

## LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AS STRATEGIC PARTNERS FOR SERVICE DELIVERY IN NIGERIA

Peter Elias, Olamide Afolayan and Olatunji Babatola

Department of Geography, University of Lagos, Nigeria

E-mail: pelias@unilag.edu.ng&po\_elias@yahoo.com. +234-8034010411

### Abstract

*This paper is motivated by recent controversies surrounding granting of autonomy to local governments in Nigeria and examines advantages of local governments as dependable vehicles for service delivery. By using qualitative data and extensive literature review, the paper reflects on the historical evolution and the objectives of decentralization in Nigeria, discusses present state and nature of service delivery, and strongly supports the need for inclusive governance based on popular participation at local level. Decentralization must be both political and fiscal with each tier of government concentrating on its constitutional responsibilities and available resources. Local governments should have the freedom of preferences and choices as well as control over their decisions, assets, resources and expenditure. The paper concludes that the multiplier effect of service delivery through local governance include improved well-being and human resource development, increasing productivity and income, popular participation and democratic stability, market expansion and socio-economic development.*

**Keywords:** Decentralization, local governments, service delivery, socio-economic development, Nigeria

### Introduction

A major distinguishing feature between prosperous and poor nations is the level of public service delivery. Countries in the west have recognised the importance of social infrastructure and have spared no cost in providing them. The availability and efficiency of public services in a nation cannot be divorced from the governance system. Governance in the highly successful nations is about service delivery and largely involves local governance. Most African nations have however – until recently – not recognised this fact (Mabogunje, 2011a). Public service delivery is still being administered by the central government and the local governments are merely their appendages (Oviasuyi et al, 2010; Aigbakoba and Ogbonna, 2004; Akindele, et al, 2002). Because central governments are too far from the grassroots, the likelihood that citizens' yearnings received good attention or that citizens are involved in decision making is reduced. This had greatly obfuscated the delivery of efficient services and has led to the dilapidated state of social infrastructure and the vicious cycle of poverty.

Nigeria, in particular, is a victim of this service delivery debacle. Her cities are still fraught with poor power supply, dismal public transportation, inefficient security and fire-fighting services, insufficient educational institutions, inaccessible

and poorly funded medical facilities and non-existent public water supply in some cases. As a consequence, many residents of Nigeria's cities have become their own municipal authorities! They provide their own electricity, dig their own boreholes, provide their own security and handle their waste disposal themselves. In general, residents have to go considerable lengths to provide themselves with social service regardless of the taxes to the central government, in a country that has as many as 774 local governments. One sees here that it is not the mere existence (or non-existence) of local governments that ensures the provision of public services. The manner in which these local governments are administered is also important in ensuring service delivery to citizens. This is the thrust of this paper which is divided into the following sections: this introduction is section one and puts into perspective the setting for the paper followed by section two on the historical development of the Nigerian local governance paradigm. The major factors and landmarks of local governance are examined. Section three takes a critical look at service delivery in Nigeria with the view to establishing major limitations of the current service delivery framework. In section four, attempt is made to unravel the nature and causes of public service delivery debacle and argues for full autonomy of the local governments as the panacea. Section five highlights the merits

of local governance as a vehicle for public service delivery and call for true decentralization as it is practised in the advanced societies of the world.

### Historical development of local governments in Nigeria

Local government in Nigeria has passed through several phases and has been shaped by a number of factors. The periods of pre-colonialism, colonialism, independence, post-independence as well as forces of urbanisation and globalisation are just a few of the factors that have moulded the local governance framework in Nigeria over time (Mabogunje, 2011b, Oviasuyi et al, 2010; Barkan and Gboyega, 2001, Omuta and Onokerhoraye, 1994). The historical milestones are presented in Table 1 below. The traditional systems of the pre-colonial days were the foundation for the emergence of local government administration in Nigeria. Their general inexperience, lack of capacity and recognition led to the emergence of formal local authorities in the 1950s. Similarly, the proliferations of local governments tailored after the British multi-tier system made the framework

not attractive, more so their small populations and areas of jurisdictions did not make them to be viable enough for social and economic change. Notwithstanding, the need for a level of governance that is closest to the people and that will promote participation in government led to the institution and creation of local governments. With two reforms in the early 1970s and a major one in 1976, local government administration led to the formal recognition of the local government as the third-tier of government (Olowu, 1990; Onokerhoraye, 1984). This resulted to unusual cooperation between the local governments and communities with the attendant impressive implementation of several projects at the local level (Omuta nad Onokerhoraye, 1994). However, the controversies that have trailed this administrative framework ranging from definition of functions, administrative partitioning, to revenue sources and sharing formula has threatened its continued existence. Recently, local governments in some states exist in name without any form of participation in local governance or economic development.

