Agric Department and Local Fadama Desk Officers.
- ii. **Focus Group Discussion:** To generate in-depth information regarding the subject matter, Focus Group Discussion was conducted with Sabon-Gari Farmers' Cooperative Society; Hanwa Rice Farmers Association; Shika Farmers Association and Anguwar-Malamai-Dam Farmers Association.
- iii. **Secondary Source:** The only documents that were consulted are the Compendium of Project Implementation: 2009-2013 and Fadama III Implementation Completion Report, (2016).

Method of Data Analysis: Thematic analysis was adopted for the study. Thematic analysis is a method of analyzing data by putting similar responses in the same category (Kerlinger, 1986). The rationale behind the choice of thematic analysis was that 'the approach can produce an insightful analysis that answers the research questions'.

Data Presentation and Analysis**Table 3: Bio-Data of the Respondents (Respondent's Position, Codes and Dates)**

Respondents Position	Population	Code	Date
Heads of Hanwa District	1	R ₁	05/01/2022
Heads of Shika District	1	R ₂	05/01/2022
Heads of Anguwar-Malamai-Dam District	1	R ₃	06/01/2022
Chaiman, Sabon-Gari LG	1	R ₄	06/01/2022
Vice Chaiman, Sabon-Gari LG	1	R ₅	06/01/2022
Head of Agric Department, Sabon-Gari LG	1	R ₆	07/01/2022
Local Fadama Desk Officers I & II	2	R _{7 & 8}	07/01/2022
Sabon-Gari farmers' Cooperative Society	15	FGD ₁	07/01/2022
Hanwa Rice Farmers	12	FGD ₂	07/01/2022
Shika Farmers Association	13	FGD ₃	07/01/2022
Anguwar-Malamai-Dam Farmers Association	8	FGD ₄	07/01/2022
Non-Beneficiaries	5	NBR ₁₋₅	07/01/2022

Source: Researcher's survey 2021.

Analysis of Responses from Interview/Focus Group Discussion Using Thematic Method

Theme I: Preliminary Questions

Sub-Theme I a. The duration of Fadama III programme in Sabon-Gari Local Government

In the words of the respondents, "Fadama III project initial implementation is for the period of five years, from June 2009 to December 2013 but has been extended to 2017". They added that the programme closed in December 2017. (R₁, R₂, R₃, R₄, R₅, R₆, R_{7 & 8}, FGD₁, FGD₂, FGD₃, & FGD₄, NBR₁₋₅). This was supported by the summations from Fadama III Implementation Completion and Results Report, (2016) that:

The Third National Fadama Development Project was approved by the Board on June 1, 2008; but it became effective on June, 23, 2009, and the planned closing date was December 31, 2013. The revised closing date

following the first Additional Financing (AF) was then shifted to December 31, 2017.

Recently the Federal Government requested a second AF (i.e. AF of US \$50 million) for the project under emergency processing procedure. This proposed AF2 (North East Food Security and Livelihood activities seeks to respond to the urgent food and livelihood needs of households who have been affected by conflicts in the six North East states in Nigeria – Borno, Yobe, Adamawa, Taraba, Bauchi, and Gombe. (by implication, North-West and other geo-political zones are not inclusive).

Table 4: Summary of Fadama III Series of Projects

	Duration	Project Approach	Geographical Coverage
Fadama III	2009-2013	Bottom-up, CDD, building on FADAMA-II with the incorporation of FADAMA User Equity Fund for sustainable model.	36 states and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT).
Fadama AF1	2013-2017	Bottom-up, CDD, and Value chain approach with focus on cassava, rice, sorghum, and horticulture with export potential.	Six chosen states (Anambra, Enugu, Kano, Kogi, Lagos, and Niger).
Fadama AF2	2017-2019	Bottom-up, CDD approach for restoration of the livelihoods of conflict affected households.	Six North East states affected by conflict in Nigeria (Borno, Yobe, Adamawa, Taraba, Bauchi, and Gombe).

