

The Role of the Nongovernmental Organizations in Rural Development Induction in North Kordofan State, Sudan

Gaafar B. Suliman¹, Attika M. E. Marouf², Elzubair E. Elzain¹, Mohammed Y. Abdalla³, Maruod E. Maruod⁴

¹University of Kordofan, Faculty of Natural resources and Environmental studies, Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, Elobied, Sudan. ²Ministry of Agri. IFAD project, Elobeid, Sudan. ³University of Kordofan, Faculty of Education, Elobied, Sudan. ⁴University of Kordofan, Faculty of Natural resources and Environmental studies, Department of Agricultural economics and rural development, Elobeid, Sudan.

ABSTRACT:

The study aimed to evaluate the contributions of voluntary organizations on rural development in North Kordofan State. Research hypothesis were voluntary organizations played a positive role in creating rural development in Sheikan locality, and enhance the sustainability of the development. The Research pursued the analytical descriptive statistic methodology primary data were collected through the field survey that targeted random samples consisting of (192) households. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistical analysis. The secondary resources include references, researches, workshops papers, projects reports, periodicals and the internet. The study findings were: the voluntary organizations interventions effects in the study area played a positive role in the developmental process in the fields of health, basic education situation and availability of drinking water for both human and livestock by 98.4, 96.4 and 99.9% for each respectively. 95.8% of the total targeted households were satisfied with the type of services (health, education and water) in Sheikan locality demonstrating that the organizations had succeeded in providing services and better livelihood. The study recommends comprehensive communities engagement and full participation in the development planning priorities, implementation and monitoring, supporting the implementation of programs and projects that leads to stability and social cohesion and reduce conflicts over resources, Sheikan locality should work to develop a comprehensive plan on education obstacles, health care deficiency, availability of healthy water, and livelihood of rural communities.

Key words: *rural development, basic services, nongovernmental organizations*

INTRODUCTION:

Increasing awareness of the importance of rural development as accumulative intentional process for community to escape retardation consequences, bridge to progressive welfare and dignifying life, such objectives achievement requires structural transformations, strategic policy orientation. Study aimed to investigate the effects and the contributions of the International Islamic Relief, and Plan Sudan organization, in development process in rural areas in Sheikan locality, North Kordofan State, in Sudan. Stakeholder participation is a success that emerged from the Rio Summit and has gained momentum over the past 20-plus years. There was tremendous argument about NGO participation in the preparations for Rio (Kirwin, 1994), but such participation is

now taken for granted. Since the creation of the CSD in 1992, civil society organizations, including NGOs and business, have been represented by nine major group sectors and participate in the CSD with the overall purpose of informing the Commission's decision-making processes. Most governments realize how much NGOs can contribute to issues; and some governments work closely with NGOs and business, and include representatives on their delegations to meetings of various environmental treaties. A particularly positive development over the past 20 years is the increased collaboration and networking among NGOs from developed and developing countries. NGOs have also experienced a cross fertilization of interests in various issues, including environment, development, human rights, women's rights and social issues (Khor, 1997). Business also plays an important role, with actions by the WBCSD—which represents more than 200 chief executive officers from some of world's largest companies—moving industry from the periphery to the center of the sustainable development debate. Business has become more proactive by encouraging the CSR movement and using its investment in sustainable ways. But these initiatives are voluntary and involve relatively few companies. Runnalls (2008) notes that “The majority of jobs worldwide are provided by small and medium-enterprises for which these concepts are foreign” and “it is a real challenge to begin to involve the new centers of economic decision-making in the BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India and China).” Work is needed to find a more effective means to engage NGOs and business in sustainable development negotiations and implementation. The financing, technical, and management expertise of the business sector will be critical to meeting sustainable development goals. Business will be more inclined to make sustainable development or green investments the more governments, in whatever appropriate form, are able to effectively address risks associated with such investments. More effective means of involving critical non-government actors, particularly in the private sector, in implanting sustainable development is clearly a “bottom line” for sustainable development to have any chance of real and lasting success. The concept and idea of sustainable development is widely accepted, and good progress has been made on sustainable development metrics; yet the implementation of sustainable development has been largely unsuccessful. The world has made little progress in implementing programs and policies to improve the lives of the poor (Moyo, 2009), and the integration of the three pillars of economic development, social development, and environmental improvements remains a challenge. Sustainable development is not easy and will take considerable time and effort. Many of the