Table1: Historical Milestones of Decentralization in Nigeria

Epoch	Date	Decentralization	Enabling Laws	Major Features
Pre-colonial	Late 19 <sup>th</sup> Century	Locally evolved administrative machineries	Local laws and institutions	Native administration and institutions with full autonomy
Colonial	1914	2 Protectorate		<b>North:</b> Emirate administration headed by the emirs using existing local administrative and judicial systems
	1939	3 Groups of Provinces	Native, Authority Ordinance	<b>West:</b> Native authorities headed by local chiefs who had spiritual and political control over large territories
	1946	3 Regions 23 Provinces 83 Divisions	Notice No. 43 of 1933 Notice No. 1725 of 1938 Notice No. 17 of 1943	
				<b>East:</b> Institution of warrant chiefs with partial control over territories. All these led to the emergence of local governments to

Post-Independence	1963	4 Regions 35 Provinces 96 Divisions	The Mid-West Region Transitional Provisional Act No. 9 of 1963	encourage local autonomy and participation. Elected officers took charge of local administration but retained traditional model and behaviours. Local governments gained further recognition and participated actively in socio-economic development of their respective areas. Their contributions could not go far owing to their small populations and areas of jurisdiction.
	1967	12 States 96 Divisions	State (Creation and Transition Provisional) Decree 14 1967	Design of local governments with relevance at the local level leading to the emergence of development administration with no autonomy at the local level. The state governments managed local affairs. Council-manager system modelled after the American and Canadian practices with the mandate to influence development at the local level. Local governments remained merely appendages of state governments thus limiting developments at the local level.
	1976	19 States 300 Governments	Local State (Creation and Transition Provisional) Decree 14 1976	Set out clear division of functions between local and state

				governments in Nigeria. Thus, local governments became the third tier of government next to the state and the federal. Local governments played significant roles in community developments leading to successful cooperation between local governments and communities in the implementation of community-based self-help projects. Formulation of revenue sharing.
1987-1990	21 States 448 Governments	Local	State (Creation and Transition Provisional) Decree 1987 & 1989	Local governments continued to receive recognition and participated fully in their constitutional mandates amidst allegations of corruptions, inefficiencies and failures with attendant decay of infrastructure. Review of revenue sharing formula to empower local governments due to reduction in allocation to local governments
1991	31 States 595 Governments	Local	State (Creation and Transition Provisional) Decree 37 1991	Growing concern for the state of local communities, social infrastructure, new initiatives to empower local governments and communities and call for increased funding of local governments.
1996 date	till 36 States 774	Local	State (Creation and Transition Provisional)	Loss of confidence in local governments,

Governments

Decree 36 1996

eroding powers of local governments by states and revenue allocation through states. Allocation to local governments insufficient since they are considered an extension of state governments or complete diversion of funds meant for local governments by states leading to non-performance and public outcry of negligence, ineptitude and failure of local governments.

Source: Tell Magazine, March 29, 1999; Omuta and Onokerhoraye, 1994

**Service delivery in Nigeria: a prognosis**

The state of service delivery in Nigeria is a sorry one. Non-existent or inadequate as well as inefficient public services have become the norm in Nigeria. The excerpts of the report by the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) in collaboration with the Nigeria Communications Commission (NCC) and the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) put this infrastructural deficit and service delivery conundrum into context. Table 1 shows the distance and location of sources of water

available to households in selected states. It shows that the proportion of the population of the selected states that have access to water supply is generally poor. The percentage of the nation’s population with water within dwelling is only 12 per cent compared to the selected states where Abia (5%) is the lowest and Kano (41%) is the highest. Similarly, about 5 per cent of the nation’s population covers more than 1 kilometre to reach water supply with variations in the different states while the situation is worse in Sokoto (20.4%).