Source: Fadama III Implementation Completion and Results Report, 2016.

Sub-Theme I b. Level of involvement as Facilitator, Desk Officer or beneficiary in Fadama III project

The respondents responded thus:

We are all involved in making decisions on how the resources are been allocated among that are identified by multi-sectoral team of stakeholders who played a critical role in the implementation of the project. The Project helps by giving voice to the communities as well as promotes the

principles of transparency and accountability in planning and management of public investments within the LGA (R₁, R₂, R₃, R₄, R₅, R₆, R₇ & R₈). Additionally, at design, extensive consultations were held with beneficiaries, Local Government staff, local communities and technical specialists to discuss the project ideas. At the level of implementation, Fadama programme focus solely on services identified by communities for better livelihoods (FGD₁, FGD₂, FGD₃, & FGD₄, NBR₁₋₅).

Theme II: Fadama Implementation Strategies and Poverty Reduction

Sub-theme II a. Description of methods employed by Fadama III in reducing poverty

The respondents described and discussed the methods by Fadama III in reducing poverty under the following sub-headings:

- i. **Capacity Building:** The respondents broadly partitioned this component to capture (a) capacity building support for community organizations; (b) capacity building support to Local Governments; and (c) communications and information support. The objective of this component is to provide support to build the capacity of Fadama Community Associations (FCAs) and their constituent Economic Interest Groups (EIGs), Fadama User Groups (FUGs), to access project advisory services and project funding and that of the project staff to successfully implement the project.

Table 5 Summary of Capacity Building Training to FCAs and FUGs in Sabon-Gari Local Government

LGA	No. of FCAs	No. of FUGs	No. of Participants	Total Cost	35% State	35% LG
S/Gari	4	69	278	1,557,600	545,160	545,160

Source: Compendium of Fadama Project Implementation (2009 – 2013).

This is broken down according to districts in table.

Table 6 **Summary of Capacity Building Training to FCAs and FUGs in Sabon-Gari Local Government According to Districts**

District	No. of FUGs	No. of Participants	Total Cost	35% State	35% LG
S/Gari North District	22	90	597,000	208,950	208,950
Hanwa District	15	60	313,000	109,550	109,550
Samaru District	16	64	323,800	113,330	113,330
S/Gari South District	16	64	323,800	113,330	113,330
Total	69	278	1,557,600	545,160	545,160

Source: Compendium of Fadama Project Implementation (2009 – 2013).

Form the data in table 5 and 6, it is clear that Fadama programme has given capacity building support for Community Organizations in Sabon-Gari Local Government Area. This is glaring from the field survey. The FUGs are well-organised and cooperative, having group dynamics behavior in them etc. This showed that their capacities were well-built.

ii. Improvement in the Economic Conditions of Rural Communities:

Another method employed by Fadama III in reducing poverty in Sabon-Gari Local Government was through the project supports in providing productive activities, technical assistance and investment in assets, land quality and services identified by communities as relevant to generation of higher incomes and better livelihoods. In addition, the Project supported Fadama Communities to construct 67.2km of rural (access) roads to open-up farmlands and facilitate easy access to markets; more so, 260No. rural market stalls were constructed to provide marketing infrastructure for agricultural products; all these were aimed at improving the economic conditions of rural communities in the Local Government and Kaduna State in general.

iii. Increase in the Yields of Primary Agricultural Products of Participating Households: This is another method employed by Fadama III in reducing poverty in Sabon-Gari Local Government. This is achieved by providing support for farmers to procure necessary inputs, and acquire productive assets needed for effective operation of their farming activities.

- iv. **Solving the 10% Replacement Value of Assets for Generating Income of Participating Groups:** The project target is to have a 10 percent replacement value of the common asset used for income-generating activities of FUGs saved annually (with effect from year two). By the end of the project, FUGs benefitted and owned a huge sum of amount (Amount not disclosed) (R₁, R₂, R₃, R₄, R₅, R₆, R₇ & R₈, FGD₁, FGD₂, FGD₃, & FGD₄, NBR₁₋₅).