consensus-driven UN summits have resulted in broad documents, policies, and goals; and the action plans tend to be “sprawling documents that offer something for everyone” (Victor, 2006). Hodas (2010) notes that high-level international meetings—such as under the CSD and UNFCCC—“avoid concrete discussion about how to shift to a more sustainable, low carbon world economy” and “international talks increasingly become disconnected from real-world policy.” Efforts to implement sustainable development have taken place in an environment of mainstream economic planning and market-based investment, in a manner that will not disrupt overall growth. As such, implementation has not moved beyond slow incremental steps to transformative action. The WBCSD argued that there is a lack of leadership and each sector waits on the others, limiting real progress toward sustainable development. They note that “politicians tend not to run for office on promises of making the price of goods reflect their real (higher) costs for the sake of sustainable development; consumers tend not to demand to pay such higher costs; business tends not to lobby lawmakers for higher prices (Holliday, Schmidheiny and Watts, 2002). Some developing countries argue that lack of financial and technological resources, and unfair terms of trade have plagued their implementation of sustainable development. Many poor people and poor countries do not have adequate access to technology, lacking the resources, infrastructure, quality of governance, and business environment necessary to stimulate sustainable development (Economic Commission for Africa, 2002). While national governments have developed sustainable development strategies and plans, and local governments have been involved in initiatives, these actions have not led to fundamental changes. Chasek, Downie and Brown (2010) report that few countries have lived up to their Rio commitments, stating that National Agenda 21 efforts led to “increased academic debate, heightened public awareness and minor adjustments in the system of national accounts and taxation rules, but they have not fundamentally altered the way we manage and measure our national economy.” Part of the reason for the lack of implementation is that actions have tended to emphasize the symptoms of environmental degradation and not the underlying source of the problem. Jim MacNeill (2007), former Secretary General of the Brundtland Commission, asserted that we are still struggling with an issue raised in the Brundtland report: the institutions and policies we put in place to address sustainable development issues were “not only weak but they had been directed one way or another to tackle the symptoms of environmental degradation and to ignore its sources. The sources, of course, are to be found in government (and corporate)

fiscal, tax, budget, trade, energy, agriculture and other policies and in the values underlying them.” Government has not taken down the silos between departments to find the complex, integrated answers.

Development concepts

Rural development can be defined as a process of multi dimensional change affecting rural systems (Polidori and Romano, 1996). Economic growth, improvement of social conditions, and conservation of natural values are all equally important features in sustainable rural development, which should be induced according to a bottom-up approach, through a participated and sustainable use of Local endogenous resources (environment, labor force, and knowledge, patterns of production, consumption, and communication). Sustainable rural communities should be able to recognize and internalize exogenous chances of growth, i.e. markets, policies, and technology opportunities, properly integrating and balancing them with the need to preserve and enhance rural specificities and diversity (Long and Van der Ploeg, 1994). Farmers and rural people are thus assigned an active role and identified as primary economic and social actors in the determination of their development options, in the control over the development process and in the retention of the benefits. The meaning of sustainability for agriculture and rural development contains three widely recognized dimensions: environment, economy, and society. In more detail, the main environmental dimension includes: (1) utilization of natural capital, such as soil (land), water, and mineral resources, so that their use is reproducible over succeeding generations; (2) the improvement of biodiversity; and (3) recycling of wastes and nutrients that does not cause pollution of the biosphere, especially water resources. In the economic dimension, emphasis is given to maintaining agricultural raw materials and services to the nonfarm population by means that provide satisfactory economic returns to land, labor, and capital, even though the definition of satisfactory is contested and is socially and politically determined. The maintenance of economically viable employment opportunities is extended to other nonfarm, land-based industries (e.g., forestry, mineral extraction, and fishing), manufacturing, and services (e.g., tourism) located in rural regions. With regard to the social dimension, sustainable development includes the long-term retention of an optimum level of population, the maintenance of an acceptable quality of life, the equitable distribution of material benefits from economic growth, and the building of capacity in the community to participate in the development process, including the use of knowledge to create new choices and options over

time. In the promotion of sustainable agriculture and rural development, these interrelated environmental, economic, and social dimensions are pursued simultaneously rather than separately; the latter conform to conventional agriculture and rural development approaches. (EOLSS). The nongovernmental organizations and the rural development in North Kordofan State lies between latitudes 27-32 N and longitudes 12-10 and 16-35 E. It occupies about 190,480 km²; the population is estimated on 31 December 2003 to be 1,554,000 persons. Livestock populations according to 2003 statistic are about 7,302,230 heads including camels, cattle, sheep and goats. The state is considered to be one of the world leading regions for producing and exporting Gum Arabic and agricultural products as well as animal resources (Abbo, 2002).