Table 2: Percentage Distribution of Households by Distance of Dwelling to Source of Water

State	Inside Dwelling	Within 500m	500m-1km	1km or more
Borno	9.9	75.5	10.8	3.8
Sokoto	30.3	43.1	6.2	20.4
Kano	41.6	53.7	21.4	4.8
Lagos	30.3	66.9	1.5	0.9
Abia	5.0	69.2	23.8	1.9
Rivers	20.1	73.1	6.8	
FCT	15.8	46.5	30.2	7.5
Urban	21.7	53.0	23.4	1.8
Rural	12.8	60.3	20.3	6.5
National	16.1	57.7	21.4	4.8

Source: NBS/CBN/NBC Collaborative Social Economic Survey (2010)

Similarly, the analysis of distribution of household by type of electricity supply (Table 2) indicates

that over 35% of households in Nigeria have no access to any form of electricity and over 51.5%

depend solely on Power Holding Corporation of Nigeria (PHCN) for electricity while 3 per cent use generator solely and 7.6 per cent combine both PHCN and generator for electricity supply. Despite the high potential in alternative energy sources it is

sad to note that not much has been done in exploring these alternative and sustainable sources with the survey indicating that only Kano (0.3%) deploy solar panels for electricity supply.

Table 3: Percentage Distribution of Household by Type of Electricity Supply

State	PHCN/NEPA only	IPP/RE only	GEN only	PHCN/GEN only	IPP/RE & GEN only	Solar Panels	None
Borno	17.3		3.3	0.4			79.0
Sokoto	19.3	0.5	0.6	13.6	0.3		65.7
Kano	43.8	1.1	3.8	2.7	0.3	0.3	48.4
Lagos	54.3	0.2	1.3	36.2	1.9		6.1
Abia	46.2		9.0	20.0	0.1		24.6
Rivers	24.2	13.0	13.4	19.4	0.9		29.2
FCT	33.3		5.2	22.1	1.0		38.4
Urban	72.0	1.1	1.6	14.9	0.7		9.6
Rural	39.6	2.1	3.8	3.4	1.1	0.1	49.9
National	51.3	1.7	3.0	7.6	1.0	0.0	35.3

Source: NBS/CBN/NBC Collaborative Social Economic Survey (2010)

Further analysis of the distribution of households by hours of electricity supply in a typical five-working days' week depicts a despicable situation in the country. Table 3 shows that only 12.3 per cent of the total national population have a cumulative 24 hours of electricity supply, less than 4 per cent have 48 hours while as many as 42.5 per

cent claimed that they do not have electricity. The situation in the selected states is not better with variations in the duration of electricity supply in a typical five-working-day week. The rural areas are worse hit where more than 58 per cent do not have electricity supply at all.

Table 4: Percentage distribution of households by hours of Electricity supply (in a typical five- working-day week)

State	None	1-12hrs	13-24hrs	25-36hrs	37-48hrs	49-60hrs	61-72hrs	73-84hrs
Borno	4.8	41.7	1.5	11.3	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sokoto	66.8	12.4	14.8	0.3	1.2	0.0	0.0	4.6
Kano	76.2	18.6	4.3	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Lagos	13.2	47.5	19.3	13.7	2.6	1.7	2.0	0.0
Abia	51.3	29.9	8.1	5.0	2.7	2.9	0.0	0.0
Rivers	42.4	33.9	5.6	4.9	5.5	6.6	1.1	0.0
FCT	45.8	47.0	1.8	3.4	1.7	0.2	0.0	0.0
Urban	16.3	50.1	17.4	5.6	5.6	3.5	1.3	0.3
Rural	58.3	22.1	9.2	4.7	2.9	1.3	0.7	0.8
National	42.5	32.7	12.3	5.0	3.9	3.1	0.9	0.6

Source: NBS/CBN/NBC Collaborative Social Economic Survey (2010)

In the same vein, Table 4 presents the results of the analysis of the distribution of households by ownership and access to fixed telephone. It indicates that nearly 97% of households are without access to a fixed telephone. This is not

strange with growth in the subscription of mobile phone ownership in Nigeria. The change in taste has drastically affected the consumption or subscription for fixed phones.

Table 5: Percentage distribution of households by ownership and access to fixed phone

State	Own	Access only	Total	None
Borno	0.2	0.2	0.4	99.6
Sokoto	1.4	0.4	1.8	98.2
Kano	1.3	-0.2	1.1	98.9
Lagos	1.2	17.0	18.2	81.8
Abia	1.6	1.4	3.0	96.9
Rivers	0.8	5.1	5.9	94.1
FCT	1.8	9.4	11.2	88.8
Urban	1.5	4.2	5.7	94.2
Rural	0.5	1.6	2.1	97.9
National	0.9	2.5	3.4	96.6

Source: NBS/CBN/NBC Collaborative Social Economic Survey (2010)

On the other hand, the analysis of the distribution and access to mobile phone showed a very cheering picture. This is the only indicator with record showing progress in all level: national

(70.6%), urban (88.3%) and rural (60.3%). This is a direct result of the government's decision to privatise the sector shortly after the country's return to civil rule in 1999.