Sub-theme II b. The processes followed in the application of the methods

According to the respondents,

The project was prepared in a highly participatory manner this is why the project design at appraisal was considered adequate, satisfactory and had high degree of relevance. In application, Fadama project is anchored on the CDD approach making it a collective approach (R₁, R₂, R₃, R₄, R₅, R₆, R₇ & R₈). In the same vein, the response from the FGD shows that during the baseline survey by Fadama Facilitators, it was reported that Household, Villages, and Local Government decision-making processes are hitherto opaque and exclusionary; therefore, the project's facilitators working with the Fadama groups helped in overcoming the barriers deriving from lack of knowledge or insufficient cooperation among groups (FGD₁, FGD₂, FGD₃, & FGD₄).

Theme III Fadama Management and Poverty Reduction

Sub-theme III a. The planning of Fadama programme in Sabon-Gari Local Government Area

The respondents without hesitation echoed that:

In designing (planning) the project, extensive consultations were held with beneficiaries (including Heads and opinion leaders of local communities, women vulnerable groups, and especially the physically challenged. As earlier stated, The Project helped by giving voice to the communities as well as promotes the principles of transparency and accountability in planning and management of public investments within the LGAs (FGD₁, FGD₂, FGD₃, & FGD₄).

The consultation is the off-shoot of the inclusive nature of Fadama programme with its Community Driven Development (CDD) Approach from World Bank and higher levels of government.

Sub-theme III a. Examples of instructions given to Fadama beneficiaries that led to poverty reduction in Sabon-Gari Local Government

Fadama beneficiaries were taught to do the following; which they still see as their mode of operation till date: Preparation and presentation of LDP; Project identification and needs assessment; Screening and selection of best LDPs out of multiple LDPs; Savings and credit mobilization training thereby leading to the sustainability of the projects; and Monitoring of subprojects in the LGAs etc. (FGD₁, FGD₂, FGD₃, & FGD₄).

Summary of Major Findings

From the presentation and analyses of data from Focus Group Discussion and interview, a number of findings were arrived at which are discussed below:

- i. The study found that the implementation strategies e.g. *capacity building* supports assisted the farmers (beneficiaries) in ensuring among others the following: adoption of cooperative principles; book/record keeping; adoption of group dynamics etc.; In terms of *Improvement in the Economic Conditions of Rural Communities* –Fadama provided strategies like productive activities, technical assistance and investment in assets, land quality and services identified by communities as relevant to generation of higher incomes and better livelihoods; More so, the *increase in the yields of primary agricultural products of participating households* – provided support for farmers to procure necessary inputs, and acquire productive assets needed for effective operation of their farming activities etc.
- ii. On objective two, the study found that Fadama management approach by Fadama III Programme has been helpful in the fight against poverty reduction in Sabon-Gari Local Government Area. For example, the planning of Fadama programme came with extensive consultations with beneficiaries (including Heads and opinion leaders of local communities, women vulnerable groups, and especially the physically challenged. This gave voice to the communities as well as promotes the principles of transparency and accountability in planning and management of public investments within the LGAs

Conclusion

The study drew conclusion based on submissions from oral interviews and secondary documents. Consequently, we have offered recommendations designed to promote sustainability in the efforts that are geared towards poverty reduction

in Sabon-Gari Local Government and beyond. The performance of the Fadama III project was carefully examined bearing in mind the tenets of the theory of Community Driven Development (CDD) approach. It was realized that the data gotten from the field, affirmed the theoretical assertion that with the participation of the people, success will be attained.