The lands of North Kordofan are estimated to be 380,000 km² of which approximately 53 million feddan is good for agriculture and forestry. The main problems facing agriculture in state are the unfortunate climate and the low rainfalls. The soils in generally are soil in the northern parts of the state interested with some clay soil and the valleys and oasis; the central parts of the state are clayed Pedi plains to clay plains. In the southern parts of it, soils are moderately fertile but are good for the majority of the dry lands crops. The main crops grown in the state according to the availability of water are millet, sorghum, sesame, groundnuts, watermelons and Roselle. Sometimes field crops are mixed with some local variety of beans. The nongovernmental organization active in North Kordofan State were, WFP, SCF, UNDP, WHO, PLAN SUDAN, International Islamic Relive, Islamic Relive, and more than 38 national organizations also were operating in the state. The Islamic Relive Rounded the world is a humanitarian nongovernmental organization, founded in 1984, in the united kingdom, and has the consultancy membership in NU Social and Economic Committee, the organization aimed to enhances communities, through integrated development empowerment of livelihood, and social equity, the organization active in drinking water projects, education, health, and community capacity building, it covered 400 villages through donated funds. Plan Sudan International Organization was an international charity humanitarian organization concerning in children, was established in Spain civil war in 1937, started its operations in 1977 in Sudan, its activities were in 19 communities in Sheikan locality.

METHODOLOGY:

The study used household questionnaire for primary data collection, simple random sample of 192 household were selected out from total number of 960 households, during the year 2016, representing 20%.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

Table (1) health situation after the organizations intervention, far better 76.3% and better 22.1%.

Table (1) Health Situation after Organizations Intervention

situation	Frequent	Percentage
far better	145	76,3
better	42	22,1
no deference	3	1,6

Field survey, 2016.

Table (2) descried basic education situation after the organization intervention, where 53.2% were far better, 43.2% better, and 3.2% were no difference.

Table (2) basic education situation after organization intervention

situation	Frequent	percentage
Far better	101	53.2
better	82	43.2
No deference	7	3.6

Field survey, 2016.

Table(3) revealed that human and animal drinking water availability was far better by 86.8% ,12.7% situation was better, 0.5% were responded no difference.

Table (3) human and animal drinking water availability situation after organization intervention

situation	Frequent	Percentage
Far better	165	86,8
Better	24	12,7
No deference	1	0,5

Field survey, 2016.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The study concluded that the interventions effects study area played a positive role in the developmental process in the fields of health, basic education situation and availability of drinking water for both human and livestock by 98.4, 96.4 and 99.9% for each respectively. 95.8% of the total targeted households were satisfied with the type of services (health, education and water) in Sheikan locality demonstrating that organizations had succeeded in providing services(health, education and water) and better livelihood.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Planning of rural development projects should be in the coherent with comprehensive development as general national strategy.
2. The international nongovernmental organizations participation in rural development is essential and make deference in the development process in study area, authorities have to pre intervention plans and targets for such cases.

REFERENCES:

ADSEO, Baseline, 1999

Chasek, Pamela, David Downie and Janet Welsh Brown, 2010. Global Environmental Politics, fifth edition. Boulder: Westview Press.

EUROPE (Regional Sustainable Development Review) - Promoting Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development - I.R. Bowler ©Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems (EOLSS)

Hodas, David, 2010. International Law and Sustainable Energy: A Portrait of Failure. Widener Law School Legal Studies Research Paper, No. 10-21.

- Holliday, Charles O., Stephan Schmidheiny and Philip Watts, 2002. *Walking the Talk: The Business Case for Sustainable Development*. SanFranciso: Berrett-K.
- Humanitarian Aid Commission, 2016 Annual Report.
- Ibrahim Ryhan, et al.2001. *Rural Development Faculty of Agriculture Eyn Shems University, Egypt*.
- International Islamic Relive Round The World, 2016, Annual Report , Kordofan State Branch.
- Khor, Martin, 1997. *Effects of Globalization on Sustainable Development after UNCED*. Penang: Third World Network.
- Kirwin, Joe, 2004. *Rio Two Years On: A Strong Reaction*. Accessed at: [ttp://jaygary.com/agenda21.shtm](http://jaygary.com/agenda21.shtm)
- Mohamed Auad Gelal Addin 1970, *some issues of population and Development in the third world, Khartoum University*.
- Moyo, Dambisa, 2009. *Dead Aid: Why Aid is Not Working and How there is a Better Way for Africa*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- North Kordofan State General Secretary 2015 Annual Report, Statistic and Information Department.
- Operational – Community Development fund project (CDF)-Khartoum -2007- page 2*
- Polidori, R. and D. Romano (1996) *Agricoltura e sviluppo, dattiloscritto, lavori preparatori di 'Agricola 96' Conferenza Provinciale dell'Agricoltura, Firenze 18 novembre*.
- Runnalls, David, "Our Common Inaction: Meeting the Call for Institutional Change." *Environment Magazine*, 50 (6), pp. 19-28
- Sheikan Locality 2016, Information Center print*.
- Victor, David G., 2006. "Recovering Sustainable Development." *Foreign Affairs*. January/February. Accessed at: <http://greeneconomics.blogspot.com/2006/06/thoughts-on-sustainable-development.html>.