Table 6: Percentage distribution of households by ownership and access to mobile phone

State	Own	Access only	Total	None
Borno	44.1	12.0	56.2	43.8
Sokoto	42.3	22.0	64.3	35.7
Kano	51.6	15.7	67.4	32.6
Lagos	92.0	1.7	93.7	6.3
Abia	83.0	10.4	93.4	6.6
Rivers	81.8	10.8	92.6	7.4
FCT	75.6	12.1	87.7	12.3
Urban	88.3	5.3	93.6	6.4
Rural	60.3	19.2	79.5	20.5
National	70.6	14.1	84.7	15.3

Source: NBS/CBN/NBC Collaborative Social Economic Survey (2010)

The same cannot be said about the internet service in spite of the effect of globalization. The analysis of the distribution of households by ownership and access to internet service (Table 6) reveals that more than 93 per cent of the nation's population neither own nor have access to internet service. This indicates a very poor record with highly urban

areas like Lagos, FCT and Rivers having less than 20 per cent of their respective population having access to the internet service. The survey shows that some states do not have respondents who own internet service and even where they have access the proportion is still very insignificant.

Table 7: Percentage distribution of households by ownership and access to Internet Service

State	Own	Access only	Total	None
Borno	0.0	0.2	0.2	99.8
Sokoto	0.8	1.4	2.2	97.8
Kano	0.3	1.7	2.0	98.0
Lagos	3.0	14.0	17.1	82.9
Abia	0.0	3.1	3.1	96.9
Rivers	0.7	11.5	12.1	87.9
FCT	3.2	18.0	21.2	78.8
Urban	1.3	8.0	9.4	90.6
Rural	0.2	2.2	2.4	97.6
National	1.8	4.3	6.1	93.6

Source: NBS/CBN/NBC Collaborative Social Economic Survey (2010)

The situation is however different on a regional level. The South west - Lagos - particularly shows relatively impressive numbers in the mobile telephony, access to internet, electricity supply and water supply sectors. The South-South also shows relatively remarkable levels of service delivery particularly in the mobile telephony, power supply and water supply categories. This can be said to be a direct result of the autonomy enjoyed by states. This has enhanced public service delivery at the state level. But this is not the case with the local governments.

In contrast, the North West and North East states record very dismal service provision. For instance, a staggering 79% of the households surveyed are disconnected from any source of electric power in Borno State and an even more alarming 98.2% of the households in Sokoto have no access to a fixed telephone. This may be unconnected with the lack of clear purpose, pragmatism and people-friendly policies in the administration of such states. Also, households in rural areas are worse-off when compared with their urban counterparts. This shows the lopsided concentration of social infrastructure and services in urban areas in the country. It is thus clear that if there is to be any improvement in the condition of service delivery in Nigeria, a change in the governance framework

must be implemented. Having established the critical role of governance in service delivery debacle, the paper at this point analyzes the nature and causes of service delivery failure in Nigeria for a richer insight.

### **Nature and causes of service delivery debacle in Nigeria**

A number of explanations have been proffered for the observed scenarios above. First among them is the intrinsically defective local governance paradigm in effect in the country. This governance framework emphasises the nature of local governments as appendages to the state and central governments and as such militates against adequate and effective service delivery (Khemani, 2004).

Next, the nation's dependence on crude oil for revenue has had debilitating effects on the government's attitude to service delivery. The government of Nigeria does not take its responsibility to its citizens seriously because it does not depend on the taxes they pay and such does not feel obliged to provide services to them. In fact, the impression that they are doing Nigerians a favour by offering services is a common one among the ruling class, so they are upset when Nigerians demand for better services.



Thomson (2004) puts it succinctly when she states the “the failure of government is a failure of service delivery-; and -oil made government a dispensing machine; because government no longer thought it needed revenue from the people, and it could fund itself through oil revenue, it started to think that it was doing people a favour, not delivering services, but being a favour-giving entity”. But the truth is that the problem of service delivery in Nigeria can be found in the restructuring of the local governance framework.