Recommendations

- i. **The Need for Feasibility Studies to Avoid Elite Capture:** Any serious project, especially if it has to do with poverty reduction, must first undertake feasibility studies of the terrain of operation and the characteristics of the targeted beneficiaries. This is the only way to avoid errors committed by the Fadama III project. This is in line with the findings of Abang (2015).
- ii. **Emphasis should be placed on Strategizing for both crop farmers and other types of farming e.g. Poultry and Ranching:** The strategy adopted by Fadama III which included capacity building and empowerment were not categorically only focused on crop farmers. For any poverty reduction programme in future, emphasis should be placed on every aspect of farming.
- iii. **Provide alternative to counterpart funding:** If it has to do with improving the lives of the poor, there is no need expecting the poor to raise money that they cannot afford. Instead, empower them in form of a loan which they must pay back. If it is done this way, a lot of them will benefit.

References

- ADB (2005). Selected statistics on African Countries. Tunis. Development Research Department. African Development Bank. Vol. XXIV.
- Adeniyi, P.O. (1991). The revolutionary transformation of rural Nigeria: *Special Report on the Contribution of Babangida's Administration to Rural Development in Nigeria*, National Inventory of Community-Based infrastructural facilities in Nigeria. December, 1991. P.4.
- Balogun, O.L & S.A Yusuf (2011). Effects of social capital on welfare of rural Households in south-west states, Nigeria; *Journal of Agriculture and social sciences* 7: 41-48.
- Bracho, T. (2000). *Poverty and Education in Mexico*, in Reimers (ed) (2000).
- C. Moser, (1993). Evaluating Community Participation in Urban Development Projects, Development Planning Unit Working Paper No. 14

- Ekong, E.E. (1991) *Rural Development and the Persistence of Poverty* Inaugural Lecture Delivered at the Former University of Cross River State, now University of Uyo, Akwa-Ibom State
- Kerlinger F.N. (1986). *Foundation of Behavioural Research*. 3rd Edition, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York
- McMillan, J. H. & Schumacher, S. (1993). *Research in education: A Conceptual Understanding*. New York: Harper Collins.
- National Fadama Development Programme Agriculture and Rural Development Department, OCAR.2 April, 2004.
- National Bureau of Statistics (2017). Report on the contribution of Agriculture to the Nigeria GDP. Abuja, Nigeria.
- Narayan, D. (1997). *Designing Community-Based Development: Social Development Working Paper No. 7* Washington, D.C World Bank, in Stuart Gillespie (2004) op.cit. Obadan, M. (2012) "Poverty Reduction in Nigeria: The way forward" CBN Economic and Financial Review Vol. 39 No. 4 P.4.
- Onwuka, N. (2006). "Nigeria: why Operation Feed the Nation Failed" article can be found on net; www.britanica.com/print. Cited in Abang (2015). Unpublished Thesis on the Impact of Fadama II on Poverty Reduction in Nigeria.
- Onyenechere, Emmanuella C. (2010). *Appraisal of Rural Development Programmes in Imo State of Nigeria*: Journal of Social Science, Vol. 22, No 3 PP 173-178
- Orgi, J. I. (2005). "An Assessment of Impacts of poverty Reduction programmes in Nigeria as a development strategy; 1970-2005" unpublished Ph.D dissertation, St. Clements University, Turks and CAICOS Island. Cited in Abang (2015). Unpublished Thesis on the Impact of Fadama II on Poverty Reduction in Nigeria.
- Pakistan, Government of (2001). *Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper*, Islamabad, Government Press.
- Rahnema M. (1997). *Poverty in Wolfgang Sachs (ed) The Development Dictionary*, Johannesburg, Zed Books.
- Rural Poverty Report (2011) *Investing in Rural People IFAD*. www.rura.povertyportal.org
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- United Nation Development Programme (2005) *Nigeria Human Development Report*. Lagos: UNDP.
- World Bank (1980b). *Poverty and Human Development*. Washington DC.
- World Bank (2012). *Human Development Report*. The World Bank, Washington, D.C