**Local governments and service delivery**

The widespread public outcry about the state of public infrastructure is beginning to reach a crescendo considering the high expectations and apparent failure of the three-tiers of governments

to deliver since the return to civilian administration in Nigeria. The objectives of decentralization should not be limited to political decentralization without fiscal decentralization. This entails increased authority, full autonomy, transparent accountability and improved capacity of local administrations (USAID, 2009). The decentralisation of authority is a major step in this direction. Decentralization – the transfer of the responsibilities of governance from a central government to lower levels of government, particularly the local government level – is an important step in bringing governance closer to the people and downscaling public service delivery. Local governments must be allowed to exercise their authority based on the functions clearly as enshrined in the constitution (Table 7).

Table 7: Constitutional Expenditure and Revenue Sources

Tier of Government	Expenditure Category	Revenue Sources
Federal only	Defense; Shipping; Federal trunk roads; Aviation; Railways; Posts, telegraphs and telephones; Police and other security services; Regulation of labor, interstate commerce, telecommunications; Mines and minerals; Social Security; Insurance; National statistical system; National Parks; Guidelines for minimum education standards at all levels; Water resources affecting more than one state;	FEDERAL Import duties, excise duties, mining rents and royalties, petroleum tax, company income tax, capital gains tax, personal income tax: armed forces, external affairs officers, non-residents, residents of federal capital territory and Nigerian police force; stamp duties; capital transfer tax; value added tax.
Federal-State (shared)	Antiquities and monuments; Electricity; Industrial, commercial and agricultural development; Scientific and technological research; Statistics and surveys; University, technological and post-primary education; Health and social welfare;	STATE Capital gains tax, personal income tax; stamp duties; pools betting and other betting taxes; motor vehicle and drivers’ licence; entertainment tax; land registration and survey fees; property taxes and rating; gift tax
State-Local (shared)	Primary, adult and vocational education; Health services; Development of agriculture and non-mineral natural resources;	
Local government	Economic planning and development; Cemeteries, burial grounds; Homes for the destitute and infirm; Markets; Sewage and refuse disposal; Roads, streets, street lighting, drains, other public facilities;	LOCAL GOVERNMENT Licences fees on television and wireless radio; property taxes and rating; market and trading licence and fees; motor-part duties; advertising fees.

Sources: Ajayi, 2013; Mabogunje, 2011c; Khemani, 2001; Akindele, S.T., Olaopa, O.R. and Obiyan, A. Sat. 2002

The reasons for the failure of local governments in service delivery include lack of clear objectives, ambiguous legislation and jurisdiction, poor planning of the decentralization process, inadequate resources, shortage of skilled personnel to service the reform as well as poor overall management (Khemani, 2001; Cheema and Rondinelli, 1984). For decentralization to be effective, sustainable and relevant to developmental needs of the country in question, it must go beyond just the creation of local governments to the complete devolution of powers and responsibilities to local governments. Mabogunje (2011d) lists these categories of responsibilities as political, administrative and fiscal responsibilities. To further ensure their relevance to infrastructure development, local governments should be made more competitive by granting them full autonomy. This will guarantee financial and decision independence. The bane of local government administration in Nigeria is the over dependence on states and the federal. True decentralization will consolidate democracy and promote broad democratic choice in Nigeria. In the post-conflict Cambodia (2002) this strategy resulted in regime stabilization by promoting participatory public service delivery at the local administration established on donors. Donor agencies support and promote increased participation in local governance. Thus, each local government should be allowed to source for fund and implement projects in their areas. Mabogunje (2011b) lists the sources of credits available to local governments as (i) central government lending usually operated through ministries of local government; (ii) direct access to banking institutions; (iii) borrowing from the Municipal Development Bank; and (iv) direct access to the capital market. Employing these means of sourcing credit will ensure the fiscal autonomy of local governments, improve their ability to deliver on infrastructure to the people and reposition them for greater relevance to national development.

The institutionalization of an inclusive, participatory government from bottom-up will lead to a natural process of vertical accountability. Through local capacity building and empowerment, latent groups who would not ordinarily participate will become encouraged to join in governance. For instance, NGOs could

voluntarily participate in oversight functions that monitor decisions, revenues and spending as is the case in Philippines under the administration of Aquino who made it a policy to expand the political space in 1991.

## Conclusion

The infrastructural deficit and service delivery failure afflicting Nigeria and the consequent developmental setbacks these have caused compels a change in the framework for local governance. If power – administrative, political and fiscal – is completely devolved to local governments and they are independent the fortunes of citizens with respect to public service delivery will improve drastically. As a matter of fact, it will promote serious efforts towards internal revenue generation and reduce the age-long battles over revenue sharing formula that have sometimes stagnated developments. Indeed, good urban governance can only happen when participatory democracy complements representative democracy at the central and regional/state levels. This will herald a new dawn for public service delivery in Nigeria and mark a huge step out of the doldrums that have plagued the country for decades. The pursuit of political and fiscal decentralization notwithstanding, the central government has responsibilities that cannot be compromised. It must effectively defend civil liberties, political rights, and the rule of law throughout the country together with protecting the integrity of the state. Even though local administrators have rights to powers, resources and spending, these must be within the ambits of the law of the nation. All form of lawlessness and recklessness in the use of resources, assets and responsibilities must be avoided to protect the objectives of local governance and enhance public service delivery in Nigeria.

## References

- Agbakoba, R. and Ogbonna, M. (2004). *Local Government Administration and Development in Nigeria* (Lagos: The Human Rights Law Services), pp. 6-7.
- Ajayi, B. (2013) Financial Management and Resource Mobilization in Infrastructural

- Development Fund (IDF) Projects: *A Paper Presented at the IDF Launch workshop* in Owerri, July 31, 1990. In: *A Collection of Papers and Speeches*. (Ibadan: Penthouse Publications (Nigeria). pp.140-151
- Akindele, S.T., Olaopa, O.R. and Obiyan, A. S. (2002) Fiscal Federalism in Nigeria: A Contemporary Review, *Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 6, nos.3: pp. 215-235
- Barkan, Joel D. and Gboyega A. (2001) *State and Local Governance in Nigeria. Public Sector and Capacity Building Programme*. New York, USA: The World Bank, African Region.
- Cheema, G. Shabbir and Rondinelli, D.A. (eds) (1984), *Decentralization and Development: Policy Implementation in Developing Countries*, Beverly Hills: Sage
- Khemani, S. (2004) *Local Government Accountability for Service delivery in Nigeria*. Development Research Group, New York, USA: The World Bank.
- Khemani S. (2001) *Fiscal Federalism and Service Delivery in Nigeria: The Role of States and Local Governments*, Prepared for the Nigerian PER Steering Committee. Federal Republic of Nigeria
- Mabogunje, A. L. (2011a) The Inclusive City: Popular Empowerment of Local Governments in a Rapidly Urbanizing Africa. In *Papers, Speeches and Keynotes*. (Ibadan: Foundation for Development and Environmental Initiatives). Pp. 135-143
- Mabogunje, A. L. (2011b) Access to Credit for Local Governments. In *Papers, Speeches and Keynotes*. (Ibadan: Foundation for Development and Environmental Initiatives) Pp. 265-274.
- Mabogunje, A. L. (2011c) Decentralization and Urban Governance. In: *Papers, Speeches and Keynotes*. (Ibadan: Foundation for Development and Environmental Initiatives) Pp. 307-317
- Mabogunje A. L. (2011d) Local Government Councils as Vehicle for Economic Development. In *Papers, Speeches and Keynotes*. (Ibadan: Foundation for Development and Environmental Initiatives) Pp 318-327
- Omuta, G. E.D. and Onokerhoraye, A.G. (1994) *Regional Development and Planning for Africa*. Benin City: The Benin Social Science Series for Africa.
- Olowu, D. (1990) The Failure of Current Decentralization Programs in Africa, pp. 74-99 in J.S. Wunsch and D. Olowu (eds) *The failure of the Centralised State: Institutions and Self-Governance in Africa*, Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press
- Oviasuyi, P.O., Idada, W. Isiaraojie, L (2010) Constraints to Local Government Administration in Nigeria. *Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 24, nos. 2: pp. 81-86.
- SACN (South African Cities Network), (2004), *State of the Cities Report 2004*, (Pretoria: SACN)
- Thomson, W. (2004) *Delivering Service in Nigeria: A Roadmap*. Office of Public Service Reform, :United Kingdom.
- USAID (2009) *Democratic Decentralization Programming Handbook*, Prepared for the Office of Democracy and Governance (DG) of the US Agency for International Development, Washington D.C.